

Lo(o)sing Animals: Literary Animal Agency in Nineteenth-Century France

Hailey Anne Burgess

A dissertation

submitted in partial fulfillment of the
partial requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2018

Reading Committee:

Louisa Mackenzie, Chair

María Elena García

Richard Watts

Radhika Govindrajan

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Department of French & Italian Studies

©Copyright 2018
Hailey Anne Burgess

University of Washington

Abstract

Lo(o)sing Animals: Literary Animal Agency in Nineteenth-Century France

Hailey Anne Burgess

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Louisa Mackenzie

Department of French & Italian Studies

This dissertation examines literary animal presence in three important texts by Gustave Flaubert and Émile Zola. It argues that these representations of animals should be considered potential actors with the capacity for dynamic agency, thus shifting the optic of critical analysis that has often considered literary animals to be the representations of something altogether different from themselves. Collectively, the readings and analysis throughout this study demonstrate the ways that literature (and literary representations) are rich spaces for new articulations of the historical and social contexts of industrialization and colonization in France and France's colonies during this era, particularly as it pertained to the shifts in the treatment of real animals. *Lo(o)sing Animals* therefore reveals the implicit connections between the animals in literature and those who were experiencing the changes in practices of agriculture, colonization, and industry. In so doing, and by employing thinking and theory from both Literary and Animal Studies, this dissertation moves to restore to animals – both literary and real – the potential to act as agents in the world(s) that they share with humans. The moments that are

examined over the course of the chapters demonstrate different modes of agency ranging from the individual (“I”, in the sense of Florence Burgat’s philosophy for animals’ potential to possess this) to more general considerations of certain species’ unique impact on humans’ lives and culture (and vice versa). Despite these differences in kind, each moment upon which I focus purposefully engages with the animals who often escape notice by most readers because of the way they are taken to be unremarkable: it is this that I aim to show as being, on the contrary, especially remarkable when it comes both to the animals themselves and the literature where one finds them.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Table of Contents.....	5-6
Acknowledgments and Dedication.....	7-8
Introduction.....	9
Chapter 1. Farm Animals: Particularities of Species in the New Age of Agriculture.....	32
<i>The “I” in “Animal”: Some Key Concepts for (Re)reading Animals.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>A House in the Country: A Brief Overview of Madame Bovary’s Plot.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Romantic Illusions or Irritating Reminders?: Animals’ Importance for Emma.....</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Between Labor and Leisure: Horses as a Bridge Between Spaces.....</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Different Species.....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>The New Marketplace: Shifting Perspectives on Farming in Rural France.....</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Être bête: The Paradox of the Old Woman at the Farmer’s Market.....</i>	<i>76</i>
<i>The Ghosts that Haunt Us: Madame Leroux and Beyond.....</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Conclusion. What Emma Bovary and Animals Can Tell Us About Colonial Othering.....</i>	<i>85</i>
Chapter 2. Exotic Animals: Rereading Representations of Animals in Salammbô.....	89
<i>A War of Attrition: A Brief Plot Summary of Salammbô.....</i>	<i>98</i>
<i>The Elephants in the Pen: Pachyderm Identities in Salammbô’s “Exotic” Landscapes.....</i>	<i>99</i>
<i>Animetaphor or Metaphor for the Other?: Lions at the Threshold of Symbolism in the Temple of Moloch.....</i>	<i>105</i>
<i>Crucified Metaphors, Wild Characters: Felines Acting Dangerously in Life and Death.....</i>	<i>107</i>
<i>Lo(o)sing “Exotic” Animals: Questions of Captivity in Colonial Contexts.....</i>	<i>116</i>
<i>Conclusion. The Industriousness of Rereading Animals in Salammbô.....</i>	<i>119</i>
Chapter 3. Ghostly Animals: The Seething Presences of Industrial Animals in La Bête humaine.....	121
<i>Blood Lines: A Brief Overview of La Bête humaine’s Main Plot Lines.....</i>	<i>131</i>
<i>“Brute” Force: The Human Beasts in Roubaud and Jacques.....</i>	<i>133</i>
<i>Captive Country: The Absence of Animals as a Seething Presence at La Croix-de-Maufras.....</i>	<i>136</i>
<i>On the Wrong Track: The Beheaded Cow.....</i>	<i>138</i>
<i>Tools of the Trade: Farm Animals Turned into Consumables.....</i>	<i>145</i>
<i>The Many vs. the Many: Inserting Animals into the Framework of Nineteenth Century Minor Characters.....</i>	<i>150</i>
<i>Conclusion. The Crazy Bull.....</i>	<i>153</i>
Post-script: Georges Franju’s Le Sang des bêtes (A Visual Track).....	157
Conclusion.....	159
<i>Making Literature “More Bête”: New Readings of Realist and Naturalist Literature.....</i>	<i>161</i>

<i>Embêté: How Literary Animals Trouble Our Understandings of Real Animals</i>	164
<i>Future Directions: Focusing on Flaubert</i>	165
Epilogue: The Polar Bear Tunnel and the Tiger in the Window	168
Bibliography	170

Acknowledgments

I must first thank the real animals whose lives were imagined by Gustave Flaubert and Émile Zola. May you live new life (and find yourself resurrected) in this work. And to my feline companion, Mater, whose presence was particularly persistent during the last stages of this project, thank you for your companionship. Your desire to constantly remain nearby was a tangible manifestation of the kinds of animal acting towards which I have aimed to move in my work.

To Louisa Mackenzie, the Chair of my dissertation committee and the person who first taught me about Animal Studies, I am indebted to the way that you have shaped my person and my work. The guidance and the faith that you have shown in this project have been invaluable to its completion.

To María Elena García, for the warmth and fervor you bring to everything that you do, and for how you bring people together who care about animals: thank you. Your invitation to join the Animal Studies Working Group in 2014 was foundational to my apprenticeship in this field and how to make it talk to other disciplines.

To the members of the Animal Studies Working Group between 2014 and 2017 – Annie Dwyer, Katheryn Gillespie, Will McKeithen, Skye Naslund, and Scott Venters – your feedback, encouragement, and openness to my literary work were the main reasons my passion for it abided through maternity leave and the challenges that time away from academic work presents. More importantly, the friendships that I made there, although some of us have lost touch, are treasured.

I would particularly like to thank Logan O’Laughlin, another member of the ASWG. You have walked this path with me since my first day in Animal Studies. Your patient ear and willingness to give critical feedback (and abundant encouragement!), despite my lack of expertise, have been an anchor, especially over the past year.

To the members of my Reading Committee: Louisa Mackenzie, María Elena García, Radhika Govindrajan, and Richard Watts, thank you for sharing your feedback and knowledge over the past three years. The diversity of your collective expertise and the resulting variety of sources and suggestions that you have provided have helped me create a project that is able to cross disciplinary lines in a way I never could have anticipated.

To my family and friends, who have been ready with encouragement at all stages of this journey, your love and support have carried me through times of great doubt and questioning. Particularly to my husband, Michael: thank you for never giving up on me, and for never letting me give up on myself.

Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank God. My faith has been tried daily since I began working in Animal Studies, given the way it has opened my eyes to the plights of animals in our world today (and in history). However, looking back on the work AS has allowed me to do, I see a clear path, not the bumpy, twisting trail that I felt I was walking as I struggled with new and challenging questions about what my work might contribute or how I live.

This dissertation is dedicated to my son Jonathan, whose presence has made questions of a well-lived and acknowledged life – for both animals and humans – so much more urgent to me.

May you never be afraid to ask good questions, nor to look for the things that you sense but cannot see. What you see may not be what you expect, and it's likely that at times you will greatly dislike it, but do not turn away. Allow these moments to push you to pursue a life that considers and respects all creatures, though this will often be a costly task.

And in all of this, may the Lord guide you and give you the strength to hold on to hope, remembering that your ability to impact the lives of others is not a weight to crush you, but an opportunity to celebrate.

Introduction

In the latter half of *Salammbô*, the centerpiece for the second chapter of this dissertation, an army of elephants is let loose on the Barbarians, who are trapped in a naturally-formed enclosure. Their enemies, the Carthaginians, and their allies the Numidians (who were formerly the Barbarians' allies), have led them into this space. The elephants have been trained and outfitted to destroy, and they do so with ease:

...les Barbares, éblouis par le soleil, apercevaient confusément...de grosses masses noires qui [...] supportaient [des gerbes couleur d'argent]... C'étaient des lances dans des tours, sur des éléphants effroyablement armés. Outre l'épieu de leur poitrail, les poinçons de leurs défenses, les plaques d'airain qui couvraient leurs flancs, et les poignards tenus à leurs grenouillères, – ils avaient au bout de leurs trompes un bracelet de cuir où était passé la manche d'un large coutelas ; partis tous à la fois du fond de la plaine, ils s'avançaient de chaque côté, parallèlement. [...] Déjà, [les Barbares] se trouvaient enveloppés. Les éléphants entrèrent dans cette masse d'hommes ; et les éperons de leur poitrail la divisaient, les lances de leurs défenses la retournaient comme des socs de charrues ; ils coupaient, taillaient, hachaient avec les faux de leurs trompes ; les tours...semblaient des volcans en marche...les horribles animaux, passant au milieu de tout cela, creusaient des sillons noirs. Le plus furieux était conduit par un Numide couronné d'un diadème de plumes. [...] ...les grosses bêtes, dociles comme des chiens, pendant le carnage tournaient un œil de son côté.¹

[...the Barbarians, dazzled by the sun, vaguely made out great black masses supporting [silvery sheaves]... They were lances in towers, on terrifyingly armed elephants. Apart from the pikes on their chest harness, the spikes on their tusks, bronze plates covering their sides, and the daggers fastened on their knee pads – at the end of their trunks they had a leather ring holding the handle of a large cutlass; starting off all together from the end of the plain, they advanced from each side, in parallel lines. [...] [The Barbarians] were already surrounded. The elephants came into this mass of men; the spurs on their fronts divided them, the lances on their tusks turned them over as if they had been ploughshares; they cut, chopped, hacked with the sickles on their trunks; the towers...looked like moving volcanoes...the horrible animals, going through the middle of all this, dug out black furrows. The wildest was driven by a Numidian crowned with a diadem of feathers. [...] ...the great beasts, docile as dogs, looked towards him during the slaughter.]²

This “mass” of animals, physically responsible for the deaths of the better part of an entire army, are, *grammatically*, “subjects.” They are the ones doing the killing, the injuring, and the trampling of the Barbarians in this horrific scene. However, the elephants are ultimately

¹ Flaubert, 267.

² All English translations of excerpts or other bracketed translations from the primary texts are taken from the translation listed in the Bibliography for that novel. On the occasions when I have provided an original English translation, it is noted.

denied this subjecthood, both in the way they are described by Gustave Flaubert, the author of *Salammbô*, as well as in the manner that most literary critics have read them (or other animals). Throughout what is a quick attack, the elephants maintain the position as the main actors, as they “coup[ent], taill[ent], hach[ent]” and “creus[ent].” Clearly, the animals themselves are doing these things and in this way, directly influencing the state of the war. However, this agency is swept aside in the last phrase, as the presence of the Numidian man who has been driving them on is made known. The animals defer to him from the moment he is first mentioned, “dociles comme des chiens.” This animal allegory transforms the elephants into a metaphor, themselves: they have become the soldiers of the Numidian. No longer themselves, they now act at the behest of another, and at his will instead of their own. Moments later, they kill the remaining Barbarians, this time by simply walking over them:

On [...] attachait les jambes et les mains [des Barbares]; puis, quand ils furent étendus par terre les uns près des autres, on ramena les éléphants. Les poitrines craquaient comme des coffres que l'on brise...leurs gros pieds enfonçaient dans leurs corps avec un mouvement des hanches qui les faisait paraître boiter. Ils continuaient, et allèrent jusqu'au bout.³

[[The] hands and legs [of the Barbarians] were tied; then when they had been laid on the ground side by side, the elephants were brought back. Their chests cracked like boxes being broken...their great feet sank into the bodies with a twist of the hips which made them look lame. They continued, and went on to the end.]

Once again, the elephants are doing the crushing, but here they seem to have lost the momentum with which they enter the narrative in the previous passage: they simply “continu[ent], et [vont] jusqu'au bout,” as if it is just a short walk to the end of a pathway. The abundant detail that Flaubert gives to describe how they are outfitted at the outset of this gruesome scene does not account for the lack of description he gives of their unique capacities as elephants. If one were to consider these qualities, how might it change the understanding of a

³ Flaubert, 268.

text like *Salammbô*, which is saturated with similarly graphic scenes where humans and animals are entangled both physically and in their descriptions?⁴ Further, how are these readings and understandings expanded by a more comprehensive consideration of the actual historical contexts where a text is set and from which Flaubert writes?

As I will show throughout this dissertation, a consideration of both the historical context from whence these novels emerge as well as the qualities and capacities that these literary animals would have had as real animals makes way for readings that recognize the singular agency of which they are capable and moves to revisibilize them. The integration of these details allows me to gesture towards (and imagine) the lives these animals [might have] led in their own right. Nineteenth-century France underwent two major social shifts: industrialization and colonization, each of which had unique impacts on the lives of animals, both real and literary. As is often the case in periods that change how entire cultures and groups function and interact, the consequences of these social shifts are also evident in nineteenth-century French literature, particularly in the novel form. Largely following Honoré de Balzac's example, French literary traditions began to shift towards what was coined "réalisme," away from "romantisme," which aimed to depict society as accurately as possible, in spite of these texts' status as fiction. Because of the ways that the authors of this period – particularly the two whose work is examined here, Gustave Flaubert and Émile Zola – sought to do this within each of their unique writing styles, I find it not only interesting, but essential, to take their texts, to a point, at face value. Zola's work moved beyond the basic concepts of Realism to what he called "naturalism", which, while rooted in the basic concept of Realism, was particularly focused on scientific fact that emerged out of

⁴ When one considers that this is never necessary to do for *human* characters due to the fact that the reader is inevitably human (and thus understands the physical and, in most cases, psychological *enjeux* of this shared "identification" of species), the necessity of the call to make an effort to understand "the animal side" begins to make sense.

the experimental medicine of his time.⁵ The prevalence of the idea of natural science became essential not only to developments in farming and other production practices during this period, but also to how the bodies of colonial Others were categorized in discourse about colonial spaces (and, subsequently, how those humans and animals were treated). As Michael Bell points out in his Introduction to the *Cambridge Companion to European Novelists*, “over the course of the nineteenth century...natural science rose in prestige to become the paradigmatic form of *truth statement*, and novelists began widely to invoke its authority.”⁶

The literature of the nineteenth century is thus an important place to begin to consider real animals via their relation to literary animals, given both the Realist and Naturalist traditions as well as the period’s importance for animals in the contexts of industrialization and colonization in France. Jason Hribal, as he calls for animals to be integrated into conceptions of the working class, extrapolates at length about the ways that non-humans have directly contributed to capitalism, despite being “unwaged.”⁷ He articulates the “role which animals have played in the development of the agricultural and industrial revolution...[and] how this process in turn impacted the lives of these creatures—both qualitatively and quantitatively.”⁸ While he argues that animals’ work goes back to their earliest interactions with humans, his analysis also pointedly reveals the rapid increase in the standardization of the majority of practices involving animals as laborers, which began in earnest in the nineteenth century: from the farm to the mines to the cotton mills, animals were bred with the aim of exploiting specific

⁵ Brian Nelson, “Émile Zola (1840-1902): Naturalism” in *The Cambridge Companion to European Novelists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 297.

⁶ Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 10.

⁷ “‘Animals Are Part of the Working Class’: A Challenge to Labor History” in *Labor History* 44.4 (2003), 436.

⁸ Hribal, 436.

qualities, from increased milk “output” to physical strength and endurance.⁹ These shifts towards a scientifically managed breeding, particularly as it pertained to farming, required these processes to be largely conducted “‘out of sight, out of mind’.”¹⁰ Thus, readings that attempt to reverse the erasures to which animals were subjected during this time and that acknowledge the active influence that they had within these social phenomena makes way for them to be integrated into these historical moments in ways they are often denied.

Considering animals in literature in a way that incorporates understandings of their capacities as real animals – now largely possible thanks to the significant ethological and sociological research that has been done since this period – can move us towards the kind of reformulations (or eliminations, as some scholars call for) of the categories of both human and animal that many have continued to call for, and this from all over the spectrum of academic specialties.¹¹ For instance, taking into account the way that elephants (and their bodies as symbols) were mobilized in French colonial projects makes their frequent appearance in *Salammô* notable, and yet they are nowhere mentioned in the 14 pieces featured in *The Cambridge Companion to Flaubert*, despite several authors’ discussion of the novel itself.¹² In

⁹ Hribal, 437-448; Hribal’s article focuses largely on accounts and data from the newly-formed United States and the United Kingdom, but the idea of animals as laborers, and how this role intensified with industrialization, is what interest me within the French context; The industrialization of farming was not the first time that certain animals were exploited for their unique traits or capacities, but it was the standardization and scientific side of the breeding practices that emerged during this period that make it unique.

¹⁰ Ibid, 439.

¹¹ This dissertation will engage with such several ethological studies, particularly as it pertains to cows and pigs in Chapter 1 and elephants in Chapter 2; Aph Ko and Syl Ko especially show how a reformulation of the categories of human and animal will ultimately still fall short of a restoration of humanity to the human Other or the recognition of the animal Other as being worthy of subjecthood. Only the elimination of these categories and an attempt to reformulate how we think of living beings can begin to move towards these types of understandings; See also Zakiyyah Iman Jackson’s essay that openly aims to discuss these fraught issues of race, species, space and “beyond the human” (*Outer Worlds: The Persistence of Race in Movement “Beyond the Human”, GLQ A Journey of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 21.2-3, 2015).

¹² Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004; Both Michael Tilby’s chapter, “Flaubert’s place in literary history,” and Anne Green’s, “History and its representation in Flaubert’s work,” provide interesting discussions of the historical background of *Salammô*, as well as its connections with the France of his lifetime (e.g. Second

an Animal Studies context, however, these animals were the focus of an article by Éliane DalMolin in a recent issue of *L'Esprit Créateur*. In the article, DalMolin considers elephants' unique place in the formation and progression of France's social and political history via both *Salammbô* and Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables*, which she takes as examples of how powerful an animal's symbolism within a culture can be.¹³ In her examination of these literary moments, DalMolin moves to show how their place as symbols effectively establishes elephants' lack of power and, I would argue, agency within the social mechanisms and particularly as it pertains to the rise and fall of France's Empire. In this way, she begins to gesture towards different modes of reading animals, thus giving an example of the ways that engaging both questions of a species' unique physical strengths or weaknesses alongside their past (and, subsequently, present) symbolic meanings can further understandings of their representations in literature.

This dissertation thus aims to continue down a similar path by looking at passages such as the two discussed in the opening pages of this Introduction. In these moments, I have shown how elephants can be read as authors of their own actions, even if they do not always act independently of another's will. To acknowledge the influence of the Numidian over them does not eclipse their physical actions, which require them to act of their own accord, or choice.¹⁴ By looking at this scene in this way, it's possible to see the elephants as more than just a necessary inclusion for their symbolic (and, as I will discuss further in Chapter 2, "exotic") power. Once one shifts the optic of the reading towards the animal, it becomes feasible to explore how

Empire France). However, neither one address the "exotic" animals (or humans, for that matter) that are the actors in this text.

¹³ "Un éléphant, ça trompe : l'animal et l'Empire" in *L'Esprit Créateur* 51.4 (2011).

¹⁴ Of course, in such a situation where there is a "master", one can imagine that for the elephants to not follow instructions would have likely meant death for them, especially given that they had been procured solely for purposes of war. However, animals have been shown to "rebel", as Jason Hribal's article demonstrates as it pertains to horses and cattle, and examples of which are widely circulated as it pertains to current day moments when animals have escaped from factory farms (see Gillespie, Pachirat and Scully for examples of this).

considering non-human species as more than references for something – or someone – other than themselves can lead to a deeper understanding of both the animals themselves (e.g. their real counterparts outside of the novel) as well as the contexts from whence the novel emerged.

My work therefore moves to reconsider literary animals as real animals and to take into account the contexts that shape both their literary depictions and the lives they would have lived during the historical period of their author. As I have mentioned, the fictional nature of the novel form allows us to imagine the ways that real individuals' (animal or human) presence seems to linger on the page and can lead to the kinds of “experiments with multiple perspectives and processes” that Susan McHugh describes in her book *Animal Stories*.¹⁵ In this book, McHugh takes literature and other fictional medias to show how “fiction localizes mutable historically and physically contingent perspectives,” which brings her to examinations of social phenomena of the 21st Century such as industrial farming.¹⁶ To consider human fictional characters as the depictions of physical, sentient bodies like those that one sees walking around each day is quite easily done. However, this move is not as common – or easy – when it comes to animals in fiction. It seems to be for this reason that literary animals are easily sidelined as allegories or metaphors, acting as stand-ins for either humans (or even a human idea), if not ignored altogether as part of the “setting” of a text. For example, Sandy Petrey’s description of Émile Zola’s body of work limits “individuals within [society]” to those who can understand “what it means to be a *human* being in the modern world.”¹⁷ In reference to Flaubert’s work, Laurence

¹⁵ *Animal Stories: Narrating across Species Lines* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 1.

¹⁶ Ibid; For instance, McHugh’s chapter “The Fictions and Futures of Farm Animals: Semi-Living as ‘Animalacra’ Pig Tales” addresses the various readings and iterations of George Orwell’s *Animal Farm*, throughout her analysis showing how “the precise struggle through which literary history has arrived at a nonmetaphorical reading [of this novel]...indicates what remains at stake for reading animal stories” (182).

¹⁷ “Zola and the representation of society” (*The Cambridge Companion to Émile Zola*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 40, my emphasis.

Porter explains that a “*human* object of description may reveal itself through forms of self-characterization,” in this way limiting character formation to individuals who are human.¹⁸ In both cases, the critic neglects to mention the roles that animals are capable of playing; more than just symbols, the work of Hribal and others shows how animals exercise pivotal influence on the development of all manner of industrial production and everyday life, in spite of the ways that their bodies have been made to be invisible.¹⁹ Moving away from this intentional refusal to notice animals’ potential influence in literary texts, this dissertation reshapes and re-presents these diverse actors in fresh readings of important novels from the nineteenth-century French archive by Flaubert and Zola.²⁰

To this end, this project engages most prominently with the fields of Literary and Animal Studies. In order to deconstruct previous readings of literary animals, current scholarship cannot simply be set aside without pointing out some of the specific issues (and strengths!) in certain critics’ readings of these novels, either as a whole or in the same excerpts that I aim to open back up for consideration. I have begun to do this here and aim over the course of the chapters to engage with others who address some or all of the passages I focus on. Kenneth Shapiro describes all individuals working in Animal Studies (within any accompanying discipline) as

¹⁸ “The art of characterization in Flaubert’s fiction” (*The Cambridge Companion to Flaubert*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 127, my emphasis.

¹⁹ I will discuss several of these other scholars over the course of this project, in particular the work of Timothy Pachirat, Noëlie Vialles, and Jocelyn Porcher and Tiphaine Schmitt. Each of these authors demonstrates either the unique capacities that animals have for what we call “work” or the entangled nature of work in such places as the slaughterhouse or abattoir.

²⁰ This dissertation could easily have focused exclusively on animals in the novels of Gustave Flaubert. As it stands, two of the three chapters engage his texts, and the third provides a brief vignette in its conclusion that examines another. His unique perspective on nineteenth-century society and culture resonate particularly well with discussions about real animals in literature. While this is in part *due* to his adherence to the Realist tradition in France at this time (despite, as we have seen, a parallel rejection of doing so), Flaubert’s constant use of irony provides interesting opportunities to question these “realistic” depictions of situations and characters, shedding new light on some of his own potential views on issues such as industrialization and colonization. Having said this, Flaubert attested throughout his *Correspondance* a deep desire to “authenticate” his fiction as much as possible and did considerable research for such works as *Salammbô*. This will be discussed further in Chapter 2.

"scholars who are committed to the value of valuing animals," pursuing ways in which to "move animals from the 'margins' to the 'center'."²¹ In placing this work within this theoretical frame, however, it is useful to make a distinction between the French and Anglophone contexts of this field, which have emerged at different speeds and for unique reasons.

Within the French context, these theorists, by and large, often continue to use the term *la question animale* instead of "French Animal Studies."²² This lexical preference demonstrates, in and of itself, certain key elements of the French way of thinking about animals. Firstly, it implies that these studies and questions are just that: questions. More open-ended than a "study," a "question" – while not necessarily a "good one," as Jocelyn Porcher and Vinciane Despret will show us – does not provide foregone conclusions, or "answers." In the particular context of re-presenting and rereading animals in literature, a "question" leaves issues such as animal subjectivity open-ended, without any obvious resolution or "solution." Secondly, the use of "*la question animale*" suggests it is possible that more than one answer will be articulated, and that these answers might well emerge out of different contexts for asking the question in the first place.

While "Animal Studies" almost always refers to ethical questions, Jean-Baptiste Jeangène Vilmer explains that the French *question animale*, while it also refers most often to issues of ethics within whichever field is at hand, did, in some cases late in the nineteenth century, "not designate an ethical problem, but instead referred to breeding practices," again

²¹ "History and Future of Human-Animal Studies" (presentation, Animals and Society Institute's Human-Animal Studies Summer Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL, July 9-16, 2017); Certainly, not all disciplines of Animal Studies as a global term "value" animals in the same way. For instance, a medical professional's understanding of "valuing" an animal might look very different from a philosopher's.

²² This distinction between French and Anglophone modes of approaching thinking about animals has prompted several notable projects specifically focused on French scholars' work, such as the collection of essays edited by Louisa Mackenzie and Stephanie Posthumus, *French Thinking about Animals* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2015).

alluding to the more open nature of “*la question animale*.”²³ He also points out that the focus on ethical considerations of animals has been an issue that the French have long considered: despite the fact that Jeremy Bentham’s question about whether an animal is capable of suffering (instead of reasoning) is often acknowledged in the Anglophone world as the first articulation of the “relevant criterion for the moral consideration of animals,” thinkers like Michel de Montaigne and Jean-Jacques Rousseau provided similar observations centuries earlier.²⁴ This brings us to the third unique facet of “*la question animale*,” also articulated by Vilmer. There are philosophical, cultural, and political reasons for which this field [of *study*] in this geographical location is framed so differently.²⁵ I will thus show in each of the three chapters of this dissertation the unique cultural elements that set France apart within the larger contexts of industrialization and colonization, two of the most important historical phenomena of that century.

While there are a limited number of scholars who focus specifically on animals in literature, many whose work has to do with animals in history or who have conducted research on animals in certain specific spaces are equally relevant to this dissertation. Foundational for a

²³ Foreword, *French Thinking About Animals* (eds. Louisa Mackenzie and Stephanie Posthumus, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2015), vii; He cites a comment from the Chamber of Deputies in 1921 that *la question animale* “referred to the ‘importance of the animal’s pure and determined breed’” (ibid); In “From Animal to Animality Studies” (*PMLA* 124.2: 2009), Michael Lundblad proposes Animality Studies as a framework of thinking about “real” animals that does not specifically focus on advocacy for non-human animals, but instead that can provide useful insights into such varied fields as sexuality and human politics. For Lundblad, the question of ethics for [non-human] animals that I mention within the context of Animal Studies (and, in many cases, *la question animale*) does not need to be a primary focus of this framework (497).

²⁴ Ibid, viii.

²⁵ Ibid, xi; Vilmer outlines in detail that France has several major “holdbacks” when it comes to these issues of non-human animals, organizing them into these three distinct categories: 1) Philosophy: France’s deep roots in Humanism continue to impact how animals are perceived to this day; 2) Culture: Their long-standing connection to culinary specialties and local traditions has made it challenging to suggest the elimination of such delicacies as *foie gras* or of spectacles such as the *corrida*; and finally, 3) Political: The powerful minority of pro-hunting members in French Parliament and the large number of French beauty products utilizing animal ingredients and coveted world-wide (x-xi).

re-presenting of literary animals are the concepts that Éric Baratay and Jean-Christophe Bailly emphasize in their work. Baratay is a French historian who moves to build what he calls “animal histories,” accounts that aim to carve out places for animals as “real beings” who have unique capacities just as humans do. He highlights the need for us to consider animals within specific historical contexts – for instance, horses and dogs in World War II – and how they acted as subjects in their own rights.²⁶ Bailly urges us to consider the possibility that historical phenomena such as industrialization have pushed human animals to consider non-human animals' "way of being in the world...[as] a background against which to highlight the supremacy of humankind", thus denying animals the potential to be "considered on [their] own terms."²⁷ This dissertation thus also aims to bring Bailly's call — a call to give non-human animals the potential to *be* themselves — to fruition in literary contexts in conjunction with the imaginative mode of building animal histories that Baratay has theorized.²⁸ Bailly also presents the compelling idea that physical spaces such as industrial farms relegate animals into “vast concept-spaces” that correlate directly to the mechanisms of invisibilization and erasure that such places require in order to be maintained.²⁹ Both of these scholars’ work thus undergird the new kinds of readings that this dissertation presents, which move to reconceptualize them as active participants in literature. I also aim to employ the kind of “narrative ethologies” that Susan McHugh proposes, taking into account trends across literary narratives alongside the ethological

²⁶ For his restoration of “animal histories” within the context of WWII, see *Bêtes des tranchées : des vécus oubliés* (Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2013), and for a more general introduction to this mode of imagining animals’ histories, *Le Point de vue animal : Une autre version de l’histoire* (Paris: Seuil, 2012).

²⁷ *The Animal Side* (New York: Fordham, 2011), 2.

²⁸ Baratay’s “imaginative” histories are only thus in that they take *human* accounts of historical events and moments as starting points. His work thus remains grounded in these actual first-hand accounts, despite the somewhat “fictive” mode that must be adopted in order to then move towards imagining animals’ experiences of these same events.

²⁹ Bailly, 10.

findings on species and behavior that have influenced these narratives. Just as McHugh's work shows the effectiveness of taking literary narratives as spaces capable of impacting real animals (and the politics that surround them), my close readings move to better understand the experiences of animals in literature and their potential agencies based on their historical contexts, as well as the way that – particularly in the case of farm animals but also for that of quickly disappearing “exotic” animals – their literary presence persists in the tradition of the Realist novel during the nineteenth century. This persistent presence is unique from the kinds of animal presences in the Romantic novels that preceded and eventually coincided with the Realist and Naturalist traditions, given the way that this form of literature relied heavily on emotions and idealized images of nature.³⁰

It is important to acknowledge the influence of two French philosophers upon the field of Animal Studies and within the context of these re-imagined (hi)stories of animals. Jacques Derrida's infamous anecdote of his cat observing him in the nude finds its way into many articles and books on the topic (including my own), and his former student, Élisabeth de Fontenay, has also had an important influence on work in the field, especially within the French context.³¹ In her treatise on philosophy within the context of animals, De Fontenay states:

Or les animaux...ne possèdent pas les mêmes mondes intérieurs que ceux qui ont pu ou auraient dû pouvoir dire 'je', 'tu', 'il', et 'nous'. [...] "À quel titre, se mettant à leur place, les fera-t-on parler ? [...]_Mais d'archives animales on ne trouve nul vestige...Les empreintes de leurs pieds, leurs effluves, les restes de leurs nids s'effacent vite et nous laissent aussi peu de traces que le vent. Quant à leur langage, il n'imprime pas plus de marques...Et même si l'on reconnaît que les animaux ont une histoire, il faut ajouter qu'elle consiste uniquement dans celle de leurs rapports avec les hommes.³²

[Thus animals...do not possess the same interior worlds as those who have been able to or who would have been able to say 'I', 'you', 'he', and 'us'. [...] By what right, putting ourselves in their place, would we

³⁰ “Romanticism” in *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online* (Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 2017).

³¹ Perhaps for the way that he so adeptly and thoroughly brings together French thought on the topic of animals, Derrida seems to permeate the work of nearly every author working within Animal Studies – whether French or Anglophone – while De Fontenay is not as prominently referred to. Certainly, her work takes Derrida, in some of her philosophy, as a starting point, but also departs from it at other moments.

³² *Le silence des bêtes* (Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1998), 20-21.

*make them speak? [...] But we don't even find traces of an animal archive...Their footprints, their scent, the remnants of their nests are quickly forgotten and leave us as little trace as the wind. In regard to their language, it too leaves little behind...And even if we acknowledged animals as having a history, one would have to add that it only consists of the moments they share with men.]*³³

She emphasizes the significant task of overcoming animals' lack of history as one undertakes any project that attempts to restore to them their singular contexts, due to the fact that it will always already have emerged from a "human" context: after all, we write, therefore we are human. De Fontenay follows her mentor in these sentiments, as Derrida asserted how "ignor[ing] that rupture [between species], indeed that abyss, would mean first of all blinding oneself to so much contrary evidence..."³⁴ Thus, while my readings cannot rise above all potential pitfalls of anthropocentrism due to species difference, I move to restore a history to animals in my work by acknowledging animals, along with Baratay, as "individuals with their own specific set of characteristics...even people with their own behaviors; in short, they are subjects. These ideas...should be tested in the field while leaving room for some flexibility in how the definitions are used."³⁵

The question of how to avoid anthropocentric depictions of literary animals has been examined by a number of other scholars and philosophers, both in and outside of the French context. Erica Fudge emphasizes, not unlike Baratay, the importance of attempting the imaginative work of animal histories and moves to do this very work in her consideration of what it might have been like to be a cow during the nineteenth century.³⁶ She says, "I know that I can never answer the questions, what was it like to be a cow or to be a cow among other cows?"

³³ My translation.

³⁴ Jacques Derrida, *The Animal That Therefore I Am* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 30.

³⁵ Baratay, "Building," 4.

³⁶ "What Was It Like to Be a Cow?: History and Animal Studies" in *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 10.

But that does not stop me from asking.”³⁷ If one hopes to avoid the potential pitfalls to which I have previously alluded via De Fontenay and Baratay, and that Fudge refers to as well, it is logical to consider the historical accounts that include animals, but beyond this to reorient “our position in relation to them”, in this way “perhaps [...] chang[ing] our understanding of our shared realities.”³⁸ Fudge acknowledges that even though this would be done via more recent work in animal welfare science and ethology, this examination of animals’ experiences now is essential to an understanding of their experiences “then.”³⁹

This dissertation’s readings of animals in nineteenth-century French literature is situated within two specific cultural phenomena of the time: industrialization and colonization. Chapters 1 and 3 focus most pointedly on the effects industrialization on activities related to farming, while Chapter 2 is oriented towards the issues raised by colonial projects that were active during this time. Though they are not always discussed at the same time throughout this project, I consider these two phenomena to be pieces of a single, more general movement within French society that pushed for continual advancement in all areas over the course of the nineteenth century. The collective social progress that brought about the expansion of trains, industrial agriculture and the French Empire enacted irreversible shifts in the treatment and consideration of animals (and, it should be noted for the third case, the treatment and consideration of *humans* in colonial spaces). The main change that these growths in [human] society – the first two in particular – set in motion was an erasure of animals from the public sphere.

As these processes (and progresses) put premiums on efficiency and productivity, animals’ roles in everyday life were reformulated, specifically as it pertained to the

³⁷ Fudge, 10.

³⁸ *Ibid*, 15.

³⁹ *Ibid*, 11.

slaughterhouse, or, in nineteenth century terminology, the abattoir.⁴⁰ Noëlie Vialles' research on the relocation of the abattoir in southern France describes the shifts in "knowing" that are now required in order to maintain the modern practices of industrial farming: "[it] has become an invisible, exiled, almost clandestine activity. We know it goes on, *of course*, but it is an abstract kind of knowledge."⁴¹ Nicole Shukin theorizes the effects that capitalism has had both on the displacement of the slaughterhouse (and its subsequent reorganization, addressed in Timothy Pachirat's work) as well as on our perceptions of animals.⁴² In this way, Shukin makes clear the ways that practices such as industrialized slaughter have been instrumental in the construction of a singular view of animals as passive individuals who exist outside of history, and calls for the development of "histories of animal agency" in order to begin to reverse these detrimental shifts.⁴³ Jason Hribal's consideration of animals as members of the working class would naturally shift one's understanding of their histories, if they chose to follow this reasoning.⁴⁴ While the analyses throughout this dissertation do not include a comprehensive discussion of the political stakes of capitalism, the social changes of the nineteenth century greatly affected human-animal relations, in many ways pushing animals to the margins. While we might expect literary representation to sideline animal presence in a similar manner, I argue that we can read key moments in novels as giving voice to the disappearing animal, whether through sounds, narrative agency, attention to suffering, or animals' positions as subjects.

⁴⁰ While these two terms do have slightly different meanings in English depending on their historical context, the first is technically the English translation for the second. Throughout this dissertation, I will attempt to use them based on whether I am referring to 20-21st century descriptions (=slaughterhouse) or nineteenth century (=abattoir).

⁴¹ *Animal to Edible* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 5; Timothy Pachirat's extensive first-hand account of an American industrial slaughterhouse in *Every Twelve Seconds* confirms the extent of this "abstraction" and invisibilization and is discussed at length in Chapter 3 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

⁴² *Animal Capital* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).

⁴³ *Ibid*, 130.

⁴⁴ Hribal's study is essentially limited to the 17-19th centuries, but the idea of animals as laborers shifts how one thinks of them, given the agency we assume when it comes to "work" and "workers".

The expansion and maintenance of French colonial projects during the nineteenth century played a different, but equally key role as industrialization in changing the ways that animals were seen (or not) and categorized or valorized by the French public. While these spaces were physically outside of France, their effects on the discursive representations of both animals and humans from these geographical locations continues to be seen today, particularly in the ways that it impacted the understandings of race and the colonial Other.⁴⁵ This dissertation thus also addresses these issues of representation vis-à-vis species and racial formations and particularly how formulations of subcategories that occur within each category are often interdependent due to the ways that they were framed within the contexts of colonialism. Colonized human bodies are not only physically disciplined and confined, they are also conceptually positioned outside the primary formulation of “the human” *par excellence* that Aph Ko and Syl Ko so adeptly describe in their essays aiming to reimagine these very issues of race and species, as well as the questions of animality that pertain to each.⁴⁶ Val Plumwood’s theorization of the Other as depending on Western “rationality” and formulations of “reason” emphasizes the violence that the human-animal divide enacts on both human *and* animal bodies within this group, showing how colonial rhetoric works both within the home country and inside the colonial space to reinforce these understandings of what is “human” and what lies outside of it.⁴⁷ Chapter 2 in particular takes up these scholars and others to show how unique constructions of animality work

⁴⁵ The work of scholars such as Eric Ames, Nigel Rothfels, and Walter Putnam focuses on zoos and their direct connections to colonization and the discursive shifts that they necessitated in order to be successful. While each of these individuals’ work focuses on a unique aspect of zoos (whether by focusing on a specific individual who had particular influence on the development of zoos, like Ames on Carl Hagenbeck; the impacts zoos have on how one sees and understands animals and colonial Others, as Rothfels with the gaze; or how a specific Colonial Exposition emerged out of colonial projects in France, as Putnam does with his article in *French Thinking*) the fact that the varying forms of these displays (spectacles) emerge out of colonialism is consistent for all three.

⁴⁶ *Aphro-Isms* (New York: Lantern Books, 2017).

⁴⁷ *Environmental Culture* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

together to maintain rhetorics of power and dominance that maintain human superiority over animals while putting into question the humanity of these groups of colonial human Others at the same time.

Beyond the consideration of how rereading animals in literature helps to begin revealing these violent discourses of race and species, this dissertation explores the disappearance of real animals that begins during this time as the potential pathway to their transformation into “ghosts” as a result of the “perpetual vanishing” that Akira Mizuta Lippit describes.⁴⁸ That “human advancement always coincides with a recession of nature and its figures” brings about this “curious configuration” that aligns particularly well with Avery Gordon’s conceptualization of haunting, even down its similarity to her description of a “constellation of effects” that are both “historical and institutional.”⁴⁹ The irony of the new re-presentations of animals that I move to articulate in this dissertation is that, unless the mechanisms which perpetuate animal vanishings through our current century are quickly reversed, literary animals will be the only ones who remain. After all, as John Berger stated decades ago, animals are the “living monument to their own appearance..., everywhere...disappear[ing].”⁵⁰ The now “indeterminate world” that animals occupy still threatens the “safety of world” within which humans live, created and maintained by the categories that are greatly reinforced and theorized over the course of the nineteenth century in France.⁵¹

⁴⁸ *Electric Animal* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 1.

⁴⁹ *Ghostly Matters* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 8; These two scholars do set out to discuss unique issues – while Lippitt addresses animals specifically, Gordon’s work is a larger-lensed consideration of the relationship between knowledge, power, and experience. However, Gordon’s concepts apply extremely well to questions surrounding the animal, both real and literary, and it is for this reason that her work undergirds many of my analyses throughout this dissertation.

⁵⁰ “Why Look at Animals?” *About Looking* (1980): 24.

⁵¹ Lippit, 1; Berger, 51.

Overall, this dissertation explores the potential of literary animals to exercise a kind of agency within fictional narratives, particularly those who are often read as pieces of the setting of a particular text or otherwise elements of the background of a given *milieu*. These kinds of agencies are not always individual, embodied agencies, but instead often reveal themselves to be spectral as they linger in the narratives and stand in for the bodies that texts and histories have replaced. De Fontenay mourns the damage wrought by philosophical thought and practice on animals' representations and how we perceive them:

*Où vont passer les bêtes elles-mêmes, en chair et en os, en griffes et en fourrures, en odeurs et en cris ? Si elles devaient s'absenter du fait d'un parti pris méthodologique, n'aurait-il pas mieux valu continuer à se taire à leur sujet ?*⁵²

*[Where will the animals themselves go, then, in their skin and bones, claws and fur, smells and cries? If they must leave because of the results of a methodological question, wouldn't it have been best to simply keep quiet on their behalf?]*⁵³

Repeatedly, she returns to the question of whether or not we — who are human animals — have the right to speak for non-human animals. However, if this is never undertaken, we cannot begin to broaden the definitions of history that are necessary, according to Baratay, if we wish to extend it to animals themselves.⁵⁴ But despite the challenges that arise upon undertaking the work of imagining the reality of non-human experience, it is exactly what this project aims to do. In order to think productively about and with these textual animals, I consider not only their flesh and blood, but also their ghostly natures in the nineteenth century, and how their presences — even as background or assumed metaphors, or perhaps particularly in these roles — continue to “seeth[e] and linger[...].”⁵⁵ In so doing, these presences work to signal the “not there” of real animals in spaces of industrial farming and their denial of subjectivity by colonial projects. Both

⁵² *Le silence des bêtes*, 25, emphasis mine.

⁵³ My translation.

⁵⁴ Baratay, “Building,” 3.

⁵⁵ Gordon, 195.

of these types of haunting demonstrate how animals in literature can reveal the “unsettled relationship between what we see and what we know,” much of which is rearranged and undone in the wake of these two social phenomena.⁵⁶

The first chapter, “Farm Animals: Particularities and Origins of Species in the New Age of Agriculture,” considers Gustave Flaubert’s *Madame Bovary* in light of the changes in France’s long-standing agrarian culture as the effects of industrialization over the course of the nineteenth century were first felt in the rural parts of the country. As I have already begun to show in this Introduction, these shifts had significant impacts on the ways that literary animals were depicted and how real animals were treated within the context of a new, industrializing agriculture, given the implications of the Realist and Naturalist novels whose prominence, in many ways, took over that of the Romantic novel in the mid- to late-nineteenth century. The chapter begins with a reading of horses in the novel to demonstrate the goal of the overall project: to show moments when literary animals exercise their capacity to demonstrate agency within these fictional spaces in a similar way to literary humans. I continue by showing the unique impacts on species distinctions that begin to emerge not long after the shifts of this period, and then move into a discussion of the agricultural fair in the local village where the novel is set. This section addresses the rhetorical work that was required in order to begin encouraging the rural areas of France to think of the nation *as* a nation; by mobilizing the research of Eugen Weber’s study on the emergence of a French national identity and considering the capitalist direction that the state was pushing agriculture, the shifts in thinking about animals begin to transform within this literary context.⁵⁷ Finally, it considers how Emma Bovary’s life might have unfolded differently from the boring life Flaubert extends to her, which is wholly unfulfilled and ultimately ended by

⁵⁶ Gordon, 194.

⁵⁷ *Peasants into Frenchmen* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976).

her material and amorous pursuits. This alternate life would have been altogether contrary to the progress-oriented mentalities that she demonstrates throughout this foundational text in French Literature. It seems likely that it would not have been unlike the life of Madame Catherine Niçaise Leroux, who is the primary focus of the section following the discussion of the agricultural fair and whose entire life has been spent raising animals on her farm. I thus move to put the two women in a space of compare-contrast, exploring the different shared attributes and Flaubert's potential justifications for his choices.

The second chapter, "The Exotic Animal: Rereading Representations of Animals in *Salammbô*," turns to the text with which I opened this Introduction, also written by Gustave Flaubert, and the doubled colonial site where it takes readers, given the historical context of Carthage's war with the Barbarians in the third century B.C. and France's active colonial projects in this same geographical location at the time of the novel's publication. Over the course of additional readings of elephants as well as several that consider lions in this novel, questions of race and species permeate the discussions of the animals as individual actors in the text. Despite his self-professed denial of ever deviating from historical fact, Flaubert's unique perspective during a time in France when what Edward Said calls "orientalist" views abounded is evident throughout the text.⁵⁸ In addition to the account of the battles and conflicts that relate directly to the Mercenary Revolt, *Salammbô* also recounts the story of Salammbô, who is the daughter of the Carthaginian captain Hamilcar, and her tumultuous relationship with Mâtho, the captain of the Barbarian Army. This part of the story, however, is not included in my analysis, given that it is not directly relevant to the discussions of animals and colonized humans upon

⁵⁸ "Orientalism" emerges out of a deep fascination with the foreign peoples and lands of colonial projects and establishes a unique rhetoric that Said argues is foundational for the continued power dynamics between Occidental and Oriental (in the geographic sense) spaces. This concept will be further articulated in Chapter 2.

which I focus. Further, the serpent that Salammbô keeps in her quarters in the holy temple of Tanit is not addressed, due to the significant amount of criticism that exists focusing on its religious and sexual implications.⁵⁹ Since these issues are not currently a focus of my considerations of this colonial context, I have chosen to exclude the serpent from my discussions of animals in *Salammbô*. However, in a future iteration or expansion of this chapter or the dissertation as a whole, it would be important to integrate (re)readings of the serpent in order to acknowledge its potential as itself, instead of as symbol for any number of other meanings as it is currently read.

An important aside should be made regarding a term used frequently throughout Chapter 2: “barbarian.” Given the focus that this project gives to animals, and the particular focus of this chapter on colonial animals and human Others, the term should be clearly defined within the context of *Salammbô*. Dictionaries still place the less-subjective, and original, definition of the word first: “a member of a community or tribe not belonging to one of the great civilizations (Greek, Roman, Christian).”⁶⁰ However, more often than not, “barbarian” is understood as “an uncivilized or brutish person,” the second definition given in the entry. Synonyms range from “wild man/woman” to “heathen” to “beast.” It is therefore important to emphasize the fact that, while the Barbarian Army in *Salammbô* is considered less civilized by the Carthaginians, its designation as “Barbarian” is not necessarily *because* of this perspective. Instead, this adjective is used due to their varied origins, as pointed out frequently in Flaubert’s referral to the abundance of different “tribes” in their army, especially as he describes their camp(s). Having said this, it is unlikely that Flaubert chose the term arbitrarily, and that he was well aware of its

⁵⁹ Both Corrine Samanidayar-Perrin and Göran Blix’s articles, both referenced in Chapter 2, discuss the serpent and provide unique perspectives on its meanings.

⁶⁰ See definitions for “barbare” in *Le Nouveau Petit Robert de la langue française* (2008) and “barbarian” in *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition* (2005).

history as a term to delineate and sideline the Other. Ironically, many of the most “barbaric” actions throughout this novel – if we take the term’s second definition – are done by the Carthaginians, not the Barbarians.

The third chapter, “The Ghostly Animal: The Seething Presences of Industrial Animals in *La Bête humaine*,” takes Émile Zola's *La Bête humaine* as the basis for another consideration of the shifts in the depictions and understandings of animals – still largely those coming from “the farm” – during the nineteenth century in France. This shift in perception emerged initially out of the physical moving of the slaughterhouse from the middle of the city to the “fringe”. Noëlie Vialles' introduction to her study of the slaughterhouse in the Adour region of Southern France comments on the progressive moving of these establishments and how it has helped us achieve “knowing nothing” about the process of “making meat”:

*In former times, sacrifices were solemn occasions celebrated in public. Later, slaughterhouses operated in the middle of towns, when animals were not actually killed in the street. Nowadays, slaughtering has become an invisible, exiled, almost clandestine activity. We know it goes on, of course, but it is an abstract kind of knowledge. ...we demand an ellipsis between animal and meat.*⁶¹

Vialles’ study also touches on the changes in practice that accompanied the slaughterhouses’ increased distance from society, prioritizing speed of death and butchering in order to “make” more meat. These changes, incremental as they might have seemed at the time, led to different modes of depicting animals in fiction. In turn, readers not connected with the farming industry, which would have included the vast majority of those living in the city, also began to perceive these animals differently. While they were no longer a physical presence in most French people’s daily lives, animals had been replaced: the train and other machines largely moved in to take their place. This chapter thus considers the apparent absence of animals in the

⁶¹ Vialles, 5.

rural landscapes Zola sets his story in by homing in on the few that do appear throughout the novel.

Lo(o)sing Animals centers literary contexts as key historical sites, and the chronological order of the novels' publications is thus fitting as it provides a genealogical progression through Flaubert and Zola's work.⁶² The project's focus on the concept of "progress" within the contexts of industrialization and colonization during the nineteenth century in France further undergirds the order of the three chapters. While this dissertation emphasizes the need to imagine the experiences of literary animals *as* animals, it simultaneously moves to examine the way that the social phenomena in France during this time force them to become ghostly, references for their bodies even as they disappear from view. Ultimately, this dissertation moves to seek out the unremarked (or unremarkable) animals in each text in order to restore to them both the visibility and histories that the mechanisms and social changes of industrialization and colonization progressively erased. By considering literary animals in nineteenth-century French literature as worthy and capable of being actors within narratives, their stories join together with those of the literary humans alongside whom they live on the page and ultimately eke out new possibilities for them both in fiction and as they are observed in France and France's colonies during this period.

⁶² *Madame Bovary* was published in 1856 (serially in the *Revue de Paris*), *Salammbô* in 1862, and *La Bête humaine* in 1890.

Chapter 1

Farm Animals: Particularities and Origins of Species in the New Age of Agriculture

*We gallop for a while, blowing our horns to try them; silence. ...the wind is sharp and bracing, footprints of jackals and camels half obliterated by the wind.*⁶³

Much like one sees in the correspondence from his travels, the descriptions in Gustave Flaubert's novels are everywhere permeated by sensory details and the presence of animals often plays a significant role. *Madame Bovary*, his most enduring work and one of the most-read novels in French literature, is no exception: the distinction between the town and the countryside is manifest in the types of sounds (and silence) heard by the main characters. The two towns where Flaubert's main protagonist, Emma Bovary, lives after she's married are Tostes and Yonville, both isolated villages in the countryside of Northern France. Due to the rurality of these places, animal noises function as both reminders of the isolated locations of the narrative and notable moments in the characters' lives. Farm animals' sounds often accompany the moments when Emma's ennui, a principal element of the novel, is brought back into focus. For instance, the agricultural fair, a scene that I will later examine at length, is one where these sounds are described in detail:

Les bêtes étaient là, le nez tourné vers la ficelle, et alignant confusément leurs croupes inégales. Des porcs assoupis enfonçaient en terre leur groin ; des veaux beuglaient ; des brebis bêlaient ; les vaches, un jarret replié, étalaient leur ventre sur le gazon, et, ruminant lentement, clignaient leurs paupières lourdes, sous les moucherons qui bourdonnaient autour d'elles.⁶⁴

[The beasts were there, their noses towards the cord, and making a confused line with their unequal rumps. Drowsy pigs were burrowing in the earth with their snouts, calves were bleating, lambs baaing; the cows, on knees folded in, were stretching their bellies on the grass, slowly chewing the cud, and blinking their heavy eyelids at the gnats that buzzed around them.]

⁶³ *Flaubert in Egypt*, trans. and ed. Francis Steegmuller (The Bodley Head, 1972), 56.

⁶⁴ Flaubert, 131.

Emma, bored in her marriage and life with Charles Bovary, has come to the fair with an acquaintance named Rodolphe, with whom she is already cultivating the beginnings of an affair. As the two wander through the fair area, her disgust is tangible upon hearing, smelling and seeing these animals – regular presences in a provincial life.⁶⁵ In spite of her haughty attitude towards the animals, the mention of their sounds actually corresponds quite directly to how, according to Laurence M. Porter, other sounds in this text show that Flaubert’s style “forms part of a steadily sharpening focus that dispels uncertainty.”⁶⁶ However, the kinds of sounds he cites are not these sounds from the fair, but rather at Emma and Charles’ wedding: “one first hears a vehicle approach; then it is revealed as one of the six types of carriage....”⁶⁷ He goes on to explain how these sounds set off “an effect of true-to-lifeness” via a “zoom-in perspective.” In this way, Porter places a premium on the sounds made by humans (or human-made vehicles, in this case). Given Flaubert’s choice of a rural setting to situate his protagonist’s ennui, I would extend his observations about sound to animals. While Porter’s detailed analysis of character formation in Flaubert’s work touches on how human representation and setting are foundational for the author’s narrative, the presence of animals is hardly mentioned, and should at the very least be given a passing acknowledgement. While in this dissertation, I am arguing for them as much more than background, even critics who consider animals to be relatively inanimate pieces of the setting of a text should acknowledge the fact that they are nonetheless foundational to how

⁶⁵ Charles’ character is tragically bovine in nature, making his last name (and Emma’s) a foundational irony in this celebrated work. While this dissertation argues to restore a more active role to animals like cows, in the sense of this adjective as it is usually employed, this country doctor fits it well: excelling at nothing, blindness to his wife’s lack of affection, unaware of his impact on her, etc. In short, he is the embodiment of ennui and failed aspirations, both in general and for Emma herself.

⁶⁶ “The art of characterization” in *The Cambridge Companion to Flaubert* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 129.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

this setting is created in the imaginary of the reader (e.g. farm animals versus “exotic” animals).⁶⁸

Despite the connections that can be made between these sounds and the events and moments that they characterize, many critics might still consider them to be moments of “issueless description”: “details [that] will not reappear to serve some *use* later in the story...[and from which] it is difficult to extract a meaning or purpose.”⁶⁹ I would argue that these details are in fact very useful, as they signal both the persistence of the agrarian lifestyle late into the nineteenth century in France and a simultaneous and uncomfortable shift towards the industrialization already partially developed in the city.⁷⁰ The latter created new modes of thinking about animals, and farm animals in particular began to be identified as products more and more frequently.⁷¹ It is indeed because of the ways that animal bodies are mobilized in the

⁶⁸ Porter’s framework for characterization distinguishes between types of narrative within Flaubert’s work, and separates in this way *Madame Bovary* and *Salammô*. I would suggest that these different categorizations of animal could further this distinction even within his framework, were he to incorporate animals as common presences in Flaubert.

⁶⁹ Michael Sayeau, “‘Un cœur simple:’ An Uneventful Narrative,” *Critical Insights: Gustave Flaubert*, ed. Tom Hubbard (Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2015), 217, emphasis mine; Sayeau’s essay focuses specifically on a short novel of Flaubert’s called *Un cœur simple*, but this passage of his essay, which is the first paragraph of the piece, takes Roland Barthes’ essay “The Reality Effect” as its starting point. Barthes considers several descriptive details of the novella as presenting a unique challenge to literary critics, given that they essentially serve no purpose in the narrative as a whole. Sayeau paraphrases a key question posed by Barthes: “Would the story have been any different at all, save for being a few words shorter, had Flaubert chosen not to include [this detail]?” I believe that this question and the other considerations about such “moments of issueless description” is particularly applicable to *Madame Bovary*. It would seem that animals’ sounds are considered thus by Flaubert but given his persistence in including such abundant detail, I would suggest, along with Barthes and Sayeau, that there is something to be remarked in the animals’ audibility, though in a cursory reading it might appear quite unremarkable.

⁷⁰ The agrarian lifestyle that I refer to here becomes distinct from farming itself. In certain areas, larger slaughterhouses were built and thus the lifestyles of those who lived around them began to integrate a new way of interacting with (or not, rather) animals. However, in other parts of the country and even in these same areas, those who were not involved in this work would have continued to live and work alongside their animals, many into the 20th-Century (see Robb, Weber).

⁷¹ This period also saw the rise of the domestication of certain species of animals, creating a direct parallel to the reduction of attention paid to farm animals as this attention was, in effect, rerouted towards pets – though still not out of a concern for the well-being of the animals themselves. Following an overview of the study of pet keeping via the concepts of key scholars in Animal and Pet Studies, Kari Weil’s chapter in her book *Thinking Animals*, “Is a Pet an Animal?,” describes domestication and the practices it requires as “a process of taming that turns animals into property” (55). A longer discussion of this phenomenon alongside that of the changes in

major shifts in agricultural practices from this time forward that the ways that they were discussed and framed moved easily towards allegory and symbolism.

The “I” in “Animal”: Some Key Concepts for (Re)reading Animals

This chapter aims to demonstrate these shifts in farm animals’ treatment and depiction in order to move towards more accurate animal histories. However, it is important to acknowledge the fact that the consideration of these and other animals as products – in other words, objectified bodies that can be produced for the benefit of humans – was not in and of itself a far cry from certain dynamics between humans and animals that existed before the industrial revolution. Florence Burgat in particular reminds us that there has long existed a violent treatment of animals by “une humanité qui se pose *contre* les animaux” [“a humanity that positions itself *against* animals”] and that for this reason, it would be best to “nuancer, voire de révoquer...l’idée qui y eut pour les animaux un bon vieux temps, avant la saison rude qu’ils traversent depuis l’industrialisation.” [“nuance, if not revoke...the idea that there was for animals a ‘good old days,’ before the harsh season that they have endured since industrialization”]⁷² Burgat is a French philosopher who calls for readings and understandings of animals that are based in phenomenology, which emphasizes the lived experiences of all beings. Instead of limiting our (humans’) understandings of animals through the live *expériences* [=scientific experiments] imagined and executed in human spaces and/or by asking human-centered

agriculture during the nineteenth century would be extremely useful for future iterations of this dissertation, but in the interest of time, it has been set aside for a reworked version of either this chapter or the entire project in manuscript form. The thinking of scholars such as Kathleen Kete (*The Beast in the Boudoir*), Harriet Ritvo (*The Animal Estate*, discussed in other sections of this dissertation), John Berger and certainly Yi-Fu Tuan (*Dominance and Affection: The Making of Pets*) would be essential to such an expansion of my readings, alongside Weil’s scholarship.

⁷² *Une autre existence* (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 2012), 366; All translations from *Une autre existence* are my own.

questions, a focus on their life experiences (e.g. without human imposed frameworks or limitations) makes it possible for them to be perceived as individuals who “live their lives in the first person.”⁷³ In a literary study such as my own, combining Burgat’s way of thinking animals’ lives in this manner helps create connections between the philosophical, literary, and ethological studies of the texts and animals at hand that have been conducted independently of one another. Extending one’s preliminary research across this variety of disciplines opens up the readings that follow to better understand the implications of animal representation in the texts, both as we understand the authors’ intentions in how they chose to include or describe them as well as literary critics’ analysis of animals in these texts over the years.⁷⁴

Throughout this chapter, I often turn to Jocelyn Porcher’s modes of thinking about farm animals as I discuss them within the context of *Madame Bovary*. Porcher is the director of the

⁷³ “The Unexpected Resemblance between Dualism and Continuism, or How to Break a Philosophical Stalemate,” trans. Dantzel Cenatiempo in *French Thinking about Animals* (eds. Louisa Mackenzie and Stephanie Posthumus, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2015), 49.

⁷⁴ Given its focus on the less-obvious animals throughout *Madame Bovary* (with the exception of the horse), this chapter does not examine one of the most obvious – if brief – animal presences in the novel: Emma’s pet dog, Djali. A gift from a gamekeeper whom Charles had cured, this dog’s presence is remarkable in the provincial setting of the text, as it is “a little Italian greyhound”. She is thus not a working breed in the sense of, for example, a sheep dog, which wouldn’t be a surprise to see in this rural space. Djali – a female, thus doubly significant in that she is an animal and a feminine body, both “lesser” categories or distinctions during this time – is thus purely a pet, for Emma’s pleasure. One can see resemblance between Emma and her dog in the ways that the latter runs in circles and is characterized by a “melancholy face” that Emma even compares to herself directly. The dog thus represents some of the unsettling characteristics of the industry of petkeeping whose growth paralleled that of the industrialization of agriculture during this time, and which become so prevalent in the urban areas that became increasingly devoid of the presence of farm animal. In these spaces, as Kari Weil explains, pets “hovered on the borders of [humans’] kin and kind”, much like Djali seems to do here in comparison with Emma, her mistress (“They Eat Horses”, 46). If I choose here to discuss Djali only in a footnote, it is due to limitations of the chapter framework and not to further the habit of “scholars writing about the animal-human divide [who] do not address pets” (Heidi Nast, “Critical Pet Studies?” *Antipode*, 2006, 896). Indeed, I believe this dog could be considered in the same way that Nast talks about “pets (especially dogs) invok[ing]...an entirely new kind of sociality and love, one more tailored to the...narcissism of post-industrial lives than children” (900). While Emma lives during the industrial revolution, her actions are not unlike those that Nast is describing, which enact a “kind of owner-owned love relationship [that] carries and is emblematic of...heightened forms of privatizations” that revolve around capitalism and industrial progress in general (902). To appropriately discuss the elements that Djali’s presence alongside Emma imply, one would therefore need to consider the dog’s foreignness as well as her difference from the other animals in this rural space.

INRS (*l'institut national de recherche et de sécurité*) in Paris, and her research focuses on farm animals – how they are raised and how the interactions between humans and animals within these contexts function.⁷⁵ Her focus on these relationships emerged out of her desire to better understand “d’où venait ce que je mangeais...il fallait faire naître les animaux, les élever puis les tuer. Non pas tuer *du* lapin mais *mes* lapins, *mes* poulets, *mes* oies... Est-ce que c’était bien ? Est-ce que c’était juste ? [...] Pour moi, cela n’allait pas de soi” [“where my food came from...it was necessary to bring animals to life, to raise them, and then kill them. Not just kill *a* rabbit, but *my* rabbits, *my* chickens, *my* geese... Was it good? Was it right? [...] For me, the answers to those questions weren’t self-evident.”].⁷⁶ After many years of pursuing research in a variety of settings where animals were *élevés*, ranging from her own first farm in the country outside of Paris to time spent working in industrial settings, Porcher considers animals in each of these settings as actors in the actual work, and seeks to understand this (these) role(s) as such.⁷⁷ Jason Hribal’s argument for animals as much-needed additions to the category of “the working class,” to which I referred in my Introduction, echoes this idea of animals-as-workers even more emphatically.⁷⁸ His articulation of the contributions of many species to the progress of industrialization is convincing, and the fact that it sounds like such a revolutionary idea, when it is actually a logical one, demonstrates just how much the hidden nature of animals’ work has played into their continued subjection to violence in the workplace and in the advancements of scientifically-driven breeding.

⁷⁵ Jocelyn Porcher, “Biographie,” website of Jocelyn Porcher, July 2, 2018, <http://jocelyneporcher.fr/devenir-sociologue-a-l-inra/?l=fr>.

⁷⁶ Ibid; My translation.

⁷⁷ Porcher and Tiphaine Schmitt. “Dairy Cows: Workers in the Shadows?” in *Society & Animals* 20 (2012).

⁷⁸ “Animals are part of the working class’: a challenge to labor history” in *Labor History* 44.4 (2003).

In their article “Dairy Cows: Workers in the Shadows?”, Porcher and Tiphaine Schmitt describe the study they undertook at a dairy cow farm, where they conducted extensive observation and interviews of both the cows and the family who owns and operates the farm.⁷⁹ Like Burgat, they acknowledge the long-standing relationship between humans and animals, but gesture beyond the context of violence that she emphasizes:

First, animals have been involved in human activities for thousands of years. Their presence in the field of work is therefore nothing new, even though we have not yet clarified how animals perceive their work. Yet, how can we understand the work that animals farming consists of, and the role of the human-animal relationship in that work, without taking into account the animals themselves? The sociological question of work in animal farming, which concerns the terms and actors of a relationship, can no longer afford to overlook animals’ engagement in work, in a world that is profoundly human but based on a human-animal relationship. [...] they...live, from birth to death, in our human world.⁸⁰

Thus, Porcher and Schmitt acknowledge that animals are certainly at the mercy of humans. However, they also move to focus on animals’ individuality and how that can – and, indeed, must – remain a focus of humans’ considerations of animals in these spaces.⁸¹ One could argue that their research chooses to a certain degree to ignore the suffering that animals experience in factory farms, but Porcher and Schmitt defend their work’s importance specifically vis-à-vis these industrial spaces.⁸² Katheryn Gillespie has conducted extensive research on dairy

⁷⁹ While certainly the term “interview” gestures towards the conversations that Tiphaine regularly had with the family, the article’s description of the cows at times gives the impression that the animals also shared their thoughts on certain processes, if not with the researcher, then certainly with the farmer. This is not explicitly said by Porcher, but the overall thrust of the findings remains similar: these animals have extremely unique personalities and ways of being in the world that impact how they experience their daily lives.

⁸⁰ Porcher and Schmitt, 39-40.

⁸¹ It is certainly important to distinguish the relatively small farm that this research is based on – of 65-70 cows – from the kinds of factory farms and industrial slaughterhouses that Matthew Scully and Timothy Pachirat’s respective studies examine. In those contexts, it is physically impossible to acknowledge the animals’ role as workers, even simply on a logistical level. Scully in particular describes the extreme lack of people that he encountered when he visited the actual farming spaces of the industrial pig farms in North Carolina. The issue of mechanized work and the removal of human interaction thus complicates these discussions, and certainly is one of the main factors that allow for the “out of sight, out of mind” concept to be carried forward despite the horrific conditions that farm animals experience in life and death.

⁸² They describe the emphasis that ethology has put on studying wild animals while neglecting to consider farm animals in similar ways. This is not to imply that the studies on wild animals have reduced their shrinking numbers, given that this is largely due to massive climate change and the continued urbanization of “wild” spaces.

farms in the Pacific Northwestern United States, and her findings show that these differences in opinion when it comes to cows' capacities to be "workers" has perhaps less to do with a lack of ethological research, as Porcher and Schmitt imply, and more to do with the focus on profit, when it comes to the ways animals' (in this case, cows, as in Porcher and Schmitt's study) physical limits are pushed:

...the biological bodies on which the industry relies have inherent natural limits that are in constant tension with industry tenets of increased efficiency. Bodies, pushed to capacity, break down, and when these bodies break down, they are slaughtered to eke out the last bit of capital in the form of meat, skin, and offal.⁸³

This focus on the product – "meat, skin, and offal" – that can be "eke[d] out" even after biological limits are surpassed demonstrates the complexity of implying that a lack of research is the main reason more industrial farms don't adjust their practices. While Hribal's study focused on animals' work prior to the 20th Century, I imagine that he would align himself with Gillespie, as he, too, explains the key part that the discursive shift from calling animals' flesh "meat" played in the movements towards increased production in farming – or even for farming to be referred to as "production".⁸⁴ However, Porcher and Schmitt's work remains relevant particularly within the literary context of work such as my own.

However, Porcher and Schmitt claim that this lack of research is the reason that the living conditions of farm animals have deteriorated: their "visible suffering has become invisible."⁸²

⁸³ "Sexualized violence and the gendered commodification of the animal body in Pacific Northwest US dairy production" in *Gender, Place and Culture* 2013; Like Scully and Pachirat's studies, Gillespie's research focuses on the context of industrial farming practices in the United States. However, the particular parallel here that I wish to emphasize is her focus on dairy cows, like Porcher and Schmitt's study.

⁸⁴ Hribal, 438; Noëlie Vialles, to whom I refer throughout other sections of this chapter and dissertation, also discusses the issue of the term "meat", particularly in the way that it distances the animal body (the living thing) from its transformation into a product (the dead thing = "meat") (*Animal to Edible*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

As I have mentioned above, my readings throughout this chapter aim to acknowledge the animals in *Madame Bovary* as more than just background noise: in certain cases, if not all, even as subjects in their own right. In order to do this, I move to consider them as “I”s, beings who are capable of “organiz[ing] relations with and in an environment, but [are] also the subject of these experiences.”⁸⁵ The philosophical subjectivity that Burgat articulates in her work finds physical examples throughout Porcher and Schmitt’s study, as they explain the individual tendencies of many of the cows and the ways that the farmer recognizes and works around these differences. The contributions of the animals to the process of raising or working with them is at no point more evident than when they “resist,” as Hribal calls it, or, in the words of Porcher and Schmitt, refuse to do the work: “animals’ collaboration at work is visible when it is not obtained” but is otherwise not visible.⁸⁶ Along these lines, my readings, in moving away from focusing only on the human characters of *Madame Bovary*, attempt to show how literary animals do just this: resist the “work” that they are presumed upon to do – e.g. without ever being given the choice not to – by functioning as indicators of a certain setting or time. Beyond this, the historical considerations of them that reading them as “I”s necessitates – e.g. the circumstances that changed their living conditions – also enable us to read individual literary animals as the hauntings of their previous lives. How does the presence of the animals that, in this text in particular, are living in a time of uncomfortable shifts towards industrialization, gesture towards the kinds of agrarian practices that, if not free of violence and death, certainly involved a basic acknowledgment of the physical needs of animals?

In a first section, I will show how animals’ presence in Emma Bovary’s life is persistent, but that there are distinct species that characterize the period before her marriage to Charles and

⁸⁵ Burgat, “Stalemate”, 56.

⁸⁶ Hribal, 448-450; Porcher and Schmitt, 43.

her life after. After this, I will move into a consideration of the key role that horses play in Emma Bovary's life and this novel: these animals occupied important working roles both in the city and the country, which provides an interesting connection between the two spaces and the different ways that they underwent industrialization. Next, I will discuss the question of whether farm animals become unique species beginning during the industrial revolution of the nineteenth century: Was the pig living on a peasant's farm in the 1700's really the same as a pig who was raised destined to die in a slaughterhouse 100 years later? How do we reconcile the shifts that were happening, and that I have briefly alluded to above, in how animals began to be perceived as part of the process of farming as an industry? In moving towards the answers to these questions, one can begin to build a history that integrates and acknowledges animals in their own right, as Éric Baratay urges us to do: by considering their actual contexts and the origins of both the physical and discursive origins from whence these contexts emerged.⁸⁷ The following section will demonstrate a key instance where this novel demonstrates historical shifts happening in France during Flaubert's time: the chapter in *Madame Bovary* that describes the events of the farmer's market in Yonville. Over the course of this excerpt, he uses this otherwise inconsequential event to highlight many of the ironies in France's movement towards more industrial models and how agriculture became integrated into the concept of patriotism in France as a result.⁸⁸ Because of the way French society was moving towards a more capitalist model at this time, the development of the agricultural industry as well as the continued participation of

⁸⁷ Logan O'Laughlin discusses the case of a particular feral hog who escaped confinement and regressed into a wilder state. It is this degree of species difference that I mainly argue for here, although the issue of genetic modification is certainly a literal change in species' make-ups, and this is addressed in my discussion as well (*Toxic Animal Encounters*, 126).

⁸⁸ While the agricultural fair is significant for the town of Yonville, when one considers *Madame Bovary* as a whole and this event's impact on the narrative, it seems, at first glance, to not advance the plot in any significant way. I argue the multiple ways that it is actually a pivotal moment in the novel.

animals in other industries such as mining integrates meant that they played a significant part (or were a significant piece) in the new modes of forming identity that were emerging.⁸⁹ While their presence is often overlooked, animals' essential part in an agricultural fair like this one means that by taking a closer look at the passage, we can continue to work towards framing a history that notices and acknowledges them in this discussion. Finally, I will consider an old woman, Madame Leroux, who represents everything that these new modes of thinking rebel against, and yet who is recognized publicly at the market for her "service" of 54 years on a farm. Beyond the way she makes evident the two modes of thinking that were struggling to prevail during this period, Madame Leroux also enables the reader to imagine what Emma's life might have been, had she not married Charles and remained on her father's farm.⁹⁰ This alternate existence would have likely been more deeply entangled with animals, as opposed to the mild – if persistent – presence they have in her life as depicted in the novel. In this analysis of Madame Leroux' character, we will briefly examine the ghost of the Madame-Bovary-who-wasn't and the animal echoes that surround this unfulfilled (and unresolved) existence. This hypothetical version of Flaubert's main character becomes in this discussion an articulated "seething presence, acting on and meddling with" our understanding of her like the ghostly presences in much the way Avery Gordon describes senses of "hauntings" in relation to our lives – our histories and those of others

⁸⁹ Jason Hribal's arguments for animals-as-workers and the advancements that result from their work demonstrate how they are key participants in American, British and Irish societies' movements towards a more capitalist model; while not focusing on France specifically, I would argue that the consistency of animals' work and presence in these three locations could be extended to other parts of Europe and the Western world during this time.

⁹⁰ As Rosemary Lloyd points out, the women in *Madame Bovary* (including Emma) are almost all defined by their relationship to the men around them, and even Emma in her self-absorbed nature is aware of the limitations imposed upon women during her time. This is evident in the way that she talks about wanting a son, through whom she might live her life vicariously since she cannot live it herself (*Madame Bovary*, New York: Routledge, 1990, 39-40). For this reason, it is not unreasonable to imagine that, had she not married Charles, Emma would likely have remained on her father's farm to support him.

persist in impinging on our current existences.⁹¹ The companions that Emma would have had in this alternate life intrude on the one she is actually living, and thus begin to paint a clearer understanding of her fragmented nature.

A House in the Country: A Brief Overview of *Madame Bovary's* Plot

One of the most well-known novels of all of French literature, *Madame Bovary* tells the story of Emma Bertaux, who marries Charles Bovary after his first wife dies suddenly. She enters into marriage with many illusions about love and romance that she's collected from clandestine reading during her time as a young girl in a convent. Emma actively pursues two love affairs, first with Rodolphe and then Léon, and over the course of the moments when she senses she is finally feeling the passion she deserves after so many years in a dull marriage, she also begins to accumulate significant debt in the purchasing of luxury goods. Her daughter, Berthe, is born not long before the start of her affair with Rodolphe, but Emma finds that she is bored by motherhood, much like she is by being a wife. When Lheureux, the town merchant, calls in her debts (most of which are unknown to Charles), Emma finds no one willing to help advance her the money, and in her despair, she swallows arsenic and suffers a horrific death.

The novel is set in rural France, mostly in the town of Yonville, which is largely recognized to be identified with the town of Ry. This is the area of France where Flaubert grew up, and his subtitle for the novel, *Mœurs de province* [Provincial virtues] provides an ironic contrast to Madame Bovary's life in the country. While she does initially attempt to remain faithful to Charles and lead the life of a housewife, her childhood fantasies ultimately undo her patience with the banality of Yonville. Principal in this background are farm animals, whose

⁹¹ *Ghostly Matters*, 8.

presence in moments when Emma's ennui is openly mentioned by Flaubert. While they correspond with his deference to and importance within the Realist tradition in France during this time (although certain scholars emphasize his dislike of this literary tradition), the realities of the industrial revolution in France over the course of the nineteenth century brought me to consider them differently in a novel that, at first glance, seems to be set in such a classic provincial location.⁹²

Romantic Illusions or Irritating Reminders?: Animals' Importance for Emma

While still married to his first wife, Charles Bovary is awoken, "one night towards eleven o'clock...by the noise of a horse pulling up outside [the] door."⁹³ Even before she is physically present, this description of an animal noise, the first in the novel up to this point, signals Emma's impending entry into the narrative. Her presence will continue to be characterized by audible reminders of the persistence of animals in the milieus that she will take a great disliking to. The boredom that she will feel following her marriage to this unassuming and altogether unsuccessful country doctor seems to be echoed in the way that Charles, on his way to her father's farm (and the couple's first meeting), "let[s] himself be lulled by the quiet trot of the horse."⁹⁴ Given the way that horses, in particular, have a strong influence on Emma's life and affairs, the mention of one here serves as an anticipation and foreshadowing of the main character of *Madame Bovary*. The way he so easily nods off also demonstrates Charles' "well-meaning mediocrity" and the

⁹² In *Madame Bovary: The End of Romance*, Eric Gans emphasizes Flaubert's lack of admiration for both "the works [and] the doctrines of the writers in his time who called themselves 'realists'" (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1989, 43). However, Gans goes on to say that "[for] the readers of his time...*Madame Bovary* carried out the realist program better than any of the productions of this marginal school" and that the novel was ultimately recognized as a "realist masterpiece".

⁹³ Gustave Flaubert, *Madame Bovary*, trans. Eleanor Marx-Aveling (Public Domain, 1880), 18; The doctor is summoned to "come immediately to the farm of the Bertaux to set a broken leg".

⁹⁴ Flaubert (trans. Aveling), 19.

way that he will figuratively sleep through his marriage, being “too trusting to see anything but surface.”⁹⁵

The young woman that Flaubert places in the middle of this text never finds happiness, but continues to reach for it in a multiplicity of ways in spite of — or perhaps *in order to* spite — her circumstances.⁹⁶ Daniel R. Schwarz faults Emma for being “a self-absorbed narcissist[...] who seems to eschew work” and for the way she seduces Charles, who “doesn’t realize what a coquette [she] is [...]”⁹⁷ At first hopeful that her marriage to Charles will lead to the kinds of love stories she once read, which were “qu’amours, amants, amantes, dames persécutées s’évanouissant dans des pavillons solitaires... ‘messieurs’ braves comme des lions, doux comme des agneaux, vertueux comme on ne l’est pas” [“love, lovers, sweethearts, persecuted ladies fainting in lonely pavilions... ‘gentlemen’ brave as lions, gentle as lambs, virtuous as no one ever was”], Emma soon perceives her life and future as a “corridor tout noir...qui avait au fond sa porte bien fermée” [“dark corridor, with the door at the end closed shut”].⁹⁸ These novels led her to build dreams of her future that were completely outside the realm of possibility, no matter whom she might have married. She had anxiously anticipated a future full of “l’attirante fantasmagorie des réalités sentimentales” [“the attractive phantasmagoria of sentimental realit[y]”] not unlike the ones she read of.⁹⁹ Raymond N. Mackenzie considers this to be

⁹⁵ Daniel R. Schwarz, *Reading the European Novel to 1900* (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Limited, 2014), 114; Raymond N. Mackenzie, “Introduction” (*Madame Bovary*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2009), xxvi.

⁹⁶ While I will not examine all of the lengths that Emma goes to find fulfillment, she largely seeks happiness in the arms of lovers, none of whom have any connection to a life lived with or among animals, aside from horses.

⁹⁷ Schwarz, 115.

⁹⁸ Flaubert, *Madame Bovary* (Brussels: UltraLetters Publishing, 2013), 36.

⁹⁹ Flaubert, 37; Emma read these novels during her time at a convent from the age of 13. An “vieille fille qui...les pensionnaires s’échappaient de l’étude pour...voir. [...] Elle comptait des histoires vous apprenait des nouvelles...et prêtait aux grandes, en cachette, quelque roman” [“old maid who[m]...the girls often slipped out from the study to go and see...told stories, gave them news...and on the sly lent the big girls some novel...”] (36). Thus, she begins even then to imagine a life that will take her away from animals and the ennui that they represent.

Flaubert's "mockery... [of] such novels' romanticism, their lack of realism," which shows how animals' roles between the two literary traditions did not remain static.¹⁰⁰

It is thus important to note that the "gentlemen" alluded to in the love stories Emma used to read are compared directly to animals in order to illustrate their traits. Now that she has grown older and married, her chances of meeting such a gentleman (for clearly, she has discovered, Charles is neither "brave as [a] lion" nor "gentle as [a] lamb"), while not completely eliminated, are limited by the bounds of her marriage. Ironically, the real animals who surround her in the life she actually leads throughout the novel are neither lions nor lambs but provide instead the background and the source of her unending chores and eventual ennui in her provincial existence. As I have already mentioned, these two groups of animals – the lions and lambs and the animals in Emma's provincial existence – could be distinguished further given the literary traditions they function as symbols of: Romanticism versus Realism. In the case of the former, the animals function purely as symbols of fantasy, stand-ins for men via the [human] qualities they supposedly represent. However, in the case of the animals that populate Emma's actual life, they are very real, as we see at the agricultural fair, to the point that they disturb her by their sounds and smells. It is in this way this second group of animals who remind her of the depth of her failure to experience any of the kinds of encounters she once dreamed of, adding insult to what she perceives as her eternal injury, and spurning the allegorical animals that Flaubert inserts into his descriptions of Emma's ideals.

Given how, from Emma's perspective, animals emphasize the mediocrity of her life, Charles Bovary is clearly not the only source of Emma's deep disappointment and boredom. She certainly articulates her disdain for her husband early on in their marriage, describing Charles as

¹⁰⁰ Raymond Mackenzie, xxvii.

someone who “n’enseignait rien...ne savait rien, ne souhaitait rien,” [“taught nothing, knew nothing, [and] wished nothing”], thus failing to do his duty of “excell[ant] en des activités multiples, [l’]initier aux énergies de la passion, aux raffinements de la vie” [“excel[ling] in manifold activities, initiat[ing her] into the energies of passion, the refinements of life.”]¹⁰¹ Certainly, the critical perspectives on his character that I have mentioned above demonstrate an affinity with her feelings. However, as we shall see in the different ways animals are described in relation to Emma, her disdain extends beyond Charles to the places to which she feels her marriage chains her, spaces where her dreams of finally escaping a rural life are shattered. This hope, directly connected to her aspirations of a great love story, is founded in a refusal of the “envahissements lyriques de la nature” [“lyrical invasions of Nature”] that were inscribed in many of the religious texts that she was read in the convent, as “elle connaissait trop la campagne; elle savait le bêlement des troupeaux, les laitages, les charrues” [“she knew the country too well; she knew the lowing of cattle, the milking, the ploughs”].¹⁰² Anything that had to do with the “aspects calmes” and “la verdure” [“the green fields”] only appealed to her “lorsqu’elle était clairsemée parmi les ruines” [“when broken up by ruins”]. The reference to “ruines” furthers the romantic aesthetic to which I have already referred, and in so doing paints a clear picture of Emma’s fantasy.¹⁰³ Romantic writers often “creat[ed] larger-than-life heroes” much like the “messieurs” of the novels Emma read during her time at the convent.¹⁰⁴ Not surprisingly, when they are not functioning as the kinds of allegories referring to men and love discussed earlier, animals in Romantic *tableaux* are often accompanied by a specific set of

¹⁰¹ Flaubert, 40.

¹⁰² Ibid, 35; Flaubert’s irony is evident here in how Emma’s true aspirations emerge out of the books she reads *clandestinely* at the convent, not from those she must read for their education there.

¹⁰³ Gray, Eugene F. “Romanticism” in *The Gustave Flaubert Encyclopedia*, 275-6.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

surroundings, as they are in this citation. In this manner, they are easily overlooked: they “are flashing half-signs ordinarily overlooked” by the reader “until...they become animated by the...*forces of atmosphere concealed in them.*”¹⁰⁵ Emma accepts the potential for “la nature” to include animals – perhaps as they graze on “la verdure” – but only if the physical ruins of human histories remain visible. It is animals’ intrusion on her own life that she continually resents, and this only deepens her ennui.

As Emma dreams of escaping the rural life that she’s nevertheless reminded of by the presence of animals, she attempts to console herself in the arms of two lovers: Rodolphe and Leon. As she feels she does not deserve the life she's been "dealt," she feels in these moments “a satisfaction of revenge.” As she betrays Charles, it seems that she finally is able to sense the “joyous bubblings” she has for so long dreamed of, and she is “without remorse, without anxiety, without trouble.” He is none the wiser until the final pages of the novel, following her violent and slow death by arsenic, when he opens a secret drawer in Emma's desk to find all of Leon and Rodolphe’s letters. I will come back to this discovery and the events immediately following shortly, but for now will consider the unique role horses have in Emma’s affairs and how the reading of the early stages of her affair with Rodolphe in particular is changed when we notice their presence. As she seeks release from the provincial life in this relationship, she does find it, but it is still *via* animals: her first affair begins whilst riding a horse.

Between Labor and Leisure: Horses as a Bridge Between Spaces

Horses occupy a unique position in the context of agricultural changes and spaces in nineteenth-century France because of the way that they were workers both in actual “jobs” –

¹⁰⁵ Gordon, 204, emphasis mine.

such as the cotton or sugar industries or as commercial transport in the city – and also in order to enable humans’ leisure activities – e.g. riding for pleasure.¹⁰⁶ In these ways, their presence in the city was not erased from view in the same way(s) that cows’, sheep’s or pigs’ were. However, I would argue that the way that the work that they did and its intensification over the course of this century demonstrate similar impacts for the animals themselves. In other words, their physical bodies, while perhaps more visible to the general public, were not treated better for it:

Nothing could be worse than the deaths suffered by most horses, who either collapsed on the street from overwork (and then were sold to the renderer) or were sold to the renderer first, only to be starved to death in the truck that hauled other horses to a similar fate.¹⁰⁷

Thus, while they might have been visible, horses were alienated much like the working classes to whom, as we have seen, it could be argued that they belonged. However, to incorporate horses alongside humans in the working classes of urban areas would also pose certain challenges: it was sometimes horses’ meat that these classes ate.¹⁰⁸ Horses’ “meat” was soon relegated to legal status alongside cows, sheep and pigs in France 1866, when the first [legal] horse butchery was opened.¹⁰⁹ In this way, their labors were multiplied in the city.

While they were certainly not free from labor in the country, the labor they did there was much different, particularly within the context of pleasure riding and breeding. Early on in *Madame Bovary*, the Bovarys attend a ball put on by the Marquis d’Andervilliers and his wife. Over the course of Flaubert’s description of this evening, many horsebreeding terms are used, whether referring directly to horses themselves or else to the people in attendance: “L’un se

¹⁰⁶ Hribal, 447; I will continue to use the term “worker” for animals in Hribal’s sense of it throughout this and the following chapters.

¹⁰⁷ Kari Weil, “They Eat Horses, Don’t They? Hippophagy and Frenchness” in *Gastronomica* 7.2 (2007), 47.

¹⁰⁸ Weil, 44

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, 47; The consumption of horse meat by the “working and lower-middle classes” before this legalization was widespread enough to be the subject of a study that Weil references by Alexandre Parent-Duchâtelet which focused on such outfits that were essentially underground, much like prostitution. Weil underscores the irony of the fact that this study coincided with another he conducted of his well-known study of prostitution (50).

plaignait de ses coureurs qui s'engraissaient..." ["One complained that his *racehorses* were growing fat..."] / "Le marquis, pour l'amuser, la mena voir les écuries" ["The Marquis, to amuse [Emma], took her to see the *stables*."] / "...des plaques de porcelain portaient en noir le nom des chevaux. Chaque bête s'agitait dans sa stalle..." ["...porcelain slabs bore the names of the *horses* in black letters. Each animal in its stall whisked its tail..."]. Here, horses and the "horse business" are clearly being called on by Flaubert as indicators of class, particularly in comparison to Emma and Charles' positions in society, given the contrast the descriptions of breeding and the racehorses pose to their "petit cheval" ["little horse"] who "trottait l'amble dans les brancards, qui étaient trop larges pour lui" ["ambled along the shafts that were too big for him"]. Here, Emma's position in society is reinforced for her in the physical differences between the kinds of horses that inhabit her world versus those that frequent the luxurious lives of those she observes at the ball. Kari Weil's article on women horse riders – "amazonnes" – in nineteenth-century France points out the way that horses made up an integral, if perplexing, part in the formation of class boundaries:

Horses for riding or for driving were to become the center of a dandified public life style that brought various worlds together, combining elements of both 'high society' and the world of 'le spectacle,' while making the distinctions between these worlds and the classes of people frequenting them increasingly difficult to ascertain.¹¹⁰

While Emma does not ride a horse at the ball, a bit later in the story, she finally gets the chance in a scene when her affair with Rodolphe begins in earnest. Her relationship with Rodolphe initially begins with a day of conversation at Yonville's agricultural fair, a chapter that will be discussed at length in the following section. While this is not the beginning of the physical side of their affair, the hubbub of the animals and the auction are almost drowned out

¹¹⁰ "Purebreds and Amazons: Saying Things with Horses in Late-Nineteenth-Century France" in *differences* 11.1 (1999), 7.

(despite their being peppered, in the narrative, throughout Emma and Rodolphe's interactions) so attuned is the couple to one another and their conversations. As they walk through the town to the field and square where the auction will be held, they pass the area where the examination of the animals is happening. Rodolphe is recognized by the president of the jury, but quickly avoids him so that he can continue conversing with Emma. They pass by the "longue undulation de...corps [d'animaux] tassées" ["the long undulation of these crowded animals"] and carry on talking, hardly paying any mind to the beings around which the entire event is organized. The only further mention of animals is to acknowledge Rodolphe's occasional stopping to look at "quelque beau sujet, que Madame Bovary n'admirait guère" ["some fine beast, which Madame Bovary did not at all admire"]. The animals waiting to be judged are loud and animated, but the ones that the couple actually stops to see are simply called "subjects." However, without these animals, and without the horses that eventually bring them to pursue their affair further, Emma and Rodolphe's relationship wouldn't have been likely to mature; it is their only occasion to begin getting to know one another and to heighten the romantic interest.

While their flirtation is evident throughout their conversations on the day of the fair, Emma and Rodolphe's relationship is not consummated until six weeks later. At this time, Rodolphe and Charles decide, in the name of Emma's health, that horse riding would be a good solution for the heart palpitations she has experienced off and on for months, and of which her husband cannot divine the origins. Initially, Emma openly objects to the idea of riding with Rodolphe, not wanting to betray her true feelings for him to her husband. But just as "elle objectait qu'elle n'avait point de cheval" ["she objected that she had no horse, Monsieur Rodolphe offered one"]. His ploy works perfectly, as Charles sends word to accept his offer as soon as he has a habit made for her.

Flaubert might well have had Emma and Rodolphe begin their affair immediately following the agricultural fair, given the flirtatious nature of their conversations and the general commotion in town that might have protected them from any of the townspeople being sure of seeing them leave alone, together. However, he chose to delay and have this relationship's physical side begin after a ride out of town on horseback.¹¹¹ Weil points out that, given the importance that horses had in nineteenth-century French society, particularly as it pertained to financial means – e.g. one rode only if one had the means, as we see here whilst Emma must be given a horse by Rodolphe, as her and Charles only have one for his travel purposes (and a small one, at that) – “it is not surprising that Emma Bovary's adulterous affair is initiated with a gallop through the woods.”¹¹² Emma is intrigued by Rodolphe partly due to his apparent wealth and social status, as he owns a large estate outside of town. In this way, the horses are a sign of her taking on some of this bourgeoisie, although ultimately, Rodolphe leaves her. However, I am also interested in this scene by the fraught roles that horses played in nineteenth-century France, which ranged from pleasure mount to mine worker.¹¹³

Horses' place as collaborators in activities such as the riding Emma and Rodolphe undertake here, intense laborer in the cases of industrial production sites such as mines and cotton mills, and finally “meat” when it came to the issue of hippophagy, legalized in the latter half of this century, meant that the relationships they shared with humans ranged from the intimate and cooperative, to the violent, to the deadly. In using “collaborator” and “cooperative”

¹¹¹ Ironically, on the day they actually begin their physical adultery, Emma and Rodolphe leave Yonville alone, together under the eyes of many of the townspeople seeing them leave – but this is due to Charles' utter cluelessness of his wife's capacities for seduction, as he himself was tricked without realizing it before marrying her, as Schwarz points out.

¹¹² Weil, “Purebreds and Amazons,” 9.

¹¹³ Both Kari Weil and Jason Hribal discuss these roles and the ambiguity that it gave to human-horse relationships.

here, I follow the kind of thinking about human-animal relationships on farms that Vinciane Despret and Jocelyn Porcher propose in their study, *Être bête*.¹¹⁴ Porcher also alludes to this way of thinking about animals collaborating in being raised (for a product) in her article with Tiphaine Schmitt, which I discussed earlier in this chapter.¹¹⁵ These concepts of cooperation and work are somewhat similar, but I would still move to distinguish the work of a horse in a mine or being raised for meat from that of the animals used for pleasure riding. Weil describes the entangled existences that “amazones” shared with their horses, sometimes even choosing their equine companions above a romantic relationship with a man.¹¹⁶ While far from being on the same level when one considers the power dynamics of pleasure riding – e.g. the rider necessarily guides the horse where they want them to go, not usually allowing the latter to decide the path – I argue that in this scene there is still an important cooperative, if not participatory, element shared between Emma, Rodolphe, and their horses.

The two horses might not exactly act as an “I” in the sense of Burgat’s treatment of the term, but they remain a remarkable presence in this first stage of Emma's affair. In this way, it appears to be a purposeful choice on the part of Flaubert. While it is impossible to guess all levels of his rationale, the meticulousness with which he approached writing, and the composition of this novel in particular, leads me to conclude that Emma and Rodolphe embarking on their affair in the context of horse riding is no accident. Even in the city, horse

¹¹⁴ Arles: Actes Sud, 2007; This study was conducted in France at a number of pig and cow farms of various sizes. Over the course of their interviews with the farmers and their observations, Despret and Porcher found that those who chose to allow their animals to “be themselves” (as much as was possible within a space of captivity, no matter how large) had the most positive attitudes about raising them. Approaching the “work” with an attitude of collaboration – although it is necessarily for a very specific end – enabled a depth of communication and intimacy between the farmers and their animals that those who either refused such openness or had too large of a farm didn’t acknowledge. These individuals also described the intelligence of the animals, whereas many of the others didn’t consider their animals capable of any meaningful intraspecies relationships or social organizations.

¹¹⁵ Porcher and Schmitt, “Dairy Cows.”

¹¹⁶ Weil, “Purebreds and Amazons,” 5.

riding had by this time become a frequent activity, in Paris representing those who could not only afford to own (or rent) a horse, but also who had the time to engage in such a leisurely activity, the main aim of which was to be “seen.”¹¹⁷ Weil also explains that “it was not only the rich, but also the ‘would-be’ wealthy who would sport their attire and horsemanship” in the Bois de Boulogne.¹¹⁸ In this way, the activity of horse riding becomes another symptom of Emma’s desires to climb the social ladder, and one that Rodolphe must help her by lending his horse, if also himself. I would also argue that horses’ presence, as animals who were still necessary in the country for basic transportation, also provides an opportunity to read them as more than just the tools for Emma’s tryst. While their presence is clearly necessary to get from one place to another, it is interesting that this is a species that Emma clearly does not extend her haughty attitude from the fair to. Is this because they are capable of crossing over from their roles on a farm to extend to her the possibility of her freedom? I will argue that they actually have a participatory role in this very important moment in Emma’s life, thus demonstrating their continued significance for her character and within Flaubert’s narrative itself.

When Rodolphe arrives to the Bovary home to take Emma riding, several townspeople come out to send them off for the day and to see the horses, of which “l’un portait des pompoms roses aux oreilles et une selle de femme en peau de daim” [“one had pink rosettes at his ears and a deerskin side-saddle”]. The chemist Homais warns Rodolphe that “Un malheur arrive si vite ! Prenez garde ! Vos chevaux peut-être sont fougueux !” [“An accident happens so easily. Be careful! Your horses perhaps are mettlesome”]¹¹⁹ The presence of these two statements

¹¹⁷ Weil points out that there were specific time slots to appear in the Bois de Boulogne in Paris, the main place where those who wanted to see and be seen by “the richer half” of Parisians (“Purebreds and Amazons,” 5-6).

¹¹⁸ Weil, 5-6.

¹¹⁹ Flaubert, 151; The *Nouveau Petit Robert* cites horses in its definition of “fougueux”: “Cheval fougueux. →vif.”

attributing to the horses what would normally be considered human characteristics – decorative hair accessories and a spirited personality – demonstrate the fact that human animals, while they may attempt to “reduce animals to their instincts and focus on the invariables,” cannot resist using familiar terms to describe the ones they live with.¹²⁰ Thus, we see that the horses, while they are not given direct acknowledgment as active participants (in the very activity that *requires* their participation), seem almost to betray the limitations set out for them. Further, their potential for influencing the progression of the events at hand is evident in the first adjective describing their character in Homais’ statement. That they “peut-être sont fougueux” implies that Emma’s horse might not heed her at all times, and thus that these animals have the capacity to disrupt choices made by her and Rodolphe.

As they reach the outskirts of town, Emma’s horse, at the moment “qu’il sentit la terre...prit le galop” [“he fe[els] the ground...set[s] off at a gallop”].¹²¹ This departure, for the animal, is physical, and for Emma as well, who with that same step enters into an experience that is altogether new for her. The vivacity with which the horse shows its enthusiasm when it recognizes its freedom is evident in this split-second, and the *fougueux* character to which Homais alluded seems to be emerging. If the horse’s action is taken on its own, apart from Emma and Rodolphe’s budding romance, it is a very reasonable way for this animal to respond when he feels he has returned to the space where he can be most horse-like, out in the open and without the limitations of a fence or a stable. But, beyond this, perhaps the horse is also responding in a way not unlike the animals that Porcher and Despret describe in reference to farms where the farmers perceive their task as collaborative with the animals. As “the space alongside of” is occupied – from both the human and the animal side – the horse becomes a

¹²⁰ *Être bête*, 35, my translation.

¹²¹ Flaubert, 151.

companion to both Emma and Rodolphe, actively influencing this particular moment of the relationship.¹²² If it weren't for the horses, the couple would not be able to get far enough away from town to consummate their love, and in a similar way, the horses would not be free to run without Emma and Rodolphe's "invitation." In this way, while it is certainly not the same scenario as those animals who labor to "produce" their own meat (or, as in the case of the dairy cows of Porcher and Schmitt's study, their own milk), I read a similar level of collaboration given the mutual benefit that the horses and Emma and Rodolphe experience.

This participation seems to go beyond this initial level when Emma, for a brief moment, loses track of the horses and finds herself truly alone with Rodolphe. Stopped in a wooded area and having dismounted, the lovers have wandered a bit from the animals. As she attempts to avoid a romantic moment – she still hesitates to commit fully to the affair, despite her intense dissatisfaction at the life she is living with Charles and her desires to experience a more luxurious lifestyle – she desperately looks around for the horses, saying "vivement: –Ah! tenez, n'en parlons plus... Où sont les chevaux ? Retournons" ["hurriedly—'Ah! do not speak of [our destinies] again! Where are the horses? Let us go back!"].¹²³ They are easily found, but the horses slight wandering leaves Emma openly upset. More than just a way to get from one place to the next, or as the necessary presence for an activity in the fresh air, the horses, here, appear to be Emma's trusted companions as she enters into a new kind of relationship. They are present when she finally "devenait elle-même comme une partie véritable de ces imaginations et réalisait la longue rêverie de sa jeunesse, en se considérant dans ce type d'amoureuse qu'elle avait tant envié" ["became herself, as it were, an actual part of these imaginings, and realized the love-

¹²² Despret and Porcher, 74.

¹²³ Flaubert, 153.

dream of her youth as she saw herself in this type of amorous women whom she had so envied”].¹²⁴

Horses’ presence and influence is notable in this key moment in Emma’s life as she begins her affair with Rodolphe, but even after her death, they remain foregrounded by Flaubert in relation to her. Let us return to Charles as he has discovered Emma’s love letters. Finally faced with the evidence of her affairs, Charles becomes totally despondent, staying shut in at home, refusing to see anyone including his patients. Buried in debts, Charles must sell his silver, his furniture, essentially everything of any value that he can part with. The last thing that he has to sell is “son cheval—dernière ressource” [“his horse—his last resource”], and he goes to a market to do so in the last few pages of the novel.¹²⁵ There, in a classic Flaubertian turn of irony, he encounters Rodolphe, who invites Charles to have a drink with him after awkwardly giving his condolences for Emma’s death.

This scene is notable in two ways, both of which bring us back to Charles’ horse. First, the fact that Bovary’s last resource *is* a horse and that he comes across Rodolphe at the very moment he is giving the animal up speaks to their persistent presence in Emma’s life (and, here, in her death). As I have mentioned before, it could be pointed out that Charles simply keeps the horse until the last due to the fact that, in a place like Yonville, they would still have been used to get from one place to another. But again, Flaubert’s choice is peculiar: his mention of the horse and Rodolphe being seen by Charles in nearly the same breath is unlikely to be a coincidence. Bovary is literally getting rid of his last material possession, and it is only at this moment that he encounters the lover of Emma’s whose very suggestion of riding horses as an activity to help

¹²⁴ Flaubert, 156.

¹²⁵ *Ibid*, 336.

improve her health is what led to the consummation of their relationship.¹²⁶ Coming face-to-face with one of the men who his wife loved more than he, this interaction eliminates the little will to live that Charles has left. The next day, he dies sitting in the garden he built for Emma.

These close readings show how horses are able to influence the human relationships to which they are witness as more than just “pure objects on which human representations, knowledge, [and] practices are exercised.”¹²⁷ Looking at them in this way increases the depth of our understanding of Flaubert’s novel as it pertains directly to real animals in nineteenth-century France and reveals how their literary counterparts are capable of demonstrating their importance amidst the massive shifts that industrialization sparked in France during this period.

Different Species

Examining the text directly is essential to create new ways of understanding and reading animals in nineteenth-century France. However, it’s also essential to acknowledge the historical context, and how the shifts in culture and society in the real world impacted animals’ lives and their depictions in literature. Eugen Weber’s study of France during the late, long nineteenth century reveals a country that, despite a heavy emphasis on being “the most ‘one’ in the whole world,”¹²⁸ remained deeply fragmented when it came to the realities and attitudes of city dwellers versus country dwellers – in other words, peasants.¹²⁹ This fragmentation resembled the

¹²⁶ Charles is selling his horse, not Emma’s. However, its proximity in the text to Rodolphe’s presence remains notable for the connection it has to the beginning of his and Emma’s affair. In effect, Charles himself essentially gave his blessing for the affair in encouraging her to ride with Rodolphe despite Emma’s protests that “it might look odd”.

¹²⁷ Baratay, “Building,” 5.

¹²⁸ Baron Haussmann, quoted in *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 9.

¹²⁹ While Weber does not imply that all “nobles” had left the countryside by this time, his study emphasizes the rifts that persisted between the cities, where the majority of the political events and changes were happening, and the countryside, where news traveled at a slow pace, if it reached these areas at all.

rifts that will be discussed in Chapter 2, which is concerned with France's relations with its colonial sites. As Weber explains in his opening chapter, the total lack of understanding that existed between the two groups as a result of the increased progress inside the city was the root of a tangible contempt for peasants from the point of view of those who lived in the city.¹³⁰ At times, city dwellers even went so far as to exaggerate the outsiders' "savagery, insist[ing] on the more picturesque—hence backward—aspects of their activities."¹³¹ Eugen's work brings to light the details of this complex period in a country whose cultural differences were many even before colonization, but where, during this time, "diversity became imperfection, injustice, failure, something to be noted and to be remedied."¹³²

Weber demonstrates many accounts that attest to the fact that the changes (in social life and political policy) that happened inside the city over the course of the nineteenth century rarely impacted the countryside in any meaningful way, if at all. For this reason, peasants might not have been aware of the most notable changes during this time, the increased dissimulation of slaughtering and other practices involving animals. Noëlie Vialles' study of slaughterhouses in southwest France reveals the irony of this dissimulation: that as fewer animals were seen in the city, their presence persisted, and even grew, in the countryside.¹³³ However, the nature of these animal presences, which were always already a characteristic of country life, were changing. Animals' presence inside the industrial slaughterhouse – which, even during this time, when it was nothing like the factory farms of today, often occupied the fringe between city and

¹³⁰ Weber, 6.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid, 9.

¹³³ *Animal to Edible*; Weber's extensive findings certainly show that there was a great diversity across France as far as cultural and social differences. In spite of these differences, Vialles' study, which focuses on an area of the country far from Paris, still shows that the gradual pushing-out of the abattoir was likely common throughout the country.

countryside – was not the living-with that had for centuries characterized farming practices in France.¹³⁴ Human-animal relations continue to characterize life in the countryside even amidst the changes brought about by industrialization. This is evident in the passage immediately preceding the beginning of the agricultural show in Yonville, which we will discuss at length in the next section. As Rodolphe is trying to figure out how to proceed in wooing Emma, he realizes that an obvious opportunity to see her is just around the corner: “‘Parbleu !’ ajouta-t-il, voilà les comices bientôt ; elle y sera, je la verrai” [“‘By Jove!’ added he, ‘there’s the agricultural show coming on. She’ll be there. I shall see her’”].¹³⁵ The off-handedness and certainty of this statement makes clear that everyone in a town like Yonville would have attended this event, if not been a participant. In current day France, a French farmer who makes an effort to pay attention to his animals for his animals, and not just to maximize production, is one who aims to purposefully “set [his] practices apart from others.”¹³⁶ Thus, a new type of animal presence was being built even amidst the persistence of the older types – a new species, perhaps, of animal.

While asserting that the animals in the early versions of industrialized farms constitute a new species might initially sound bizarre, it is an important possibility to consider, given the current-day realities of factory farming in France and the rest of the Western world and their origins when this novel was written. Despite the fact that they are a far cry from the nineteenth-century abattoir, the industrial slaughterhouses and factory farms that pepper the fringes of towns all over the world today find their origins directly in the kind of farming practices that first

¹³⁴ Perhaps, then, we might even go so far as to define a specific *space* called “fringe”, instead of its definition as the edge or periphery of something else (*Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th Edition, 2007). Here, however, I will focus on the issue of the animals occupying this space.

¹³⁵ Flaubert, 125.

¹³⁶ Despret and Porcher, 45.

emerged in the nineteenth century, which sought above all to remain hidden.¹³⁷ The changes in thinking about animals that were set in motion in this historical moment due to the advancements in farming hinged on a different kind of animal: one who was either eliminated completely (impossible, if society wished to continue used the products that come from animals), or one whose physical presence was eliminated, at the very least from view. As Matthew Scully notes, “at...corporate farms they have accepted [the] severities [of animal suffering]...and they are counting on you to do the same.”¹³⁸ These changes in practice have thus literally altered certain characteristics in animals like pigs and cows due to the physical impositions of smaller living spaces, reduced independence, and eventually less time in the outdoors. Scully’s accounts of what he witnessed at hog farms in North Carolina make clear that it is by no means the natural instincts of the pigs that have been altered – they continue to attempt to root and to turn even as they are confined to spaces where there is nothing to root in (or for) and movement is impossible.¹³⁹ However, his visits and interviews also reveal the extent of genetic modifications that are conducted in order to maintain the uniformity of meat that comes out of factory farming. One group of agricultural scientists is even going so far as to attempt to “engineer” pigs that produce less phosphorous in their manure.¹⁴⁰ The “new scientific projects to make this ‘great system’ [of factory farming] even greater” demonstrate in a shocking way its success in

¹³⁷ Vialles, 17, 27-31.

¹³⁸ *Dominion* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2002), 31; While Scully’s research focuses on industrial slaughterhouses and factory farms in the United States, several of the farmers he interviews make statements to the effect that these types of outfits are located not just in the US, but all over the world (256, 262).

¹³⁹ Scully, 266-69.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 277; Scully describes this kind of thinking as “the particular madness of trying to make all of one’s other madnnesses fit together rationally”, since this is a modification that emerges out of concerns for the challenges posed by the massive lagoons where the waste from factory farms goes. In several notable cases, these lagoons have flooded and contaminated nearby bodies of water, and in their normal state seep into the ground and air around them, likely impacting surrounding communities of humans and animals (256-58).

promoting meat and dairy consumption.¹⁴¹ consequently how the initial move of hiding the slaughterhouse from view has enabled it to progress to a point where “the codes of life will now and forever be in the hands of men who can tell you with a straight face that confinement for animals is comfort....”¹⁴²

Another example of a pivotal change in practice is that of transportation. Graham Robb’s Chronology in his study *The Discovery of France* notes horses’ replacement by steam [in relation to the railroad] in 1844.¹⁴³ This literal elimination of a species of animal from an activity in which they previously acted in a significant capacity is of special note for what it says about the new motivations and goals of the industrial age. Certainly, horses were still seen providing transportation in the countryside – evident throughout *Madame Bovary* – but the fact that in an official capacity they were struck from the roster, as it were, lends tangible evidence of their new place in society.¹⁴⁴ It is for these reasons that I believe this is a discussion not just of different categories of pigs, cows, or horses, but of unique species.¹⁴⁵

The definition of “espèce” in *Le Nouveau Petit Robert* is as follows:

“**ESPÈCE** [...] du latin *species* “vue, regard”, “apparence”, plus tard “marchandise” [...] famille de *specere* [...] « regarder »

II. CE QUI ENTRE DANS UNE CATÉGORIE: 1. (fin XIIIe) Classe (de personnes, de choses) définie par un ensemble particulier de caractères communs. → **catégorie, genre, qualité, sorte, type.** – *De la même espèce* : comparable, semblable (→ **nature, ordre.**)”¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ The extent to which these corporate organizations are able to control advertising is shown both in Scully’s work and, in a much more technical manner, in Nicole Shukin’s *Animal Capital*. Her work in particular demonstrates the discursive and aesthetic techniques that are *hypervisibilized* in advertising effectively maintain the façade required to carry out the actual “business” of factory farming animals at such alarming – and increasing – rates. See her Introduction for a discussion of the ways that animals are fashioned into “partial objects” that attempt to fill human desire for an “originary wholeness that never did or can exist, save phantasmatically” (3).

¹⁴² Scully, 277.

¹⁴³ New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007, 360.

¹⁴⁴ Robb, 360.

¹⁴⁵ In *Animal Stories*, Susan McHugh describes EnviroPig™, a literal refashioning of porcine genetics that eliminates the phosphorous pollution from pork production, perhaps the result of the study to which Scully refers in *Dominion*, and to which I have alluded previously. In this case, there is an actual new version of the species that has emerged out of the intensive circumstances of industrial farming and the health hazards that it has created.

¹⁴⁶ “Espèce.” *Le Nouveau Petit Robert*. 2008.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary's entry for the English word is similar:

“**species** [...] appearance, kind species, fr. *specere* to look. [...] 1 a: kind, sort. b: a class of individuals having common attributes and designated by a common name.”¹⁴⁷

Both of these entries emphasize the fact that a “species” is a unique group of individual beings that are connected by their “ensemble particulier de caractères communs,” or “common attributes.” Despite the similar *apparences* that they might share, cows or pigs raised on a farm before the industrial period and those raised during or after are very different animals, indeed.¹⁴⁸

In all of these shifts that bring about the existence of new “species,” it is not the cow or pig who have chosen to adapt to their situation. Rather, humans have chosen to change how they relate – or don’t – to cows and pigs as they raise them, which in turn has altered their physical make-up(s). The animals’ incapacity to speak and the disadvantage that it presents is intensified by their physical limitations to rebel against their living circumstances: they are never capable of having a true dialogue with a human, despite what parrots might lead us to believe.¹⁴⁹ Vinciane Despret points out that, when it comes to scientific research with animals, the only way to discuss this issue objectively is by “resisting the we that academic knowledge imposes in order to constitute [this] difference” in the first place.¹⁵⁰ A study that seeks to understand the [authentic] distinctive qualities of humans and/or animals – perhaps in an effort to maximize the

¹⁴⁷ “Species.” *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. 11th edition. 2004.

¹⁴⁸ It is also possible that the physical appearances of these two species of cows or pigs *would* differ significantly. As Matthew Scully notes, the pigs in factory farms today look nothing like wild pigs (28-31). They are pale and extremely susceptible to sunburn if exposed to even the tiniest bit of natural light, due to the fact that they spend the majority of their lives indoors.

¹⁴⁹ Technically, animals never have a “say” in the sense of speaking, and this has long been the path to justify outright abusive behavior towards them (Tobias Menely, *The Animal Claim*, 8). This does not mean that they are incapable of responding, however. Even speech is something that certain species of animal, such as the parrot, can master when asked the right questions. For Despret, this does not simply mean choosing the words that yield a *specific/looked for* answer, but rather “polite” questions (Despret, “Animal Worlds”, 127-129).

¹⁵⁰ “The Becomings of Subjectivity in Animal Worlds,” *Subjectivity* 23 (2008): 129.

capacities of both sides to do work or collaborate in something like farming – must move beyond the simplistic question of whether an animal can speak or not. As I will discuss in the next section, *Être bête* certainly demonstrates the depth of relationship that can be shared between humans and animals in farming when both seek a certain “attunement” to one another.¹⁵¹ However, how are we to become “attuned” to animals in literature, like Emma and Rodolphe’s horses?

The kind of attunement that is possible when humans and animals share physical spaces is quite simple, in spite of the fact that not all farmers choose to practice it. But how do we, as humans reading literature, attempt to attune ourselves to literary animals? Susan McHugh urges us to take them seriously for many reasons. While scientific – here, I use this term simply as the opposite of literary – inquiry is often considered more relevant in the eyes of a general public, McHugh emphasizes the urgent relevance of literary work that considers the animals in fiction because of the fact that “literature [is] one of many locations for negotiating the representational problems of animals.”¹⁵² The “representational problems” here emerge from shifts in modes of thinking about animals that occur due to the industrialization of farming, principally due to the dissimulation of what is actually happening in these processes as well as by persistent and abundant advertising that alludes to its innocence, as I have mentioned earlier. Instead of being the focus of the processes involved – e.g. How can we raise animals best and most efficiently while also taking into account their basic needs and capacities throughout the process? – animals are usually treated as the means to the end, just another piece of the machine that this industry has now become. The distancing that has resulted – for all of those not working in the

¹⁵¹ *Être bête* (Arles: Actes sud, 2007).

¹⁵² “Literary Animal Agents,” *PMLA* 124.2 (2009): 491.

slaughterhouse, as well as, in a unique way, those who do – has created a false impression of the “innate” power and superiority humans have over animals.¹⁵³

Thus, it becomes clear that for an attunement to literary animals to become possible, the issue of human superiority must be taken seriously as a potential – and common – stumbling block. The term itself makes up a key piece of the definition of “speciesism” in *Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*:

“I the “prejudice or discrimination based on species, *esp.*: discrimination against animals” [...] “the assumption of *human superiority*.”¹⁵⁴

Prior to the spread of mechanized machines across France, particularly in rural areas, animals’ participation was more necessary, and indeed, directly associated with individuals from the countryside. Human and animal lives were truly shared, down to a sharing of shelter in many cases.¹⁵⁵ For this reason, and given the fact that so much of France remained rural for so much longer than other parts of Europe, I argue that it was during the industrial revolution that animals’ active participation was not necessary for something like transport, and when, in something like farming, the impending arrival of the disassembly line and factory farming brings them to be more *marchandise* than co-producers. This word’s presence in the French definition of *espèce* is significant: how did a word that previously denoted a group of like-beings now also come to mean something that can be bought or sold? Taken out of our current context, this word means “cash” in French. However, its location in the *Nouveau Petit Robert* definition remains peculiar and worth noting.

¹⁵³ Those inside of the slaughterhouse are still impacted, just in completely different ways. Vialles’ book has several sections where this is discussed using direct quotes and dialogue with workers from abattoirs (46-52). The psychological coping mechanisms necessary to conduct this work are both fascinating and upsetting.

¹⁵⁴ “Speciesism.” *Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary*. 11th edition. 2004, my emphasis.

¹⁵⁵ Weber, 41-43.

The movement towards the mechanization of any and all tasks including farming thus caused animals – who are no longer contributing directly to this progress other than by their physical presence – to be relegated to an even lower status of inferiority than they were previously. Katheryn Gillespie points out the fact that “the power imbalance between human and nonhuman animals is so great [in the food system], as nonhuman animals are fundamentally ownable, commodifiable, and killable in service to human interests.”¹⁵⁶ This statement, while it applies specifically to industrial farming practices, has certainly been true even before the industrial revolution and the hyper-mechanization of raising animals that exists today. However, the nineteenth century still saw a significant shift in farming practices that moved more towards scientific knowledge than lived knowledge as the basis for knowing what will be the most effective, and in this manner, the animals that humans were raising transformed from a position where they had more opportunity to be collaborators to a status as objects that could be modified: tools, in effect, for human benefit. Once this transformation occurred, the likelihood of a farmer to choose to “help grow (up) and make happy” as he raises his animals became greatly reduced, if not eliminated altogether.¹⁵⁷ Instead, the product that is left after the death of the animal becomes the sole driving force, and animal lives simply what happens in-between, a process that must be made as efficient and cost-effective as possible. The *marchandise* that comes from the flesh of a species now supersedes the species itself. In a country like France, whose culture is so deeply rooted in the idea of agriculture and the land, how does the industrial mindset survive outside of the city? How can one hope to convince farmers in the countryside – peasants, to take Eugen Weber’s term – to “maximize production,” not just (literally) make a living?

¹⁵⁶ “Witnessing Animal Others: Bearing Witness, Grief, and the Political Function of Emotion” in *Hypatia* 31.3 (2016), 573.

¹⁵⁷ Despret, “Animal Worlds,” 136.

The New Marketplace: Shifting Perspectives on Farming in Rural France

The changes in practice that bring about these significant movements within species categories require the cooperation of countryside people and spaces. While the invisibilizing of animals would mainly happen in the cities by the expansion of the slaughterhouse as it was moved to the outskirts of town, these buildings would sit at the edge of the places where animals' presence persisted in the daily lives of many. The agricultural show in *Madame Bovary* illustrates very well the tensions that these changes created between city and countryside (which certainly includes towns and villages). It reveals the dissonances between the focus on animals for profit and the banality of their presence as an unremarkable, but still foundational element of country life. The shifting meaning of the French *espèce* demonstrates just how significant the changes were in the ways that the perceptions of animals were changing: today, the word that means physical currency is the term that initially could distinguish between species – and which would have been used most often to distinguish between species of animals, who are becoming currency during this period in more ways than one.¹⁵⁸

As it begins in Yonville midway through the novel, the anticipation that has built leading up to the show is palpable in Flaubert's description of the elaborate preparations, of which all the townsfolk are chatting on the first day. Within the context of animals in the nineteenth century, it is a pivotal moment to examine for many reasons within the context of industrialization in France and its impact on the visibility of animal presence in relation to farming and the making

¹⁵⁸ There is not space to discuss it within the body of this chapter, but this issue is played out in the American context of "stockyards" quite literally – animals, called "livestock", thus become the origin for the term "stocks" in its modern sense of a stake in a company for profit. See Nicole Shukin for a discussion of the Chicago Stockyards specifically, and several related issues on how the animal becomes currency, both monetarily and aesthetically (*Animal Capital*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009, 92-104).

of products that depended on animal parts. The following section will address two excerpts from this chapter, considering how either discussions or depictions of animal bodies demonstrate the shifts in thinking about agriculture and farming during this period in France. Further, it will examine how agriculture and patriotism are used together in the main speech given at the fair to reframe farming as an industry in a space where it has, until this point, simply been a way of life.

While different critics propose a variety of analyses for the functionality of Flaubert's irony, each critic seems to agree that because he is known to be so ironic in his style, there are certain elements that cannot be taken at face value. The agricultural fair is a chapter in *Madame Bovary* that, at first glance, seems quite inconsequential to the whole of the novel, as it really does little to advance the plot other than to provide the first moments that Emma and Rodolphe spend alone. However, it has been cited in a number of articles that address irony in Flaubert's work. Both Vaheed Ramazani and Timothy Unwin discuss irony within the specific context of Flaubert's narrative style, but their points are also particularly useful for our readings from the theoretical perspective of Animal Studies. As Unwin points out, it is nearly impossible to "know precisely who is being ironic about whom" in *Madame Bovary*, due to the "endless shifts of narrative viewpoint" which mean a lack of "a single perspective from which to assess character or events."¹⁵⁹ For this reason, he maintains that "numerous possible readings must exist."

Vaheed Ramazani takes little at face value when it comes to this novel, and his article certainly unpacks the "irony of irony" in *Madame Bovary* just as the title promises.¹⁶⁰ He describes Homais the chemist's discourses as "pseudoscientific jargon" and notes the "bombastic orations at the agricultural fair," citing both elements as contributing to the novel's "satirical

¹⁵⁹ "Gustave Flaubert (1821-1880): Realism and aestheticism" in *The Cambridge Companion to European Novelists*, ed. Michael Bell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 246 and 249.

¹⁶⁰ "The Irony of Irony in *Madame Bovary*" in *Critical Insights on Gustave Flaubert*, ed. Tom Hubbard (Amelia: Grey House Publishing, 2015).

citation.”¹⁶¹ In his Introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to European Novelists*, Michael Bell goes so far as to call Homais “the repository, both sinister and ludicrous, of progressive Enlightenment cliché.”¹⁶² However, I aim to take this character along with the other elements of this section as-is in order to demonstrate a larger kind of irony that speaks to the cultural and social changes that industrial progress brought about in France, specifically as it pertains to agriculture and the animals implicated therein. Further, reading this chapter of *Madame Bovary* in this straightforward manner affirms the “weight of historical or sociological insight” that Bell describes in fiction, along with “underlying philosophical assumptions” on the part of the author.¹⁶³ If, as Unwin suggests, there are such a variety of readings possible, then perhaps considering this section in a more candid light can demonstrate an ironic point of view that is particularly productive for what it reveals about animals and their literary representation during this time. Ramazani claims that the narrative elements of the novel leave the reader with no “clear signposts for interpretive closure” in order to arrest “the negative spiral of irony that [...] threatens to undercut virtually anything we may say about the text,” but I disagree that this is the case.¹⁶⁴ What happens if we set aside the assumption that no interpretation can hold up in the face of Flaubertian irony, especially as we consider the implications of certain excerpts for agriculture and animals?

Certainement, je m’y entends, puisque je suis pharmacien, c’est-à-dire chimiste ! et la chimie, madame Lefrançois, ayant pour objet la connaissance de l’action réciproque et moléculaire de tous les corps de la nature, il s’ensuit que l’agriculture se trouve comprise dans son domaine ! ... Croyez-vous qu’il faille, pour être agronome, avoir soi-même labouré la terre ou engraisé des volailles ? Mais il faut connaître plutôt la constitution des substances

¹⁶¹ Ramazani, 115.

¹⁶² Bell, 11.

¹⁶³ Ibid, 1 and 13; Eugene F. Gray also describes Homais as someone who “is a walking almanac”, though his knowledge remains “in undigested form” (Laurence Porter, ed. *The Gustave Flaubert Encyclopedia*, 171).

¹⁶⁴ Ramazani, 116.

dont il s'agit [...] bref, il faut se tenir au courant de la science par les brochures et papiers publics, être toujours en haleine, afin d'indiquer les améliorations...¹⁶⁵

[Certainly I understand [agriculture], since I am a druggist—that is to say, a chemist. And the object of chemistry, Madame Lefrançois, being the knowledge of the reciprocal and molecular action of all natural bodies, it follows that agriculture is comprised within its domain. [...] Do you think that to be an agriculturist it is necessary to have tilled the earth or fattened fowls oneself? It is necessary rather to know the composition of the substances in question [...] in brief, one must keep pace with science by means of pamphlets and public papers, be always on the alert to find out improvements.]

Homais' assertion that he understands agriculture in this excerpt provides an underlying observation on animals that betrays the pivotal shift in modes of thinking about animals and nature during the nineteenth century in France up to which I have been leading. He implies that, since he understands the scientific facts related to raising animals, it follows that he is an expert in farming, and implies further that the fact that he has never actually experienced much of it for himself is irrelevant. His statement is clearly inflated, making it necessary here to acknowledge a minimum degree of irony. However, if he is read as a stereotype of a certain type of person – rural, relatively (or even very) intelligent, a social climber, etc. – then it is very productive to take him at his word for analyses' sake. He presents biological knowledge as the main pathway to a keen understanding of agriculture as he claims that by “se tenir au courant de la science” [“keep[ing] pace with science”], one is able to know the most information about animals. While they may indeed prove helpful to learn about animals' biological make-up, a study like Vinciane Despret and Jocelyn Porcher's makes quite clear that “brochures et papiers publics” [“pamphlets and public papers”] are by no means the most effective way to truly understand an animal, how it lives best, or even how to raise it most “efficiently” — for food or otherwise. While the English translation communicates the general meaning of Homais' words effectively, the French

¹⁶⁵ Flaubert, 128.

expression that it replaces, “se tenir au courant de” pushes my point here even further. Homais is encouraging a kind of passive move here, and I might re-translate the English to “riding the waves of science,” thus implying an uncritical approach to agriculture, which has, up to this point, maintained, if not always employed, the potential to be a highly collaborative relationship between humans and animals.

Despret and Porcher’s extensive interviews with pig and cow farmers consistently reveal this collaborative aspect, thanks to an awareness on the part of the farmer that the more one can cultivate an “art de vivre avec les animaux” [“art of living with animals”] that “permet de construire la perspective de ceux que l’on connaît” [“that allows one to build an understanding of those that we know”], the easier it is to understand the animals’ needs and how they can live a life most true to themselves.¹⁶⁶ It requires a posture of leaning in to the animal in order to experiment [together] and, in so doing, distinguish a kind of voice in the animal, thus becoming equipped with a capacity to advocate for animals in the way that Tobias Menely describes in the Introduction to *The Animal Claim*:

...an advocate is one called upon by another’s voice to speak for others in his or her own voice. To recover the force of the vocal imperative—its capacity to intervene or interpose, its availability to redirection or remediation—is to understand community not as a closed system of reciprocal entitlements, but as something constitutively open to those whose voices lay claim to rights not yet recognized.¹⁶⁷

The kind of experimenting that I refer to here has nothing to do with the types of tests and prodding that take place in medical and scientific experimentation on animals. Thinking again of Homais’ words, then, it becomes clear that the kind of agriculture that is most attuned to the

¹⁶⁶ Despret and Porcher, *Être bête*, 45 and 74.

¹⁶⁷ *The Animal Claim* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 1.

animals with whom and the land where it is happening will be more capable of “indiquer les améliorations” [“find[ing] out improvements”] than one that simply goes with the flow.

Despite the difference of the context between Flaubert’s fiction and the kinds of research pertaining both to smaller scale farming, as Despret and Porcher’s study largely does, or industrial farming, as Kathryn Gillespie’s work does, I believe this excerpt provides a strong sense of the direction in which perspectives on agriculture were moving during the nineteenth century in France. As scientific knowledge and advancement progressed and increased, the knowledge of animals’ capacities – e.g. what they could do insofar as it interested humans versus what they might be capable of, without the impositions of human expectation – becomes the main foundation, alongside maximum profit, for how to conduct agricultural practice. And while the studies to which I refer were written very recently, they are, in many ways, the direct results of perspectives on agriculture during Flaubert’s time. In Homais’ words, he holds a clear respect for agriculture.¹⁶⁸ What is not clear is whether he holds a true respect for the actual animals who participate in agriculture, who are unique individuals with particular preferences and needs. He equates “engrais[er] des volailles” [“fatten[ing] fowl”] with “labour[er] la terre” [“till[ing] the earth”], implying that these kinds of activities are essentially interchangeable.¹⁶⁹ In no way

¹⁶⁸ As I mentioned earlier in this close-reading, many critics assert that Homais’ perspective should not be taken so literally, given Flaubert’s ironic style and the fact that the chemist clearly is the target of “Flaubert’s unequivocal judgment on the debased values of modern society” (Gray, in *The Gustave Flaubert Encyclopedia*, 171). But even if he *was* meant to be a caricature of a narrow-minded scientist, his points of view also clearly correspond to the perspectives of characters such as Lieuvain, which I also discuss, here, and which, together, do provide a historiographical context. We should therefore take these words at face value expressly *because* of the contradictory nature that exists in what is being said – whether it is said ironically or not.

¹⁶⁹ Certainly, the term “engraisser des volailles” holds, of its own accord, a host of incongruities when it comes to the respect one does or doesn’t hold towards animals, given the way that it turns the chicken or turkey into an inanimate object *made* to be a certain way, and who, heaven forbid, might resist.

would I propose that the earth or plant life should be discounted completely, but here it is clear that animals – sensible and sensory beings – should be given a different kind of regard.¹⁷⁰

Homais himself does not go so far as to say so, but what Lieuvain’s speech on the marketplace makes clear is that animals’ roles within the mechanism of agriculture are to be one of the key means for these agriculturists to attain the patriotism that produces “cette intelligence profonde et modérée qui [...] contribu[e] ainsi au bien de chacun, à l’amélioration commune et au soutien des États, fruit du respect des lois et de la pratique des devoirs” [“that profound and balanced intelligence that...contribut[es] to the good of all...and to the support of the state”].¹⁷¹ After a lengthy preamble, Lieuvain, the councilor from out of town who has come to represent the nearest prefect at the agricultural show, addresses the importance of animals. However, he does so either within the context of either “the agriculturist” or, at one point, “the earth,” these being the catalysts for “toute l’importance que *l’on retire d[u]* modeste animal” [“all the momentous things that *we get out of th[e]* modest animal”], instead of the other way around.¹⁷² Once again, the idea of the animal as an object – or even, perhaps, a site – to be cultivated, not to be understood or known over time, to simply be part of the daily means of subsistence or even wants, is evident in these words.¹⁷³ Indeed, the councilor continues in his insistence on the animal-as-product, as he incites all in attendance to consider “ces comices [...] comme des arènes pacifiques où le vainqueur” [“these shows [to] be [...] pacific arenas where the victor”] is the one who has applied themselves, “surtout à l’amélioration du sol, aux bons engrais, au

¹⁷⁰ There has been substantial work done on what would be considered inanimate nature objects as actually being sentient beings with unique conceptions of world. See, for instance, Eduardo Kohn’s *How Forests Think: Towards an Anthropology Beyond the Human* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013).

¹⁷¹ Flaubert, 138.

¹⁷² *Ibid*, 139, emphasis mine.

¹⁷³ It is interesting to note that in Despret and Porcher’s study, many of the farmers’ philosophies on raising animals *with or alongside* those animals – as co-workers and co-habitants – could be described as philosophies that aim to *cultivate*. However, within this context, it is a goal of cultivating a *relationship*, not an end goal only.

développement des races chevalines, bovines, ovines et porcines” [“above all, to the amelioration of the soil, to good manures, to the development of the equine, bovine, ovine, and porcine races”].¹⁷⁴

The emphasis on products as a key element to patriotism permeates this discourse in Yonville as a literary space, and here it is interesting to once again consider the France that Eugen Weber describes. While farmers have always made a living using their animals and the products made from them, the idea of loyalty to a state by giving of the fruits of one’s labor did not exist in many of the rural corners of the country well into the nineteenth century in France – partly due to the fact that many people who lived in the country had little to no concept of what “France” was.¹⁷⁵ As Weber points out, “patriotism was an urban thought, a handle for an urban conquest of the rural world that looked at times like colonial exploitation.”¹⁷⁶ In this way, Lieuvain’s speech seems to quietly echo discursive elements France’s colonial projects as he discusses the concepts of capital and “support[ing...] the state” with – for the reader, at least – clear ulterior motives. A member of the government from outside of town, presumably with little to no actual experience in agriculture himself, Lieuvain chooses words that, first, flatter, before inciting the people of Yonville to continued agricultural industry. In this way, he adeptly begins to shift the thinking even of those who won’t see the results of most of the changes it is aiming to bring about, but who will be instrumental in executing them.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁴ Flaubert, 141.

¹⁷⁵ It could be argued that, in some parts of France, this rural isolation persisted well into the 21st-Century. See, for example, *The Discovery of France* by Graham Robb, who makes observations not dissimilar to many of those made or gathered by Eugen Weber from nineteenth-century accounts.

¹⁷⁶ *Peasants into Frenchmen*, 98.

¹⁷⁷ “...a gentleman in a short coat with silver braiding, with bald brow, and wearing a tuft of hair at the back of his head, of a sallow complexion...”, Flaubert, 208; Weber references a text published by the secretary to the French Academy in 1751, which stated that “those who lived a scant one hundred leagues from the capital were a hundred years removed from it in their manner of thought and action” and goes on to emphasize that this statement “can as appropriately be applied to nineteenth-century France” (97).

What place, then, is left for animals in the midst of an era that will seek to “adapt nature to human intention” with the aim to maximize production and financial gain instead of “seeking harmony with nature”?¹⁷⁸ If farming was to be recognized as a lasting piece of France’s national image, and its sustained success a sign of the patriotism of the French people, any discussion of animals’ identities needed to be purposefully and firmly moved out of the public rhetoric. The collaborative nature that is necessary in small-scale farms attributed too much agency to the animals and not enough superiority to the humans.¹⁷⁹ People in positions of power such as the [literary] Lieuvain, had to wield their words in a way that would make the reshaping and rearrangement of modes of thinking about animals’ place in the world and how they did or did not participate in society possible. In a country where the majority of the landmass remained relatively isolated from the seat of government (and any news of it!), agriculture is the most logical target for the instillation of the desire to *produce* more to profit more in the rural inhabitants of these areas.

The majority of the reports written by government officials or soldiers that are cited in *Peasants into Frenchmen* reference the shared lives of humans and animals in these spaces – and not as a redeeming quality. Transforming animals into products thus greatly helps in transitioning to an economy that no longer needs to be concerned with animals’ lives except for how their lives impact their *deaths*, and also ushers in what Nicole Shukin calls “a supplementary economy of aesthetic consumption built into the line.”¹⁸⁰ While the means to the end of physical consumption is first mechanized during this time – in the form of disassembly lines – these “lines” also spark a second kind of consumption. I refer here to the ability to

¹⁷⁸ Despret, “Animal Worlds”, 136.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid*, 129.

¹⁸⁰ *Animal Capital*, 94.

consume animals not only with the mouth, but also with the eyes, and these two types of consumption go hand in hand from this time forward: they “work together” (collaborate?) psychologically, philosophically, and practically to completely change the way animals are perceived in the real world and depicted in the literary sphere. The more animals were theorized and their bodies analyzed to make productivity more efficient in farming, the more they became seen as just another scientific category.

According to Homais, science is “la connaissance de l’action réciproque et moléculaire de tous *les corps de la nature*” [“the knowledge of the reciprocal and molecular action of all *natural bodies*”] and so, from his perspective, “il s’ensuit que l’agriculture se trouve comprise dans son domaine” [“it follows that agriculture is comprised *within* its domain”].¹⁸¹ Meanwhile, Lieuvain repeatedly refers to “the state” and how it will “allég[e] autant qu’il est en lui, le fardeau de [leurs] pénibles sacrifices” [“alleviate...the burden of [their] painful sacrifices”].¹⁸² Thus, the fact that “natural” – e.g. animal – bodies are a necessary part of the processes of both farming and science is assumed to be sufficient proof that the two are connected, and the sacrifices that are acknowledged in this work are not those of the animals, but of the humans, implicated in the industry in question. This next excerpt, however, exposes the relational element of agricultural work, and in doing so also reveals the presence of animals that persists in spite of the shifts in how they were perceived within the context of industry.

Être Bête: The Paradox of the Old Woman at the Farmer’s Market

“Catherine-Nicaise-Élisabeth Leroux, de Sassetot-la-Guerrière, pour cinquante-quatre ans de service dans la même ferme, une médaille d’argent – du prix de vingt-cinq francs !” [...] Alors on vit monter sur l’estrade une petite vieille femme de maintien craintif, et qui

¹⁸¹ Flaubert, 128, my emphasis.

¹⁸² *Ibid*, 141.

paraissait se ratatiner dans ses pauvres vêtements. Elle avait aux pieds de grosses galoches de bois, et, le long des hanches, un grand tablier bleu. Son visage maigre, entouré d'un béguin sans bordure, était plus plissé de rides qu'une pomme de reinette flétrie, et des manches de sa camisole rouge dépassaient deux longues mains, à articulations noueuses. La poussière des granges, la potasse des lessives et le suint des laines les avaient si bien encroutées, éraillées, durcies, qu'elles semblaient sales quoiqu'elles fussent rincées d'eau claire ; et, à force d'avoir servi, elles restaient entrouvertes, comme pour présenter d'elles-mêmes l'humble témoignage de tant de souffrances subies. [...] Dans la fréquentation des animaux, elle avait pris leur mutisme et leur placidité. [...] La séance était finie ; la foule se dispersa ; et, maintenant que les discours étaient lus, chacun reprenait son rang et tout rentrait dans la coutume : les maîtres rudoyaient les domestiques, et ceux-ci frappaient les animaux, triomphateurs indolents qui s'en retournaient à l'étable, une couronne verte entre les cornes¹⁸³

[“Catherine Nicaise Elizabeth Leroux...for fifty-four years of service at the same farm, a silver medal...” [...] Then there came forward on the platform a little old woman with timid bearing, who seemed to shrink within her poor clothes. On her feet she wore heavy wooden clogs, and from her hips hung a large blue apron. Her pale face framed in a borderless cap was more wrinkled than a withered russet apple. And from the sleeves of her red jacket looked out two large hands with knotty joints, the dust of barns, the potash of washing the grease of wools had so encrusted, roughened, hardened these that they seemed dirty, although they had been rinsed in clear water; and by dint of long service they remained half open, as if to bear humble witness for themselves of so much suffering endured. [...] In her constant living with animals she had caught their dumbness and their calm. [...] The meeting was over, the crowds dispersed, and now that the speeches had been read, each one fell back into his place again, and everything into the old grooves; the masters bullied the servants, and these struck the animals, indolent victors, going back to the stalls, a green-crown on their horns.]

This passage is striking in how it contrasts with the previous one. The chemist Homais and the councilor Lieuvain attempt, in turn, to frame working with animals and nature – agriculture – as a skill that can be both learned and known through scientific knowledge and that should be recognized by any citizen as a patriotic act. However, animals, who are necessary participants in the industry of agriculture, are hardly mentioned, thus removing any potential for individuality or acknowledgment. In spite of these efforts to ignore and sideline the animal, the current excerpt demonstrates the potential for humans to enact an “extension of subjectivity” and to move to a collaborative, instead of an exploitative, space alongside animals in farming.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸³ Flaubert, 144.

¹⁸⁴ Despret, “Animal Worlds,” 129.

Catherine Nicaise Elizabeth Leroux's (from now on, Madame Leroux) "maintien craintif" ["timid bearing"] betrays her fear of "les drapeaux, par les tambours, par les messieurs en habit noir..." ["the flags, the drums, the gentlemen..."], leaving her to "demeur[e] tout immobile, ne sachant s'il fallait s'avancer ou s'enfuir, ni pourquoi [...] les examinateurs lui souriaient" ["stand motionless, not knowing whether to advance or run away, nor why...the jury were smiling at her"].¹⁸⁵ She is chosen as the representative par excellence of a life dedicated to agriculture. The life that Madame Leroux has led has indeed been one full of the sacrifices to which Lieuvain has alluded in his speech. However, this correlation ends up being ironic, as she seems to have lived mostly apart from the men making these statements, given the reference to her "fréquentation des animaux" ["constant living with animals"]. Flaubert describes the "mutisme et...placidité" ["dumbness and...calm"] of animals as something that Madame Leroux has "pris" ["caught"], but if the lens is slightly shifted, so do the negative connotations of the description of this intimate existence. What if these are positive traits, characteristics of a place where "humans and animals talk to each other...and present different modes of subjectivity to each other"?¹⁸⁶ When reframed in this way, this describes a capacity that must be purposefully sought after and learned.

As we saw with the opening discussions of Homais' scientific monologue, however, comparing a text in two different languages can contribute to the depth of analysis, and in this excerpt focusing on Madame Leroux, it is again the case. In French, the description of Madame Leroux is more closely aligned with the concept of a collaborative effort like those that many of the farmers from Despret and Porcher's study articulate in their practices in raising animals. Instead of having simply "caught" the qualities of animals, as the English translation states,

¹⁸⁵ Flaubert, 144.

¹⁸⁶ Despret, 133.

Madame Leroux “[les] avait *pris*”, a verb that requires the subject to play an active role.¹⁸⁷ In Despret and Porcher’s study, the farmers attempt to attribute or restore the kinds of capacities that have become recognized as exclusively human to animals: the ability to reason, to organize one’s group, to respond, etc.¹⁸⁸ This old woman clearly made a decision early on in her life to take on a unique way of acting and living, perhaps pushing the kinds of actions described in the interviews with the farmers even further. As the crowd observes her hesitation at getting onstage, someone exclaims, “Ah! qu’elle est bête !”¹⁸⁹ Indeed, Madame Leroux seems almost to have chosen not just to work with animals, but even to “*devenir bête*.”

Not only has Madame Leroux been here labeled “stupid,” as it says in the English translation, but the French adjective identifies her *as* “beastly,” or even “a beast.” My play on the title of Despret and Porcher’s book is inspired by the way that it shows how the term *bête* is capable of expressing so many different things by being placed here in Flaubert’s text. However, the different layers of this term and its variations are similar in that they are each two-sided and demonstrate the paradoxical nature of a specific historical or cultural shift (and, perhaps, a discomfort) that emerge out of the changes brought on by industrialization and the new society that it is shaping. As we consider these issues in relation to animals, it is important to briefly consider the question of religion, as it is something that, here with Madame Leroux, Flaubert highlights.

I have previously cited passages which allude to Emma’s fascination with “literature of easy and sensationalistic identification” that liken men to lions or lambs because of their

¹⁸⁷ Flaubert, 144, my emphasis.

¹⁸⁸ The work that the farmers from Despret and Porcher’s study is not at all diminished by this line of reading, but it is important to consider that even collaborative farming must be initiated by the humans involved, whereas I believe that Madame Leroux’s case provides an example of someone who sought to take the process even further.

¹⁸⁹ Flaubert, 143.

admirable qualities.¹⁹⁰ This particular combination of animals comes from a Biblical tradition as well as the Romantic literary tradition, given the way that the Scriptures often pair the two or use them each to demonstrate how God relates to His people. However, with the Enlightenment and industry, Catholicism was not as popular as it once had been throughout the country (at least in the learning of Scripture, not necessary that the practices stopped), and thus these metaphors and allusions get lost without any more current context, even as they are carried over.¹⁹¹ Mme. Leroux, as she sheepishly accepts her medal and walks offstage, “marmott[e] en s’en allant: ‘Je la donnerai au curé de chez nous, pour qu’il me dise des messes’ [“mutter[s], ‘I’ll give it to our cure up home, to say some masses for me’”].¹⁹² Just as Lieuvain has just given a speech on the patriotic nature of agriculture and she given a medal for her life of service to this industry, the reader and the audience are struck by what seems to be a total indifference to any of the humans around her. She says nothing else during her time onstage, and “walk[s] away” with “a smile of beatitude” on her face. Homais exclaims, “Quel fanatisme !” as the ceremony adjourns. In the religious sense, too, then, Madame Leroux is *bête*. She represents the leavings of religious and literary traditions that now seems rather ironic – and certainly do not embody progress. It is even more ironic that, despite the ways that some choose to justify domination of animals with the call to dominion of them in the Bible, most religions do not condone cruelty, abuse, or neglect of

¹⁹⁰ Ramazani, 118.

¹⁹¹ In the Introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to European Novelists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), Michael Bell points out that it was over the course of the nineteenth century that “natural science rose in prestige to become the paradigmatic form of truth statement”, thus eclipsing the Protestant undertones of 18th-Century fiction. Further research would be necessary in order to consider whether these “tradition[s] of Protestant self-examination” were also prominent in French fiction of this period, but it stands to reason that, even if it weren’t Protestantism, the similar trends in British, French, German and Spanish literature that Bell’s collection demonstrates would imply that Catholicism, the logical alternative in the French context, was also superseded during the nineteenth century by the natural sciences. Bell even cites the case of Flaubert’s Homais following his discussion of natural science, claiming him as the “progressive Enlightenment cliché” (a judgment that I have taken to task here by providing an alternate reading of his character within the specific context of shifts in agriculture)(10).

¹⁹² Flaubert, 145.

animals (which are all words we could use to describe current-day farming practices, which find their origins in industrialization).¹⁹³

Let us now return to the remark made about Madame Leroux as she approaches the stage, and how fraught the French word *bête* is. Because it is both noun and adjective, it always already has two potential meanings, but beyond this, it has in recent years become a bit of a catch phrase or word play in Animal Studies. In their article on Flaubert and Balzac's "Lessons in Natural History," Matthias Preuss and Sebastian Schönbeck take the term to task, along with its variation *bêtise* (a noun that "designates a foolish or untimely remark, a folly," or a naughty thing a child has done). For them, this is a concept that must be "historicize[d], contextualize[d] and poeticize[d]...with the help of exemplary literary texts," and that cannot be easily defined.¹⁹⁴ Attempting to define the distinction(s) between humans and animals presents a similar challenge: the differences seem clear at the outset, but upon even the slightest closer look, the line that was drawn blurs. Derrida emphasizes the *bêtise* of any study that hopes to talk about (or for) animals, since as humans we can never fully understand another species' psychological and physiological workings. After all, ask Preuss and Schönbeck, "How do lifeforms translate into literary form?"¹⁹⁵

Madame Leroux's case is thus an interesting one, for even as she is compared to an animal ("Ah, qu'elle est *bête* !"), she is a human, and so the reader can actually make relevant

¹⁹³ Matthew Scully's book takes inspiration from these Biblical starting points, and the ways that humans have managed to justify and build rhetoric around practices to dissimulate the horrors that are their reality. He discusses everything from factory farming to trophy hunting in Africa. He takes as his starting point the verse from Genesis which gives Adam dominion over all the plants and animals of the earth, and sheds light on how particularly hog farming areas are some of the most conservative parts of the United States. He argues that the Christian faith is meant to be one that is care-based – though not necessarily free of animal *death* – but that the power we have been "given" by God is often used as a way to justify what in other contexts (e.g. pet keeping) would be considered criminal.

¹⁹⁴ Abstract for "*Bêtes Studies: Flaubert's and Balzac's Lessons in Natural History*" in *JLTonline* 9.2 (2015), 1.

¹⁹⁵ Preuss and Schönbeck, 2.

observations, being human themselves! Flaubert certainly employs this term not only to mean its English equivalent (“stupidity”), but also to blur the lines between humans and animals in the context of the agrarian lifestyles that persisted in these parts of rural France.¹⁹⁶ Madame Leroux has clearly chosen to live her life with animals (unlike, for instance, Emma, an issue to which we’ll return in the following section), and perhaps she is even becoming like her animals, to *devenir bête*.¹⁹⁷ The line between human and animal is blurred even further by two words in particular in the description of the old woman: “intérieurement effarouchée” and “s’enfuir.”¹⁹⁸ Both of these terms are especially animal-centered, and the richness of the French language means that there would have been multiple alternatives that would have been less so. Thus, Madame Leroux’s being “inwardly spooked” by the flags and tempted to “escape” or “flee” give the impression that she is not a just an old woman, but perhaps that she’s become something more like a wild horse or a dog that does not recognize the person calling to them. Her actions in this moment pose a stark contrast to how one would expect the agriculturist to which Lieuvain refers to act in a similar situation. Given that they are described in his speech as the ultimate patriots for France, one imagines that they would celebrate a medal such as the one Madame Leroux receives. This contradiction thus reveals some of the most basic issues with emphasizing the identity of a human group (or the patriotism of a country) by agricultural industriousness, which ultimately depends on the lives of animals.

¹⁹⁶ Flaubert uses this term often throughout his body of work and particularly in his correspondence. Carol Rifelj’s description of the term in *The Gustave Flaubert Encyclopedia* claims that he used it in the sense of “stupidity”, and this may be so the majority of the time. However, he would have also had to have had in mind the connotations relating to animals, making it something worth addressing in the case of Madame Leroux.

¹⁹⁷ Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of *becoming-animal* might apply here but would require further integration with the rest of the close-reading about Madame Leroux. For instance, one could consider her facial expression and potential membership within the animals on her farm as two symptoms of this, along with the specific vocabulary that Flaubert chooses to use to describe her movements and physical appearance over the course of the scene.

¹⁹⁸ Flaubert, 144.

The Ghosts that Haunt Us: Madame Leroux and Beyond

As Madame Leroux's description is painted – both through Flaubert's carefully crafted words and the deeper emotions and impressions that these instill in each reader – an alternate reason for her presence emerges. Do we here witness the bifurcated future self of Emma Bovary and the life she might have led without Charles (or any other man)? This initially sounds unlikely, given how she spends her life after marriage deepening her “market-driven hedonism,” which “reward[s] her...with the proverbial ‘cheap thrill[s].’”¹⁹⁹ Emma spends her time devouring romance novels and society magazines, ordering new dresses at hardly so much as a prompting by Lheureux, seeming to only desire to be around people who only exist to see and be seen.²⁰⁰ However, the physical details of the descriptions Charles' gives of her from the first night they meet suggest that she might well have led a life much like Madame Leroux, if he hadn't taken her away from her father's farm.²⁰¹

Emma's hand, when Charles first notices it, is “a little hard at the knuckles” and “trop longue,” “with no soft inflections in the outlines.”²⁰² As they share a meal, he notices that “she ha[s], like a man, thrust in between two buttons of her bodice a tortoise-shell eyeglass.” This lack of *pudeur* on Emma's part is reminiscent of how the reader could imagine Madame Leroux having little regard for what was considered “proper” to a woman. Beyond this, there is a keen sense of *déjà vu* when one arrives to the narration of Madame Leroux's physical description,

¹⁹⁹ Ramazani, 119.

²⁰⁰ Lheureux is a “wheedling, seductive, ruthless [local] salesman” from whom Emma purchases countless items, both for herself and, on occasion, for her lovers. Laurence Porter calls him the clear representation of “the modern age of commerce and credit for which Flaubert felt great disdain” (200).

²⁰¹ This sounds as though Charles “stole” Emma, but I am simply stating that she only left the farm at this time because she was marrying [him]. Indeed, Emma was happy to leave the farm, though she did not anticipate that she would continue to live amongst farmers and their animals her entire life.

²⁰² Flaubert (trans. Avelin), 22.

which also focuses largely on her hands: “des manches de sa camisole rouge dépassaient deux *longues mains*.”²⁰³ Like Emma, her hands are particularly long, and worn from work. The parallel of worn hands in the brief physical descriptions of two women in similar circumstances – relatively isolated from human contact, yet who share much of their lives with animals – is no coincidence, given Flaubert’s meticulousness in finding the perfect word for each thought and his ability to “make ordinary words sing [...] complex notes” throughout his work.²⁰⁴ Indeed, it is a clear echo of the description of the young Emma’s hand, although hers were not yet nearly so “encroûtée[s]” or “durcie[s]” as Madame Leroux’s, which even stay “entrouvertes” and demonstrate her lifelong work and “souffrances.”²⁰⁵ Emma’s knuckles, however, even in her youth, are still hard enough for Charles to notice, therefore presenting a trace of the possible future that Emma does not realize, made more evident when the comparison with Madame Leroux’s life and person is made.²⁰⁶

While it’s true that Emma shares her life with many animals when Charles meets her, it is also clear that this would not be her choice, were she to have one. He learns throughout their conversation that she “ne s’amusait guère à la campagne, maintenant surtout qu’elle était chargée presque à elle seule des *soins de la ferme*.”²⁰⁷ Thus, presumably, life was bearable for her, until the tasks of keeping up the farm – many of which necessarily involved time spent with and caring for animals – were multiplied. This dissatisfaction foreshadows the habits that she will fall into following her union with Charles, which all emerge out of a general unhappiness with her life. Were the young doctor never to have come to treat Monsieur Bertaux at his farm, Emma

²⁰³ Flaubert, 144.

²⁰⁴ Unwin, 257.

²⁰⁵ Flaubert, 144.

²⁰⁶ She “realizes” this future in neither potential sense: neither in living out a solitary and isolated life raising animals, nor does she even *realize* that this life is her likely future before she meets Charles.

²⁰⁷ Flaubert, 17, my emphasis.

would have had little occasion to meet another potential suitor. Perhaps her father would have pursued a match elsewhere, but it seems that she had already taken up the duties as woman of the home and the farm, leading one to wonder whether he was even thinking of it anymore.²⁰⁸ Thus, I return to my opening comments, and observe the fact that, despite their clear influences over her life and its events, Emma's perception of animals is not unlike Lieuvain or Homais': they are always already a vehicle for something else – whether that is to bring one's ennui to the fore or to serve science and the progress of the industry of agriculture. The way that Madame Leroux echoes very specific characteristics of Emma's reminds the reader of the fact that Flaubert's main character, were she to have given more potential for agency to the animals that constantly surrounded her, could have found more satisfaction in her life in spite of its lacks.

Conclusion: What Emma Bovary and Animals Can Tell Us About Colonial Othering

In this first chapter, throughout my close-readings of *Madame Bovary*, I have shown some of the ways that farm animals in literature are capable of showing us new modes of reading the narrative itself as well as what literature can tell us about the historical context of a text. There are few moments when animals come to the fore as individuals in any obvious manner – with the exception of Emma, Rodolphe, and Charles' horses – but the excerpts from the chapter on the agricultural fair demonstrate how the attitudes of literary characters towards literary animals betray opinions and realities of what was going on in real life, shifts that impacted real animals following industrial progress in an industry like farming, where they move from a more

²⁰⁸ This fact is clear in the previous quote, for the expression "*maintenant surtout que...*" implies that Emma's being "*chargée presque à elle seule des soins de la ferme*" is a recent development, and that she was previously not as directly involved.

collaborative role to being considered products. Flaubert's ironic style is biting in this chapter in particular, but this makes it even richer for discussion as we consider the animal lives at stake.²⁰⁹

Looking ahead to my second chapter, which will focus on *Salammbô*, another novel by Flaubert, it seems premature to bid farewell to *Emma Bovary*. An intrepid woman, she mirrors in many ways her author (although certainly not the depth of his irony, she is too purposefully boring), and some of the interests that they share bring us to the subject matter of *Salammbô*, which provides rich grounds for a continued discussion of the animal within the context of France's colonial spaces. Both author and heroine share an enthusiasm for the exotic and the Other, though it is perhaps less clear in the case of the latter throughout the novel bearing her name. Flaubert's extensive letters from his trips to Egypt and other parts of North Africa provide ample evidence for both the research he conducted into the local cultures of the area and his personal interest in the societies and people of the Orient.²¹⁰ As we have seen throughout this chapter, Emma is profoundly discontent, bored to her core with where she is and the lack of people that populate those spaces. Animals thus serve as a persistent reminder of her sense of being stifled by her surroundings, unable to escape their mundane and too-expected qualities and inhabitants. Aubrey Porterfield calls Emma's perception of her ennui "an accident of geography," likening her, as Flaubert does himself in one of his letters, to "a plant in Egypt [...] nurtured by its environment."²¹¹

²⁰⁹ I did not go into detail in this chapter considering the *human* lives that are also deeply impacted (but not often *ended*) by changes in farming practices. As Noëlie Vialles alludes to and Timothy Pachirat discusses at length, it is most often immigrants and individuals from marginalized populations who do the "dirtiest"/most violent work in the industrial slaughterhouse. Thus, these changes in practice change a *culture*: to be a farmer previously meant you would have had to have at least some land, but now such a thing is a rarity.

²¹⁰ See Francis Steegmuller's *Flaubert in Egypt* (London: The Bodley Head, 1972) for an extensive study of these travels based on his previous work on Flaubert's *Correspondance*.

²¹¹ "Why Emma Bovary Had to Be Bored: Echoes of Flaubert's Egyptian Travel Writing in *Madame Bovary*," *Studies in the Novel* 48.3 (2016): 259.

Emma would have attended a Colonial Exhibition with great enthusiasm, I believe. The spectacle and the drama of an exotic culture of “strange”-looking humans and animals would entice her fully and ignite her desire for “something Other.” These man-made spaces would create for her new “country sides”: ones where the warm wind and the rippling sand would infuse her senses with beyond just more-of-the-same when it came to sounds, sights, and smells. While in Tostes and Yonville, she longs for anything but the countryside, in the Orient she would give everything to be in the countryside. The exotic menagerie would draw her in even more – she is clearly tempted by danger and risk, as we observe the progression and unraveling of her affairs. Thus, if we shift Emma’s perspective, it becomes clear that the disdain I have said she has for animals that remind her of her ennui (and of her failing to have attained her dreams of wild and passionate love) might well disappear into thin air if, instead of cows and sheep, one spoke of lions and elephants. Having said this, would she think much differently of the native peoples of these lands? As Flaubert, would she verily ridicule their savage and primitive culture as being animal-like, thus essentially switching the dynamic and making animals the more interesting being populating the space?

In Chapter 2, I will not necessarily address these questions about Emma Bovary’s potential responses to a visit to the Orient directly, although it would be an interesting path to pursue further in a later project. The analysis and close-readings will instead focus on issues within the questions just raised in relation to Emma, particularly as they pertain to the issue of race and species, one of the principal issues of *Salammbô*. The colonial Other has often been somewhat in the “human/animal borderlands”, as Claire Jean Kim so aptly articulates within the specific context of Black humans in America, *neither human nor animal*.²¹² The chapter will

²¹² *Dangerous Crossings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 35.

therefore discuss and examine what happens when we take animals as themselves, in a similar manner to the way that I considered horses in *Madame Bovary*. I will focus my analysis on articulating new readings of the animals that pepper this novel so heavily in order to demonstrate their relevance as individuals and how these versions of them always already permeate any colonial setting because of the effects that are felt long after its founding. As in *Madame Bovary*, taking literary animals seriously helps adjust our perceptions of the constructs of any particular era and culture, and colonial spaces and projects are one of the areas where new perspectives provide crucial insight as we continue to grapple with the implications of these human and animal histories. What is lost in the rearrangement or adjustment of species categories? When we attempt to make two species “one” in the interest of power, what exactly are the stakes and losses lived by the bodies being told they are no longer what they previously understood themselves to be?

Chapter 2

The Exotic Animal: Rereading Representations of Animals in *Salammbô*

In this chapter, I will shift my discussions of literary animals in nineteenth-century French Literature to focus on the consequences of French colonialism during this time via another novel by Gustave Flaubert, *Salammbô*. At the time of its publication in 1862, France's colonial enterprises spanned much of North Africa, including Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya. This area encompasses Carthage and its surrounding areas, where the Mercenary Revolt occurred from 240 to 238 BC, immediately following the First Punic War. Flaubert researched these events closely before laying them out as the plot of *Salammbô*, basing the majority of his research and story line on Polybius' accounts of them in his *Histories*. During this period in history, Carthage either had or was in the process of taking power over the majority of North Africa, meaning that they were an active colonizing people. Flaubert's narrative is thus built around actual historical events and individuals that emerge out of a colonial context. This same geographical area, at the time of *Salammbô*'s publication, was currently under French colonial rule, and for this reason, Flaubert also provides the reader with a unique glimpse into a "vision personnelle de l'Orient."²¹³ It is challenging, if possible at all, for any author to maintain a fully objective position with regards to their social and cultural contexts, and at this time, the sway of the "exotic" imaginary was strong in France, particularly in art and literature.²¹⁴ The long periods

²¹³ Ildikó Lőrinszky, *L'Orient de Flaubert* (Paris : L'Harmattan, 2002), 305; This is not necessarily a criticism of Flaubert, but rather a point that it is impossible to maintain an objective position as author, much like Edward Said explains. One's cultural, racial, gender, religious, and speciated contexts creep in even when steps are taken to remain neutral and should therefore be openly acknowledged in any discussion of the work and what its aims may or may not be.

²¹⁴ Due to its broader definition, I choose the term "exotic" to describe the animals and spaces throughout this chapter and in the chapter title. Victor Segalen, a naval doctor from Brest who was born in 1878 and died at

of colonial occupation throughout the spaces that make up the Near and Middle East and the northern parts of Africa, largely by Western (European) countries, enabled what Edward Said calls a “semi-mythical construct” known as *the* “Orient” to emerge.²¹⁵

According to A.J. Krailshemer, who translated and wrote the introduction for the 1977 Penguin edition of *Salammbô*, Flaubert was adamant about maintaining as much historical accuracy as possible in his texts, at one point "discard[ing] all he had so far written [of *Salammbô*] as worthless" following a six-week return trip to North Africa to conduct research for *Salammbô*. He claimed "there was no detail in his book for which he could not produce some documentary authority."²¹⁶ In spite of him stating that he remained true to the historical facts, the Orientalist views of Flaubert's time are evident in the stark contrasts that he makes between the Carthaginians and the Barbarian (or Mercenary) army. When one begins to observe the way that he describes each group, there are moments where each is made to be more “animal-like.” However, the way that this “animalization” is employed is distinct for each group. While the Barbarians are often compared to “exotic” (wild) animals such as lions, jackals, eagles, bears, etc.; the Carthaginians are compared to “farm” (domesticated) animals like cows or sheep.

the age of only 41, was also a passionate writer. His limited but dense writings that emerged from his posting to China sought to tease out the varied nature of the cultural differences he observed, while maintaining an awareness of his position as an observer of another people. In *Victor Segalen and the Aesthetics of Diversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), Charles Forsdick explains how Segalen attempted to push back on the risk of reducing or simplifying other cultures to what had previously been called “foreign, strange, unexpected,” and that it is largely for these reasons that “exotique,” unlike “Orientale,” implies a point of view that demonstrates a “particular sensitivity to the nuances of otherness experienced in contact with other cultures...also [...] a positive search for different means of *engaging* with otherness” (27, emphasis mine). This mode of thinking requires both the real and the imaginary to give as accurate a portrayal as possible of the people and places being described, making it unique in the transparency of its subjectivity. Thus, while exoticism is by no means a fully objective consideration of the Other (Forsdick explains some of its significant weaknesses in the opening chapter), its admittance to *requiring* the “imaginary” in order to paint the “full” picture makes it a term that I find more appropriate for a readjustment of readings of animals in colonized spaces.

²¹⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978), xviii.

²¹⁶ “Introduction” in *Salammbô*, A.J. Krailshemer (New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1977), 8-9.

Throughout my readings of *Salammbô*, I will show that Flaubert's Orientalist representations of animals and humans are more complex than a simple acceptance or rejection of the colonial project, and that despite his desire to push back on the "civilisation européo-orientale que l'on a voulu plaquer sur le musulmanisme" ["the euro-oriental civilization that has been imposed onto the Muslim culture"], he sometimes strengthens associations between animals and non-White humans.²¹⁷ These associations ultimately deflate both groups' capacities for agency, as they are accompanied by a unique conceptualization of "the human" which excludes them both: a "rationalist narrative of domination of the Others" which is attributed by a "small group of people that are not just homo sapiens but an ideal *type* of homo sapiens."²¹⁸ This produces what Avery Gordon calls a "constellation of effects, historical and institutional, that make a *vocabulary a social practice* of producing knowledge."²¹⁹ The characters and events of *Salammbô* are inscribed into a uniquely Orientalist background, and can thus demonstrate how the constellations of knowledge that Gordon describes enable the "Orient" to become "possess[ed] and direct[ed]" by an author like Flaubert, a member of the colonizing – Othering – group.²²⁰ My readings of animals in the following excerpts will move to refocus our understandings of them by, on one hand, acknowledging their real bodies and capacities vis-à-vis their literary positions in the novel, and on the other hand, by considering the ways in which animals' presence throughout the narrative reveals the social and cultural hauntings of French colonial power. This requires moving beyond seeing animals exclusively as symbols or

²¹⁷ Flaubert, writing to F. Baudry, qtd. in Lacoste, 81; "Musulmanisme" is an interesting term, though obvious in its implications. However, it would be worth investigating in an expanded version of this project in order to determine if it was a commonly used word that today we might synonymize with "Orientalism".

²¹⁸ Val Plumwood, *Environmental Culture*, 19; Syl Ko, "Notes from the Border of the Human-Animal Divide" in *Aphro-Isms*, 73.

²¹⁹ *Ghostly Matters*, 8, emphasis mine.

²²⁰ Said, xviii.

allegories and brings to the fore the stakes of articulating discussions of species.²²¹ In this chapter, I will thus take up Susan McHugh's call to "take literary animals seriously...forcing new questions about how literary histories bind animals...to the terms of human individuals."²²² However, within the specific context of colonial power, this task requires the acknowledgment of race, as this is a common path to "animalizing" a colonized people that aims to establish them as "lesser" versions of the same species.²²³

The imperial posture of the Carthaginians towards the Barbarians is evident when one observes the descriptions of both groups throughout the novel. In other words, one can read the former as the colonizer and the latter as the colonized, although violence is doled out equally. Corinne Samanidayar-Perrin's article alternatively refers to "l'impérialisme carthaginois" ["Carthaginian imperialism"] and "la puissance coloniale de Carthage" ["Carthage's colonial power"] as she explains the distinguishing elements of each group.²²⁴ As the fields of

²²¹ There is one animal in this novel whom I choose not to discuss directly, given the complexity of his presence in the colonial context of *Salammô*: the serpent. The one that Salammô keeps is recognized as a vital symbol of the intelligence of the gods that Carthage worships and with whom she also shares a deep connection. The symbolism behind the serpent in this story ranges from the sexual to the religious along with the exotic elements that I aim to focus on in the current chapter. However, due to the time limitations of the dissertation and the extensive work that would have been necessary to sufficiently address each of these levels of symbolism in order to explore a different reading of this serpent – namely, whether we can read it any other way, given the obvious intentions of Flaubert to employ its presence in this manner – I have chosen to set it aside for a later time. A study that explored the historical sources Flaubert consulted in writing the novel would be the best way to deduce whether there might have been a real serpent present within the context of these events of the Mercenary Revolt and Carthage's virgin priestess(es). If this were the case, it would be possible to consider the serpent in a very different way, and one that aligns more closely with my overall intent to integrate animals as potential subjects. While rethinking this animal in such a way would not be within Flaubert's initial Orientalist setting or intentions (evident in the way that he infused the narrative with common symbols of these traditions in art and literature), it would provide new ways of reading "exotic" animals like snakes that are particularly contained by symbol and allegory.

²²² "Literary Animal Agents," 491.

²²³ Aph and Syl Ko articulate this particularly well in several of the essays included in *Aphro-Isms* that focus specifically on the connectedness of race and species. These women face head-on the foundational problems with how race and species are established and maintained, and in so doing return again and again to the fact that these discursive and social issues emerge directly out of colonial domination.

²²⁴ "Animalité, barbarie, civilisation : questions de frontières dans *Salammô*," *Revue Flaubert* 10 (2010) :

Postcolonial and Race Studies have established, “animalizing” the human is one of the principal ways that colonial distinctions are created, thus making the domination of the colonizer over the colonized the foundation upon which such dynamics are able to work.²²⁵ However, Samanidayar-Perrin takes it one step further, demonstrating that both main groups in *Salammbô* are defined by their connections or resemblances to animals. The Carthaginians, the colonizing people who have nearly total control of the coastline surrounding the city, are connected to a “ordre politico-religieux dont les animaux sacrés s[ont] les garants” [“politico-religious order that is assured by sacred animals”]. In the opening sequence of events which surrounds a raucous fête at Hamilcar Barca’s residence, there is a fountain full of sacred fish said to have been descended “de ces lottes primordiales qui avaient fait éclore ou se cachait la Déesse” [“from the original angler fish who revealed where the Goddess was hiding”].²²⁶ These fish are one of the animals cited by Samanidayar-Perrin as the basis for Carthage’s religious and social identity. What she does not mention are the comparisons to animals which actually align this group more closely with domesticated, or farm animals, as opposed to the “exotic” ones that become easy references for the Barbarian army’s men.

Much later in the novel, Carthage has been under siege by the Barbarian army and their water supply cut off, all in the midst of a draught. The people of the city are becoming desperate and decide that they must sacrifice their children to Moloch in order to appease him, thus demonstrating their recognition of rebirth in death that characterizes this religion.²²⁷ As they

²²⁵ See Claire Jean Kim, Frantz Fanon, Edward Said, Aph and Syl Ko, Zakiyyah Iman Jackson and Billy-Ray Belcourt for a variety of perspectives coming from different disciplines on the subject.

²²⁶ Samanidayar-Perrin, 3; Flaubert, *Salammbô*, 11.

²²⁷ There is a fascinating “side story” that takes place amidst this series of events, involving a secret son of Hamilcar’s whom he does not want to die. He convinces his servant to give his son instead and to protect Hamilcar’s boy in exchange for food. This is an interesting moment where distinctions of class emerge; Hamilcar claims to “help” the father by giving him food, which he might otherwise never have had again. However, by the same token, he robs him of his son in order to avoid losing his (Hamilcar’s) own. While this is a minor plot detail, it

sacrifice their children, the Carthaginians become increasingly frenzied, especially following Hamilcar's declaration that the children are not men, but "Des bœufs ! des bœufs !" ²²⁸ ["Oxen! Oxen!"] While this declaration is made in an effort to distinguish the children as having become something other than human, following their sacrifice the rest of the Carthaginians seem to lose their awareness of this: "Quelques-uns qui avaient des couteaux se précipitèrent sur les autres. On s'entre'égorgea." ["Some who had knives fell upon others. People butchered each other."] ²²⁹ Thus, this scene becomes one of mutual slaughter, the bloody nature of the descriptions not unlike those one reads in *Animal to Edible*, referring to the abattoir where cows, sheep, pigs and horses are killed and portioned. ²³⁰

Hamilcar's direct reference to the children "becoming" oxen and the subsequent mutual slaughtering of the Carthaginians amongst themselves complicate Samanidayar-Perrin's declarations of the Barbarians' "solidarité, voire...fraternité avec les animaux" ["solidarity, even...fraternity with animals"], an assumption that undergirds her concept of civilization (e.g. who is more or less civilized, and thus deserves to maintain or take power over the other) defined on the basis of "animalité et humanité" throughout the novel. ²³¹ It is not only the Barbarians who are described in ways resembling real animals, and the fact that the Carthaginians do also in moments like the one above exposes the fact that *Salammbô* is permeated by the "messy entanglements of human and animal agents," the former of which, according to McHugh, "are never separable from human presences." ²³² The abundance of animal characteristics that Flaubert

would be interesting to examine more closely in a different project that focused more on the abjectification of humans in colonial contexts.

²²⁸ Flaubert, 250.

²²⁹ Ibid, 251.

²³⁰ Noëlie Vialles (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

²³¹ Samanidayar-Perrin, 2.

²³² McHugh, "Literary Animal Agency," 490-1.

uses to describe humans is initially disorienting when one tries to make out “real” animals throughout the text. Some thinkers understand this abundant fauna vocabulary to mean that the author begins from a perspective that considers the animal to be the direct opposite of the human, but this oversimplifies the issue, as McHugh’s emphasis of the two types of presences as inseparable reminds us.²³³ A brief return to the historical and cultural contexts of Flaubert’s time and the consequences of racist and speciesist modes of constructing the value of an individual will shed valuable light on this persistent – and, indeed, messy – entanglement between animals and humans.

Questions of who is more or less human in colonial contexts hinge on varying degrees of animality (which I use in a sense aligned with Neel Ahuja’s “*animalization*, the organized subjection of racialized groups through animal figures”), thus making the colonized groups defined as subspecies.²³⁴ This is also true throughout *Salammbô* between the Carthaginians and Barbarians. Beyond this, Flaubert’s uses of real animals throughout the novel remain anchored in a consideration of them primarily as animate objects treated with no regard for their potential subjectivity and agency.²³⁵ In doing so, he affirms his project of staying true to history – he accurately portrays the power dynamic of the Carthaginians’ colonization of the peoples around them during the historical period in which the novel is situated – while subsequently neglecting to attain his goal of pushing back on “musulmanisme” (synonymous here with our current understanding of “Orientalism”).

²³³ See Göran Blix’s article “Entre les dieux et les animaux: *Salammbô* et la bête humaine de Flaubert”, where he unpacks various interpretations of “animalité”. His analysis is compelling in the ways that he discusses the “status” of animals and humans and each of their connections to the gods. For him “l’humanité s’efface dans l’abjection...la meilleure façon de déshumaniser est de rapetisser l’ennemi au statut de bête” (739).

²³⁴ Ahuja, “Postcolonial Critique in a Multispecies World,” *PMLA* 124.2 (2009): 557.

²³⁵ Fayaz Chagani, “Can the Postcolonial Animal Speak?” *Society & Animals* 24 (2016): 626.

This apparent failure on Flaubert's part is, on the one hand, understandable. He lived at the height of many of France's colonial projects, and thus a time when the French were fascinated by (even fixated on) "exotic" and "Oriental" concepts and ideas. While loosely connected to geographical locations, these concepts were largely anchored in the accounts of individuals who had been to these places – a group made up mostly of privileged, white French men (like Flaubert) who had the means. It is expressly this fact, however, that reveals the other side of his inevitable failure to push back on the modes of perceiving colonized spaces during his time: the lasting Enlightenment categories that are established and perpetuated by the mere existence of colonies. In his critique of past stages in postcolonial thinking, Fayaz Chagani demonstrates the ways in which this discipline has actually reinforced an exclusionary form of humanism that "has not been open to...similarities, to the vulnerability that humans share with nonhuman animals."²³⁶ For a postcolonial mode of thinking that moves towards similar reformulations of thought as McHugh's call within the context of literary studies, and thus towards the "possibility of a broader form of affective and political community that transcends the species boundary," it is crucial to recognize the fact that, in some postcolonial scholars' considerations, animals themselves are not always a focal point even as they continue to be used as a negative benchmark.²³⁷

A movement towards understandings of nonhuman animals that are built on the "imagining [of] 'their' perceptual worlds [and that] afford[...] them with some measure of ethical and political subjecthood" can finally begin to leave behind the human-animal binary that Aph Ko and Syl Ko find so detrimental along with Chagani, given its dual deflation of both

²³⁶ Chagani, 620.

²³⁷ Ibid.

perspectives on race that exclude them each of any kind of “liberation.”²³⁸ Their discussion of the category of the human, which is engaged in several of their essays, describes the deep (and persistent) social, cultural, and legal implications of it being the only way to distinguish from the animal. During Flaubert’s time, the Ko’s remind their readers, “Western Europeans...legally and morally placed groups outside the ‘human’ zone,” which moved these groups towards the “‘animal’...a space of absence of being and lawlessness, inviting a need to be controlled, disciplined, and contained.”²³⁹ And here emerges the basis for considerations of colonized, non-White bodies as “subhuman,” “nonhuman,” or “inhuman”: while they cannot be placed directly into the category of the “animal” given that they are, in fact, human in species, animality becomes the requirement for them to be relegated to the sideline of the category.²⁴⁰ In order to push back on it, both categories need thus to be set aside. While Syl Ko is resistant to the idea of “extending personhood or individuality to animals in order to rethink/reimagine animality,” I aim to move towards just this by noticing the individual animals that populate *Salammbô* and rereading them without simply “humanizing them.”²⁴¹ These readings still require a recognition of how Flaubert has chosen to place animals in relation to the humans around them, however, in order to remain aware of how the Enlightenment categories that haunt us are being mobilized. By reading these real literary animals in such a way that recognizes the relative abundance of similarities across species lines – animals, humans, and any variation purported upon them by historical and cultural practices – we can reimagine identities without relying solely on the insufficient human-animal binary.

²³⁸ Chagani, 634; Syl Ko, “Revaluing the Human as a Way to Revalue the Animal” in *Aphro-ism*, 114-5.

²³⁹ Syl Ko, “Addressing Racism Requires Addressing the Situation of Animals,” in *Aphro-ism*, 46.

²⁴⁰ Aph and Syl Ko cite Maneesha Deckha’s legal concepts throughout this particular essay, but for my purposes it made most sense to bring them in as the two writers had organized them in their argument.

²⁴¹ S. Ko, “Addressing Racism,” 48.

A War of Attrition: A Brief Plot Summary of *Salammbô*

As I have described above, the plot of this novel is based on the historical Mercenary Revolt in Carthage during the third century B.C. The Barbarian army, made up of men from tribes around North Africa, had previously fought for Carthage during their conquest of North Africa during the first Punic War. In the opening pages of *Salammbô*, they are still in the city awaiting the pay they have been promised for the many years of service they have given to Carthage. However, the significant numbers of their army mean that Carthage cannot actually afford to pay them all (in other words, Carthage has overpromised). This leads to their revolt and the war that is the focus of Flaubert's novel.

There is a secondary story line that involves Salammbô, the daughter of Hamilcar, one of the Carthaginian generals, and Mâtho, the main leader of the Barbarian army, but the passages that are of immediate pertinence for my work are not directly associated to this part of the overall plot, and it is therefore not discussed in my close-readings. Amidst the tensions and battles that characterize the majority of the novel, the two experience a passionate – though largely long-distance – relationship that ultimately ends in them both dying in the last scene, after Mâtho has literally been ripped apart by the Carthaginians in their anger following the war and the damage it caused to the city.

Over the course of the novel, the Barbarians and the Carthaginians fight a series of violent and gruesome battles. At times, the Barbarians are joined by additional groups, namely the Numidians, who ultimately side with Carthage following their leader, Narr'havas', betrothal to Salammbô. Attempts to cut off access to food and water are made by both sides at different times: the Barbarians are forced into a naturally enclosed area for an extended period of time that ends in their being forced to fight one another to the death, and Carthage is held inside the city

walls with a dwindling water supply after the Barbarians manage to break a large hole in the aqueduct. Both sides lose massive numbers of humans and animals over the course of the war, but ultimately the Carthaginians prevail and the Barbarians that survive disperse back to their home regions.

The Elephants in the Pen: Pachyderm Identities in *Salammbô*'s "Exotic"

Landscapes

Within the first pages of *Salammbô*, the reader is given a glimpse into the violence that will persist throughout the text as a feast turns into utter chaos, ultimately ending in the massacre of many servants and animals. This gathering is being held in a suburb of Carthage by the Barbarians, who are taking advantage of the absence of their Carthaginian captain, Hamilcar, to make use of his palace, kitchens, gardens, and everyone and everything in them. As the evening progresses and their drunkenness increases, they begin to contemplate the wrongs that Carthage has done to them over their years of servitude to the city over wars and conquests. The promise of payment for their alliance seems to have been forgotten. Giscon, another Carthaginian general, arrives to the feast only to confirm these suspicions, claiming that time is needed to decide where Carthage will be able to get so much money (given the number of soldiers they engaged over the course of the war). As the Barbarians become angry and quickly turn violent, Giscon flees, leaving them to continue the destruction of life and property through the night.

Many animals (and highly animalized humans, the servants of varying tribes) populate this first chapter, but when Hamilcar finally brings himself to assess the damages and losses he's suffered at the hands of his hired army, he comes to three wounded elephants (the remnants of many more, most of whom died in the massacre) and is stunned.

...avec un geste d'horreur, il s'enfonça dans le parc des éléphants. Ces animaux faisaient l'orgueil des grandes maison puniques. Ils avaient porté les aïeux, triomphé dans les guerres, et on les vénérait comme favoris du Soleil. Hamilcar, avant de partir [Carthage], avait exigé [de sa main droite, Abdalonim] le serment qu'il les surveillerait. ...trois seulement restaient, couchés au milieu de la cour... Ils le reconnurent et vinrent à lui. L'un avait les oreilles horriblement fendues, l'autre au genou une large plaie, et le troisième la trompe coupée.

Cependant [les éléphants] le regardaient d'un air triste, comme des personnes raisonnables ; et celui qui n'avait plus de trompe, en baissant sa tête énorme et pliant les jarrets, tâchait de le flatter doucement avec l'extrémité hideuse de son moignon. À cette caresse de l'animal, deux larmes lui jaillirent des yeux.²⁴²

[...with a sign of horror, he went into the elephant pen. These animals were the pride of the great Punic houses. They had carried ancestors about, triumphed in wars, and were worshipped as favourites of the Sun. Before leaving [Carthage] Hamilcar had forced [his second-in-command, Abdalonim] to swear that he would watch over them. ...only three remained, lying in the middle of the courtyard...They recognized him and came to him. One had its ears horribly split, another a large wound on the knee, the third had had its trunk cut off.

However they looked at him sadly, like rational beings; and the one who had lost its trunk, lowered its huge head, bent its knees and tried to fondle him gently with the end of the hideous stump. At the animals' caress two tears sprang from his eyes.]

As Hamilcar faces these animals, their suffering provokes his first moment of evident sadness (as opposed to outright anger) in the wake of his surveillance of the damages. In this brief exchange of sympathy and forgiveness between him and the elephants, he acknowledges their sad gazes as those of “personnes raisonnables,” and they recognize and approach him even after their gruesome injuries have been inflicted by soldiers alongside whom they had perhaps fought over the course of the war (thus potentially instilling a distrust in humans). The benchmark so often cited (exploited) in questions of race and in the name of colonialism – reason – is here referenced to describe an animal. Despite the many similarities between humans and elephants, Flaubert’s word choice here is notable, given the term’s use in the moves made by the

²⁴² Flaubert, 133-4.

colonizer to distinguish themselves from the colonized. As Val Plumwood explains, the privileged category of “human” that this requires is established thanks to the identification of those who “deserve to be in control and to be disproportionately rewarded” because of their “reason.”²⁴³ This attribution of rationalism “allow[s] the denial and backgrounding of the Other’s contribution to the outcome...[and] of what the less powerful are or have done...includ[ing] naturalizing the master subject’s appropriation of their labour and its product.” While it might initially seem extreme to discuss what these elephants have “produced,” they have clearly been identified as contributors to past victories in war, and thus could in this way be included in the category of “laborer” in the context of a soldier’s “labor.”²⁴⁴

These elephants are thus placed by Flaubert into an allegory attributing to them at least some degree of “reason,” but not on their own – this adjective is connected to the context of a “personne raisonnable.” This relates them directly to the colonizer and imposes upon these animals a responsibility with which they cannot follow through in the same way as someone (e.g. a man) like Hamilcar. Hamilcar’s animals thus find themselves somewhat caught in the middle: while they are physically animals, by association with their master, they also apparently possess a certain amount of “rationality” (the word used in the English translation of this passage). Not unlike the Barbarians, their participation over the course of the wars to expand Carthage’s territory have been instrumental in their success and continue to be as we will see shortly. However, their symbolic meaning persists – like it does for many animals in literature – in their being religious emblems, “favoris du Soleil.”

²⁴³ Plumwood, 17.

²⁴⁴ One could, in this way, also integrate the elephants into Jason Hribal’s conception of animals as members of the working class. While this is not the kind of work that he refers to in his article, I would argue that, within the historical context of North Africa in the 3rd Century B.C., a soldier would have been considered part of “the working class” (“Animals are part of the working class’: a challenge to labor history,” *Labor History* 44.4, 2010).

The ambiguous identities of these elephants also persist in the other moments when they are present throughout the novel; they continue to play crucial roles in the lives of the Carthaginian people, sometimes even making the difference in winning a battle but still being murdered as if they are disposable once their power has been sufficiently beneficial to the people of the city. As he organizes an army to fight the Barbarians, Hamilcar's three injured elephants have become 72 (although the participation of these same three elephants is unlikely, if they survive much past their encounter with Hamilcar in their pen at all), a large group of pachyderms who were made "formidable" and yet whose "drivers" were equipped with a mallet and chisel in order to protect themselves and too much destruction, were the large animals to stampede during combat.²⁴⁵ Ironically, the animals are purposefully incited to violence before the battle, the "Indians" on their backs having "goaded them so vigorously that blood flowed over their great ears" and "made [them] drunk with a mixture of pepper, neat wine, and incense."²⁴⁶ These normally peaceable creatures, when removed from their traditional family structures and home lands, have now been shown to respond to these stressors with violence, even to the point of holding grudges against people wearing similar colors to other humans who have hurt them previously, or simply by attacking animals with whom they would have otherwise interacted in a friendly manner at random.²⁴⁷ G.A. Bradshaw's work bears witness to just how much "the lives of elephants and people of Africa have changed: [they] are engaged in a very different sort of

²⁴⁵ Flaubert (trans. Krailshemer), 137; This new "elephant army" is procured from past conquests in Utica and also from "private possession," presumably of wealthy Carthaginian citizens willing to sacrifice their animals for the city's cause and ultimate survival.

²⁴⁶ Throughout *Salammbô*, Flaubert refers to various tribes and groups of people on both sides by their origins. In this case, it seems that the elephants likely were accompanied by their original owners after the Carthaginians "won them" in battle, but this would need to be researched in a text like Polybius' in order to be confirmed.

²⁴⁷ G.A. Bradshaw, *Elephants on the Edge: What Animals Teach Us About Humanity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); 9, 26, 35-38.

conversation since colonial occupation.”²⁴⁸ In Hamilcar’s army, they initially seem to have been given some agency, albeit influenced by their altered physical states (Hamilcar also had them outfitted with sabers to extend their tusks, as if they carried at all times two extended straight out to bore anyone in their path). However, it is clear as we compare the fictional account of this historical battle next to Bradshaw’s extensive research that these elephants were, until their deaths, put under continual traumatic stress that would have had impacts on the animals’ sense of security and well-being, thus making them more slave than soldier and revealing the way animals are considered acceptable “tools” of war just as much as a canon or a catapult might be.

These physical and psychological manipulations of the elephants thus betray Hamilcar’s responding to them as “personnes raisonnables” in his gardens after the Barbarians’ destructive feast. Because it is a delineation of power and dominion that relies on drawing lines between groups of humans, colonization enacts a relocation of animals into specific concept spaces. While these spaces can be and often are physical – colonial zoos and their modern counterparts being the exemple par excellence – they are also, in their origin, philosophical. I have already explained how this plays out in the specific context of racism, but here I’d like to briefly consider animals specifically. Jean-Christophe Bailly’s work reminds us that these boundaries between human and beasts have always been off-kilter, never “stay[ing] in their places” in the same way that animals refuse to “in their own right nor in human thoughts and dreams.”²⁴⁹ Much like the hauntings that Avery Gordon speaks of in modern day life, animal presences manifest themselves “all the better to the extent that [they] hide[...], retreat[...],—or turn[...] up unexpectedly.”²⁵⁰ Hamilcar’s elephants refuse to be ignored, and even as some of them die of the

²⁴⁸ Bradshaw, 43.

²⁴⁹ *The Animal Side*, 5.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 6.

mallet and chisel that their riders wield as they begin to act outside of the “desired” way, they “overturned, crushed, trampled, worried the corpses and wreckage...continually wheeling round as they went forward” and ultimately helping the Carthaginians find a second wind (because of the elephants’ persistence to “go on fighting”).²⁵¹ Thus, the elephants transcend the impositions put on them by these humans, continuing to act differently – e.g. elephantlike – even in the midst of a war that is not their own.²⁵² They resist the human attempts to reduce them “to a body of knowledge that localizes them or to a legend that traverses them; they [can be] perceived in their pure singularity, as distinct beings that participate in the world of the living.”²⁵³

The surviving elephants are eaten during the famine that Carthage undergoes towards the end of the novel following several victories in individual battles but a severe weakening by the breaking open of their aqueduct by the Barbarians. They are listed as nearly the last species that the Carthaginians resort to eating, preceded by “all the dogs, all the mules, all the donkeys, *then* the fifteen elephants brought back....”²⁵⁴ Despite their “rationality” and the crucial parts they play in numerous battles throughout Carthage’s conquests, these massive animals are consumed by those who have kept them. At this point, it seems that perhaps they become, once again, metaphors: they have sustained the city in many ways previously, but now do so physically. Here, though, one can read them as a potential “animetaphor,” a term that Akira Mizuta Lippitt coins in *Electric Animal*, to define how animals are “already a metaphor” and working with their literary counterparts to “transport to...breathe into language, the vitality of another life, another expression: ...a metaphor made flesh, a living metaphor that is by definition not a metaphor.”²⁵⁵

²⁵¹ Flaubert (trans. Krailshemer), 148.

²⁵² Bailly, 11.

²⁵³ *Ibid*, 13.

²⁵⁴ Flaubert (trans. Krailshemer), 222.

²⁵⁵ Lippitt, 165.

Animetaphor or Metaphor for the Other? Lions at the Threshold of Symbolism in the Temple of Moloch

Elephants are not the only “exotic” animals foregrounded by Flaubert in *Salammbô*. At several key moments of the plot, lions enter the text and provide new spaces for understanding animal metaphor and agency within the context of nineteenth-century French perspectives. As I have shown, Flaubert was part of a group of artists, authors, and travelers who were, in varying degrees, seduced by “Oriental” spaces and the beings that lived in them. In the depictions of lions throughout this novel, Edward Said’s assertion that “the Orient was [...] a European invention” with “a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West” provides a place from which to start rearticulating our readings of them as themselves, while also acknowledging the bodies of knowledge that aided in integrating them into the “exotic” menagerie that directly reinforced the rhetoric of empire.²⁵⁶ Even as he sought to convey “une conception personnelle qui s’inscrit [...] contre l’orientalisme de son époque [et] rejette sans ambiguïté le colonialisme” [“a personal concept that is inscribed [...] against the orientalism of his time [and] unambiguously rejects colonialism”], Flaubert took up the lion in particular as a symbol of the wild nature of the lands that France had conquered, thus reproducing in *Salammbô* the very project he hoped to avoid. The lumping together of the Barbarians and wild animals provides then two understandings of the lions at each moment we see them – first, as metaphors for the colonized humans, and second, as lions, animals of Empire

²⁵⁶ Said, *Orientalism*, 1 and 5; Harriet Ritvo, *The Animal Estate* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 216.

following Harriet Ritvo's discussion of exotic animals in the context of British colonial conquest during the nineteenth century.

The lions who live in the temple of Moloch in Carthage are openly labeled "symbols of the devouring Sun" (the elephants in Hamilcar's gardens were simply "favourites" of the Sun) and are treated, quite literally, as housecats with big teeth. The way that they "se frott[ent] contre le[s] cuisses [des Anciens] en bombant le dos avec des bâillements sonores" does not give the sense that they are feared by the humans around them, but rather that there is a deep familiarity between species.²⁵⁷ Like the wounded elephants with Hamilcar, these enormous felines recognize the Elders and offer them signs of affection, showing no wariness or fear of them despite their captivity. While no details are given as to whether they have lived their entire lives in this space, it is clear that the lions maintain a comfortable existence, "accroupis comme des sphinx," bringing to mind the benevolence of a kind of living religious icon or sculpture. They are unphased by their captivity, but from the outside "looking in" to this text, the lions' presence in this enclosed space is a clear emphasis of the domination that the Carthaginians have over both the animals and the geographic location – after all, it is hard to imagine that whenever the lions did initially arrive to this space, they came willingly. In this way, they can be seen as symbolic alter-egos for the Barbarians, whom the Carthaginians are attempting to dominate at this moment in the text, as this meeting of the Elders is precipitated in order to grant Hamilcar the approval to begin a war with his former hired soldiers.

At the same time in *Salammbô* when the Carthaginians decide to eat the elephants during the famine, the lions in the temple die of self-imposed starvation following a change in disposition – no longer the docile, affectionate animals that once rubbed up against the Elders,

²⁵⁷ Flaubert, 106.

they “devenus furieux” [“become enraged”], causing the slaves to fear approaching them.²⁵⁸ They initially accept the Barbarian wounded offered them, but eventually begin to refuse the “cadavres encores tièdes [qu’on] leur jeta” [“still-warm corpses [that] were thrown to them”], and all die. These symbols of the devouring Sun are thus “dévorerés” themselves, eliminating any potential force that their presence may or may not have had for the Carthaginians. I shall return to this moment later in the chapter.

Crucified Metaphors, Wild Characters: Felines Acting Dangerously in Life and Death

Long before the lions in the temple of Moloch die of starvation, the Barbarians encounter another group of them, these already dead. After their feast in Hamilcar’s gardens, the Barbarians leave Carthage, having been given a fraction of the pay due them as consolation and to delay potential uprising. As they make their way towards the outskirts of Sicca, where the Carthaginians have told them to wait until they can raise the rest of their money, they encounter a strange and unsettling sight:

[Les Barbares] marchaient dans une sorte de grand couloir bordé par deux chaînes de monticules rougeâtres, quand une odeur nauséabonde vint les frapper aux narines, et ils crurent voir au haut d’un caroubier quelque chose d’extraordinaire : une tête de lion de dressait au-dessus des feuilles. Ils y coururent. C’était un lion, attaché à une croix par les quatre membres comme un criminel. [...] Les soldats se divertirent autour ; ils l’appelaient consul et citoyen de Rome et lui jetèrent des cailloux dans les yeux, pour faire envoler les moucherons.

²⁵⁸ Flaubert, 230; This is an ironic distinction in the text, since it would normally be assumed that one would fear approaching a lion. Their previous docile natures are thus emphasized, and even ridiculed slightly, by Flaubert.

Cent pas plus loin ils en virent deux autres, puis tout à coup parut une longue file de croix supportant des lions. [...] Les Barbares, cessant de rire, tombèrent dans un long étonnement. 'Quel est ce peuple,' pensaient-ils, 'qui s'amuse à crucifier les lions !'²⁵⁹

[They were marching through a kind of large gully, flanked by two chains of reddish dunes, when a sickening stench struck their nostrils, and on top of a carob-tree they seemed to see something extraordinary: a lion's head rose above the leaves. They ran to it. It was a lion, its limbs fastened to a cross like a criminal. [...] The soldiers stood round amusing themselves; they called it consul and Roman citizen and threw stones at its eyes to drive away the flies.

A hundred yards further on they saw two more, then there suddenly appeared a whole line of crosses with lions hanging on them. [...] The Barbarians stopped laughing and for a long time were seized by amazement. 'What sort of people are these,' they thought, 'who amuse themselves by crucifying lions!']

Following the readings of the lions in the temple, this scene portrays a very different view of this species. As the Barbarians encounter these animals, the reader senses a shock that, even as they jeer at the lions, is quickly amplified when they realize the extent of the death doled out in this “longue file” [“long line”] of lions. They almost seem to sympathize with the disintegrating bodies, recognizing a “punishment” that has been executed upon a group of Others by the Carthaginians. It is unlikely that Flaubert is insinuating that the animals (and, by extension, that the Barbarians share this feeling) being punished like criminals is the reason for the shock, since records of individual animals standing trial are recorded into the beginning of the 1700's in France; the issue as the Barbarians consider these lions seems to be that, even as the felines were “strong in the muscular sense, they were also manifestly powerless.”²⁶⁰ These lions are, apparently, killed and left on their crosses to issue warnings to other lions to stay away from the local people (humans), “exotic” animals are actively implicated to maintain the dynamics between Carthage and the Barbarians just as they are between, for example, France and its

²⁵⁹ Flaubert, 26-27.

²⁶⁰ Despret, *Que diraient les animaux si... on leur posait les bonnes questions ?* (Paris: La Découverte, 2014), 100 ; Ritvo, 5.

colonies in this same area during the nineteenth century. As Vinciane Despret's entry on "Justice" in her book that reframes the questions we "ask" of animals, there are many instances across a variety of cultures that recognize unspoken "contracts" between animals and humans in a given area, and Flaubert seems to insinuate such an "agreement" between the Carthaginians and the lions.²⁶¹ However, there is also no mention of the crime itself, or even of such an agreement; the lions are punished "comme des criminels" ["like criminals"] but that is all the detail that is given. For this reason, the possibility that they have simply chosen to torture these animals to spite them emerges, and the "inhumane" cruelty that repeatedly characterizes the Carthaginian people (not just their generals) is once again pointed out.²⁶² Until now, the Barbarians have likely associated lions directly with Carthage, but only by their living presence: they saw (and killed) many of the lions in Hamilcar's menagerie during the feast.²⁶³ As they look up at the crosses in awe, the possibility that in the Carthaginian psyche, they may belong to the same group of "Others" as the lions, enters the Barbarians' minds.

This potential categorization alongside animals brings us back to a key point as we examine the historical context from which Flaubert writes. It is relatively safe to say that the move to associate certain humans (biologically-speaking) with animals (as a whole, including any species therein) is one that has been clearly established as a common path to the "success" of a given colonial project. However, how can the "human" par excellence that Syl Ko and Val

²⁶¹ Despret, *Que diraient...*, 98; Despret specifically cites cases in the Congo of communities with such agreements with the lions of the area: as long as the felines stay away from the tribe, both sides keep the peace, but if ever a child is attacked, it is considered an outright deviation from the "contract", and that lion (or the nearest *single* lion) is tracked down and killed. Beyond the fact that this is a direct deviation from the "contract", a single lion attacking on its own is not usual for the species and often signals a "desocialized" individual who would likely continue to deviate from social norms throughout his or her life (both within the context of his or her own species and the "norms" of the "contract" between humans and lions).

²⁶² The sacrifice of their children to Moloch, which ends in a mutual massacre, clearly undergirds Flaubert's portrayal of the Carthaginians as being overtly cruel.

²⁶³ "...leaning over the balustrade where the lions were, [they] massacred them with arrows..." (Flaubert, trans. Krailshemer, 23).

Plumwood refer to manage to justify their domination of another group of humans? Claire Jean Kim's work has examined the "science" that undergirded much of the rhetoric and discourse denoting the superiority of the White male over the Black, Asian, and Indian body, which provided the basis during the nineteenth century (and beyond) to justify colonial power and even slavery in the US.²⁶⁴ Said emphasizes the issue with "authority," which is precisely the problem with the studies that were cited in order to establish these human bodies as "sub," when he describes intellectual authority as something that is "formed, irradiated, disseminated; [...] it is persuasive; it has states, it establishes canons of taste and value, it is virtually indistinguishable from certain ideas it dignifies as true."²⁶⁵ Neel Ahuja's work shows, however, that attempting to remove species as the primary differentiating factor between groups to create a "speciated reason" can also fail to remain objective and to set aside these manufactured "truths": it ultimately makes these distinctions within "the human" possible as it legitimizes "the definition of racial groups as subspecies" by "underst[anding] bodies in terms of resemblances [and differences] in their deep organic structures."²⁶⁶ But in all of these discussions and theories, where do real animals fit in? It is clear that the issues of race and species are always already folded up in questions about "the human," and this is a category that, with Aph Ko and Syl Ko (and others, but they are the most forthcoming and clear with these sentiments), I believe needs to be eliminated and rethought in order to truly break the cycles of repetition in discourse and oppression in society. If animals will no longer play a foundational role in any of those new identities and categories, how will "animality" be rethought? For instance, how might we understand the presence of the crucified lions for lions, or other "exotic" animals?

²⁶⁴ *Dangerous Crossings*, 26-31.

²⁶⁵ Said, 19-20.

²⁶⁶ Ahuja, 557; "Speciated reason" attempts to set aside the lines that separate species for a view of individuals as aligning not only with others of "their kind", but this is easier said than done.

In order to imagine animals as themselves by attempting to rearticulate their individual experiences, which is the astute path suggested by Éric Baratay, there are moments in a text like *Salammbô* when they should also be acknowledged as a kind of ghost. The lions on the crosses are not resurrected and never “haunt” their murderers as they might have in a scene of “classic” haunting. However, the unease that their lifeless bodies instill in the Barbarians and the way that it causes a “blind field to come into view” show how the lions are actually animating two such “ghosts”: their relation to the Barbarians as colonial Others in a classic French Orientalist location and their own natural, animal selves persisting even as they rot on dead trees.²⁶⁷ Further, their innocence is emphasized in the similarity of the description Flaubert gives of the first lion, reminiscent in no small way to that of Christ on the cross:

Son mufle énorme lui retombait sur la poitrine, et ses deux pattes antérieures, disparaissant à demi sous l’abondance de sa crinière, étaient largement écartées comme les deux ailes d’un oiseau. Ses cotes, une à une, saillaient sous sa peau tendue ; ses jambes de derrière, clouées l’une contre l’autre, remontaient un peu ; et du sang noir, coulant parmi ses poils, avait amassé des stalactites au bas de sa queue...²⁶⁸

[Its huge muzzle drooped on to its chest, and its two forepaws, half concealed under its luxuriant mane, were widely separated like the wings of a bird. Its ribs stuck out, one by one, beneath the taut skin; its hind legs, nailed one on top of the other, rose a little; and black blood, flowing through the hair, had collected in stalactites at the bottom of its tail...]

The innocence of “exotic” animals is literally laid bare, here. Despite the fact that they are dangerous in nature, the Carthaginians dominate them easily (a fact the reader can deduce by their number). The repeated mention throughout *Salammbô* of the skins of lions and other “dangerous” species – bears, wolves, hippopotamus, etc. – demonstrates the unremarkability of a human killing an “exotic” animal. Because their dangerous natures are only physical, animals become inconsequential, once dead, hardly a memory. They do not talk back, and this persists as

²⁶⁷ Avery Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*, 197.

²⁶⁸ Flaubert, 26-27.

a reason for humans to exploit them, despite significant scientific evidence that they are entirely capable of communication, if by other means.²⁶⁹ These crucified lions may well have killed an innocent human, but to silence them in the selfish aim of asserting or maintaining domination is not a complicated endeavor. Unfortunately, this is where the sidelining of animals becomes problematic in a field like Postcolonial Studies, where the relegation of groups of humans to the sideline is, as I have already discussed, largely enacted by associating them and their “nature” with that of animals – their “animality.” Chagani urges us to move beyond these long-practiced modes of thinking that depend so heavily on the categories of “human” and “animal,” even after (post) colonialism.

Frantz Fanon is one of the most quoted thinkers from the field of Postcolonial Studies, and his rhetoric often engages discourses of animality and species to make his arguments. Chagani considers this to be a notable blind spot for Fanon’s philosophy, since it effectively maintains the sidelining of animal species while moving to remove the colonial human from the limitations imposed upon them by the colonizer. To avoid “reinscribing imperial/colonial relations between humans,” we must acknowledge the mistreatment of animals that persists due to this continual omission of a discussion of the species of “animals” as we dismantle colonial constructions of the human that include sub- or alternate categories of the human based on animality.²⁷⁰ However, it should be noted that Fanon was one of the first to propose such an extensive theorization of the colonizer-colonized from the point of view of the colonized Other, and that his work thus remains foundational for any mode of thinking that wishes to move beyond the damages done and the wrongs perpetuated by colonial projects and presences. Thus,

²⁶⁹ See the entirety of G.A. Bradshaw’s work on elephants for countless examples of the ways that these animals respond and even “talk” back emphatically.

²⁷⁰ Chagani, 634.

one can still glean many valuable concepts from Fanon's explanations of how the colonized Other is created (although he does not capitalize the "o") in order to move towards the kind of reconstructions of categories that Chagani and others argue for. Fanon shows, for instance, how animal discourse is the main way the colonizer creates the category of the colonized (human) subject. His call for decolonization is thus one that aims to build pathways for "the creation of new men," a logical departure from the previously constructed human categories that relied on animal traits to distinguish them from the colonizing human.²⁷¹ Fanon describes colonial subjects as "spectator[s] crushed to a nonessential state [by colonization]" whose transformation into "privileged actors" can only happen via this process that aims to dismantle the very order of colonization. It is intriguing, from our perspective in the 21st century, that Fanon never appears to consider animals as having the potential to become even minor actors or subjects, or indeed to acknowledge the suffering that they, too, underwent and continue to undergo as a consequence of these colonial discourses. However, this is not reason enough to set aside the entirety of Fanon's thinking, given its significance in the field of Postcolonial Studies and elsewhere. His expertise as a psychologist, and thus a specialist in human, not animal, brain function, means that his work necessarily comes out of a place that emphasizes the capacities of the human to reason, speak, and act. For this reason, one should consider his thinking to be an invaluable tool to move beyond the human in futures of decolonization despite his lack of acknowledgment of real animals, and even as he describes the colonized world as being compartmentalized "first and foremost [by] what species, what race one belongs to."²⁷² Indeed, Fanon articulates what I have already shown: that the colonized human Other is first "reduced to the state of an animal" in

²⁷¹ *The Wretched of the Earth* (trans. Richard Philcox, New York: Grove Press, 2004), 2.

²⁷² *Ibid*, 5.

order to become a part of the “bestiary” to which the “colonist refers constantly.”²⁷³ Colonized human Others “strain at the leash” and yet “know they are not animals.”²⁷⁴ Thus, as one moves to consider colonization’s impacts on animal Others, it is important to incorporate into Fanon’s concepts these beings who were the very vehicle for colonial domination to be philosophically viable.

The abundance of acts of violence on human and animal bodies in *Salammbô* shows that any authentic rethinking of identities or categories requires a tireless questioning and the sustenance of tensions between “the human and the extra-human, between the problem of ethnocentrism and that of anthropocentrism.”²⁷⁵ The crucified lions, in their lack of language (and now, life), are not able to tell their “whole” story, and much of what the reader gleans from them must be inferred by the contextual details from both the novel and the two relevant historical moment(s). The pity that is sensed in reading this description of an animal’s painful death is capable, however, of pointing us in productive directions of rereading this and other moments in this novel.

The crucified lions haunt more than just their own identities, and later in the text they literally come back to “haunt” the Barbarians – or at least, ten of them. At this point, Carthage has the advantage over the Barbarians. The war is not yet finished, but the “colonizers” will, in the end, prevail. Hamilcar wants to make a show of power and decides to crucify ten of the Barbarian army, most of whom are leaders of some kind in the ranks (they were betrayed when they were led to his tent to ask for peace). As they languish on their crosses, still alive enough to

²⁷³ Fanon, 7.

²⁷⁴ Ibid, 8.

²⁷⁵ Chagani, 633.

speak and reflect upon their experience and their memories, a brief but meaning-filled conversation takes place:

...comme la croix de Spendius était la plus haute, ce fut sur la sienne que le premier vautour s'abattit. Alors il tourna son visage vers Autharite, et lui dit lentement, avec un indéfinissable sourire :

“Te rappelles-tu les lions sur la route de Sicca ?”

“C'étaient nos frères !”²⁷⁶

[...as Spendius' cross was the highest one, it was on his that the vulture came down. Then he turned his face towards Authoritus and slowly said to him, with an indefinable smile:

“Do you remember the lions on the road to Sicca?”

“They were our brothers!”]

The lions thus make their presence felt once again, their “noisy silences and seething absence[...]” creating the kinds of “tangles” that Gordon identifies as hauntings via the structure of feeling laid out by Raymond Williams that she describes in her work.²⁷⁷ At this moment in the text, the Barbarians on the cross realize that their unease upon seeing the crucified animals was indeed well-founded. They are first made to surrender their wills in asking for peace before being captured and cruelly killed. The force of the subsequent image of crucified men is a pointed example of the ways that animal and human bodies are perceived as interchangeable in colonial rhetoric, is reinforced by Authoritus' statement “C'étaient nos frères !” In this way, the lions become the reference for the Barbarians' suffering, instead of the other way around, giving them a kind of reverse agency in this literary text. As Claire Jean Kim points out, the “idea of the

²⁷⁶ Flaubert, 276.

²⁷⁷ Gordon, 200.

animal has been a vital prop in the project of defining the human,” and this is particularly evident in such a moment of parallel circumstances.²⁷⁸

Lo(o)sing “Exotic” Animals: Questions of Captivity in Colonial Contexts

The “exotic” animals that abound throughout *Salammbô* are repeatedly subjected to a literary captivity that limits their individual agency, as my readings have shown. The French Orientalist imagination that was common throughout France during the nineteenth century along with the more general context of colonial projects immediately places animals at a disadvantaged state of Other, given their status as celebrated symbols for “the human” while not physically being human. In spite of the fact that, in discussions of species, they often appear to be given precedence over the racialized human body within their shared status as Other (the Otherized human having been relegated to a sub category, and therefore already “less-than”), animals continue to be sidelined in discussions of the postcolonial or even decolonial. This sidelining extends to literature, where even thinkers who mention animals in nineteenth-century French texts often end by equating them to symbols or equivalents for human characteristics. In this way, the two groups alternatively experience similar moments of a kind of philosophical captivity at the hands of the Carthaginians in the ways they are represented as more like the other [Other] than as themselves. The Barbarians are described throughout the novel with terms from “the bestiary” to which Fanon refers, recreating the colonial vocabulary that “reduce[s] them to the state of an animal.”²⁷⁹ Meanwhile, the animals in the text – the elephants in particular – are

²⁷⁸ Kim, 31.

²⁷⁹ Fanon, 7.

repeatedly asked to act in human roles, like the elephants acting as “soldiers” for Hamilcar, the majority of them dying because of the very armor the Carthaginians donned them with.

Beyond this philosophical captivity, however, animals in Flaubert’s text experience varying degrees of actual captivity, especially by the Carthaginians. For the most part, the animals that the Barbarians keep allude to the category of “pet” – huge dogs, for instance – but otherwise are dead, showing up as skins or other parts of animal bodies.²⁸⁰ From the beginning of *Salammbô*, however, the reader is exposed to an abundance of “kept” animals, particularly in Hamilcar’s gardens – everything from lions and elephants to peacocks, monkeys, and gazelles. These animals, “exotic” for Flaubert, were likely not all from faraway lands for the peoples of North Africa. However, it is the question of captivity’s function within the context of colonialism that is important, since that is a foundational element of this novel. As the colonizers, the Carthaginians’ possession of power over this geographical location is undergirded by the presence of these animals.

While the gardens are never explicitly called a zoo, the way it is described in the opening pages of *Salammbô* evokes the kind of spaces that Carl Hagenbeck created in his “Völkerschau,” “anthropological-zoological exhibitions” that were displayed across Europe during the latter part of the nineteenth century, and whose contextualized displays preceded those of the modern zoo.²⁸¹ As Eric Ames explains, the aim of these spectacles was to group “foreign peoples and exotic animals within the same display space” in order to “evok[e] the special locality in which the specimens are typically found.”²⁸² Thus, the presence of the Barbarians – a collection of

²⁸⁰ This question of pet animals is one that would be interesting to explore in the context of *Salammbô*, but that would likely require a chapter of its own. Questions that emerge from the field of Pet Studies are extremely apt here, but due to time constraints and the trajectory of the current chapter have been set aside.

²⁸¹ Eric Ames, *Carl Hagenbeck’s Empire of Entertainments* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008), 63.

²⁸² *Ibid.*

tribes foreign to Carthage in and of themselves, given the diversity that is evident in the army – in the same “space” as the “yard for the elephants, pits for the wild beasts, [and] prison for the slaves,” while perhaps not as nuanced or purposefully arranged, bears striking similarity to Hagenbeck’s, which we can now recognize for their overt imperial overtones.²⁸³ In addition to their similarities with Hagenbeck’s displays, Hamilcar’s gardens function similarly to the way that zoos did in Britain during the nineteenth century, according to Harriet Ritvo: “zoos reenacted and celebrated the imposition of human structure on the threatening chaos of nature,” featuring certain “animals selected for stardom” who were “presented...as evidence of British ability to subdue exotic territories.”²⁸⁴ Thus, this space of captivity, when one recognizes it as a space purposefully created by the colonizer, becomes a place where the spectacle of animality and “exoticism” looms large. The Barbarians’ destruction of it over the course of the feast, then, can be read as an attempt to undo Carthage’s dominion – one that ultimately fails, although the garden is left to become overgrown and the animals retreat into a state of “wildness.”

The lions in the temple of Moloch are another important case of captivity in *Salammbô*. Although they are also explicitly “kept,” the easy life that they live seems to have changed their natures. As I observed earlier, they act more like docile, overgrown housecats than the dangerous lions that the Carthaginians crucify on the road to Sicca, and their obvious familiarity with the Elders testifies to the regular interactions of a pet with its owner(s). Their refusal to eat the “still-warm bodies” that the slaves offer them during the famine in Carthage suggests that they have lost their “exotic” or wild taste (although not before eating several Barbarians) – one that the crucified lions seem to have maintained in order to merit their punishment. This strange site of “petkeeping” adds another layer to the colonizing project of the Carthaginians; in Europe, pet-

²⁸³ Flaubert (trans. Krailshemer), 17.

²⁸⁴ Ritvo, 217-218.

keeping expanded and became more and more complex and controlled as the colonial projects of Britain and France continued. In Britain, dog and cat “fancying” rose steadily during the nineteenth century, and the “purer” the breed, the more valuable the animal.²⁸⁵ Thus, the lions in the temple are reminiscent in no small way to the “purest” of their kind, the crucified representing, of course, the opposite. Their deaths by voluntary starvation, then, raise questions about the intent of Flaubert in portraying them in this manner. While little is said about petkeeping, zoos, or animals in general in his correspondence, the choice to eliminate the temple lions from the narrative just before the Carthaginians re-emerge victorious pushes back on the contradictory captivities exposed in colonial contexts.

Conclusion: The Industriousness of Rereading Animals in *Salammbô*

Over the course of these close readings, the “exotic” animals of Flaubert’s *Salammbô* have been rearticulated as I have sought to move beyond previous discussions of them that focused more on their lack of humanity than on their animality. The implications of their presences in the landscapes and situations where the author has chosen to mobilize them at times affirm the colonial project of the Carthaginians, and at others, push back. The elephants in particular provide rich opportunities to address the tensions that are always present in discussions of the colonial and postcolonial, as they are clear subjects during many of the battles and at the same time, subjected to the Carthaginians’ actions to influence their behavior and their physical bodies (with alcohol, spices, armor, etc.). The ever present “precaution” of instruments with which to kill them if they somehow “escape” the bounds of animality imposed upon them by their keepers mimics the persistence of the categories of the “human” and the “animal” that so

²⁸⁵ Ritvo, 87, 91, 98.

easily lead to the addition of the “subhuman” and the conglomeration of racialized and animalized human Others alongside animals themselves. Continuing to reread these literary animals as real animals, then, begins to move to spaces where the “precautions” – both physical and philosophical – can be set aside for more productive means of discussion and identity.

Chapter 3

The Ghostly Animal: The Seething Presences of Industrial Animals in *La Bête humaine*

Partway through his essay on the representation of society in *The Cambridge Companion to Emile Zola*, Sandy Petrey makes an interesting observation: “Small and large, equine and human, naked and clothed, material and spiritual, animate and inanimate, *all that finds a place in society* becomes in Zola’s depiction a key to understanding society.”²⁸⁶ I emphasize the words that refer to a place in society because of the way that it exposes a critical grey area in this and other essays throughout this collection: a common tendency to forget animals’ importance to the constitution of nineteenth-century French society particularly within the context of industry.²⁸⁷ While here, there are animals acknowledged along with humans – “*equine and human...animate and inanimate*” – this potential to have a place in society is limited, as it is only extended to horses. Petrey’s analysis throughout the essay only mentions animals at one other moment, and it is to refer to the as “a ravenous beast ready to devour” as an allegory for a coal mine in *Germinal*.²⁸⁸ As I will show in this chapter, and as an abundance of work on French society in general demonstrates, horses are indeed important in formulations of social and national identity.²⁸⁹ However, I also aim to show that other farm animals – cows, for instance – should be included in these formulations during the industrial period.

²⁸⁶ “Zola and the representation of society” in *The Cambridge Companion to Emile Zola* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 44, emphasis mine.

²⁸⁷ Certainly, there are other articles and collections that would reveal both this same blind spot and more nuanced considerations of Zola’s work and animals’ places in it, but for the purposes of this project I limit my discussion here to this collection which brings together several authoritative Zola scholars at a relatively recent date.

²⁸⁸ Petrey, 41.

²⁸⁹ See, for example, Éric Baratay’s work on horses in World War II (*Bêtes des tranchées : des vécus oubliés*, Paris: CNRS Éditions, 2013) or Kari Weil on horses in France during the nineteenth century (“Men and

In this chapter, I will thus turn to industrialization in nineteenth-century France and the impact it had on the depictions of literary animals, as well as on the way real animals “haunt” society during this period, despite the fact that they had essentially been erased from sight in most physical spaces. While my first two chapters have considered novels by Gustave Flaubert, I focus here on *La Bête humaine*, written by Émile Zola and published in 1890, ten years after Flaubert’s death. This slight difference in eras provides an opportunity to show the consequences of the kinds of shifts towards a farming industry that is most concerned with financial benefit, like what we see at the agricultural fair in *Madame Bovary*. These shifts had already begun to emerge, even during Zola’s lifetime. While horses were officially replaced by steam around 1844, in the middle of Flaubert’s lifetime and before the publication of both *Madame Bovary* and *Salammbô*, the impacts of the locomotive and the mechanized tendencies that it encouraged were still most prevalent in the city.²⁹⁰ Thus, Zola’s novel – set in both the countryside (specifically, at a train crossing called La Croix-de-Maufras) and in the city (usually inside the train stations of Le Havre or Paris, but occasionally on city streets) – provides a unique multi-faceted perspective on the absent (erased) natures of animals at this time. As in the horse’s literal replacement by steam (in other words, by trains), species considered working or farm animals were largely pushed to the fringes of daily life with the advancements of industrialization. *La Bête humaine*

Horses: Circus Studs, Sporting Males and the Performance of Purity in Fin-de-Siècle France,” *French Cultural Studies* 17.1, 2006). Horses were also an important symbol of colonialism, as Sandra Swart’s article on horses in South Africa demonstrates, examining at length how “human and horse species have become entangled in a range of relationships” in these colonized spaces (“The World the Horses Made’: A South African Case Study of Writing Animals into Social History,” *IRSH* 55, 2010, 242). While her work does not focus specifically on France’s colonial spaces, I would argue that her study is relevant to these kinds of entanglements between humans and horses in a more general sense as well.

²⁹⁰ That horses were replaced by *steam* (as Graham Robb’s Chronology in *The History of France* indicates) evokes an ironic image of a literal ghostly animal, as the vapor surrounds and obscures [visually] horses who had been the principal companion and “mode of transportation” for humans for centuries. As I will show, horses in particular continued to be present beyond these kinds of “retirements” from previous tasks alongside humans, but usually beyond those points perceived more as tools than as collaborators or companions.

provides several key examples that demonstrate the way that attempts to hide farm animals from sight and daily life often fail, for their presences persist despite this regimentation inside, for instance, the walls of the slaughterhouse.²⁹¹ In this literary text, their physical presences persist – sometimes even, or especially, in the most abandoned spaces – and these point in turn to the way that their absences ultimately spill over as the sense of something missing, transforming farm animals into ghostly presences that haunt nineteenth-century French society. But can these feelings truly be seen as holding a place in Zola’s larger project that seeks to understand the society of his time, thus expanding Petrey’s concept with which I opened? I believe that these feelings are entirely capable of doing so, and further, that the literary animals that one finds in *La Bête humaine*, while sparse, also contribute significantly to Zola’s own goals.

In Chapter 1, I discussed at length the ways that humans began to think differently about animals in France during the nineteenth century, particularly within the context of agriculture. The move towards raising animals such as cows and pigs in the most efficient way to turn the most profit – and, according to the men like Lieuvain who were sent to the towns and villages to promote it, to also boost French patriotism – greatly reduced the opportunity for most people to see them regularly, let alone to understand the mechanisms that were purposefully sidelining their agency in the interest of human profit and progress. This push also began to impose physical changes upon these species that transformed them significantly. For this reason, I

²⁹¹ Susan McHugh uses the term “meat animals” to refer to pigs, cows and sheep in Chapter 4 of *Animal Stories* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011). My inclusion of horses, who are not always considered as animals that are eaten – although this is a topic that could be integrated, given the tradition in France (Kari Weil’s article “They Eat Horses, Don’t They? Hippophagy and Frenchness” in the Spring 2007 issue of *Gastronomica*, would be a useful source to begin with, given her authoritative position as a scholar of Animal Studies) – is why I will continue to use the term “farm animals,” referring thus to the animals one would have expected to see on a farm prior to industrialization, and certainly in rural areas of France well into the nineteenth century.

addressed the possibility of entirely new species as a result of industrial farming.²⁹² In an effort to push back on the way animals are consistently included as mere backdrops in Flaubert's novels, I also considered horses in *Madame Bovary* and their modes of participation and influence on the narrative and main characters. I continued to move to read animals in this way in Chapter 2, although *Salammô* displays an entirely different group of animals, specifically that of "exotic" animals within colonial contexts. In both chapters, important moments reveal different kinds of haunting: in *Madame Bovary*, animals' presence haunts Emma's existence to remind her of her failure to have the kind of life she's dreamed, and I also considered the possibility of Madame Leroux as a ghostly version of what Emma might have become; and in *Salammô*, the crucified lions haunt both the representations of other lions and the Barbarians.

The abundance of animal life that characterizes both novels by Flaubert is in no way present, in Zola's text: *La Bête humaine*, despite its title, includes few real beasts. Instead, the narrative focuses on a select number of humans who act outside of their humanity, thus making the reversal of terms (e.g. *humain* as the adjective for *bête* and not the other way around) apt. In this chapter, I will examine both these "human beasts" and the sparseness of animals throughout the novel reveals the spectral nature of real animals in the nineteenth century, as well as the "unsettled relationship between what we see and what we know" that emerges from these hauntings, as Avery Gordon describes.²⁹³ These animals' seem to lack any agency (partly due to the fact that we encounter one only after her death and the others as they are about to die), but the strange moments that they crop up urge the reader to consider how this agency actually

²⁹² While the drastic changes that I refer to are from more recent descriptions of industrialized farming (e.g. pigs with translucent skin), they emerge from changes that aim to hide farming and slaughtering from the general public completely.

²⁹³ *Ghostly Matters*, 194.

“seeth[es] and linger[s].”²⁹⁴ In examining the passages where animals enter Zola’s narrative, I will also show how they allow one to see what Éric Baratay describes as the distinct “répercussions des conduites animales sur la production littéraire” [“repercussions of animal behaviors on literary production”] and also “quels mots, en retenant quels traits, ces textes décrivent les actions et les conditions réelles des bêtes” [“which words, in retaining which traits, these texts describe the actions and real conditions of animals”] appear throughout the novel.²⁹⁵ While the majority of this text is characterized by an absence of animals, it is precisely in the scenes where they enter the reader’s view that one begins to make connections to the historical context of nineteenth-century France, where they were essentially removed from view.

This literary text thus functions as one of the “sources d’origines humaine” that Baratay insists are the only way one can “déconstrui[t] les présentations des faits pour saisir ce qui arrive concrètement aux bêtes” [“deconstruct the presentation of facts to grasp what actually happens to animals”].²⁹⁶ He goes on to say that “la littérature romanesque, des nouvelles aux romans, [...] s’avère, sur ces aspects formant le décor des histoires, une source très précieuse et très souvent validée par les autres documents” [“fictional literature, from short stories to novels, [...] becomes, in these aspects that form the background of stories, a valuable source that is often validated by other documents”].²⁹⁷ In a similar vein, Susan McHugh also affirms the correlation between real and literary texts in order to rethink animals both real and literary as she urges us to seek out the connections between the “representational forms and material conditions of species

²⁹⁴ Gordon, 195.

²⁹⁵ “Chacun jette son chien: De la fin d’une vie au XIX^e siècle” *Romantisme* 153.3 (2011): 151.

²⁹⁶ *Ibid*, 150.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid*; While he does not cite literary texts as the only type of text that can move us towards these understandings of animal histories, Baratay clearly emphasizes the unique capacity for literature to show the historical context(s) from which it emerges.

life.”²⁹⁸ The “sneaking feelings” that begin to creep in as one reads these brief passages show how haunting, which is one of the main ways that the real animals in Zola’s text function, as a result of our meeting them in or immediately before their deaths, “is one of the most important places where meaning—comprehension—and force intersect.”²⁹⁹ The animal deaths the reader bears witness to can in this way continue to reveal unique perspectives of their lives. This “optique d’une histoire élargie, dépassant l’horizon humain pour s’intéresser à ce qui l’entoure” [“optic of an expanded history, exceeding the limit of the human to pay attention to what is outside of it”] is only accessible when one stops long enough to acknowledge these “vies [et morts] des animaux réels” [“lives [and deaths] of real animals”] and their contexts.³⁰⁰ While in *Madame Bovary*, the animals in the text are all clearly associated with farmers and farming, it is unclear where exactly the cow and horses we encounter in *La Bête humaine* belong.

Noëlie Vialles’ work on the pushing-out of abattoirs in the south of France throughout the course of the nineteenth century demonstrates another key element to a rewriting of history that chooses to acknowledge real animals of this period. While before, the majority of farm animals’ lives, and even their deaths, were shared with humans as companions and collaborators, during this new industrial era, they began to be simply “handled”: packaged and sold, rarely seeing a human save for their abatteur.³⁰¹ The elimination of the abattoir from the center of French towns significantly altered the basic relationship between humans and animals, ultimately enacting a

²⁹⁸ “Literary Animal Agents,” 490.

²⁹⁹ Gordon, 194.

³⁰⁰ Ibid, 148-149.

³⁰¹ Vialles discusses this term in relation to “tueur,” which was commonly used in the 19th century in the Basque and other rural regions where abattoirs were most common. “Abatteur” became a necessary diminutive of the former term outside of these areas, since those not living in close-quarters with animals understood “tueur” to be a homicidal murderer (47); Timothy Pachirat’s work demonstrates how, in a 21st-Century industrial farm, the killing of an animal cannot be attributed cleanly to a single person. He emphasizes the [fact that one person does the stunning, which removes an animal’s consciousness of life, and another removes the breath of life, make it impossible to discern who is the “killer”].

near-total alienation. While previously, the agrarian traditions of France and the slow transition experienced in its rural areas to industrialization meant that there were more regular interactions with animals, following these transitions, the reliance on animals was greatly reduced (as it already had begun to be in the city). The only humans that farm animals came into contact with perpetuated the new industry that became, not long thereafter, factory farming. On the other side, the only animals most humans now came into contact with were domesticated: pets, who, in many ways, were also very much products of an industry, though this one based on an *excess* of care.³⁰²

It was during this time that the majority of the public's main contact with *dead* (and dying) animals was relegated to the butcher's shop. What was once a "bloody spectacle" had been "rendered invisible".³⁰³ The blood, guts, and head had been removed, leaving only the meat, that is to say, the animal-as-*product*. Of course, this had always been one of the principal outcomes of animals' lives on a farm before industrialization began to encroach on this part of society. Never before, however, had public sensibilities been so firmly impacted "with regard to such realities as death (human or animal), suffering, violence, waste and disease...and finally animals themselves".³⁰⁴ This shift thus demonstrated a movement toward the de-person-alization of farm animals that leads to a concealment of reality in order to deceive the public and attain the goal of maximizing production and reducing the sensitivities that might hinder this process. These deceptions were what sparked our current state, "an era in which meat comes into our

³⁰² A brief discussion of petkeeping during this period would be relevant, here, and would serve to further expand the analysis, but for time purposes will appear in a future iteration of this chapter or dissertation. As I mention in Chapter 1, pet keeping did shift the kind of attention given to the species who were chosen for domestication, but they still became objects. As we read in Kari Weil's section on pets in *Thinking Animals* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), pet keeping had everything to do with humans' identities in as they were built amidst the class, gender, and sexual tendencies of the nineteenth century.

³⁰³ Vialles, 66.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid*, 19.

homes antiseptically packaged in cellophane wrappings.”³⁰⁵ Without any occasion to interact with the animals whose meat one consumes, one can never meet their gaze, an aspect that is often referred to in accounts attributing to the animal a unique capacity to “look back” into our eyes. Certainly, one of the most well-known examples of this kind of epiphany comes from the French philosopher, Jacques Derrida, who experiences what he calls an authentic *exchange* of awareness with his cat during a moment when he gets out of the shower to find her looking at him.³⁰⁶ Wendy Woodward also cites a cat to emphasize the importance of the gaze of the animal, emphasizing how the “typical sense of human superiority” is undermined when one acknowledges “the cat [or any other animal] as a subject capable of looking.”³⁰⁷ This acknowledgment “respond[s] to the cat as a fellow being, rather than as an inferior one.”³⁰⁸ For these reasons, even within the context of an animal’s gaze in literature (as Woodward discusses in her book), its elimination is an act violent both philosophically and, as we have begun to see, physically.

Removing even the possibility to gaze is the ultimate violence towards animals, because it eliminates any possibility of shared moment such as the one Derrida experiences with his cat. Certainly, his sense of a moment actually shared with her might not be experienced by another who were to live this same small event. However, the spatial modifications that farming and the abattoir underwent beginning in the nineteenth century eliminate all potential even to see these animals, let alone experience a meaningful exchange. For how can we be aware of another being – and thus, of their potential individuality – if we are incapable of seeing them, and, furthermore,

³⁰⁵ Pachirat, 3.

³⁰⁶ *The Animal That Therefore I Am* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 3-11.

³⁰⁷ ³⁰⁷ *The Animal Gaze* (Johannesburg: Witz University Press, 2008), 1; Woodward’s reference is not to Derrida’s cat, but within the context of a cat looking at a queen (or a king, as some other versions of this saying go).

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

when we are the ones who have prohibited them this right?³⁰⁹ These purposeful efforts to hide the ways that animal becomes edible is a violent move, given the isolation of both animals and farm workers “physically, linguistically, and socially [...] in a zone of confinement that is inaccessible to most of society,” as Pachirat shows. He calls for a “politics of sight” that will attempt to reveal “what is hidden and to breach [these zones], literally or figuratively...in order to bring about social and political transformation,” and this move is also necessary in the field of literature. These animals are, not unlike the industrial buildings that house the horrific circumstances of real animals today, ensnared in so many metaphors or backdrops, particularly within the context of *La Bête humaine*.

As Pachirat’s work shows, industrial farming could not have become what it is today without this elimination of the gaze of the animal from the equation and from the farm workers’ awareness.³¹⁰ In many ways, it is this lack of gaze that makes possible the ever-increasing number of farm animals being “produced” throughout the Western world today, and this began as the slaughterhouses were moved out of sight and largely out of mind. In our current – and very young – century, the growth of the slaughterhouse and its capacities to raise and kill have already “advanced” at a staggering speed, increasing exponentially since the nineteenth century.³¹¹ The gaze is violently and repeatedly cast aside into the mud, blood and guts of the

³⁰⁹ I want to point out the exclusion of blind animals or humans from this lack of capacity due to a lack of seeing; often those beings who, having eyes, have either never had or who have lost the capability of using them physically are far more aware than most. The violence I describe here emerges from the move first made by humans of being the ones who remove an existing capacity to see from animals – they are given no choice in the matter and yet the impact changes their entire reality.

³¹⁰ Despite the fact that his book focuses specifically on industrial farming in the United States, the work that Jocelyn Porcher and Vinciane Despret have done shows that there is also a definite industrial end of the farming spectrum that is extremely prevalent in France (*Être bête* Arles: Actes Sud, 2007).

³¹¹ This expansion has built up especially shocking speed in the last 80 years, as we can see in numbers of animals killed year-to-year (and this only for food purposes); I place “advanced” in scare quotes due to its subjective nature within this context. Certainly, if one profits from the death of more animals at a faster rate, they would call this rapid growth and expansion “advancement” or “progress”. If not, and when one takes stock of the collateral impacts of meat “produced” at such speeds, including significant environmental damage and poor health

killing floor (or, as we read in *Every Twelve Seconds*, into complicated machines to render or sanitize them before disposal). Élisabeth de Fontenay, in her treatise on animal rights, reminds us of Derrida's reference to "a world without animals...by means of a devitalizing or deanimalizing treatment...the production of figures of animality that are so new that they appear monstrous enough to call for a change of name."³¹² Decades before the current state of this industry, Derrida wondered whether species would not soon become something other than themselves, a horrific consequence stemming from the refusal to look.

The aspect of the physically visible had thus everything to do with the abattoirs being moved outside of the city walls in nineteenth-century France. The question of blood and guts contributed not only to the issue of sanitation, but also to a certain "pollution of the eye."³¹³ The prohibition of private slaughtering that funneled essentially all killing of farm animals to the outside of town and out of the public eye accomplished three key things in one fell swoop, articulated here by Vialles:

*(1) This was the measure that 'cleared' the butcher and made him 'innocent', (2) the measure that cleaned up the streets...[and] it was also... (3) the measure that transferred the images of death and blood to abattoirs and those who worked in them.*³¹⁴

Meat, the product that humans create from animals, does not have eyes – it is eye-less – and thus wholly incapable of gazing. The elimination of the gaze brings us one step closer to the "world without animals" to which Derrida refers, a world where animals have finally become something essentially unrecognizable, even, I daresay, unseeable.

from artificially altered and overly stress bodies, it seems hard to imagine anyone considering it to be a positive thing.

³¹² *Without Offending Humans* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 13.

³¹³ See David L. Pike's chapter in *Filth*, edited by William A. Cohen, for a more in-depth discussion of sanitation concerns in Paris during the nineteenth century. Ironically, animals are not a specific focus of either the Introduction to this collection nor Pike's chapter, and thus this is another avenue for further expansion of the theorization for this project.

³¹⁴ *Animal to Edible*, 17.

This chapter will therefore argue for readings of animals in *La Bête humaine* that move to restore their potential to return the gaze of humans by considering the modes of thinking that emerged during this time of industrial progress in France. I will show the ways that the mechanisms of industrialization had singular effects on the lives of real animals, and that one can start acknowledging them as agents in their own right by reconsidering their literary representations. In his chapter considering Zola and the nineteenth century, Brian Nelson comments that “Zola’s vision is strongly marked by the anxiety that accompanied industrialization and modernity.”³¹⁵ My readings of animals in *La Bête humaine* attempt to resolve – or, at the very least, to shed some light on – some of this anxiety by choosing to focus specifically on the beings who were so instrumental to so many elements of this period, even as they were pushed aside from view. This erasure of presence in full view of society physically positioned literary animals as uniquely capable manifestations of the hauntings of their real (absented) counterparts. Thus, this text also lays bare the ways in which the spectral presence of real animals finds new life (afterlife?) in the physical presences of animals in the literary text.

Blood Lines: A Brief Overview of *La Bête humaine*’s Main Plot Lines

The main plot of this novel focuses on the affair of Jacques Lantier and Sévérine Roubaud. Lantier is a train conductor based out of Le Havre, whose train “La Lison” runs between this smaller city and Paris, and Sévérine is the wife of the deputy station master at Le Havre. At the outset of the story, Sévérine admits to a long-standing affair with a much older man, Grandmorin, who is essentially her godfather, and has provided much financial and social

³¹⁵ “Zola and the nineteenth century,” *The Cambridge Companion to Zola* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 7.

support for the Roubauds; her husband explodes in jealousy and the couple then conspires together to murder Grandmorin on the train from Le Havre to Paris. Jacques, who is visiting his godmother Phasie at La Croix-de-Maufras, thinks he sees a man cutting another man's throat, but he is not sure. The train passes by him so quickly that it's uncertain what he's seen, but it begins to haunt him nonetheless. While much of the book is taken up by scenes and tense dialogue in the office of the judge as Séverine and her husband attempt to be absolved of suspicion for this crime, Jacques battles a different kind of tension. The title of the novel could be applied to several characters, as I have already implied by pointing out that several of them surpass the bounds of their humanity, each for selfish reasons. Jacques, however, is the clear target of this unique combination of words, since he is plagued by a desire to slit women's throats anytime he sees this part of their body exposed. This temptation, which is also the way that Grandmorin is murdered, is directly reminiscent of the way that many animals are slaughtered in industrial settings: cutting the throat deeply and cleanly. Throughout the novel, Zola uses expressions referring directly to what had become the traditional ways to slaughter farm animals, for instance: "...si le président lui tombait sous les mains, il le *saignerait comme un cochon*" ["...if the president were to fall on his lap, he would *bleed him like a pig*"].³¹⁶ The violent implications of these words are situated in a scene where the reader discovers the presence of a *brute* or *bête* in Roubaud as well, and it is his case and Jacques' that I will first examine before focusing on the animals in the text. These two moments where men are clearly being likened to animals present a haunting of another kind: one that demonstrates an animal instinct that stems from both biological and philosophical origins.

³¹⁶ Émile Zola, *La Bête humaine* (San Bernadino: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015), 101, emphasis mine.

“Brute” Force: The Human Beasts in Roubaud and Jacques

Despite the absence of real animals throughout this novel, the references to *brutes* and *bêtes* are frequent. Often, they refer to one of the main male characters, Roubaud and Jacques Lantier. In the scene to which I refer above, Roubaud “redevient la brute inconsciente de sa force” [“once again became the brute unaware of his strength”] upon learning of Sévérine’s longtime sexual relationship with Grandmorin, her godfather. A struggle ensues in their tiny apartment overlooking the Le Havre station, as Roubaud fights an impulse to kill her in his anger and his shame and Sévérine’s reaction is described by Zola:

Chaque fois qu’elle faisait un effort pour se redresser, il la rejetait sur le carreau d’un coup de poing. Et cela haletant, les dents serrées, un acharnement sauvage et imbécile. [...] La fureur de Roubaud ne se calmait point. [...] Il ne se possédait plus, battait le vide, jeté à toutes les sautes du vent de violence dont il était flagellé, retombant à l’unique besoin d’apaiser la bête hurlante au fond de lui. [...] [Sévérine] regardait son mari, aller, venir, tourner furieusement, comme elle aurait regardé un loup, un être d’une autre espèce. Qu’avait-il donc en lui ? Il y en avait tant sans colère ! Ce qui l’épouvantait, c’était de sentir l’animal, soupçonné par elle depuis trois ans, à des grognements sourds, aujourd’hui déchaîné, enragé, prêt à mordre.³¹⁷

[Each time she made an effort to rise he knocked her back on the floor by a blow from his fist. And he did this panting, with clenched teeth, in savage and senseless fury. [...] The fury of Roubaud was not calmed. [...] No longer under self-control, he struck about in space, a victim to all the gusts of the violent tempest lacerating him, only to awaken the imperative necessity of appeasing the howling brute within him. [...] [Sévérine] watched her husband, going and coming, turning furiously round, as she would have watched a wolf, or an animal of some other species. What was the matter with him? There were so many husbands without anger. The thing that terrified her was to perceive the brute, whose presence she had suspected for three years, from certain sullen growls, at this moment unchained, mad and ready to bite.]

This scene portrays a common perception of a man “given over to his animal side” in cultural representations today: film, literature, and art have continued to perpetuate this kind of “blood lust” or “seeing red” as a uniquely masculine trait. While Roubaud’s is less directly

³¹⁷ Zola, 23, 26, 27, emphasis mine.

oriented towards killing, his desire for revenge in the wake of his jealousy of Grandmorin is palpable. However, instead of putting the responsibility of his emotions on him, Zola's description of his actions and state of being refer the reader to an animal "vocabulary": "haletant," "les dents serrées," "la fureur," "apaiser la bête hurlante," "un être d'un autre espèce," "grognements sourds," "prêt à mordre." These words are similar to those often used to "animalize" racialized Others in colonial contexts, which begs questions about Zola's intent by describing Roubaud this way.³¹⁸ While race is never mentioned explicitly here (nor, for that matter, at any point in the novel), this image is indeed similar to those mobilized to establish the superiority of the White human during this time. It appears, then, that Zola is employing these terms, which would have already been familiar in demeaning ways in the context of race, to relegate Roubaud to the status of an animal, since this was one of the key modes of imposing "subcategorizations" of "the human."³¹⁹

Although he, too, experiences moments like the ones described above in Séverine and her husband's struggle, Jacques' animality is quite different from Roubaud's, due to its specificity. Roubaud brings to mind a blind, angered bull (like those made thus on purpose for human entertainment), grasping and punching in hopes of injuring anything at all. But as I have already shown, Jacques' malaise – the desire to cut a woman's throat upon seeing the skin exposed – correlates closely to the ways that animals were killed in slaughterhouses during this time and

³¹⁸ See Claire Jean Kim's article "Murder and Mattering in Harambe's House" (*Politics and Animals* [Online] 2.1, 2016) as well as her chapter on Michael Vick in *Dangerous Crossings* for two specific cases when these kinds of vocabularies were actively mobilized to condemn racial others. Particularly in the Michael Vick case, the idea of "Black men as violent beasts impervious to improvement" construct the conflict and outcome.

³¹⁹ It would be worthwhile to dig deeper into the reasons that Zola appears to purposefully exclude questions of race throughout this novel, despite the prevalence of colonial projects to France's society during the nineteenth century; See Chapter 2 for more involved discussions of how racial categories are imposed using animality, as well as how animals are "humanized" in order to demean these racialized human Others and giving animals a false "superiority."

can therefore not be so easily described as a simple animalization.³²⁰ He also demonstrates a deep attachment for his closest working “companion” – La Lison, his train. For Jacques, this train is his steed, almost always compared directly or indirectly to a horse or a woman. This contradictory image of the locomotive implies that Jacques is more intimately attached to his train than he is to Sévérine.³²¹ He seems to enjoy the work he shares with La Lison, and the descriptions throughout the novel are reminiscent of those one imagines would be given of a farmer and his horse ploughing a field. However, the train has literally replaced the horse in the interest of industrialization, so why the persistence of this kind of relationship between Jacques and an unfeeling – if not inanimate – object?

As I have explained in the introduction to this chapter, the removal of animals from the public eye enacted by the industrialization of farming (and transportation, but I will address this more, later) was out of sync with the interdependent relationship between humans and animals that had previously existed since the beginning of time. While the term “the beginning of time” may initially sound too broad, the ruptures that are set off during this period, largely having to do with defined spaces and visibility (or invisibility), are unprecedented. Matthew Senior, David L. Clark, and Carla Freccero refer to the prevalence of animals in humans’ lives as they describe the Chauvet Cave in France, which dates back over 30,000 years. These paintings and others like them demonstrate the ways that “from the beginning...it would seem that the human came *after* the animal and represented herself...as a fragmented body – a spectator, a hunter, a worshipper

³²⁰ Roubaud is the one who kills Grandmorin by cutting his throat. However, this is an event that both brings Sévérine and Jacques together (she seeks him out to try to deduce whether he saw everything) and shows him that his malaise is far from over. As he stands over Grandmorin’s dead body, is filled with a kind of strange admiration: “Ah ! n’être pas lâche, se satisfaire enfin, enfoncer le couteau !” (59)

³²¹ This doubled-metaphor of the train as both horse and woman is one that would be a worthy path for further research. However, for the purposes of this project, I have chosen to focus exclusively on the animal, as this expansion of the work would inevitably require expanding my knowledge of Feminist Studies.

of moving herds of animals.”³²² Thus, the ruptures that were being enacted in nineteenth-century France from the living, feeling beings with whom humans had previously shared many aspects of their lives created an imbalance that is tangible in the literature of the period. For this reason, the fact that Jacques treats La Lison at many moments like a horse signals this imbalance, and how neither human or animal is ever able to stay fully in the new, separated and distinct space they have been assigned to.

Captive Country: The Absence of Animals as a Seething Presence at La Croix-de-Maufras

Early on in the novel, Jacques returns to the countryside to visit his godmother Phasie, which he does somewhat regularly. When she retires for the night, he goes outside to take some air.

Aussi [Jacques] distinguait [...] nettement la campagne, dont les terres autour de lui, les coteaux, les arbres se détachaient en noir, sous cette lumière égale et morte, d’une paix de veilleuse. [...] Puis, il songea à marcher du côté de Doinville, la route par-là montait moins rudement.³²³

[[Jacques] could clearly distinguish the country. The land around him, the hills, the trees stood out in black against this equal, deadened light, soft as that of a night lamp. [...] Then he thought of going towards Doinville, as the road in that direction was not so steep as the other way.]

This rural space is where we would expect to find a farm, and thus where it would follow that we’d also expect to see farm animals. Instead, there is a signal station and a family whose

³²² “Editors’ Preface: *Ecce animot*: Postanimality from Cave to Screen,” *Yale French Studies* 127 “Animots”: *Postanimality in French Thought* (2015): 9.

³²³ Zola, 46.

lives revolve around attending to it. In this moment, the solitude and deadness of noise – e.g. a lack of noise – that Jacques hears (or doesn't hear) lay bare, quite literally, the effects of the shifts that have had such impacts in the land- and cityscapes that the reader encounters: the very beings which made France's agrarian culture possible are neither visible nor audible. Jacques seems almost surprised by the countryside's unique aspects at La Croix-de-Maufras, as the fact that he was able to "distingu[e] nettement la campagne" and all of the land within it is pointed out specifically. The light that is described, however, sounds unnatural: it is "égale et morte," reminiscent beyond the reference of a "veilleuse" of a dim light in an industrial space. Natural light is the opposite of this: always moving and alive. Jacques appears to be unsettled by this intense quiet, deciding to "marche[...] du côté de Doinville," thus moving towards the city, or even towards more of this evenly dispersed (though dead) light. The fact that "la route par-là montait moins rudement" also suggests that moving towards a town or a city is fundamentally and physically easier – enabling one to both exert less effort physically and avoid the spaces that are uncannily (eerily) quiet.

There is a feeling of natural enclosure in this space: "les terres *autour* de lui, » "la route par-là *montait*." Reading this passage, one expects an animal to enter the narrative, but there are none. It is as if they have been shut out, as opposed to what humans seem to do most often to animals in shutting them in: in cages, as metaphors, within backgrounds. The absence of animals gapes at us even reading this in the 21st-Century: we still expect them.³²⁴ Brian Nelson claims the land around Phasie's house "seems to exist in a pre-historic world, beyond or before civilization."³²⁵ However, if this is indeed the kind of reference Zola wishes to make – without

³²⁴ Gordon, 27.

³²⁵ "Blood on the Tracks: The Uses of Space in Zola's *La Bête humaine*," *Australian Journal of French Studies* 43.1 (2006): 15.

any further qualifications, at least – should, prominently feature animals, not exclude them. In fact, there is here the opposite of the abundant life that the term “pre-history” (or beginning, as I coin it in the introductory section of this chapter) implies: there is instead an intense lack of animals living natural lives surrounding La Croix-de-Maufras. Having said this, one might instead frame this space as a place of “pre-animal-history,” as it is mobilized in the following close-reading to “se penche[r] sur les propres vies des animaux réels” [“gesture towards the actual lives of real animals”], a mode of rethinking moments for which it is high time, according to Baratay.³²⁶

On the Wrong Track: The Beheaded Cow

Partway through the conversation that Jacques carries on with Phasie before he goes outside, he asks how things have been going managing the signal station. Her commentary is interesting, and here one encounters the first real animal in the novel:

Dieu merci, voici cinq ans que nous n'avons pas eu d'accident. Autrefois, un homme a été coupé. Nous autres, nous n'avons encore eu qu'une vache, qui a manqué de faire dérailler un train. Ah ! la pauvre bête ! on a retrouvé le corps ici et la tête là-bas, près du tunnel...³²⁷

[It is now five years since we had an accident, thank God. A long time back a man was cut to pieces. We have only had a cow, which almost upset a train. Ah! the poor creature! We found its body here, and its head over there, near the tunnel.]

This single cow, whose mention could easily go unnoticed if one were not specifically looking for her, enacts a strong presence when read within the context of the landscape of La

³²⁶ Baratay, “Chacun jette,” 149.

³²⁷ Zola, 43.

Croix-de-Maufras.³²⁸ As I have shown both in the introductory section and in the discussion of the “pre-animal-history” with which we could designate the spaces surrounding Phasie’s house, Éric Baratay advocates, along with Élisabeth de Fontenay, for this kind of imposing individuality for animals within real historical contexts. Baratay’s concept of animal histories incites humans – the only ones capable of writing down history – to consider that animals’ experience(s) of a given historical moment or situation is unique to them both as an individual and a species, thus giving it validity of its own account.³²⁹ De Fontenay emphasizes the importance of historical context for any understanding of other events that involve the same place or individual – whether animal or human.³³⁰ Her emphasis on the maintenance of historical context for our understanding of the perception of the animal – both as a living being and as a concept – further contributes to the multi-layeredness of this and other literary studies that focus on animals. While it is of urgent importance to acknowledge them as beings with the potential for agency in many of the ways that humans have this potential, she warns against the risk of dismissing certain human individuals by turning an exclusive focus on animals.³³¹ In a consideration of the few animals

³²⁸ I choose the feminine pronoun “she” for the cow due to the fact that, in French, Zola could have emphasized the presence of a *male* cow by using “taureau” (m.). “She” does thus *not* refer to the [also feminine] *bête* that Phasie uses; this is a mode of language that I hope to get away from due to its stereotypical consideration of animals.

³²⁹ Using authoritative documents, Baratay has begun this work, compiling numerous accounts of animals, “according to” animals, in history, particularly from WWI, in his book, *Bêtes des tranchées : Des vécus oubliés* (Paris: CNRS, 2013); In *Aphro-Ism*, Aph and Syl Ko emphasize that one of the foundational elements of racism is that “knowledge” has been judged and written down, by and large, by White, privileged men. They thus argue that, for history to move to acknowledge racialized and animal bodies, these assumptions – that “authoritative” knowledge must always be based on someone whose ideas have already been “acceptable” for centuries or decades, largely because they were able to share them in the first place – must be set aside and we must be open to this authority coming *from* racialized and animal Others (New York: Lantern Books, 2017. See in particular 71-75 and 118-19).

³³⁰ *Without Offending*, 59-60.

³³¹ De Fontenay provides a scathing critique of Paola Cavalieri’s condemnation of Article 3 of the Nuremberg Code “as the moment and place where animal experimentation was officially legalized” (*Without Offending* 58). She explains that this is a simplistic judgment that refuses to acknowledge the immediate historical context of this Article: “the cruel, degrading, mutilating, and mortal research carried out on men, women, and children” that had been done by the Nazis, thus treating “human beings as livestock” (59).

present in *La Bête humaine*, it is therefore crucial to consider the real-world context within which Zola was writing. As I have shown throughout Chapters 1 and 2, even fictional beings cannot – nor should they be – completely isolated from such contexts, and indeed we can read these real beings more effectively by placing them fully where they would have been.

This cow's beheading is therefore extremely useful to an analysis of the depiction of individual farm animals in nineteenth-century literature, as it stands out in this abandoned countryside where the reader continues to expect animals. The only other real animal mentioned thus far in the novel – a dog whose whines are audible to Séverine and Roubaud during their heated exchange about her sexual relationship with Grandmorin – is found in the heart of the city.³³² While today and even during the time when the novel is set in a city like Le Havre, the dog was recognized as a pet or companion animal, many dogs experienced traumatic histories in nineteenth-century France, particularly in Paris.³³³ This context thus makes the dog's whine, otherwise unremarkable because one expects to hear it in an apartment in the city, very remarkable: it is the first living animal that the reader encounters, and it is still not physically visible. Otherwise, the most frequent presences of the animal can be found in the terms *bête* and *brute*, used repeatedly to describe Jacques' malaise and struggles throughout the text.³³⁴ However, while their meaning comes from animalized characteristics (here, like in Zola's title, nouns that previously referred to real animal bodies made into adjectives to allude to these bodies' common physical traits), these terms maintain an underlying sub-category of the human that manages to hide animals in plain sight and also to devalorize their previous presence in these

³³² The instances of "bête" and "brute" are mostly in conjunction with Roubaud's "rage".

³³³ In "Chacun jette son chien", Baratay describes the exponential number of dogs in Paris and how, while the phenomenon of pet-keeping was also growing, new taxes imposed on any dogs that were found wandering incited huge numbers of dog murders.

³³⁴ As I showed in the section describing the two main male characters of *La Bête humaine*, these terms are also used during the heated exchange between Roubaud and Séverine.

words. Thus, both of these types of literary representations, one of a real animal and the other alluding to animals, are not visible.

In the country, the cow's presence would be one the reader is not shocked by, just like the dog's presence in the apartment in the city. The fact that she is dead – and still the only animal we have seen around La Croix-de-Maufras, the countryside space in this novel – is what is peculiar. She is both a present referent for her own body and an absent referent for other bodies like hers, which would have grazed in this area before the train tracks were laid and the tunnel dug. The cow has been relegated to a space humans and human society have chosen as they occupy vast areas that animals used to, in this way undermining their individuality and unique nature(s). As Jean-Christophe Bailly puts it, this confinement of animals puts them in the “background against which [...] the supremacy of mankind” is highlighted, both physically and philosophically.³³⁵ Humans have defined “vast concept-spaces from which [animals] are not supposed to be able to exit, while [they, humans] are to be defined precisely...by the fact that they have managed to...leav[e] behind *bestiality*...and *animality*...as if these were stages in a journey....”³³⁶ These modes of definition intrude on the categorization of the human, all the while being necessary to its construction.

The beheaded cow is ultimately killed by an extension of the same social mechanism that has confined her to this isolated place to begin with: her beheading is executed by a locomotive, an inanimate product of industrialization. Even the space she had been relegated to was intruded upon by the progress of the industrial period. One might also read her presence in a second way within the industrial context: it is the cow who is not where she is supposed to be (the abattoir), and therefore who is rebelling against her own confinement and must be corrected. In death, her

³³⁵ *The Animal Side*, 2.

³³⁶ *Ibid*, 4-5.

body has been separated like it might have been, had she been in the space where she should have been. She is literally scattered: “...le corps ici et la tête là-bas, près du tunnel...” [“...its body here and its head over there, near the tunnel...”]. The way that the cow’s body is littered across the rural landscape is also similar to the ways that animals’ appearances and depictions throughout life and fiction during the nineteenth century are scattered and disjointed: no longer welcome in the spaces they once occupied, farm animals nonetheless persist in haunting many aspects of human life.

The cow’s body is found not far from Phasie’s house, but the head is discovered “près du tunnel,” further away from this rural homestead. That Zola represents this cow in pieces nods to the ruptures that were being enacted during the nineteenth century that ultimately enabled the kind of massive expansion, for instance, of industrial farming that we see today. In the introductory section of this chapter, I discussed the mechanisms of dissimulation and displacement that shifts in agricultural practice put into motion, based on the work of both Noëlie Vialles and Timothy Pachirat. To briefly recap the point relevant to the current passage, one of the most significant ruptures that undergirded the progression towards modern farming practices was that of preventing a shared gaze between humans and animals. The way that Zola has chosen to describe and place the cow in *La Croix-de-Maufras* and her broken body – body near the house, head near the tunnel – demonstrates the physical and philosophical implications of eliminating the gaze.

The placement of her head directly next to the tunnel, an opening that is dark, ominous and the location of some of the most troubling and important moments of the novel reveals the way that she seems to be rebelling against the location humans are trying to impose upon her. As her eyes are fixed forever looking towards the tunnel – a reference for progress and industry –

her body also rebels, found “ici,” presumably not far from where Phasie and her family often spend time. The cow appears to have been loitering or trying to approach the humans with whom, for so long, farm animals shared such deep intimacy, and yet never got there. Rebellion in death, perhaps, but what might she have thought of the train in life? Might she have anticipated her fate as she saw it screaming down the tracks? Many naturalist texts of this time began to allude to and acknowledge a certain level of animal intelligence, “*créditant les animaux de sentiments, d’intentions, de volontés, de désirs, et de compétences cognitives.*”³³⁷ But what does this tell us about what this cow might have understood of her death (or life)?

In *Être bête*, Jocelyn Porcher and Vinciane Despret show how farmers who continue to raise their animals in a more traditional way emphasize the interaction and exchange between themselves and their animals, instead of the processes that they use to raise them. The gaze and the ability to see one another as both sides attempt to communicate is the foundational element to the entire experience – and, indeed, process – of raising the animals. This concept of *faire monde* (to make world) is something that industrial farming is fundamentally incapable of, given the focus on fast, efficient production. It could even be said that the industry’s goal is to *faire enfer* (to make-Hell). The small-scale farmers in Porcher and Despret’s study repeat time and again the necessity of figuring out what it is that the animals need and want. They advocate for the individuality of their animals, explaining that when they feel they are being seen and heard, they “are happy to collaborate.”³³⁸ Thus, that the cow’s head is so far removed from the humans she might have interacted with during her life is indicative of her isolation from them in this space that progress has both deeply changed and also left behind.

³³⁷Despret and Porcher, 39; Given Zola’s connection to the Naturalist tradition in literature, this is a significant point.

³³⁸ *Ibid*, 58.

The way that she has been physically cast aside from society is a clear illustration of the kinds of shifts in thinking that lead to the large scale industrial farming that happens today. However, the locations of the head and body also speak to issues that emerged during this time around the categorizations of human and animal. I have discussed these categorizations at length in Chapter 2 within the context of colonialism shortly before Zola's time, but *La Bête humaine* provides a more general portrayal of the effects of mechanization and efficiency that characterized this historical moment, particularly so close to the turn of the century. As industrialization advanced, the presence of farm animals became almost resented – their modes of being were unsettling in ways that they had never had the capacity to do before the arrival of machines. Perhaps this unease grew not just out of the growing lack of necessity of their presence, but also due to what was being discovered or hypothesized regarding their capacities to think or feel physical or emotional pain or happiness. Of course, farm animals continued to be extremely necessary to society when it came to food, but this was not what was in question: it was their individuality that was dreaded for the way that it threatened the progress of industrial farming or machines. Just as Jacques Derrida's cat begins to give him the impression that she can see right into his soul, perhaps farm animals becoming more than just animals as they were previously thought unsettled longtime assumptions and practices to a point beyond what it had ever done before. The head, and all that it encompassed physically, psychologically and physiologically, was meant to be an area that humans alone could occupy. The annexing of farm animals' physical bodies to the fringe of city and countryside along with the abattoir alludes to this refusal to admit that animals live complex lives and are capable of interacting in meaningful ways with humans.

This scene at La Croix-de-Maufras is easily missed; it is a mere three lines in a 300-page novel with many events that portray a fascinating, if disturbing, plot. It is only when one has chosen to take up the “practice of reading *for* the representation of animals [in literature]” that Woodward says one is alerted “to animals in texts who have, for the most part, *escaped* notice.”³³⁹ This cow’s death was violent (if relatively quick), but her physical presence is described in a way that reveals the ways that “representation has ethical repercussions” in literature, each one having “an interrelationship with the way that culture responds to the real animal.”³⁴⁰ Susan McHugh’s work, as I have shown elsewhere in this chapter and Chapter 2, asks thinkers in Animal Studies to use literary texts and their unique aesthetic to aid in the “critique [of] anthropocentrist models and...[to] elaborate creative new forms of agency.”³⁴¹ Even in death, Zola’s beheaded cow speaks volumes about animal life in France in the nineteenth century.

Tools of the trade: Farm Animals Turned into Consumables

In the latter part of *La Bête humaine*, animals enter the plot once again, but this time, still alive: a band of horses. Flore, Phasie’s daughter, has long been in love with Jacques. He has also had romantic feelings for her at times but has quite literally run away from her in moments of his malaise, the night of his return to La Croix-de-Maufras being a case where he only narrowly escaped killing her. She has divined Jacques and Sévérine’s affair, and in her isolation, she is obsessed by her jealousy and resolves to kill them both by derailing the train. Her tool (weapon?)? A band of horses that her close friend has pulling two large stones.

³³⁹ Woodward, 18, emphasis mine.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid*, 15.

³⁴¹ McHugh, “Literary Animal Agents,” 489.

...[Flore] cherchait furieusement un obstacle, quelque chose qu'elle pût jeter en travers de la voie... [...] Mais ses regards venaient de tomber sur le fardier, l'épaisse et basse voiture, chargée de deux blocs de pierre, que cinq vigoureux chevaux avaient de la peine à traîner. [...] Énormes, hauts et larges...ces blocs s'offraient à elle... [...] Les chevaux se raidirent, un instant, le fardier, lourd de son énorme charge, oscilla sans démarrer ; mais, comme si elle se fût attelée elle-même, en bête de renfort, il s'ébranla, s'engagea sur la voie. Et il était en plein sur les rails, lorsque l'express, là-bas, à cent mètres, déboucha de la tranchée. [...] ...elle maintenait, de sa poigne de fer, les cinq chevaux, cabrés et hennissants dans l'instinct du péril.³⁴²

[[Flore] looked about her furiously for an object, something she could case across the line... [...] But her glance had just fallen on the dray, a heavy, low conveyance, loaded with two blocks of stone, which five strong horses found difficulty in drawing. [...] These two enormous masses...stood there before her... [...] The horses strained. For an instant the dray, heavy with its enormous load, oscillated without advancing; but, as if she had harnessed herself to it like an extra animal, it at last moved and came across the line. It was right on the rails as the express, a hundred yards away, issued from the cutting. [...] In her iron grip she held back those five horses, rearing and neighing with the instinct of peril.]

Zola's text mobilizes horses in two principal ways in *La Bête humaine*: 1) the horse or its attributes as reference or description for Jacques' train, La Lison; and 2) a band of horses used to derail and ruin this same train by Flore. In this section, I will address the second, more literal depiction of the horse. Before the industrial period, horses were farm animals in a slightly different way than cows, since they were raised not just for their meat (in France in particular), but as workers or collaborators for tasks like plowing. They would have also provided a principal mode of transport for those with the financial means, and in these cases, horses would have been constant companions. Even as they continued, to some degree, to be employed for transportation reasons into the industrial period, their roles, like other farm animals', shifted significantly as the necessity of their participation in these roles diminished or disappeared completely due to the

³⁴² Zola, 264-65.

invention of machines capable of doing the same tasks more efficiently (and likely at a lower cost).³⁴³

In the passage above, a band of horses is caught somewhere in the middle of this shift in necessity. Not only are they capable of transporting and pulling people, but here, they specifically transport massive stones. As we consider how these horses might have experienced this particular moment, it is clear that Flore pushes them beyond their physical limits – whether within the context of farm work or that of their considerable hauling skills.³⁴⁴ They “se raidirent” [“stiffened up”] until she adds her strength; Flore has pushed them beyond normal limits, and demands their continued participation (ultimately, unto death). No longer collaborators, these horses have become this young woman’s tools. She attempts to employ her horses as inanimate (or, at least, un-will-full) tools for her plan to kill Jacques and Sévérine, but the description of the wreckage betrays their beingness amongst the rubble:

...le cheval qui n’était pas mort, gisait lui aussi, les deux pieds de devant emportés, perdant également ses entrailles par une déchirure de son ventre. À sa tête droite, raidie dans un spasme d’atroce douleur, on le voyait râler, d’un hennissement terrible. Les cris s’étranglèrent, inentendus, perdus, envolés.³⁴⁵

[...the horse, which had not been killed at once, with his two fore hoofs cut off and his belly ripped up. By his erect head, the neck stiffened in a spasm of atrocious pain, he could be perceived rattling the death agony with a terrible neigh, which failed to reach the ear in the thunder of the agonizing engine. The cries were stifled, unheard, wafted away.]

³⁴³ See my discussion of Jason Hribal’s article, “‘Animals are part of the working class’: A challenge to labor history” in Chapter 1 for more detail on the various roles horses began to occupy in the work of the industrial age, even once they were “replaced by steam” in 1844.

³⁴⁴ Baratay’s book *Bêtes des tranchées*, to which I alluded earlier in this chapter, builds the animal histories of both dogs and horses during World War II. Horses were also used in mining in areas where that was prevalent; this could provide another avenue of discussion for these animals in literary texts, as it would inevitably shed even more light on how they experience certain types of events or stress.

³⁴⁵ Zola, 268-69.

The suffering of the only horse left alive of the five who executed the derailment of the train is rivaled only by the train's. The description of the horse's injuries within the context of the train accident deepens the disgust and revulsion experienced by the reader, while also building a sympathy for his suffering.³⁴⁶ As the humans injured by the wreck are letting out "hurlements inarticulés de bête" and begging to be saved or put out of their misery, the horse's cries remind us that animals, too, feel pain. In the slaughterhouse, they are stunned to prevent them from feeling, cutting off their brain from the rest of their body to stop the nerves from serving one of their primary purposes.³⁴⁷ The horse suffering by the track seems out of place – in other words, his presence is unexpected so near to the train and the tracks – and therefore is worthy of pity. Having been fatally injured, the horse is no longer seen solely within the context of his role as tool, and his beingness becomes painfully evident. Flore's horses are at once fictional and real, depending on what one allows them to be and be capable of as the passage is read. While they are fictional from the beginning, the description of their death, which illustrates their physicality via the pain they experience in dying (like the humans around them), emphasizes that many of their capacities are not at all different from ours. This scene allows us to see the horses from both perspectives: first in the way Flore did, in her moment of fury, as tools; and secondly, as beings that live and breathe, experiencing fear and pain just like humans in situations of stress, danger, or crisis.

³⁴⁶ I will use the masculine pronoun for the same reasons that I chose the female pronoun for the cow: "cheval" being a masculine word and "vache" feminine, in the original French.

³⁴⁷ Unfortunately, stunning often does not work the first time. Pachirat explains that, in the stunning of cattle, the effectiveness of the initial shot (or any shot) from the stun gun relies on the skill and size of the knocker (individual worker operating the stun gun) as well as the pressure being supplied to the gun (22). While this kind of stunning is within the context of current-day practices, an example of what these practices (when they were used) looked like can be seen in Georges Franju's film, *Le Sang des bêtes* (I discuss it in more detail in the Post Script). The first animal that is slaughtered is a horse, who is first "stunned" with a hammer and large nail. It is effective in the film, but one can imagine that this might be a method with even more margin for error, given it would rely both on the stillness of the horse and the steadiness and strength of the individual doing the stunning.

The overall thrust of the industrial revolution was to maximize efficiency of as many tasks as possible, and this was often best attained through the mechanization of some or all of a given task, depending on its complexity. While by and large animals were simply replaced by tools and machines, at other times they were caught up in a sort of active metaphor, becoming tools themselves. By becoming tools, I mean to say that their individuality and capacity to collaborate was eliminated due to the way that humans' perception of animals changed during this time. As daily life was shared less and less with animals, farm animals especially became being-less objects that had the potential to help or hinder the efficiency of life in an industrial world.

The denial of the ability for animals to be someones reveals a reliance on the detrimental – and frequent – distinction between humans and animals. Many thinkers in both Animal and Race Studies point out that attempting to compare humans and animals cannot yield unbiased answers: animals always already do not share many of what are considered the defining attributes of humans, such as the capacities to read, write, and “reason.”³⁴⁸ However, they do share more physical and psychological attributes than many humans had imagined at the creation of these two categories, and this makes it particularly important to put them into question, if not to eliminate the human-animal divide completely. It isn't necessary to read a philosophical treatise or book to make these deductions. However, the fact that these types of texts continue to be written today reveals that it is something that has been overlooked or purposefully hidden by such practices as industrial farming in order to move forward with a progress that demands of

³⁴⁸ Following Aph and Syl Ko, as well as Val Plumwood, I place “reason” in scare quotes here due to the subjectivity that the word carries in the Western world, despite its definition. Issues of race and species and the (mist)treatment of racialized Others and animals revolve around questions of “reason” and “rationality” that have been posed by a small group of White, privileged humans, and thus the term as a distinguishing factor in any circumstance remains murky.

farm animals an efficiency of growth and life that is impossible without scientific modification and horrendous conditions. It literally sees animals as machines, thus attempting to help humans to stop considering the ethical side of such an industry. If animals cannot think like humans do, then it is justifiable to say that they share no other attributes with us, either.

The Many vs. the Many: Inserting Animals into the Framework of

Nineteenth-century Minor Characters

The physicality of Flore's band of horses raises an important issue in rereading farm animals in nineteenth-century literature. As long as they are considered tools that have been used to execute her plan, they have no potential to impact the progress of the story in the same way as the fictional human characters. However, once one is reminded, in the description of the last horse's death, of their physical and feeling bodies, it is once again feasible to consider that they are capable of acting as minor characters in the way Alex Woloch discusses.³⁴⁹ Woloch seeks to show the representation of any particular character in a novel is formed, to an important extent, by the amount of space they are given and where they are placed in the progression of the narrative. His project moves through a series of questions that consider, among other details, the interactions between characters and how they enter or exit the story.³⁵⁰ In this way, Woloch aims to "construct a new framework for interpreting [...] characterization itself—the literary representation of imagined *human* beings."³⁵¹ While his system of thinking is limited to the human characters within the nineteenth-century novel, I think it is logical and necessary to

³⁴⁹ *The One vs. The Many* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

³⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 14.

³⁵¹ *Ibid*, emphasis mine.

integrate animals into that system. After all, fictional animals are positioned just like Woloch describes fictional humans: into “determined space[s] and position[s] within the narrative as a whole.”³⁵² These are the defining characteristics of what Woloch calls “character-spaces”. Given the way that authors such as Flaubert and Zola rely on animals’ presence for logical backdrops, the insertion of them into this same system is an expansion I believe essential, and that, beyond this, ultimately strengthens Woloch’s theories.

The other piece to this framework puts “an individual human personality” into relation with the space that I’ve already addressed.³⁵³ This specificity assumes that animals are not capable, in their individuality, of having the same kind of impact on a text as humans. The first piece to his system of thinking, the “character-system,” puts the “character-spaces” into the organization of the narrative. As he describes this, he adds to the description of those spaces, explaining that they are “differentiated configurations and manipulations of the human figure.”³⁵⁴ I again emphasize animals’ potential, both of their own accord and through their depiction and representation by humans in written and spoken language, to be “configured and manipulated” in this same way. In literature, [human] authors are constantly mobilizing animals of all kinds to function as more than themselves – and sometimes as nothing of themselves. But what of the animals’ own abilities to act within these real and fictional versions of themselves? As Jean-Christophe Bailly reminds us, despite being consistently urged to stay in specific spaces, “animals have never been able to stay in their spaces, neither in their own right nor in human thoughts and dreams.”³⁵⁵ Fictional animals must therefore be added to the host of potential minor characters who can function within Woloch’s framework.

³⁵² Woloch, 14.

³⁵³ *Ibid*, emphasis mine.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid*.

³⁵⁵ Bailly, 5.

The fact that animals were not included within this “elect” in Woloch’s project is not surprising; they cannot speak, write, or reason like humans can (or, at least in a way that we can understand) and this still brings many authors and readers to exclude them as potential actors.³⁵⁶ But even if an animal in a fictional text is meant to be an allegory for either a human or a human concept, he or she can still have a significant impact on the direction of the plot. However, to incorporate animals into this category, they must also be given the capacity to act as individual agents. This does ask of the reader to actively see the real animal beyond the common perceptions of them as metaphors, allegories, or background. However, even in cases where the author’s intention was not that the animal be seen as fully itself, attempting this leap of thinking and reading reveals a new depth of understanding of animals and the texts where they can be found.

The perception and depiction of animals during the industrial period reflects the changes that were happening in the way farm animals were being raised and the beginnings of industrial farming. The erasure from the public eye and the limitations that were placed upon those animals is echoed in the literature being written at the same time. Just as, in the city, populations were booming, the growing number of farm animals in meat production made it harder to remember that, aside from there being many species of animals going to the slaughterhouse, there were also individual animals, each of whom was capable of exercising their own agency, given the chance to do so.

³⁵⁶ Here I refer to nineteenth-century authors given the scope of Woloch’s work that limits itself to that era; since this period, particularly within the literature that has emerged from the field of Postcolonial French Studies and (not surprisingly) Animal Studies, there are many authors who choose to write animals in as actors. For instance: Patrice Nganang’s *Temps de chien*, Patrick Chamoiseau’s *Les neuf consciences du malfini*, and Marie Darrieussecq’s *Truismes*, all position an animal as the main protagonist in the narrative. In so doing, these novels imagine, respectively, the experiences of animals at specific historical moments, in the midst of ecological shifts, and over the course of physiological shifts of being and knowing the social world.

In the section that follows, I will conclude this chapter by way of a close-reading of another animal in literature. Gustave Flaubert's short novella, *Un cœur simple*, provides an interesting scene with a bull whose presence as a strong male animal body amongst two women and two children allows for an interesting site to once more consider the issues I have already discussed. This animal, who lives in a field that the group crosses as they return home from a picnic, is occupying "his" space, yet still enclosed. The brief encounter that the humans have with him provides an opportunity to attempt to restore to the bull some of the individuality and uniqueness so often denied real animals in literature by most literary criticism up to this point.

Conclusion: The Crazy Bull

Un cœur simple is a short novel that was published by Flaubert in 1877. It tells the story of Félicité, a servant woman who gives everything to those around herself. While the setting is not unlike *Madame Bovary*, this book resembles *La Bête humaine* in the sparseness of animals that one finds throughout. Félicité is given a parrot at one point, and he seems to be both "l'amour de sa vie" and the physical manifestation of God.³⁵⁷ I will here focus on a different animal in the text, this time, a bull. Félicité and her mistress, Madame Aubain, and her children, Paul and Virginie, have had a picnic in a field by a nearby farm. As they walk home, they cross a pasture where a solitary bull lives, and are briefly pursued:

[Le taureau] avança vers les deux femmes. Mme Aubain allât courir. —Non ! Non ! moins vite !

Elles pressaient le pas cependant, et entendaient par-derrrière un souffle sonore qui se rapprochait. Ses sabots, comme des marteaux, battaient l'herbe de la prairie ; voilà qu'il galopait maintenant ! Félicité se retourna, et elle arrachait à deux mains des plaques de terre

³⁵⁷ In the final scene of the novel, Félicité sees Loulou the parrot, now dead and stuffed, flying away above her head as she dies. This passage is commonly described as an ironic allusion to the Holy Spirit (See, for example, Michael Sayeau's chapter, "'Un cœur simple': An Uneventful Narrative" in *Critical Insights: Gustave Flaubert*, ed. Tom Hubbard).

qu'elle lui jetait dans les yeux. Il baissait le mufle, secouait ses cornes et tremblait de fureur en beuglant horriblement. [...] Le taureau avait acculé Félicité contre une claire voie ; sa bave lui rejaillissait à la figure, une seconde de plus il l'éventrait. Elle eut le temps de se couler entre deux barreaux, et la grosse bête, toute surprise, s'arrêta.³⁵⁸

[[The bull] advanced towards the two women. Mme Aubain was going to run. –No! No! slowly!

They walked quickly, still, and heard from behind the audible breath getting nearer. His hooves, like hammers, beat the prairie grass; now he was running! Félicité turned around, and she ripped up with both hands patches of earth that she threw in his eyes. He lowered his nose, shook his horns and trembled in fury with a horrible bellow [...] The bull had backed Félicité up against the pasture fence; his spit splashed into her face, one second more and he would have gored her. She had the time to squeeze through two slats, and the huge beast, completely surprised, stopped.]

This scene demonstrates the clash of two worlds: the former world of farming as it used to be, and the modern world where the humans in this excerpt now live, away from farm animals and thus relatively unfamiliar with them and with their tendencies.³⁵⁹ The palpable fear in this scene is one that, while possible before industrialization, is intensified significantly due to a lack of familiarity. This alienation between humans and farm animals permeated the cities of France during this era and has only intensified since. The nouns and verbs used to describe the bull and his actions signal the baseline of uncertainty surrounding such large farm animals that create an artificial sense of distinction between humans and animals: “comme des *marteaux*,” “*tremblait de fureur en beuglant horriblement*,” “sa bave lui *rejaillissait à la figure*,” “*grosse bête*.” These italicized terms represent excesses of various qualities: too much strength (due to his hooves being strong enough to sound “like hammers”), too much fury, too much spit, too much

³⁵⁸ Gustave Flaubert, *Un cœur simple* (San Bernadino: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015), 10.

³⁵⁹ Clearly, they live close enough to this farm to get there by foot, and thus are not too far from “countryside” spaces. However, they spend most of their time in the town, and are all quite taken by ideas of travel. Paul, the son, eventually goes away in the Navy and Félicité becomes obsessed by trying to trace his movements.

stupidity. The excesses lie with the animal, not with the humans. However, it is the humans who have intruded on the bull's designated space, and that are thus disrupting his normalcy. There is a lack of *recul* taken by the women and children returning home from their picnic to not consider that they are upsetting a balance that has been created and crossing a place that is unlike the ones they are accustomed to.

Despite Bailly's emphasis on the impossibility of a complete and clean separation between humans and animals due to the history that connects us, it falls on humans to consider the consequences of a world where this separation is being attempted and how this should shift the way we respond to animals. Industrial farming is one of the most significant manifestations of the "conditions orchestrated by the most recent civilizations [that] make the separation sharper than ever before," and if we do not acknowledge this and begin to think about how to find a new balance that gives agency to both humans and animals to make decisions about when and where to act – and interact – then farm animals in particular will become nothing short of automatons.³⁶⁰

One of the ways that we can begin to think differently about the relationship and balance between humans and animals is, as I do here and have done throughout this chapter, reading them differently in literature. If the nineteenth century was the period when farm animals were quickly and firmly pushed out of the public eye in order to expedite farming processes for a growing population and to hide the means in the interest of decorum, it was also the moment when literary farm animals are pushed into

vast concept-spaces from which they are not supposed to be able to exit, while human beings are defined precisely [...] by the fact that they have managed to get themselves out of these enclosures, leaving behind

³⁶⁰ Bailly, 10.

*bestiality [...] and animality, deeply feared, as if these were stages in a journey and bad (though haunting) memories.*³⁶¹

The description of the bull in *Un cœur simple* is a perfect example of a farm animal caught in the rhetoric – “the concept-space” – of the industrial period. All of the qualifiers Flaubert employs are diminutive terms that distinguish and elevate the human over the animal, making the bull out to be in excess of what is acceptable. Élisabeth de Fontenay emphasizes how deeply these distinctions have influenced human philosophy, creating cycles and paths of thought that “ai[ent] toujours, déjà et encore, interprété cette verticalité comme posture ontologique et séparation irrécusable” [“have always, already and still, interpreted this vertical positioning as an ontological posture and indisputable separation”].³⁶² The way that these distinctions and spaces have been maintained over decades with little reconsideration reveals the mechanisms by which animals – in general, although farm animals suffer particularly in this equation – have been transformed into ghosts, particularly in literature where their presence manifests as what Avery Gordon calls “flashing half-signs” that can only be noticed once one begins to purposefully consider the circumstances that have made them, essentially, invisible.³⁶³

³⁶¹ Bailly, 5.

³⁶² *Le silence des bêtes*, 21.

³⁶³ *Ghostly Matters*, 204.

Post-script: Georges Franju's *Le sang des bêtes* (A Visual Track)

In his 1949 documentary, Georges Franju captures on film the slaughter of eight calves who will become veal by the time the stunning, bleeding, cleaning and dressing are finished. As they are killed at most three at a time by decapitation, the eyes of those not yet slaughtered grow larger and larger, smelling the blood and presumably in anticipation of their fate. After bleeding, the heads are cut off completely, thrown in a pile and, eventually, counted for slaughterhouse records. The calves' eyes are still open as the heads wait to be counted. Like the cow we encounter at La Croix-de-Maufras, their eyes look but no longer see, now nothing but a shell of the living, breathing individual that once inhabited the body now removed.³⁶⁴ The heads are thrown onto the floor at the edge of the building, with the light of the slaughterhouse doorway behind them, a physical allegory demonstrating the space that farm animals were forced to occupy, either living or dead, from the industrial period onward. They sit at the edge of the door but are not allowed to leave until they are dead. The heads will most likely be rendered, thus experiencing an annihilation unique in its totality, even in the slaughterhouse. The slaughterhouse workers, conversely, come and go as they please, seeing the animals as nothing more than a task.³⁶⁵

As Franju's documentary ends, the camera pans to a train heading out on the tracks beyond the slaughterhouses. It is, within the industrial context, an idyllic image: steam billowing

³⁶⁴ A similar absence-of-individual happens in industrial slaughter following stunning, when "the cow's eyes typically take on a glazed look, and its tongue often hangs limply from its mouth" (Pachirat 54).

³⁶⁵ Vialles' discusses how abattoir workers were able to cope with the job, had they not come in to it, as some whose accounts she includes, "because [they]'d always liked it." Since the abattoir had been organized into a production line by the 19th century, the repetitiveness of the task of killing having been "reduced to a small number of movements" was what allowed workers to "get used to it" in order to "stop taking any notice" of the "animal left in the carcass" (51). Pachirat demonstrates, in the context of the 21st-Century industrial slaughterhouse, how different pay classes inside these spaces denote different social classes, racialized minorities being hired to do the dirtiest and most physically taxing work for the least pay. His "politics of sight" thus moves to rethink our perceptions of race, not simply questions about the animal.

straight up from the stack, shiny black sides, moving straight through a maze of tracks going to various centers of industry and progress. However, as Franju demonstrates curtly leading up to this concluding image, the efficiency and speed achieved by the mechanization of so many things, including farming, dissimulates the things that were destroyed and corrupted by that process. Like the meat that it might be transporting, this train will never gaze at an animal or a human and be able to share its will or its experience. Meanwhile, the ungazing, though pleading, eyes of Zola's beheaded cow continue to stare into the tunnel, long after the train has passed.

Conclusion

*N'y a-t-il que l'homme pour vivre sa vie ? [...] N'y a-t-il que lui pour naître et mourir, ressentir l'angoisse ou la joie ?*³⁶⁶

[Is man the only one who can live his life? [...] Is he the only one who can be born and die, feel distress or joy?]

By and large, literary studies have tended to overlook animals until very recently, even when texts are set in spaces where one expects to find farms, such as Yonville in *Madame Bovary*. At La Croix-de-Maufras in *La Bête humaine*, too, readers might anticipate a cow's presence, if not that they will come upon her already in pieces. *Salammbô* is unique in the abundance of animals that it presents (their presence so permeates the narrative that it would be impossible to miss), but "exotic" animals preclude different contexts: in this almost fantastical space, *ménageries* and zoos come to mind, due to the after-effects of colonial expositions and the spectacles that originated in spaces like Carl Hagenbeck's Tierparks.³⁶⁷ As I have shown at certain points throughout this dissertation (and as I aim to do in my own readings and analysis), Animal Studies scholars (as well as from the French context of *la question animale*) have begun to take a closer look at these animals within their various contexts. For example, Anne Simon has examined Flaubert's *La Légende de Saint Julien l'hospitalier* and the intimacy that its protagonist finds in his frenetic animal hunts, and we discussed Éliane DalMolin's study of elephants within the context of the French Empire, which takes both Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* and Flaubert's *Salammbô* as literary sites to demonstrate the ways that these animals

³⁶⁶ Florence Burgat, *Une autre existence* (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 2011), 13.

³⁶⁷ While this particular display of Hagenbeck's began after the turn of the 20th-Century, its foundations can be found in his previous displays of "exotic" animals and peoples throughout Europe leading up to this point. See Eric Ames' work, described further below, for an extensive study of Hagenbeck's life and the legacy he left behind.

can be read both as themselves and for the symbolic meaning they lend the political and social environment of France during the nineteenth century.³⁶⁸ These articles, as well as others that have been discussed throughout this dissertation, show that literary animals are starting to emerge from the backgrounds to which they were so often sidelined in the past.

Lo(o)sing Animals has moved to advance this shift in both French Literary and Animal Studies by re-presenting literary animals in each of the three novels by Gustave Flaubert and Émile Zola that it examines. Inspired by the historically-oriented yet imaginative work of building animal histories that Éric Baratay proposes, my (re)readings have engaged the social context of France during the nineteenth century in order to restore a depth of subjecthood to the animals in these texts. In so doing, I have examined the effects of displacement enacted by industrialization, particularly as it pertains to the slaughterhouse, and considered the implications of the human-animal divide imposed and reinforced by colonial projects. The racialization of both human and animal Others within colonial contexts that these readings have revealed shows the need to adjust our understandings of the category/ies of animals and the violence of the Enlightenment category of the human that imposes entanglements of humans and animals whose resolutions are at once complex and urgent.

In so doing, this dissertation has also gone beyond these (re)readings of animals in literature to consider their presence as tangible hauntings for the real animals that were disappearing at alarming rates over the course of the nineteenth century in France. While the beheaded cow in *La Bête humaine* stares blankly into the tunnel at La Croix-de-Maufras, Timothy Pachirat reminds us of the staggering number of cows like her, whose lives have been subsumed by the mechanisms and erasures of the industrial era:

³⁶⁸ Simon, "De la chasse au carnage dans *La Légende de saint Julien l'Hospitalier*," *L'Esprit Créateur* 51.4 (2011); DalMolin "Un éléphant, ça trompe: l'animal et l'Empire" (ibid).

*I barely make out a shimmer, something catching the sunshine and throwing it back. I stare, puzzled, and slowly realize that it is the eye of a cow.*³⁶⁹

In reading this passage, despite its description of a cow still alive, I am reminded of the pleading, lifeless eyes of the beheaded cow. This project thus suggests that animals' presence in literature effectively draws the reader back to the historical contexts from whence they come: back to the places where their gazes were removed and where they were subsequently denied the capacity to see at all. Avery Gordon describes the hypervisibility of the post-modern culture and how this simply perpetuates the violent invisibilizing to which society has subjected racialized individuals and animals. I have in these chapters exposed the "exclusions and invisibilities" to which literary animals have persistently been subjected in order to bring attention to and begin to resolve the material effects that relegating individuals to the shadows that these have produced.³⁷⁰

Making Literature "More Bête": New Readings of Realist and Naturalist Literature

Lawrence R. Schehr, in an essay called "Flaubert's failure," describes at length the ways in which the author's endeavors were fraught with predictable moments of failure, both within his narratives and in his own methods for writing.³⁷¹ In discussing *Madame Bovary*, Schehr notes how failure itself (Charles' failure to become a successful doctor or husband, Emma's failure to attain the kind of life and happiness she desires) is set "against a neutral background."³⁷² He goes on to say that, in the way many of the details throughout the novel could be replaced by any

³⁶⁹ *Every Twelve Seconds*, 22.

³⁷⁰ Gordon, 17.

³⁷¹ *The Cambridge Companion to Flaubert* (Timothy Unwin, ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

³⁷² *Ibid*, 213.

other, “Flaubert is...making it more *bête*.”³⁷³ His discussion at no point acknowledges animals’ presence in neither this nor other novels, including *Un Coeur simple*, which he calls “an ironic version of *Madame Bovary*.” In so doing (or rather, *not* doing), I would argue that Schehr misses an opportunity to nuance his argument in a fascinating way. Incorporating animals and their inclusion in these “neutral settings” might problematize some of his points, but it could also deepen the concept of failure as a mode of reading Flaubert. As I have shown, Flaubert’s irony can in effect be turned on its head in order to reveal more about his social and historical context, as opposed to taking every caricatured character – such as Homais, Yonville’s verbose pharmacist – as nothing but a caricature. Thus, why not take animals’ presence as another detail where Flaubert may or may not have “failed” – for example, by comparing their different kinds of representations in *Madame Bovary* versus *Salammbô*? In so doing, the incorporation of *bêtes* in to an analysis of this author who was so taken with *bêtise* could consider whether perhaps the sum of his failures actually allowed for some surprising successes.

Zola’s “epic type of realism” was characterized by a unique employment of the naturalist aesthetic, according to Brian Nelson.³⁷⁴ Nelson explains that the author was aware of “the selecting, structuring role of the individual artist and of the aesthetic he adopts,” and that Zola’s fiction acquires its power...not so much from its ethnographic richness as from its imaginative qualities.”³⁷⁵ In a way, I take up this concept of “imaginative qualities” in my readings of *La Bête humaine* in Chapter 3. When it comes to animals, I demonstrate how, despite being hardly present in the novel, one could read these absences as a gesturing towards the lost presences of real animals in France during the industrial revolution. Thus, “imaginative qualities” become

³⁷³ Schehr, 213.

³⁷⁴ “Zola and the nineteenth century” in *The Cambridge Companion to Emile Zola* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 4.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid*, 4-5.

hauntings of these real animal lives before the mechanized and automatic inventions and progress that characterize this period. Given the way that the majority of work on this novel only acknowledges nonhuman bodies in their direct relation to the train or to the kinds of “human behavior that lie beyond the control of reason and the will...that resembles *automatic* reflex and locomotor problems such as tics and convulsive movement,” as Rae Beth Gordon points out later in the *Cambridge Companion*, one could consider animals’ roles in the concepts of automatism that Gordon’s essay engages with.³⁷⁶ In so doing, it could be possible to expand the implications of the psychological advances upon which her essay focuses. The kinds of psychological behaviors that she describes as characteristic of *La Bête humaine* strongly resemble certain descriptions of animals, particularly within the context of their animality:

*This...unknown force will be found in the mechanical, involuntary, automatic aspects of human behaviour that lie beyond the control of reason and the will, behaviour that resembles automatic reflex and locomotor problems such as tics and convulsive movement. This...includes instinct, impulsive acts, idée fixe (original emphasis), and passion.*³⁷⁷

Gordon seems here to paraphrase certain concepts of Cartesian thought, given Descartes’ declaration that animals were simply machines, down to the way that, when they cried out during dissection, he insisted that they were “not feeling or expressing pain but making mechanical noises like a clock might make if certain mechanisms within it were triggered.”³⁷⁸ It seems then that this might be a starting place to imagine animals’ influence on the automatism to which Gordon refers throughout her article. While I certainly agree that this is a key characteristic of *La Bête humaine*, I find the lack of acknowledgment of Descartes within Gordon’s discussion to be a missed opportunity, and that it would allow for a deeper consideration of these automations’

³⁷⁶ “*La Bête humaine: Zola and the poetics of the unconscious*” in *The Cambridge Companion to Emile Zola* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 152.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid*, emphasis mine.

³⁷⁸ Claire Jean Kim, *Dangerous Crossings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 34.

impacts on the perceptions of animals during Zola's time and in the midst of industrialization. To in this way incorporate actual *bêtes* into the text whose title refers to them quite directly (if it does not insert them, directly) provides interesting new directions for readings of many key moments of this novel.

Embêté: How Literary Animals Trouble Our Understandings of Real Animals

Florence Burgat reminds us of the fact that,

*L'histoire naturelle des bêtes, on en conviendra, est tout autre chose que la mémoire gardée par l'humanité de ces vies et n'est pas du tout la conscience que chacune d'elles a eu sa vie. Il manque aussi une histoire des animaux pour eux-mêmes autre que celle des représentations et des pratiques humaines ayant partie liée aux animaux réels ou symboliques.*³⁷⁹

[The natural history of animals, let's agree, is not at all a memory kept by humanity of these lives and it not at all an awareness that each of them had their life. Also missing is a history of animals for themselves outside of the representations by and practices of humans that are connected to real or symbolic animals.]

Literary studies in general often consider animals as irrelevant in their own right, but this refusal to acknowledge them as actors that are the subjects of their own experiences perpetuates the categories of the human and the animal that the Enlightenment solidified and reified as the only two possibilities. As Burgat's work demonstrates, similarly to Éric Baratay, but on a philosophical plane: "Sans la référence à la notion d'expérience, l'existence perdrait sa spécificité et pourrait se ramener à la description en troisième personne d'un parcours..." ["Without any reference to the concept of experience, existence would lose its specificity and could lead to a third person description of a journey or life..."].³⁸⁰ It is when we choose to restore the capacity to experience life that what Logan N. O'Laughlin calls the "quiet and pernicious

³⁷⁹ *Une autre existence*, 354.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

power of nonhuman animals and their figures” can begin to transform our understandings of their place in the social and literary shifts of the nineteenth century in France, as it is able to do in a multiplicity of other fields.³⁸¹ This troubling can and should extend to the understandings we have of the histories of real animals during this period, in the ways that it gestures first to the way they were constantly hidden from sight as a consequence of industrialization, and then how their bodies were employed and subjected to the concepts of colonial power that ultimately created and maintained the categories of human and animal. In refusing to continue to accept natural histories as the equivalents of animal histories, and by combining the knowledge that we can find in historical documents, ethological research, and literature, we open ourselves up to possibilities of new futures for these animal lives – we can give them an afterlife.

Future Directions: Focusing on Flaubert

In the last few months of the writing process, it became evident that this project could have easily focused exclusively on Gustave Flaubert’s works, given the complexity of his personal attitudes towards the issues of progress and colonization during his lifetime. The novellas *Un Cœur simple* and *La Légende de Saint Julien l’hospitalier*, for example, would lend themselves very well to close-readings through the lens of Animal Studies, given the abundant presences of animal bodies in the stories and also already in the relatively extensive criticism that exists focusing on them in recent scholarship.³⁸² The fact that there are an increasing number of critical articles that discuss animals specifically in Flaubert’s work (including those I have cited below and throughout this dissertation) makes such a project seem both relevant and important:

³⁸¹ *Toxic Animal Encounters* (Seattle: ProQuest, anticipated 2018), 171.

³⁸² See Michael Sayeau’s previously mentioned chapter, as well as Julien Weber’s forthcoming book chapter on *La Légende de Saint Julien l’hospitalier* (*Donner sa langue aux bêtes*, expected Summer 2018).

just because an article discusses animals in Flaubert, many of them still sideline the physical animal in favor of common allegorical readings of them. Thus, it is a time when there are fresh opportunities to contribute to the foundations of a new way of reading one of the most well-known authors of nineteenth-century France. Further unpacking and expanding different perspectives on these texts would provide important expansions to the fields of both French and Animal Studies. Thanks to such a project, future readers and scholars would be able to see different sides of Flaubert's widely-read texts as well as those lesser-known that have gained more attention in recent years, like the novellas mentioned above. I have begun to lay the foundation for this work in this dissertation: for example, the issue of irony, while certainly an element that any reader of Flaubert can identify as essential to his writing style, is one that I think needs to be re-examined and refocused to take into consideration a wider understanding, and which I begin to do in the section of my first chapter that addresses irony in *Madame Bovary*.

Another direction that I have considered for my current work beyond this dissertation was alluded to in the conclusion of Chapter 1. It might not integrate into the manuscript project that I articulate above but would be a fascinating article: imagining how Emma Bovary would experience a trip to the Orient, and how it might change her perspectives (or not). More imaginative in nature, this short project would engage with Flaubert's *Correspondance* and texts like Francis Steegmuller's *Flaubert in Egypt*, thus allowing juxtaposition between the author's lived experiences and the potential ones of his jilted heroine. The concept of Emma exploring the Orient could also lead to a "reading" of her experiencing a Colonial Exhibition, perhaps in Paris. This would open up a wider range of more recent scholarship on exotic animals that would speak easily to the accounts of Flaubert's trips to the Orient, such as Eric Ames' and Nigel Rothfels'

work on colonial and modern zoos.³⁸³ No matter how it emerged, this project would allow for further consideration of the exotic menagerie that is discussed throughout Chapter 2, perhaps expanding on the discussions of lions and elephants specifically within these spaces. In either situation – an actual visit to the Orient or to a colonial zoo – Emma’s experience could be read in a way that could consider even more deeply issues of race and species than I have been able to do in this dissertation, which I think is essential to any expansion of my work in this kind of direction.

No matter which of these expansions or different paths that this project may or may not take in the future, it is an exciting time to be thinking about animals in literature. The research to which I refer throughout these chapters, as well as a list of articles, essays and books waiting to be added to future iterations of these close readings, has shown me that, during this time of urgency in the lives and futures of real animals, literature allows us to think differently – more expansively. One can entertain animal histories more easily by attempting to articulate them in a fictional manner (while, certainly, remaining cautious to take as a foundation the non-fictional accounts available, as Éric Baratay reminds us). Even in the face of mass extinction and as climate change is being put into question by entire political groups, imagining animal futures by way of literature might allow us to hold on to the hope that those futures exist, fueling us on to action in our daily lives when it comes to what we eat, how we live and the causes we support.

³⁸³ Ames, *Carl Hagenbeck’s Empire of Entertainments* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008); Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

Epilogue: The Polar Bear Tunnel and the Tiger in the Window

As a child, I loved the zoo. At the time, the one nearest to my home was the Portland Zoo, and I vividly remember the polar bear exhibit. To get to the main viewing area, one had to walk down a long tunnel in the style or shape of an igloo (or what we understand to be an "igloo"), gradually descending into a slightly-neon green-blue lit tank. It was cold down there, I remember. But the chill was always forgotten if the bears were swimming in that area. The excitement as one watched them zoom by the window which allowed us to look in underwater is invigorating to a child. But the disappointment on the days when one had walked all that way — for it felt a very long way, for a child — only to find that the bears were likely in the upper area or just out of sight was almost heartbreaking. Why weren't the bears where they were supposed to be? We would go to another exhibit and plan to return to check if they had returned, but rarely did we end up having the time.

Years later, I was living in Chicago not far from the Lincoln Park Zoo. Their polar bear exhibit was depressing much of the year, as it seemed to be significantly smaller than the one I had so loved in Portland: a real disappointment. (At least that polar bear had something closer to his real environment for part of the year — until the hot, humid summer arrived.) No, at this zoo, the star, for me, was the tiger. I was fascinated by the figure 8 he would walk, when one caught him at the "right" time. When he wasn't there, the ground showed his path. In the thick of winter, he often spent time near the viewing window, right on the rock outcropping it was built into. I remember one time, my husband looked on as the tiger put his hand (paw) where mine was on the glass. Then, it was "cute". Today, I wonder if he was asking me to get him out.

Today, I grapple constantly with whether or not I will ever take my two year old son to a zoo. My fear is that Jonathan, too, will be blinded by the spectacle of it all: the artificial

"environments" where they are kept, the isolation from others of their kind, the constant movement of faces in front of their glass or their bars. Worst of all, in my mind, are the dressed up lies that are only now beginning to be questioned about zoos, many of which have been pasted all over the exhibits for all to see. Even if my husband and myself are purposeful in explaining, from our two points of view, why zoos are inherently *not* a positive or acceptable thing, will he still be wooed by the stronger current of belief that "everyone" goes to look at these "cute", "scary", "magnificent" beings and that that is "how it has been" and that this is why "it is okay"? I wonder if this is even a conversation parents should have inside the walls of a zoo, or if it is best to have it only at the time it comes up when a field trip is arranged or a friend invites him.

Of one thing, I am sure: by no fault of their own, the animals in a zoo are not really there. Despite their *physical* presence, they have been made into "objects of our ever-extending knowledge. What we have learned about them "is an index of our power, and thus an index of what *separates* us from them."³⁸⁴ This "extensive knowledge" has, from the human perspective, removed animals' capacity for looking/seeing *back*, thus eliminating their capacity to be anything more than a living postcard. We have fashioned animals – all animals, but particularly those we go to see in zoos – into ghosts. As John Berger said almost 40 years ago, "Today we live without them."

³⁸⁴ Berger, 14.

Bibliography

- Agamben, Giorgio. Kevin Attel, trans. *The Open*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. Print.
- Ahuja, Neel. "Postcolonial Critique in a Multispecies World." *PMLA* 124.2 (2009): 556-563. PDF.
- Ames, Eric. *Carl Hagenbeck's Empire of Entertainments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008. Print.
- Bailly, Jean-Christophe. Catherine Porter, trans. *The Animal Side*. New York: Fordham, 2011. Print.
- Baratay, Éric. Stephanie Posthumus, trans. "Building an *Animal History*." *French Thinking about Animals*. Louisa Mackenzie and S. Posthumus, eds. Michigan State University Press, 2015. Print.
- . "Chacun jette son chien. De la fin d'une vie au XIX^e siècle." *Romantisme* 153.3 (2011): 147-162. PDF.
- Bargues Rollins, Yvonne. "Une minute, une seconde, un quart de seconde : vision photographique dans *La Bête humaine* d'Émile Zola." *Romantisme* 135.1 (2007): 87-97. PDF.
- Belcourt, Billy-Ray. "Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects: (Re)Locating Animality in Decolonial Thought." *Societies* 5 (2015): 1-11. PDF.
- Berchtold, Jacques. "Figures de l'auteur en bêtes. Autoréflexivité dans *Madame Bovary*." *Revue Flaubert* 10 (2010) : 1-16. Web. 22 October 2014.
- Berger, John. "Why Look At Animals?" *About Looking* (1980): 1-26. PDF.
- Blix, Göran. "Entre les dieux et les animaux: *Salammbô* et la bête humaine de Flaubert." *Modern Language Notes* 128.4 (2013): 723-743. PDF.
- Bradshaw, G.A. *Elephants on the Edge: What Animals Teach Us about Humanity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009. ProQuest Online Access.
- Burgat, Florence. Dantzel Cenatiempo, trans. "The Unexpected Resemblance between Dualism and Continuism, or How to Break a Philosophical Stalemate." *French Thinking about Animals*. Louisa Mackenzie and S. Posthumus, eds. Michigan State University Press, 2015. Print.
- . *Une autre existence*. Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 2012. Print.

- Chagani, Fayaz. "Can the Postcolonial Animal Speak?" *Society & Animals* 24.2 (2016): 619-637. PDF.
- Clark, David, Carla Freccero and Matthew Senior, eds. *Animots : Postanimality in French thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015. PDF.
- DalMolin, Éliane. "Un éléphant, ça trompe : l'animal et l'Empire." *L'Esprit Créateur* 51.4 (2011): 18-31. PDF.
- DeKoven, Marianne and Michael Lundblad, eds. *Species Matters: Humane Advocacy and Cultural Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012. Print.
- Derrida, Jacques. David Wills, trans. *The Animal That Therefore I Am*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008. Print.
- Despret, Vinciane. *Que diraient les animaux, si...on leur posait les bonnes questions ?* Paris: La Découverte, 2012. Print.
- Despret, Vinciane et Jocelyne Porcher. *Être bête*. Arles: Actes Sud, 2007. Print.
- Dumesnil, René. *Gustave Flaubert: L'homme et l'œuvre*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer et Cie, 1932. Print.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Peau noire, masques blancs*. Paris: Éditions du seuil, 1952. Print.
- . Richard Philcox, trans. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 2004. Print.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Madame Bovary*. Brussels: UltraLetters Publishing, 2013. Print.
- . *Salammbô*. Brussels: UltraLetters Publishing, 2013. Print.
- . A.J. Krailshemer, trans. *Salammbô*. New York: Viking Penguin Inc., 1977. Print.
- . *Un cœur simple*. San Bernadino: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015. Print.
- Fontenay, Élisabeth de. *Le silence des bêtes*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1998. Print.
- . *Without Offending Humans: A Critique of Animal Rights*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012. Print.
- Forsdick, Charles, and David Murphy, eds. *Francophone Postcolonial Studies: a critical introduction*. London: Oxford University Press, 2003. Print.

- Forsdick, Charles, and David Murphy, eds. *Postcolonial thought in the French-speaking world*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009. Print.
- Forsdick, Charles. *Victor Segalen and the Aesthetics of Diversity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Franju, Georges, dir. *Le Sang des bêtes*. The Criterion Collection, 1949. Film.
- Fudge, Erica. "What Was It Like to Be a Cow?: History and Animal Studies." *Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, Linda Kalof, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. PDF.
- Gans, Eric. *Madame Bovary: The End of Romance*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1989. ProQuest Online Access.
- Gillespie, Katheryn. "Sexualized violence and the gendered commodification of the animal body in Pacific Northwest US dairy production." *Gender, Place and Culture*, 2013. PDF.
- Gordon, Avery. *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.
- "Gustave Flaubert." *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 2017. PDF.
- Hribal, Jason. "'Animals are part of the working class': a challenge to labor history." *Labor History* 44.4 (2003): 435-453. PDF.
- Huggen, Graham and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism*. New York: Routledge, 2010. Print.
- Jackson, Zakiyyah Iman. "Outer Worlds: The Persistence of Race in Movement 'Beyond the Human'." *GLQ* 21.2-3 (2015): 215-218. PDF.
- Kim, Claire Jean. *Dangerous Crossings*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Print.
- . "Murder and Mattering in Harambe's House." *Politics and Animals* [Online], 2.1 (2016): 37-51. PDF.
- Ko, Aph and Syl Ko. *Aphro-Isms*. New York: Lantern Books, 2017. Print.
- Lacoste, M. Francis. "L'Orient de Flaubert." *Romantisme* 119 (2003): 73-84. PDF.
- Lippit, Akira Mizuta. *Electric Animal*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000. Print.
- Lloyd, Rosemary. *Madame Bovary*. New York: Routledge, 1990. Taylor & Francis eBooks Online Access.

- Lőrinszky, Ildikó. *L'Orient de Flaubert*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2002. Print.
- Lundblad, Michael. "From Animal to Animality Studies." *PMLA* 124.2 (2009): 496-502. PDF.
- Mairesse, Anne and Anne Simon. "Introduction." *L'Esprit Créateur* 4 (2011): 1-5. PDF.
- Mackenzie, Louisa and Stephanie Posthumus, eds. *French Thinking about Animals*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 2015. Print.
- Mackenzie, Raymond N. Introduction to *Madame Bovary*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 2009. Ebook Central Online Access.
- McHugh, Susan. *Posthumanities: Animal Stories: Narrating across Species Lines*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011. Print.
- . "Literary Animal Agents." *PMLA* 124.2 (2009): 487-495. Web. 17 January 2018.
- Menely, Tobias. *The Animal Claim*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2015. Print.
- Nast, Heidi J. "Critical Pet Studies?" *Antipode* 38.5 (2006): 894-906. PDF.
- Nelson, Brian. "Blood on the Tracks: The Uses of Space in Zola's *La Bête humaine*." *Australian Journal of French Studies* 43.1 (2006): 13-18. PDF.
- , ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Emile Zola*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. Print.
- O'Laughlin, Logan N. *Toxic Animal Encounters: Queer Environmental Threats and Racialized Reproduction Anxieties*. Seattle: ProQuest Dissertation, anticipated 2018. PDF.
- Pachirat, Timothy. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011. ProQuest Online Access.
- Pagès, Alain. "Comment définir le naturalisme ?" In *Re-Reading Zola and Worldwide Naturalism: Miscellanies in Honor of Anna Gurat-Migdal*. Edited by Carolyn Sniper-Hort, Marie-Sophie Armstrong and Riikka Rossi. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013. ProQuest Online Access.
- Pick, Anat. *Creaturely Poetics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011. Print.
- Plumwood, Val. *Environmental Culture*. New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.

- Porcher, Jocelyn and Tiphaine Schmitt. "Dairy Cows: Workers in the Shadows?" *Society & Animals* 20 (2012): 39-60. PDF.
- Porter, Laurence M. ed. *A Gustave Flaubert Encyclopedia*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001. Print.
- Porterfield, Aubrey. "Why Emma Bovary Had to Be Bored: Echoes of Flaubert's Egyptian Travel Writing in *Madame Bovary*." *Studies in the Novel* 48.3 (2016). PDF.
- Preuss, Matthias and Sebastian Schönbeck. Abstract of "*Bêtes Studies: Flaubert's and Balzac's Lessons in Natural History*." *JLTonline* 9.2 (2015). PDF.
- Ramazani, Vaheed. "The Irony of Irony in *Madame Bovary*." *Critical Insights: Gustave Flaubert*, Tom Hubbard, ed. Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2015. Print.
- Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987. Print.
- Robb, Graham. *The Discovery of France: A Historical Geography*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007. Print.
- "Romanticism." *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., 2017. PDF.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1978. Print.
- Saint-Pierre, Bernardin de. *Paul et Virginie*. Paris: Bordas, 1995. Print.
- Saminadayar-Perrin, Corinne. "Animalité, barbarie, civilisation: question de frontières dans *Salammbô*." *Revue Flaubert* 10 (2010): 1-14. PDF.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Black Orpheus*. Trans. S. W. Allen. Paris: Présence Africaine, 1963. Print.
- . *La critique de la raison dialectique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1960. Print.
- Sayeau, Michael. "'Un cœur simple': An Uneventful Narrative." *Critical Insights: Gustave Flaubert*, Tom Hubbard, ed. Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2015. Print.
- Schehr, Lawrence R. "Flaubert's failure." *The Cambridge Companion to Flaubert*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
- Schlossmann, Beryl F. "Orientalism — in Theory — *Salammbô* and the Orient of Style." *Critical Insights: Gustave Flaubert*, Tom Hubbard, ed. Amenia: Grey House Publishing, 2015. Print.
- Schwarz, Daniel R. *Reading the European Novel to 1900*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd., 2014. ProQuest Online Access.

- Scully, Matthew. *Dominion*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002. Print.
- Shukin, Nicole. *Animal Capital*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009. Print.
- Sniper-Hoyt, Carolyn, Marie-Sophie Armstrong and Riikka Rossi. "Introduction" to *Re-Reading Zola and Worldwide Naturalism: Miscellanies in Honor of Anna Gurat-Migdal*. Edited by Carolyn Sniper-Hort, Marie-Sophie Armstrong and Riikka Rossi. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013. ProQuest Online Access.
- Stegmuller, Francis. *Flaubert in Egypt*. London: The Bodley Head, 1972. Print.
- Stegmuller, Francis, ed. *The Letters of Gustave Flaubert*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. Print.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. *L'ancien régime et la révolution*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1887. Print.
- Tolmatchoff, Vasily. "Flaubert, 'Slice-of-Life' Aesthetics and Naturalist Novels about Art." *Excavatio: Emile Zola and Naturalism* 16.1-2 (2002): 284-90. PDF.
- Unwin, Timothy, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Flaubert*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
- Vialles, Noëlie. *Animal to Edible*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994. Print.
- Vilmer, Jean-Baptiste Jeangène. *Éthique animale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2011. Print.
- Waal, Frans B. M. de. "Anthropomorphism and Anthropodenial: Consistency in Our Thinking about Humans and Other Animals." *Philosophical Topics* 27.1 (1999): 255-280. PDF.
- Weber, Eugen. *Peasants into Frenchmen: The Modernization of Rural France*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1976. Print.
- Weil, Kari. "Purebreds and Amazons: Saying Things with Horses in Late-Nineteenth-Century France." *differences* 11.1 (1999): 1-37. PDF.
- . "They Eat Horses, Don't They? Hippophagy and Frenchness." *Gastronomica* 7.2 (2007): 44-51. PDF.
- . *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now?* New York: Columbia University Press, 2012. Print.
- Woloch, Alex. *The One vs. The Many: minor characters and the space of the protagonist in the novel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003. Print.
- Woodward, Wendy. *The Animal Gaze*. Johannesburg: Witz University Press, 2008. Print.

Zola, Émile. *La Bête humaine*. San Bernadino: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2015. Print.

———. John Sterling, trans. *Complete Works of Emile Zola*. Delphi Classics, 2012. iBook file.