I. Introduction

John Ernest Steinbeck (1902-19 68), American novelist, born in California, took his native state as the background for his early short stories and novels and described the lives of those working on the land with realism and understanding. *Tortilla Flat* (1935) was his first success, and he confirmed his growing reputation with two novels about landless rural workers, *In Dubious Battle* (1936) and *Of Mice and Men* (1937), the story of two itinerant farm laborers, one of huge strength and weak mind, exploited and protected by the other. His best-known work, *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939), is an epic account of the efforts of an emigrant farming family from the dust bowl of the West to reach the 'promised land' of California. Among his later novels, which are often marred by sentimentality and uncertainty of purpose, are *East of Eden* (1952), a family saga, and *The Winter of our Discontent* (1961). He was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1962, by which time his reputation had already declined in his own country.

Steinbeck is distinguished for his lucid prose, engaging naturalistic descriptions, forceful symbolism, and the examination of the myth of America as Edenic paradise. Sympathetic to the plight of the impoverished and downtrodden, his Depression-era fiction offers poignant depiction of socioeconomic conditions and human realities in the American West during the 1930s. Though controversial for the overt socialist views evinced in much of his work, he continues to receive critical acclaim for his best selling novels, several of which were adapted into successful motion pictures and plays. The distinctly American perspective and journalistic realism of Steinbeck's social protest novels struck an emotional chord with the reading public and exerted an important influence on contemporary literature.

Steinbeck was not only prolific; he also had as a wild range of talent as any writer America had produced. The novels themselves varied widely in theme and style. But there was much more than the novels. Steinbeck had also written some excellent short stories, especially those that make up *The Long Valley*, and there was a number of nonfiction books, like *The Sea of Cortez*, which tells of a scientific expedition to the Gulf of California, and *Travels with Curley*, which describes a trip made with a poodle in a camping truck to the four corners to the United States, "in search of America" (582).

Steinbeck also did an extensive amount of writing for newspapers and magazines, and he wrote plays and films as well. The plays were more or less adopted from novels (*The Moon Is Down* and *Of Mice and Men* were two of the most successful). Many of the films were adaptations too, but in this media there were also original works such as *The Forgotten Village*; *Lifeboat*, which was directed by Alfred Hitchcock; and *Viva Zapata*, which is starred by Marlon Brando.

It will obviously not be very easy to make many generalizations on the career as long and varied as Steinbeck's, but it is certainly safe to say that much of that career was deeply affected and colored by the author's early life in and around Salinas, California. Not only did the area provide him with a setting for much of his best work, but it also gave him a deep respect for nature, for simple living, and for natural people.

After graduating from Salinas High School, Steinbeck enrolled as an English major at Stanford University. He took many writing courses and also electives in science, but he did not graduate. Having already decided that he wanted to be a writer, he left the collage in 1925 for New York, where the publishers were. His first job, however, left him no time for seeking publishers, no time for anything but eating and

sleeping. He wheeled cement, seven days a week, for the construction of Madison Square Garden. His next job as a reporter for the *New York American*, was somewhat less consuming of his physical energies, but he was even less well prepared for it than he had been for wheeling cement, and he was soon fired. None of his fiction sold either, and he returned to California as a deck hand on a ship, a very disappointed young man.

But he wanted to be a writer, and for the next several years he remained in California, pouring all the energy he could into his fiction. Even the commercial failure of his first three novels- *Cup of Gold* (1929), *The Pastures of Heaven* (1932), and *To a God Unknown* (1933)-did not turn him away from his goal. The fourth novel was *Tortilla Flat* (1935). It is a humorous celebration of poor but spirited everyday folk, the book had great appeal to a reading public still suffering the effects of the Great Depression. It appeared on best-seller lists for months and won an award for the best novel by a Californian. With *Tortilla Flat*, Steinbeck's career as a popular writer had begun.

But unlike many writers who follow up their successes with more books in the same vain, Steinbeck refused to be typed. Next he published *In Dubious Battle*, a serious novel about the role of Communist agitators in an agricultural laborer's strike. In theme, in style, in tone, it is markedly different from anything Steinbeck had previously written. It is a good novel, however, in which to see some of the author's most characteristic attitudes. His next two novels represent him at the height of both his power and his popularity. The first of them, *Of Mice and Men* (1937), was an immediate success, and in its play version won the 'Drama Critics' Circle Award. The second novel, which won the Pulitzer Prize, was *The Grapes of Wrath* (1939). It has been aptly described as nothing less than a national event. It was banned, it was

burned, and it was debated over national radio and criticized on the floor of Congress. And it was the number one best seller in 1939 and remained among the top ten books in the following year. Both books may be classified as a social protest literature, for both are concerned with the explanation of migrant workers. But looking at the novels today, we can see that they are much more than criticisms of social conditions of their day.

Not long after the publication of *The Grapes of Wrath*, it became apparent that a much larger cause than the exploitation of migrant workers was going to have to occupy the center of Steinbeck's attention, as well as the attention of all other Americans who cared about democracy. Steinbeck also participated in World War II in several ways. Perhaps the most direct contribution was the book-movie *Bombs Away*, which told the story of "the kind of quality of our [American] Air Force, of the caliber of its men and of the excellence of its equipments" (584). In addition, Steinbeck gained some firsthand experience of the war. Becoming a correspondent for the New York *Herald Tribune*, he spent a good part of 1943 abroad, writing articles from England and North Africa. Years later, his war dispatches were published in a book, *Once There Was a War* (1958).

Finally, there was the "war novel" *The Moon Is Down* (1942), written as a result of conversations Steinbeck had with a colonel in the office of Strategic Services. The novel is said to have been very popular among those involved in resistance movements in Nazi-occupied countries, and the king of Norway decorated Steinbeck for its contribution to the resistance.

Like many sensitive persons, Steinbeck detested most of what he saw when he was directly involved in the war, and that feeling perhaps played a major role in his next three novels- *In Cannery Row* (1944), *The Pearl* (1945), and *The Wayward Bus*

(1947): though none of them is directly about war, all show a strong distaste for what might be regarded as typical persons or practices of our [American] civilization (585). His philosophic epic, *East of Eden* (1952), is most important of the five novels published in the fifties and sixties. His last work of fiction is *The Winter of Our Discontent*, a study of the corrupt moral climate of modern America, a novel, which is neither optimistic nor very successful. Steinbeck was a man who insisted that one should see not what one wishes or what one expects, but what is.

The title *Of Mice and Men* comes from the Robert Burns' poem "To a Mouse", whose theme is that the best-made plans of mice and men often go awry. The novel describes how the dream of two migrant workers, George and Lennie, for a house and a little plot of ground is destroyed. The social structure can be blamed, in part, for the tragedy, for it should not be as difficult as it is for the workers to raise the money they need. But the tragedy is even more directly brought on by the strong but mindless Lennie, who unintentionally kills the things he loves. The relationship between Lennie, the animal side of human nature, and George, the mental side, is forcefully portrayed in this novel, which the Nobel Prize Committee called a "masterpiece". There are many other minor characters that want to escape from the reality of their respective lives. Curley's wife wants to escape from the monotony created by the restriction that doesn't allow her to talk to anyone in the farm. She wants to be free to talk to everyone. Candy, an old man too wants to get freedom from the farm and own his own land so that he could work even after he will be kicked off by the farm-owner. George wants to get rid of Lennie so that he could have the stability in his job and enjoy his life better. Lennie, on the other hand tries to escape from George so that he could pet mice with his thumb while he works along, freely. This sense of freedom in all the characters proves that they want to escape from the

responsibility. However, the novel has a tragic end. Lennie and Curley's wife are killed and the rest are destined to continue their lives as before. None of the characters gets freedom.

Of Mice and Men, a timeless creation by John Steinbeck has stood the test of time and has established itself as one of the most successful literary works of the twentieth century. Its success not only rests on the element of story that represents the realistic lives of marginalized population inhabiting the lowest strata in the society, but also on the subtle and intricate maze of thoughts, dreams and desire that the poor often nurtures and sees them falling into pieces and turning into thin air. These thoughts and dreams often have good, realistic and justifiable base and reason, but often end in frustration because the society around the dreamer often doesn't want them to materialize either because it is too selfish to see human being elevating itself vertically upward to assure a position higher than what one's fortune has granted itself, or because, the dominant factors in the society often feel itself threatened by the progress of others, who may minimize its dominance and hegemony. Sometime, and very often, ones internal instincts and psychologies too influence ones dream and if they have a weak base, result into shattering of these dreams, like things that fall apart when center cannot hold.

In *Of Mice and Men*, the dream has often been observed as an implicit quest for freedom, not only external and superficial, but internal, psychological and freedom of life and existence. These quests, many at the same time, have often taken their courses in their own accord, and all, like a single dream, have come to a frustrating collapse at the end, with no dominant character in the novel attaining his success. The quest is very dominant and reasonable, but the outcome is hopeless. The present study

seeks to find psychological causes, which have some bearing with the dream that have been deferred and, abysmally ended with a humiliating and bitter defeat.

George the protagonist, and Lennie, his all time friend, carry the artistic mastery of the author at psychoanalytical level. This thriller that chronicles the tale of two rootless and homeless men, who have nothing but each other, has received a wide appreciation and criticism from the very time of its publication. The book blurb reads it as the chronicle of “two timeless characters, [who] desperately long for some kind of home- a root that they can believe in, land that they can care for and the painful search for self.” Robert Carlson reads it as a novel underscoring "the dream of two migrant workers, George and Lennie, for a house and a little plot of ground."This dream meets a failure, mainly because of strong but mindless Lennie (584).

The Book Blurb in Bantam 1965 reads it as an "evocative, beautifully rendered portraits of 'outsiders' struggling to understand their own unique places in the world" (1). In a sample response collected by G. Smith, almost all responses have identified dream and its shattering as the main theme of the novel. A comment in its reads:

> The dream is the engine of the plot. The dream of actually owning a farm with chickens, rabbits and the alfalfa patch has an endearing, narrative quality.. . . The dream appeals to them both, it would close their endless drifting, it gives them hope in their work and lives, and is not too fantastic for such itinerant workers (1).

Papp Carrington has identified Lennie's weakness and reads him as under:

> Steinbeck's Lennie is similarly obsessed with stroking soft things: mice, rabbits, and new born puppies, pieces of velvet, and women's hair and clothes... The sensuality of Lennie's petting is emphasized by

> Curley sharing his obsession... [H]is petting is often so violent that he inadvertently kills the animals he strokes and that a girl whose dress he fondled accuse[s] him of rape. When Curley'wife unsuspectingly invites him to stroke her soft hair, Lennie is ecstatic, but when she begins to struggle against him, he panics, accidentally breaks her neck, and tries to bury her. After George sees what Lennie has done, he laments, "I should of knew," and, to prevent Curley from lynching Lennie, shoots him himself. (1)

Thus, almost all critics have seen the novel as a depiction of failure, either of dreams or of lives. But, none of these criticisms has accepted George and Lennie as two but one entity, manifesting simultaneously or in succession. Our study seeks to establish them as complementary parts of the same individual; one the intellectual part and one the animal part, the two parts which are present in all human beings in different degree, and one is eclipsed by the other's prominence.

II. Psychoanalysis

Psychoanalysis accepts literature as an expression of the writer's state of mind and the dreams that pop in and out of it from time to time, seeking fruition. A work of literature is correlated with its author's distinctive mental and emotional traits. Some refer to the author's personality in order to explain and interpret a literary work, while some other refer to the work in order to establish biographical, the personality of the author.

Since the 1920s, a very widespread psychological type of literary criticisms has come to be psychoanalytical criticism, whose premises and procedures were established by Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). Freud had developed the dynamic form of psychology that he called psychoanalysis as a means of therapy for neuroses, but soon expanded it to account for many developments in the history of civilization, including warfare, mythology and religions, as well as literature and other arts. The theoretical framework of the classical psychoanalysis lies in Freud's own terminal claim in the twenty-third lecture of his *Introduction to Psychoanalysis*:

> Literature and the other arts, like dreams and neurotic symptoms, consist of the imagined, or fantasized, fulfillment of wishes that are either denied by reality or are prohibited by the social standards of morality and propriety. The forbidden, mainly sexual wishes come into conflict with, and are repressed by the censor into the unconscious realms of the artist's mind but are permitted by the censor to achieve a fantasized satisfaction in distorted forms, which serve to disguise their real motives and objects from the conscious mind.

The foundation of Frued's contribution to modern psychology is his emphasis on the unconscious aspects of the human psyche. A brilliant creative genius, Freud

provided convincing evidence, through his many carefully recorded case studies, that most of our actions are motivated by psychological forces over which we have very limited control. He demonstrated that, like the iceberg, the human mind is structured so that its great weight and density lie beneath the surface. In "The Anatomy of the Mental Personality," Freud discriminates between the levels of conscious and unconscious mental activity:

> The oldest and the best meaning of the word "unconscious" is the descriptive one ; we call "unconscious " any mental process the existence of which are obligated to assume –because for instance, we infer it in some way from its effects—but of which we are not directly aware. […] if we want to be more accurate, we should modify the statement by saying that we call a process "unconscious" when we have to assume that it was active at a certain time, although at a time we knew nothing about it. (99-100)

Freud further emphasizes the importance of the unconscious by pointing out that even the "most conscious processes are conscious for a short period; quite soon they become latent, though they can easily become conscious again" (100). In view of this Freud defines two kinds of unconscious:

> One which is transformed into conscious material easily and under conditions which frequently arise and another in a case of which such a transformation is difficult can only come about with a considerable expenditure of energy or may never occur at all. […] We call the unconscious which is only latent, and so can easily become conscious, the "preconscious" and keep the name "unconscious" for the other. (101)

The most of the individual's mental processes are unconscious, is thus Freud's first major premise. The second is that all human behavior is motivated ultimately by what we would call sexuality. Freud designates the prime psychic force as libido, or sexual energy. His third major premise is that because of the powerful social taboos attached to certain sexual impulses, many of our desires and memories are repressed.

Starting from these premises we may examine several corollaries of Freudian theory. Principal among these is Freud's assignment of the mental processes to three psychic zones: the id, the ego, and the superego. It reveals immediately the vast portion of the mental apparatus that is not conscious. Furthermore, it helps to clarify the relations between ego, id, and superego, as well as their collective relationship to the conscious and the unconscious. We should note that the id is entirely unconscious and that only small portion of the ego and superego are conscious. With this, we may define the nature and functions of these three psychic zones.

The working of the human psyche, as many theorist have accepted is a complex and confusing process, to explore which in a wholes is next to impossible. However, Freud's categorical polemics about the fundamental nature of man's psychological domains, in spite of being intricately complex, do have some grains in them as an entity that can not only be studied and explored within the limited purview of experimental verifications, but also can be generalized for universal utility, although with exceptions here and there. Freud's strong and authoritative clarity of the claim that man's activity in totality is the libidinal energy transformed, has been attested by many who followed him. M. H. Abrams has made the following observation in this regard:

> Freud also asserts, [. . .] that artists posses special abilities that differentiate them radically from the patently neurotic personality. The

> artistic person for example, possesses to and specially high degree the power to sublimate the ability to elaborate, fantasized wish fulfillments into the manifest features of a work of art in a way that conceals or deletes their merely personal elements and so makes them capable of satisfying the unconscious desires of people other than the individual artist; and the "puzzling" ability –which Freud else says is a power of "genius" that psychoanalysis cannot explain. (Glossary, 249)

In fact, what Freud claims to be true for artist is also equally true for the non-artist; only that it varies in the magnitude of transformation and sublimation. In this cases, unlike in the case of an artist, the transformation appears in a from, not of art, but of psychosocially governed activities that very often are fragmented, and hence we tend to see them as problems.

The id is the reservoir of libido, the primary source of all psychic energy. It functions to fulfill the primordial life principle, which Freud considers to be the pleasure principle. Without consciousness or semblance of rational order, the id is characterized a tremendous and amorphous vitality. Speaking metaphorically, Freud explains this "obscured, inaccessible part of our personality" as "a chaos, a cauldron of seething excitement [with] no organization and no unified will, only an impulsion to obtain satisfaction to the instinctual needs, in accordance with the pleasure principle. (103-04). He further stresses that the "laws of logic—above all, the law of contradiction—do not hold for processes of the id. Contradictory impulses exist side by side without neutralizing of drawing apart. […] Naturally, the id knows no values, no good and evil, no morality "(105-5).

The id is, in short, the source of all our aggressions and desires. It is lawless, asocial and amoral. Its function is to gratify our instincts for pleasure without regard

for social conventions, legal ethics or moral restraints. Unchecked id would lead us to any length—to destruction and even self-destruction—to satisfy its impulses for pleasure. Safely for the self and for others doesn’t lie within the province of the id; its concern is purely for instinctual gratification, heedless of consequences. For centuries before Freud this force was recognized in human nature but often attributed to supernatural and external, rather than natural and internal forces: the id as defined by Freud is identical in many respects to the Devil as defined by theologians. Thus there is a certain psychological validity in the old saying that a rambunctious child is "full of the devil". We may also see in young children (and neurotic adults), certain uncontrolled impulses towards pleasure that often lead to excessive self-indulgence and even to self-injury.

In view of id's dangerous potentialities, it is necessary that other psychic agencies protect the individual and society. The first of these regulating agencies, that which protects the individual, is the ego. This is the rational governing agent of the psyche. Though the ego lacks the strong vitality of the id, it regulates the instinctual drives of the id so that they may be released in non-destructive behavioral patterns. And though a large portion of the ego is unconscious, the ego nevertheless comprises what we ordinarily think of as the conscious mind. As Freud points out in "The Dissection of the Physical Personality," " To adopt a popular mode of speaking, we might say that the ego stands for reason and good sense while id stands for the untamed passions " (76). Whereas the id is governed solely by the pleasure principal, the ego is governed by the reality principle. Consequently, the ego serves as intermediary between the world within and the world without.

The other regulating agent that which primarily functions to protect society is the superego. Largely unconscious, the superego is the moral censoring agency, the

repository of conscience and pride. It is, Freud says in "The Anatomy of the Mental Personality" the " representative of all moral restrictions , the advocate of the impulse towards perfection, in short it is as much as we have been able to apprehend psychologically of what people call the "higher" things in human life" (95). Acting either directly or through the ego, the superego serves to repress or inhibit the drives of the id, to block off the thrust back into the unconscious those impulse towards pleasure the society regards as unacceptable, such as overt aggression, sexual passions and the Oedipal instinct. Freud attributes the development of the superego to the parental influence that manifest itself in terms of punishment for what society considers to be bad behavior and reward for what society considers good behavior. An overactive superego creates an unconscious sense of guilt. Whereas the id is dominated by the pleasure principle and the ego by the reality principle, the superego is dominated by the morality principle. We might say that id would make us devils, which the superego would have, us behave as angels and that it remains for the ego to keep us healthy human beings by maintaining a balance between these two opposing forces. It was this balance that Freud advocated –not a complete removal of the inhibiting factors.

Man in totality is an admixture of these psychotic forces that are in a constant state of collision for prominence. One can never nullify the other, but can minimize its manifestation. The one that is more dominant gets expressed while the one that becomes recessive waits for the dominant to numb so that it can express itself.

This is a proven fact and psychoanalysis in fiction supports this assertion. Psychoanalysis, that initially belonged to the domain of medical science slowly slipped into literature and got woven into language so deep that it became a very dominant in literature. With Lacan’s linguistic model of the human psyche, the scope

of psychoanalysis in fiction got broadened. It made the analysis of a fiction in terms of language and action, which is used to constitute the fiction, and also the language and action prescribed for the characters to speak and enact. Through the language and action, the critic can penetrate between the ‘conscious’ and ‘unconscious’ aspects of the characters or the fiction as a whole. This dimension was ignored by the critics of the past.

Lacan's smartness also lies in the fact that he revised some of the most fundamental beliefs and explanations of Freud regarding the multiple characteristics of human psyche, whose apparent result in the form of human behavior, mainly the psychosexual behavior becomes an identity of the individual at least till the time, a more potent and higher psychological level is attained by the individual. The state under discussion is a state of incompleteness, or of the need of a supplement, in absence of which, and individual is psychologically almost crippled. Lacan's observation in this regard is a vindication of the assertion:

> In Lacan's view, lack is intrinsic to subjectivity because subjectivity is built on a gap between an experience of fragmentation and an image of wholeness. Humans pursue wholeness by pursuing an endless stream of supplements makes themselves complete. While this can seem tragic, it also encourages us to get tons of stuff done as we pursue integration. (Hedges, 1)

It is obvious that psychoanalytical criticism has come a long way since influenced and persuaded by Sigmund Freud, the literary critics brought it to literature as an interpretative tool.

In the world of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud is honored as ‘The Father of Psychoanalysis’. He is equally regarded in the world of texts. His theory of

unconscious is the invaluable gift to the literary world in the sense that it has opened up the doors for the psychoanalysis to prove its worth as one of the most applied critical tools in the interpretation of literary texts. According to him human psyche is divided in the territories of conscious and unconscious. Since 1900, with the publication of his *The Interpretation of Dreams*, psychoanalysis has become an autonomous discipline. With the same publication, it has created its autonomous status within the critical schools of thought. The most significant aspect of his theory, that serves as the critical tool is the systematic study of the non-rational processes that emerge from the 'kingdom of unconscious' inherent in the depth of human psyche.

This unconscious process produces art and literature. According to Freud, there are three facets of human psychology. One part of the psyche is rational which is conscious, and the other part is irrational which is termed as unconscious. Conscious part of the psyche copes with the cultural laws, norms and values that enable an individual to maintain his presence in the society. Unconscious part, on the other hand is constituted of repressed desires that strive for revelation.

This concept of 'conscious' and 'unconscious' motivated some critics and scholars of the past and some of the present as well to explore the mind of the author and conclude the text with a final meaning. In this model of interpretation, the language of the text remains significant only if it could explore the world of the author's mind. As a result, the criticism presented in this light remains inclined more to produce the biography of the author's psyche including author's personal life. Earnest Jone's interpretation of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* can be taken as one of the earliest examples of such type of criticism. His attempt in this critical text seems prone more to psychoanalyze the author's mind rather than to give emphasis to the text itself. Another prominent critic of the past who vividly exemplifies this type of

author-oriented trend was Mary Bonapart. She considers the characters in Edgar Ellen Poe's stories as internalized images, which, according to her, are the result of past experience, and she relates those images with author's psyche, and authoritatively declares that the story is the product of Poe's repressed libidinal desires for his mother. This trend of criticism definitely undermines the power of the text, and the language that constitutes it.

Although, with the passing time, we find improvements in the application of Freud's psychoanalysis to literature, many later generations of critics have considerably dealt with the plot, characters, action, setting, dialogues and other elements of fiction. Even then, their criticism does not seem free of attempting to derive the final meaning through the author's psyche.

For this type of criticism, certain character or characters in the fiction become author's representative, who paves way to the interpreter to penetrate into the author's psyche. This type of criticism neglects the texts existence, and emphasizes reference to the writer's personal life. It limits the scope of the text. There is no doubt that the writer is involved in the text, but not as the representative of his or her personal life; nor the author is the site of the final meaning. In fiction, he or she is involved only through language.

This traditional trend of meddling with the writer's psyche in the fictional world, in turn, diverted to the readers psyche. One of the most prominent and powerful critics who followed this trend was Norman Holland. His method of the criticism can be taken as an improvement to the earlier versions of psychoanalytical criticism. The improvement on his part is that he shifted the emphasis from author to reader. His observation of the text rest upon "what goes between the reader and text" (Jafferson 149).

For him, the pleasure of the text originates from reader's unconscious while studying literature. He asserts that when a reader reads a text, his unconscious wishes and fears transform into culturally acceptable meaning. In other words, reader's unconscious mind makes its way into his mind in the form of conscious and he gets pleasure out of the text. Even in this aspect, he does not exclude author's psyche in the production of meaning. Rather he finds text as "the scene of a collision between author and reader" (Jaffersen 149).

Holland's method of criticism is not much different from the way Freud himself adopted it in his criticism on Shakespeare's *Hamlet.* On behalf of reader he says:

> [P]sychological drama turns into psychopathological drama when the source of the suffering in which we take part and from which we are meant to derive pleasure is no longer a conflict between two almost equally conscious impulse and a repressed one. Here the precondition of enjoyment is that the spectator should himself be a neurotic, for it is only such people who can derive pleasure instead of simple aversion from the revelation and the more or less conscious recognition of a repressed impulse. If any one who is not neurotic, this recognition will meet only with aversion and will call up a readiness to repeat the act of repression which has earlier been successfully brought to bear on the impulse (Frued 226).

In this light, earlier critics found it much comfortable to interpret literature applying Freudian psychoanalysis. The reason for their feeling comfortable was their concept of the possibility of deriving final meaning out of the text. These types of approaches presuppose that psychoanalysis bears the power to reveal truth from the

text. It is not fair with psychoanalysis. This type of criticism came into vogue only because of the traditional notion that considered the author as the originator of meaning, thus the source of final meaning, and the language, a transparent medium.

Whether the application of psychoanalysis is made in a clinic for the treatment of a neurotic, or it is used to interpret a text, it is always involved in language. Involvement in language, according to post structuralist concept, is that "no meaning is sustained by anything other than reference to another meaning" (Lacan 83).

The interpretation of Freudian concept in terms of language, which is the contribution of French Philosopher and Psychoanalytic Jacques Lacan, provides a new aesthetics that the pre-Lacanian Fruedian Critics missed. "Lacan . . . did far more than extend Frued's theory of dreams, literature and the interpretation both. More significantly he took Freud's whole theory of psyche and added to it a crucial third term-that of language" (Smith 237).

Literature is not for value judgment or drawing final meaning. Once the final meaning is drawn the text is closed. The text is bound with the limitations of language. "We are forced to accept the notion of an incessant sliding of signified under the signifier" (Lodge 87). Language can at its utmost best give reference towards concept. It can never meet the signified. The task of the psychoanalytical critic is to observe the unconscious of a character or characters in the fiction through language of the fiction, and find out why and how it happened in the fictional world.

Julia Kristeva, a female psychoanalyst, is more vivid about 'the mother's language. Female language for her is, semiotic, a rhythmic and unifying. Unlike symbolic male language, it does not possess rigidly opposing and ranking elements.

> According to Kristeva, Feminine and child language: " . . . is derived from the pre-oedipal period of fusion between mother and child.

> Associated with the maternal feminine language is . . . threatening to culture (qtd. in Homans 332)."

A theory can have many ramifications and adventitious implications. From thoughts and dreams, psychoanalysis has moved a long way to language and, and even more specifically to male of female language. Whatever be the number of podia it generates, the essence of psychoanalysis lies in its basic thrusts propounded by Freud. Psychoanalysis for our purpose here is the analysis of the collective manifestation of id, ego and superego simultaneously or in turn, which after all is a universal human reality. This will be our guiding force to move ahead with the project at hand.

III. Exploration of Two Aspects of an Individual: A Psychological Reading

George and His Intellect

Few readers of Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men* have shown their benevolence and sympathetic profundity in recognizing and appreciating George, a poor helpless and homeless farm laborer as a great intellectual force, that compliments and more mundane and "aint bright" part constituted by Lennie, his compliment (24). This is, in many cases so because the readers and the critics tend to weigh George in terms of Lennie, his friend who is not "much of a talker" (24). This tendency should be changed and George, for a respectable and continuous survival should get his rightful place and recognition as the intellectual part of an almost complete human being.

The description of the physical features and the body structure of George that the author presents in the very beginning of the novel hint that George is intellect represented. He is described as a man "small and quick [. . .] with restless eyes and sharp, strong features" (2). Every part of him is well defined. He has "small, strong hands, slender arms, a thin bony nose" (2). He looks very much like a human being, and the phrases "quick", "restless eyes", "sharp, strong features" predict intellectual actions and understanding from George which ultimately get vindicated through his actions in the novel (2).

George is ego and superego. He is society conscious, self-conscious and a good seer and a planner. Id can never be a seer, and can never calculate what might come many years ahead in future, unless it recedes to the back screen the ego or superego comes to the forefront. This visionary trait in George, like that of seer, gets testified when he shows a grove and tells Lennie to remember it as a hiding place for future, when one day, he may be in problem and may have to run away for life:

> "[…] Look. Lennie—if you jus' happen to get in trouble like you always done before, I want you to come right here an' hide in the brush. "
>
> "Hide in the brush," said Lennie slowly.
>
> "Hide in the brush till I come to you. Can you remember that?" (17)

This is intellectually smart from two angles. First, it is an analysis of the past as well. "[L]ike you always done before" is indicative of an experience that George documents in his brain as a watchword to more ahead. Only an intellectual mind can treasure the knowledge of the past on the pedestal of which he can make his future stand. The second angle is that he can see his future here. He is so sure that Lennie will "get in trouble" and at the end of novel we confirm that George is as sure as the oracle of Delphi (17).

The novel abounds in many more visionary traits of George. He knows, things would not move well in the ranch, and quite early they will have to move out of it. Readers do not have to wait for long to confirm Georges' predictions. What George tells Lennie one day is worth quoting: "We gotta keep [this place] till we get a stake. We'll get out jus' as soon as we can. I don't like it no better than you do" (36).

George is a seer no doubt. He is also a great troubleshooter, and a great help in need. He is a pure intellectual force and can use his intellect in time of need to deliver himself and others out of trouble. This is a highly social and philanthropic perspective of an individual's life and George manifests a volley of this trait. This is an action supported by ego and superego as the theory of psychoanalysis has established. Let's take up a case to verify the assertion. On their first day in the bunkhouse, the owner interviews George and Lennie. George knows that Lennie is a

muddle head and if he is allowed to speak of his own accord, he will put himself into difficulty. So George takes the pain to speak even for Lennie:

> "[. . .] What's your name?"
>
> "George Milton."
>
> "And what's yours?"
>
> George said, "His name's Lennie Small."
>
> The names were entered in the book. "Let's see this is the twentieth, noon the twentieth. " He closed the book. "Where you boys been working?"
>
> "Up around Weed, " said George.
>
> "You too?" to Lennie.
>
> "Yeah, him too, " said George. (24)

George is Lennie's liberator here, and but for his smart intellect, the latter would not get an entry into the ranch.

There are other occasions as well where George displays a wonderful resource of intellectual richness and visionary character. He is sensitively critical of their conditions and the reasons that surround them. He doesn’t blindly adhere to what people say, or what the time brings forth. He has deeply calculated reasons for whatever he does, and takes not only the present into account for taking decisions, he also goes back to the past and analyses the lapses in their lives that account for much of the failures. This analysis of the past, which generates a feeling akin to guilt in George is a characteristic of ego, one step above id, for id knows no guilt. Let us see in the following lines, how critically and realistically George analyzes their own situations:

> Guys like us that work on ranches, are the loneliest guys in the world. They got no family. They don't belong to no place. They come to a ranch an' work up a stake and then they go inta town and blow their stake, and the first thing you know they're poundin' their tail on some other ranch. They ain't got nothing to look ahead to. (15)

It is human nature that a critical analysis of the present and the past gives a vision of the future. This vision that enables man to foresee a future, sustained by hope is highly appreciative and is of higher order. This is also the secrecy of the sustenance of life on earth and continuation of human civilization. Lesson from the present, vision for future and hope to sustain the same is the essence of human civilization. In the light of this observation, George shows a great visionary faculty and the character of a seer, which befits the label of a great intellectual force to his name:

> We got a future. We got somebody to talk to that gives a damn about us. We don't have to sit in no bar room blowin' our jack jus' because we got no place else to go. If them other guys gets in jail they can rot for all anybody gives a damn. But not us. (15)

This is an observation that is not merely centrifugal; it also takes into account the comparable sample cases seen around him and a conclusion drawn from something like research. He takes example of "them other guys" who have reason to "rot" in jail, and hence his criticism of the situation elevates to the plane of a realistic social criticism. George is socially conscious and sensitive to situations around him. This is highly appreciative as a very authentic study report and a calculated conclusion. George deserves a salute for the same.

George's dream, which somehow fails at the end, is a detailed one. It looks like a vividly sketched national plan for a model village that might set up sometime in future. The blue print is so precise that one cannot help appreciating a planner in George. Talking to Lennie, he outlines the feature of their future house, which in the end fails, not because his plans have flaws, but because Lennie is too stupid to behave himself:

> [W]e'll have a big vegetable patch and a rabbit hutch and chickens. And when it rains in the water, 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. (16)

The description with photographic and the plan is like that of a seer. George proves beyond doubt that he has a prophet in him, an oracle, struggling for a path, or an environment, often hurdled by stupid Lennie, the embodiment of id. His dreams are yet so profound and confident that he believes the possibility of their accomplishment at any cost. The vividness of dreams is beyond comprehension to an ordinary reader's mind:

> An' we could have a few pigs. 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. An' when the salmon run up river we could catch a hundred of 'em an' salt 'em down or smoke 'em. We could have them for breakfast. (63)

There are more details to add here. An immediate analysis and comment is mandatory here. Planning in advance for a well-defined future is a visionary activities and highly intellectual work. No ordinary mind conceives a future that is yet to exist in reality and is completely comprehended in thoughts that too do not have concrete

existence. This is a transcendental pursuit and only blessed souls are capable of doing the same. These dreams of George are extraordinary from one more point of view. Dreams, to many dreamers are usual occurrence and they are more parallel with life, not as superimposed wave motions with it. But dreams in case of George are the basic guiding force of his life and that of Lennie, and they are gearing their lives for those dreams. They live and continue living because they have dreams and they live for those dreams. How sympathetic does George grow at this hour, with his dreams full of hope, accuracy, vision, statesmanship and mastery of planning, and how at the end they turn into thin air.

George is wonderfully creative. Creativity, as Freudian theory of psychoanalysis claims, is an upper level expression of internal desires. Creativity is possible only when man elevates himself above the plane of id and transcends to the level of ego or superego. That is an intellectual level and George has this. He creates situations that never ever occurred and he can weave cock and bull stories that show wonderful intellectual excellence. On their first day in the ranch, when they face the owner of the ranch the way George hides the reality concerning Lennie and the deception he creates to beguile the owner is worth analysis here. "He can do anything you tell him," he assures the ranch owner, and adds that he "is a good skinner." (24)

These are woven falsities, which only the readers can see through. George is highly successful in his fiction because his creativity is fenced from all the four sides with strongly logical and balanced arguments. About his friend, he displays an even smarter ingenuity: "He's my [. . .]cousin. I told his told lady I'd take care of him. He got kicked in the head by a horse when he was a kid. He's awright. Just ain't bright. But he can do anything you tell him" (25). In fact, Lennie is neither his cousin, nor is he kicked by a horse when he was a kid. George himself discloses to Lennie that this

was a lie that had been necessitated by Lennie's stupidity, which, if allowed to manifest, would have put both of them into trouble, and deprive them of job. The following exchange between the two can be quoted to prove this:

> "George."
>
> "What you want now?"
>
> "I wasn’t kicked in the head with no horse, was I George?"
>
> "Be a damn good thing if you was." Gorge said viciously. "Save every 'body a hell of a lot of trouble. "
>
> "You said I was your cousin, George."
>
> "That was a lie. An' I'm damn glad it was. If I was a relative of yours I'd shoot myself." (26).

One can easily appreciate the level of creativity the naïve-looking George has attained. We need to remove a preconceived notion of belittling George because he is ranch worker or because his project fails in the end. Not every project that fails at the end is fallacious and not every successful project need to be intellectually smart. George in the Freudian parameters is a shrewd, creative statesman.

There are reasons why George doesn’t allow Lennie to talk. He is a foreseer, a visionary. "So you wasn’t gonna say a word," he advises Lennie just before the interview," You was gonna leave your big flapper shut and leave me do the talkin'. Damn near lost us the job" (26). This gives a justifiable reason for George to virtually lock Lennie's "flapper."

As long as personal matters are concerned, man has a concealing tendency. So many times, the creative falsities that man resorts to form imminently personal reasons may be spontaneous. Man's true test of intellectual faculty lies in his response to social questions. A man, who can say no to something that the universal conscious

says no and yes to something to which the universal consciousness says yes is intellectually smart. George has a trait something like this. He is a bold social critic, and comments on issue which are social, although they may not necessarily concern him and his dumb stupid friend Lennie. To the old swamper's information that Curley, the son of the owner of the ranch is "keepin' that hand soft for his wife," George immediately remarks that that "is a dirty thing to tell around" (30). He is socially conscious and knows that a civilized social life doesn't allow taboos to intrude into decency. He dingdongs with the universal consciousness and, is highly civilized. This is a higher level realization that can be expected from learned people, who know many things about the society and its culture.

Reading man correctly is an issue with this mankind has always found itself in difficulty. Not every reading about man is correct, or gets vindicated at the end. Unless they are based on the repeated observation of the same trait in an individual one is never sure to make a statement always about somebody's nature or what he or she is likely to do. Man reading is a complex psychological process, and they are true in very very rare cases. Wonderfully George is as sure as an egg in his man reading. The remarks he makes on Curly are so true that every bit of the remark gets established in the end. As for example, he warns Lennie not to meddle with that rogue in the following words:

> Look Lennie! This here ain't set up. I'm scared. You gonna have trouble with that Curley guy. I seen that kind before. He was kinda feelin' you out. He figures he's got you scared and he's gonna take a sock at you the first chance he gets. (32)

And in the end, every bit of this remark comes true. Curly and his relation with Lennie directly or indirectly becomes a reason for them to dispense with the ranch and end their corporate life in death and frustration. This is truly smart of George!

George too is humane, and his humanity is profound. He is highly grateful to people who help in one-way or the other. Their contribution to him is documented in iron letters, and he is never ungrateful. He knows where to be sympathetic and where to show his gratefulness. Why he accepts Lennie in spite of knowing that he is practically an impossible case has a heart touching story. George is simple and great.

An incident in the past that occurred between the two proves the existence of profound human sympathy in George. One day a bunch of guys were standing around the Sacramento River. George was feeling "pretty smart." He turned to Lennie and said, "Jump in," and Lennie, without a word, jumps though he did not know how to swim. This innocence of Lennie really draws George so near to him that they are one, bound by steel bonds. (44). George observes the relation in the following words; "[He] made me seem God damn smart alongside of him" (44). Lenie's devotion to George's command is so much so that he would not mind risking his own life for the sake of his friend, and George knows this very well. He is prompt in recognizing and appreciating his friend; "He never got mad about [fun I made with him]. I've beat the hell outa him, and he coulda bust every bone me in my body jus' with his han's, but he never lifted a finger against me" (44). How sympathetic is George to Lennie and Lennie to George. Sympathy and gratefulness are highly human tendencies.

George has manifested the visionary traits and the characteristics of a seer many a time. He can sense the possible outcome and ramification of a situation in a wonderfully accurate and smart way that many learned man and so called prophets often fail to do. His predictions are so true that they appear that the incidents follow

those predictions and not that coincidences marry his predictions with the actual occurrence and this places George at a high plane of intellectual esteem. He deserves a salute in his prediction that Curley's wife would invite trouble to the ranch, and more specifically to his huge and dumb friend Lennie. His prediction is as sure as an egg is an egg, and comes true from every angle. To testify the same we can pick up the following lines from his conversation with the other workers in the ranch, with whom one day, he says as a visionary that Curley's wife would invite mess for everyone living there:

> She's Gonna make a mess. They's gonna be a bad mess about her. She's a jail bait all set on the trigger. That Curley got his work cut out for him. Ranch with a bunch of guys on it ain't no place for a girl, specially like her. (57)

This is important for two highly intellectual reasons. First, it shows how shrewd George is in making his predictions that have come true at the end. Secondly, he makes a social remark here. Ranch with a bunch of guys like them a girl hovering around with a mad youth would definitely invite untoward incidents. How accurately has George here identified the fundamental id of human being and the social blindness towards norms and rules it manifests here and there? Truly enough, it is id that comes into play between the girl and sensuous Lennie, that prepared the ground for the catastrophe, making the story end up in a tragedy which is highly regrettable.

This way George displays a high understanding of situations, human sentiments and presence of mind throughout his life lived together with Lennie. His understanding of humanity and his visionary traits show their mastery till the right end of the novel. He is a seer out and out, as his benevolence is reflected not only as a friend and lifesaver, but also as an elevator. Killing itself is a macabre experience, but

killing, married with liberation and salvation, is a highly superhuman ideal which George has reflected in the novel. At the end, when he knows that Lennie has no option left save accepting death, he tried to minimize the pain it brings along. The hooligans are all set to get him "lynched" for the crime of murdering Curley's wife (103). George can at once feel the helplessness that surrounds him and his friend. He knows, as a visionary sometimes knows, that Lennie has no way out. The only thing to contemplate at hand is how to minimize the pain of death. This is a highly humane feeling. The nature of killing itself shows how full of feelings are George's actions, and how pregnant with thoughts and contemplation. This final, and the most sensational scene from the novel, where George kills Lennie is worth quoting here:

> 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. The crash of the shot rolled up the hills and rolled. [. . .] George shivered and looked at the gun, and then he threw it from him, back up on the bank, near the pile of old ashes. (117)

This scene, I feel needs to be viewed from multiple angels. George is not merely a killer, like anyone else, who would only concentrate on the death of the prey. He is feeling of his victim as much as the victim is feeling for himself. Else, one sees no reason why George, who has opted killing, should shake "violently" and throw the gun from him, "back up on the bank, near the pile of old ashes." (117). This reflects his highly humane feeling, an understanding of the pain of others, and pain of death itself. He makes his gun steady and his face "set and his hand steadied" because, his reason knows that his shaking should not make him abort his plan to deliver Lennie out of

lynching, which would bring his way, untold pain before death. George has a heart full of mercy, and a mind full of love and understanding. This is a highly intellectual and human trait, and George has established its existence in him with no room for doubt.

Lennie and His Animalistic Behavior

Lennie, the "huge man, shapeless of face, with large, pale eyes with wide, sloping shoulders," is a man of animalistic nature, as the description itself suggests. (2). He is, as the blurb in Bantam edition reads, "an inarticulate, dumb, and sometimes violent in his need." His intellectual bankruptcy and his sensuousness I believe are the manifestation of id, that predominantly defines his mind and nature, and this makes him animalistic. He is totally and all the time guided by id and he sees no past and no consequences of his actions. He has not power of analysis, and like animals, resorts to violent actions to get his desires, basically gustatory and tactile, through any means. Reason never comes into play in whatever he does, and hence every time he does a new thing or speaks a new sentence, there are questions that can be raised, or there is George to question his hollowness of reason and logic.

Lennie is animalistic from every angle. His physical feature itself makes us feel that he is born with the nature inherently. He is a man with "wide shoulders and he walk[s] heavily, dragging his feet a little, the way a beat drags his paws" (2). The comparison with a bear is more than a simile here. This comparison gets attested many times in the novel from his actions, because the moment he sees his sensual preys – soft furry things, rabbit, pups and mice—he would fail to control himself and go and attack it like a grizzly that waits for no time to get its prey done with. His arm do not swing at his sides, "but hung loosely," as though his motor activities are non

voluntary or he sees no reason to balance them. They are loosely let, and this makes him look more like animals than a human being.

There are other physical features as well that hint that Lennie is less than a normal human being, and has certain inherent problems that make him appears more animalistic. The way he walks with George on their way north from Weed towards the ranch one evening, and the way he drinks river water, are worth citation here for discussion; "His[George's] huge companion dropped his blankets and flung himself down and drank with long gulps, snoring into the water like horse" (30). In spite of George's telling he "continue[es] to snort into the pool" (2). His feature is conceived like that of a horse, and he snorts. This is completely an animal's way of drinking water, and the action of Lennie gives the premonition that his actions would move in a similar direction. From every angle, he looks bestial when he "dip[s] his whole head under, hat and all and then [sits] up on the bank and his hat [dips] down on his blue coat and [runs] down his back" (3).

Actions that Lennie display in Goerge's presence are more imitations than creations and intuitions. He mimics, like animals, as his intellect doesn't suggest what is right for him to do. This is highly suggestive of the fact that his intellectual faculty and reasons are not highly developed and he is surely a dumb. Once, after drinking water, as George replaces his hat, pushed him back from the river, draws up his knees and embraces him, Lennie imitates George exactly; "Leenie, who had been watching, imitated George exactly" (4).

Lennie is so poor in his intellect that he cannot even remember where they are going and what mission guided them. Not to the talk of the past the yet undiscovered future, he is not even mindful of the present. On their way to the ranch, the exchanges they share between them hint towards this direction, and I want to quote it here:

> Leenie looked timidly over to him. "George?"
>
> "Yeah, what ya want?"
>
> "Where we going' George?"
>
> The little man jerked down the brim of his hat and scowled over at Lennie. "So you forgot that awready, did you? I gotta tall you again, do I? Jesus Christ, you're a crazy bastard." (4)

Indeed, Lennie here sounds like a crazy bastard. It is not a long time back that they talk about reaching the ranch and joining the duty. Only a short time has passed and Lennie's mind goes blank about the present. George tells again, and Lennie listens with his mouth wide open, not exactly comprehending what his shrewd man has got to say; "Might jus' as well spen' all my time tellin' you things and then you forget 'em, and I tell you again" (4).

The forgetting nature of Lennie itself is very wonderful. He cannot remember things if they do not conform to his naturally sensuous nature. If they do, he can remember them, and this he knows for himself as he tells George in answer to the charge he is charged with above: "Tried and tried, [. . .], but it didn't do no good. I remember about the rabbit, George" (5).

Besides forgetting, he has one more trait that makes him more animal like. He, in George's words, "can't think of nothing to do himself, but he sure can take orders" (43). "Just tell Lennie what to do an' he'll do it if it don't take no figuring," George adds, where by figuring, he means the use of brain or the intellect. (43).

Lennie's remembering rabbit has broader annotations. This is not merely his memory, but his psycho-sensual orientation. This is an obsession to be more precise, and all obsessions are id reflected in one way or the other. Uncontrolled obsessions get manifested in the form of insanity, and Lennie to a great extent is insane.

Some of the obsessions of Lennie are highly suggestive of insanity sprung out of desired aborted, or repressed. He is highly sensual, especially about touching soft and tender things with smooth fur. Every time he gets time he loved to temper with furry things, be it the skin of a mouse, a pup, rabbits or women with soft hair. His tactile obsessions uncontrolled, and his reasons pushed to the attic contribute to the evolution of the situations that bring forth the final catastrophe. The irony however lies in the fact that he is not conscious of the consequences it brings, or of the society that observes him. There is no sense of embarrassment, guilt or remorse in Lennie. He is totally blinded with the highly sensual force of the id predominant in him.

This fact can be proved from more than one situation from within the novel. In the very beginning, when George sends him to the jungle to gather woods to warm their food, he comes back with a dead mouse in his pocket. When George forsakes the same Lennie like a small child complains, "I don't know why I can't keep it. It ain't nobody's mouse. I didn't steal it. I found it lyin' right beside the road" (9). Both the reasons for keeping the mouse and the justification put forward are so innocent and devoid of force that Lennie stands as a dumb, sensual and insane human being. George knows Lennie more than anyone in the world, and he himself confirms the problems Lennie inherits when he scold him for keeping a filthy mouse inside his pocket: "Blubberin' like a baby! Jesus Christ! A big guy like you"(10). How easy is the "big guy" to console and divert also reminds us of children who would believe anything you say to divert their minds for the difficult and often impossible demand. For example, Leenie becomes at once thoughtful in visualizing a live mouse for himself when George says, "You get another mouse that's fresh and I'll let you keep it a little while" (10).

Poor Leenie! How innocents and child-like are his thoughts and how easily he is hoodwinked. George knows well that he would never allow him to have a mouse in the pocket, live or dead. But a cock-and-bull story keeps Lennie's lips closed, musing over the dream when he would "pet 'em and pretty soon they bit [his] fingers and [he] would pinch their heads a little" (11).

The fact that Lennie has strange obsessions and no reasoning, or child-like reasoning is more than vindicated in a number of occasions. Once in the farmhouse, he gets Candy's pup and kills while playing with its fur. He knows for sure that George would know of it as "George always knows" and that he "won't get to tend no rabbits," the way he expresses his indignation is worth mentioning here:

> 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 your head. [. . .] Why do you got to get killed? […] Now I won't get to tend the rabbits. Now he won't let me. (93)

How simple and childlike are his thoughts and justification. They are hollow, and we cannot help sympathizing Lennie for the simplicity of his thoughts, that tell us many things about the intellectual faculty that is starkly ill developed in him.

The things that Lennie loves and dreams of are strange in themselves. They do not at all conform to the dreams and desires of ordinary human beings. He wants whatever is not within their capacities or possessions. "Whatever we ain't got, that's what you want," comments George when Lennie talks about beans that he loves to eat with ketchup. About his dreams, he is interested in rearing rabbits not because that would be a farming or that they would earn from it, but because that would give him an opportunity to stroke the fur and calm his sensuous desire. He is mad for the soft fur of the rabbits that have become his obsessions and this is the only think he

remembers about their planned future. The following conversation is highly suggestive of the nature of dream and obsessions embodying Lennie:

> "Let's have different color rabbits, George."
>
> "Sure we will," George said sleepily. "Red and blue and green rabbots Lennie. Million of 'em"
>
> "Furry ones, George, like I seen in the fair in Sacramento."
>
> "Sure, furry ones." (18)

Lennie deserves a special attention as a unique psychological variety. His dreams and desires are indeed very potent and very well defined. He wants rabbits with fur so that he could stroke them. But the dreams, in spite of being precise and well defined, are intellectually immature and childlike. This makes Lennie a "crazy bastard" and inferior in the intellectual esteem (4).

This weakness of Lennie, or even the most violent manifestation of id is seen in one of his actions in Weed also. He "hold on" a girl in Weed in his bid to temper with her soft hair, and is accused of rape, which makes them run away from the place. George evaluates Lennie in the light of this incident and this further unveils other facets of Lennie's behavior:

> Dumb bastard like he is, he wants to touch everythin' he likes. Just wants to feel it. So he reaches out to feel this red dress an' the girl [in Weed] lets out a squawk, and that gets Lennie all mixed up, and he holds on 'cause that's the only thing he can think to do. (46)

The innocence of his situation and the poverty of his memory are reflected in more than one occasions. Lennie is so innocent like an infant that he doesn’t even manage to remember the most intimate and familiar episodes connected to his life. This is the exact reason why he needs George all the time as his compliment, without

whose presence he would lose the way of life and end up in a catastrophe. The innocence of his reasons and absence of memory becomes more than apparent when he says, " I remember a lady used to give [mice] to me—ever' one she got" (10). George laughs at him, because the "lady" is none other than his own aunt Clara with whom he passed his childhood. This is an extreme case of forgetfulness and it can be attributed to the undeveloped intelligence of Lennie that nears an animal.

In the ranch house on their first day, Lennie cuts a very sorry figure with his dumbness. George knows the risk with his speaking, and warns in advance that he is not supposed to say a work. Meekly he complains, as he cannot himself calculate the reasons behind the decree. As George had warned him, he keeps mum in the interview and George does all the talking for him creating cock-and-bull stories here and there, and at the and when Lennie wants to know the reason behind the same, George diverts the child-like mind so easily, " That was a lie" (26). The lies are many, which Lennie knows are not true, but he has no courage to question them and their truth value, as he painfully admits the intellectual inferiority he is cursed with in comparison to George. Let's see one of the examples in which George tackle's Lennie about one of the lies he tells to the ranch owner:

> "George."
>
> "What you want now?"
>
> "I wasn’t kicked in the head with no horse, was I, George?"
>
> "Be a damn good thing if you was." George said viciously. "Save ever'body a hell of a lot of trouble."
>
> "You said I was your cousin, George."
>
> "Well, that was a lie. An' I'm damn glad it was. If I was a relative of yours I'd shoot myself." (26)

Poor Lennie raised no question against George for the lie about his life he tells the man. He does it for two reasons both of which are worth discussion. Firstly, he has always been looking forward to George for doing all the speaking for him in difficult situations, and secondly because, he looks forward to a time he would be stroking their rabbits, which might be aborted if he annoys George and he would say that he would not allow him to play with the rabbits. How simple is Lennie!

Social rules, conventions norms do not hold much importance to Lennie as it does to Id. He is, in George's words, "strong and quick" and "don't know no rules" (30). Fighting, like stroking mice, is his passion, and he is so quick and nimble that he accomplished it within a flash. In one occasion when a debate springs between them and Curley, and the latter's rage explodes with the words, "Come on, ya big bastard," Lennie" and slashed at Leenie, Lennie made Curley "flopping like a fish on a line and his closed first was lost in Lennie's big hand" (68-69). He was so hard in holding and so strong in flopping the man that George, for fear of murder had to interfere in the end, "Leggo of him, Lennie. Let go" (69).

The extreme case of Lennie's animal nature and his insanity with his passion comes towards the novel, which indeed becomes the pivot of their own destruction. He flirts with Curley's wife not because he in interested in her as a man is interested in a woman. Rather, her soft hair draws him to her, and it is the soft stroke of the same he pines for. He gets hold of her, and doesn't release, till she yells. The yell puts him in an awkward position as it would make people pour around, and that would generate a mess. His dumb mind no way out except calming the yell forever:

> "Now don't [yell]" 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." And she continues to struggle, and her eyes were wild with terror. […]

> he shook her, and her body flopped like a fish. And then she was still, for Lennie had broken her neck. (100)

This ends Lennie's story. He gets done with all his dreams and awaits the final catastrophe: the death sentence. The animal in him eclipses his reason so badly that even the faintest traits are not visible anywhere. He is a total dumb and completely an animal incarnate. The saddest part of his animalism is that he cannot analyze the present and foresee the future, as his friend George can do. This puts the story to a sad end, with George the reason, putting an end to Lennie the Id. Out of the demise of Id at the hand of the intellect, a psychoanalytic truth is established: Id and Ego or Superego do not exist parallel, unless one is dominant and the other is recessive.

George and Lennie as Each Other's Compliment

`George and Lennie stand at the two extreme poles. Their natures are quite the opposite and their psychological traits are bipolar. One is highly intellectual and a precise dreamer while the other is highly sensual and dumb. George is highly sensitive of the social norms and conventions and is careful about their security, while Lennie "don’t know no rules" and is not careful about their security (30). And yet, as a matter of wonder, they compliment each other and live for each other. Except in the end when situations move beyond their control, they live together for each other. In this way, they are two facets of the same personality: one intellectual part or the reason, and the other animal part of the sensuality. The former is guided by ego and superego, and the latter by id.

There are a number of occasions in the novel in which their compliment characteristics are manifested and they affirm that they live for each other. Once in the very beginning of the story when George throws a mice away from the pocket of Lennie, the latter opts to leave the former and go away and live for himself; "If you

don’t want me, you only jus’ got to say so, and I’ll go off in those hills right there—right up in those hills and live by myself" (14) . What George says in reply is heart rending, and reflected of the fact that he is incomplete without Lennie though he is dumb and foolish:

> George said, "I want you to stay with me, Lennie. Jesus Christ, somebody'd shoot you for a coyote if you was by yourself. No, you stay with me. Your Aunt Clara wouldn’t like you running off by yourself, even if she is dead." (14)

In this statement of George, although we see the obligation on the past of Lennie to be with George for his security and safety, we also see between the lines, an impossibility of life on the part of George without Lennie. He is bound by the words of Aunt Clara, and he his bound by his own conscience that wants Lennie to stay with him. Relations like the same are bound more by emotions that cannot always be judged on the basis of what one speaks alone, or has explanations in support. They exist for themselves and are not always explainable through examples and reasons. Their lives are similar though the natures are different. They are both dreamers and are both homeless. They have no families and relatives with them and this brings them closer. George can understand the reason why they need to be together:

> Guys like us, that work on ranches, are the loneliest guys in the world. They got no fambly. They don’t belong no places. They come to a ranch an' work up a stake and then they go inta town and blow their stake, and the first thing you know they're poundin' their tail and some other ranch. They ain't got nothing to look ahead to. (15)

This is their pathos that binds them together. Brush their differences aside, their similarities are so close that they defined each in terms of the other. They are

compliment from every angle and together weave up a single human being. They reconcile their thoughts with the belief that they are two, and hence are not like many ranch workers who are stark alone. George says they are different because, they "got a future" (15). This future looks secure, because they have "got somebody to talk to that gives a damn about" them (15). Both of them dream of life of togetherness: "We don't have to sit on no bar room blowin' out jack jus' because we got no place else to go. If them other guys gets in jail they can rot for all anybody gives a damn. But not us" (15). Lennie's dream of living together even more pronounces and projects the pathos of the lonely people with such a great force that no one can help sympathizing; "*But not us! An' why? Because ….because I got you to look after me, and you got me to look after you, and that's why." He laughed delightfully*" (15).

Yes, they affirm their existence for each other and the reasons that bind them. Dreams that conform to both of their desires are even stronger. They bind that so well that they cannot think of anything else that may propel their lives together. Their dreams have a strong force, and binds them so well that they are ready to live every difficult day with prowess, and face every difficult situation with bravery so that, one day, when their dream house materialized, they can "say hell with goin' to work" (16).

Their friendship is so profound that they save each other in situations, and go to any extent of sacrifice for each other. Their friendship is an exemplary one, and of high ideal. George is so well concerned for the security of his friend that he assigns him a place where he could hide one day, if he is in trouble. Not only does he assign the place, he also reminds him time to time: "Look Lennie, if you get in any kind of trouble, you remember what I told you to do?" (33).

They have not only the present that binds them. They have a sympathetic past, the sad memory of which make them bind with steel wires. They were both born in

Auburn. He remembers that Lennie had an aunt called Clara, who "took him when he was a baby and raised him up" (44). When she died, Lennie was alone, and he just went along with George out working. Since then they "got kinda used to each other after a little while" (44). They shared a lot of experiences since then, some of which are so sensational and heart touching that they renew their bonds even today and make them more and more committed to the cause of each other. George has got an incidence to share in which at his command, he blindly jumps into a river and gets almost drowned. There have been times, George remembers when he had beaten the hell out of him and Lennie had "never lifted a finger against" him (44). George knows that Leenie could put him into difficulty many a time but cannot think of getting rid of him simply because he his dumb. Here is an extract that supports this assertion;

" 'Course Lennie's a God damn nuisance most of the time," said George. "But you get used to goin' around with a guy an' you can't get rid of him" (45).

Lennie too, though dumb and crazy bears a great love and empathy for his friend. Leave alone the thought of leaving him and living together, he cannot even imagine of George being hurt. Once in the bunkhouse when the farmhand teases him with fictitious stories about George being hurt, he reveals a highly human attribute in him where we can unfold a storehouse of love for George. "George ain't got hurt," he replies. He is confident that "George ain't hurt. He's all right. He'll be back all right" (79). He commands that no one else should even suppose that George would be hurt; "What you suppoin' for?" he questions the farmhand, "Ain't anybody goin' to suppose no hurt to George" (79). Leave alone the question of hurting, Lennie is not even ready to tolerate anyone even supposing that George is hurt. He is confident that "Geoge gonna come back" because he believes confidently that "George wun't go away and leave [him]" (80). Even if Lennie remembers no incident that occurs with him or with

anyone, he remembers every work that George tells him, which makes us think of the profundity of this confidence in and care for George and the value he puts to his works. George himself acknowledges; "Jesus Christ, Lennie! You can't remember nothing that happens, but you remember ever' word I say" (114). A conversation between them, towards the end of the novel, which is quite sentimental and full of pathos, makes us think how intimate they are to one another, and how much they look one. It begins when George says that guys like them have no "fambly" (115). :

> "But not us," Lennie cried happily. "Tell about us now."
>
> George was quiet for a moment. "But not us," he said.
>
> "Because ----"
>
> "Because I got you an---"
>
> "An' I got you. We got each other, that's what that gives a hoot in hell about us." Lennie cried in triumph. (115)

Even the last sentence George utters to Lennie in the story has this feeling of togetherness, a 'we' feeling. When Lennie begs that they get "that place" of their dream straightaway, George says, "Sure, right now. I gotta. We gotta" (117).

But what follows this sentence is a tragedy. That gives a room for analysis on other parameters. Till their last exchange, they have the feeling of 'we' that bind them together and wed them to unity. In short, they are one and same person – one the intellect and other the sensuousness; one guided by reason the other by passion; one governed by ego and the superego and the other by id. In short, they are two psychological domains of one individual.

Conclusion

In the form of George and Lennie, John Steinbeck, in his novel *Of Mice and Men*, presents two psychological traits of an individual: the blend of ego and the superego in one hand, and the id in the other. George, who does all the intellectual works including the management of the present, and planning of future is an intellectual force, highly sensitive of the present, highly critical of the conditions surrounding them, and very precise about the dreams that sustain their hope, and give them reasons to continue living, in spite of being lonely and homeless. He has a profound humanity deep inside him, and ready to take any magnitude of trouble for his dumb and crazy friend Lennie, who looks up to him for every thing.

Lennie, on the other hand is highly sensuous, especially about getting to touch and temper with soft and tender things for the satiation of his tactile ravenosity. His sensuousness is so forceful that he cannot control himself when he comes face to face with any thing with soft fur or hair, be it a mouse – dead or living — or a rabbit, or even a human being. To him society and its conventions do not hold any importance, as is true for id. He remembers practically nothing if the thing is not in any way connected to his sensuous nature.

The two friends however walk and work together. George looks up to Lennie for a company, who makes him feel at home in a lonely life, where the present is tattered and the future is yet to be invented. He is a constant guide and guardian to Lennie, and commits himself to caring him, and delivering him out of danger, if his thoughtless actions push into perilous situations. They are born in Auburn many years back and have been going along together since Aunt Clara; the sole guardian of Lennie passes away. Living together, they are used to one another, and the familiarity is more than ordinary. Lennie's understanding for George, in spite of being dumb and

crazy is so profound that he never raised a finger against George, though he holds that capacity physically, even if George, in his own words, beats hell out of him. The fun they have even in hardship, the lonely lives they live together, and the glass dreams they weave and cherish every day in the dim light of hope, bind them so intimately that their lives grow to be a sort of composite life and the two see their existences in each other's eyes. In short, we can see an organic blend between the two that add up the development of a single individual with the intellect and sense wedded together in almost equal proportion.

To conclude, George is the brain, full of wisdom and reason that sustains and drives a live towards and continuous living though with difficulty. He secures the present and plans the future. He is conscious of the society and its mores, and the conventions it is defined with. Lennie his friend is simply the body, full of sensuousness, hunger and thirst. He knows no rules and conventions and his sensual orientations are so strong that he often gets overshot and invites problems. The existence of the two together creates a balance, and we can see an individual in their amalgamations with George as the head and Lennie as the body.

Works Cited

Abrams, M.H. *A Glossay of Literary Terms.* 7th ed. Bangalore: Prism, 2003.

Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory Since Plato.* Boston: Bedford, 1993.

Bassy, Peter. *Beginning Theory.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Bradbury, Malcolm. *The Modern American Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.

Bryer, Jackson R. *Resources for American Literary Study.* Vol 29. New York: AMS Press, 2003.

Carlson, Robert et. al. *American Literature*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1979. 584.

Carrington, Padd. "Alice Munro's 'Open Secrets' and John Steinbeck's Of Mice and Men." *Studies in Short Fiction*. Vol. 31.4 <http.www.ebscohost.com.html> 29 May 2006.

Desson, Howe. "Of Mice and Men" <http.www.washingtonpost.com.html> 16 Oct. 1992.

Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.

Freud, Sigmund. "Psychopathetic Characters on the Stage." *The Theory of Criticism.* Ed. Roman Seldon. London: Longman, 1988.

Guerin L. Wilfred, et. al. *A Handbook of Critical Approach to Literture*. 5th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Hedges, Warren. "Psychoanalysis and Literature". August 18, 2007. <http: // www.Sou/Edu/English/Hedges/Psytool.htm>

Kalaidijian, Walter. *The Cambridge Companion to American Modernism.* Vol 19. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2005.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Functions of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience." *Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh. London: Longman, 1989.

Porter, Joyand Kenneth M. *The Cambridge Companion to Native American Literature.* Vol. 18. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2005.

Smith, G. "The Dream in *Of Mice and Men".* <www.courseworkbank.co.uk/html> May 1999.

Steinbeck, John. *Of Mice and Men*. New York: Bantam Books, 1988.