UNIVERSITY OF PARDUBICE
FACULTY OF ARTS AND PHILOSOPHY

MASTER THESIS

2025 Aneta Pikhartová

University of Pardubice
Faculty of Arts and Philosophy

Man and Dog in 20th Century Prose

Master Thesis

2025 Aneta Pikhartová

Univerzita Pardubice

Fakulta filozofická

Akademický rok: 2023/2024

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(projektu, uměleckého díla, uměleckého výkonu)

Jméno a příjmení:	**Bc. Aneta Pikhartová**
Osobní číslo:	**H23353**
Studijní program:	**N0231A090011 Anglická filolo**
Téma práce:	**Člověk a pes v próze 20. století**
Zadávající katedra:	**Katedra anglistiky a amerikan**

Zásady pro vypracování

Aneta Pikhartová se ve své diplomové práci zaměří na literární obraz vztahu mezi člověkem a psem. Nejprve vytyčí metodický rámec, pro jehož tvorbu využije animal studies. Zaměří se na otázky speciesismu, animal welfare, postoje člověka k přírodě apod. Na tomto základě provede detailní rozbor zvolených děl Jacka Londona, Richarda Adamse, Sheily Burford, Walta Moreyho a Wilson Rawlse. Cílem bude zmapovat různorodost postoje člověka ke zvířeti, hierarchickou povahu jejich soužití a vztahu, popřípadě i jejich ovlivnění dobovou estetikou a postojem k otázkám životního prostředí.

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:
Rozsah grafických prací:
Forma zpracování diplomové práce: **tištěná/elektronická**
Jazyk zpracování: **Angličtina**

Seznam doporučené literatury:

Primární zdroje:
Adams, Richard. *The Plague Dogs*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2007.
Burnford, Sheila. *The Incredible Journey*. London: The Book Club, 1961.
London, Jack. *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004.
Morey, Walt. *Kavik the Wolf Dog*. New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1968.
Rawls, Wilson. *Where the Red Fern Grows*. New York: Laurel-Leaf, 1961.
Sekundární zdroje:
Calarco, Matthew R. *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge, 2021.
Gross, Aaron and Anne Vallely. *Animals and the Human Imagination: A Companion to Animal Studies*.
New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
Kalof, Linda. *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. Pongrácz, Péter. "What is a companion animal? An ethological approach based on Tinbergen's four questions. Critical review." *Applied Animal Behavior Science* 267, no. 1 (October 2023): 1–14.
Robles, Mario Ortiz. *Literature and Animal Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
Turner, Lynn, Undine Sellbach and Ron Broglio. *The Edinburgh Companion to Animal Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018.
Waldau, Paul. *Animal Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **PhDr. Ladislav Vít, Ph.D.**
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Datum zadání diplomové práce: **14. dubna 2024**
Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: **14. dubna 2025**

doc. Mgr. Jiří Kubeš, Ph.D.
děkan

Mgr. Olga Roebuck, Ph.D.
vedoucí katedry

V Pardubicích dne 14. dubna 2024

Příloha č. 1: **Prohlášení autora**

Prohlašuji:
Práci s názvem *Man and Dog in 20th Century Prose* jsem vypracovala samostatně. Veškeré literární prameny a informace, které jsem v práci využila, jsou uvedeny v seznamu použité literatury.
Byla jsem seznámena s tím, že se na moji práci vztahují práva a povinnosti vyplývající ze zákona č. 121/2000 Sb., o právu autorském, o právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména se skutečností, že Univerzita Pardubice má právo na uzavření licenční smlouvy o užití této práce jako školního díla podle § 60 odst. 1 autorského zákona, a s tím, že pokud dojde k užití této práce mnou nebo bude poskytnuta licence o užití jinému subjektu, je Univerzita Pardubice oprávněna ode mne požadovat přiměřený příspěvek na úhradu nákladů, které na vytvoření díla vynaložila, a to podle okolností až do jejich skutečné výše.

Beru na vědomí, že v souladu s § 47b zákona č. 111/1998 Sb., o vysokých školách a o změně a doplnění dalších zákonů (zákon o vysokých školách), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, a směrnicí Univerzity Pardubice č. 7/2019 Pravidla pro odevzdávání, zveřejňování a formální úpravu závěrečných prací, ve znění pozdějších dodatků, bude práce zveřejněna prostřednictvím Digitální knihovny Univerzity Pardubice.

V Pardubicích dne 10.3.2025

Aneta Pikhartová v. r.

NÁZEV

Člověk a pes v próze 20. století

ANOTACE

Tato diplomová práce se zaměřuje na téma člověk a pes v próze 20. století. K analýze ztvárnění psů a vztahů mezi psy a lidmi ve vybraných dílech používá obor animal studies a s ním spjaté koncepty. Mezi vybraná primární díla patří *The Call of the Wild* a *White Fang* od Jacka Londona, *Where the Red Fern Grows* od Wilsona Rawlse, *The Incredible Journey* od Sheily Burnford, *The Plague Dogs* od Richarda Adamse a *Kävik the Wolf Dog* od Walta Moreyho.

KLÍČOVÁ SLOVA

Animal Studies, psi, antropocentrismus, vztah člověka a psa

TITLE

Man and Dog in 20th Century Prose

ANNOTATION

This thesis looks at man and dog the 20th century prose. It uses the field of Animal Studies and its various concepts in order to analyze the portrayal of dogs and human-dog relationships in the selected works of fiction. These works include *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang* by Jack London, *Where the Red Fern Grows* by Wilson Rawls, *The Incredible Journey* by Sheila Burnford, *The Plague Dogs* by Richard Adams, and *Kävik the Wolf Dog* by Walt Morey.

KEYWORDS

Animal Studies, dogs, anthropocentrism, human-dog relationships

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This thesis focuses on the diverse portrayal of dogs and the relationships between man and dog in twentieth-century prose. The primary texts chosen for the analysis of this relationship are *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang* by Jack London, *Where the Red Fern Grows* by Wilson Rawls, *The Incredible Journey* by Sheila Burnford, *The Plague Dogs* by Richard Adams, and *Kävik the Wolf Dog* by Walt Morey.

These works, in particular, were chosen for various reasons. They are some of the more well-known books with canine protagonists or dog characters in central roles. Together, they feature a whole range of dog-human relationships, from loved family members to mere instruments, and they feature different types of exploitation and maltreatment, ranging from physical abuse as a form of punishment to inhumane experiments in laboratories. Among them, the inclusion of human characters is varied. Some have a human protagonist and narrator, and some contain human characters in relatively minor roles. The works contain varying degrees of anthropomorphism, ranging from talking human-like canine characters to more realistic portrayals of the animals. Some were written for children and some for adults. Lastly, some of these works were written at the beginning of the 20th century, while other texts were written in the second half of the 20th century. Thus, the selection of primary works based on these aspects helps reveal a broader range of types of human-dog relationships portrayed in 20th-century prose.

The thesis is divided into five chapters. The first chapter introduces the framework of Animal Studies used by this thesis to analyze the relationship between man and dog. The remaining chapters introduce the concepts of Animal Studies and analyze them in the chosen works of fiction: the second chapter introduces one of the most crucial concepts for this thesis, anthropocentrism; the third chapter focuses on anthropomorphism; the fourth chapter focuses on the diversity of human-animal relationships, another key concept of Animal Studies; the fifth and last chapter analyzes the rest of the selected key concepts, animal welfare and speciesism.

1. ANIMAL STUDIES

The portrayal of the human-dog relationship and the human-animal relationship in the selected texts written by Jack London, Richard Adams, Sheila Burnford, Walt Morey, and Wilson Rawls in the 20th century is varied and complex, ranging from precious companion animals that are to be loved and protected, through livestock that exists to serve as food or as a source of animal products, to viewing non-human animals as insentient objects only to be used for work or entertainment, regardless of their discomfort or suffering. In order to analyze the nuances of the human-animal relationship, it is necessary to identify and define the field of Animal Studies and its key concepts.

Mario Ortiz Robles defines Animal Studies as a relatively recent multidisciplinary field that studies animals in a variety of ways and that originated from humanistic social sciences.[1] Disciplines that contribute to Animal Studies with their distinct methodologies and questions still share a similar goal. As Julia Kindt argues, they "examine the manifold and complex ways in which humans relate to animals,"[2] and they explore "the ideas, motivations, and assumptions shaping these relationships as well as their social, economic and ethical impacts."[3] As Marion Copeland remarks, Animal Studies, being the next logical step for some scholars after feminist and ethnic criticism started to be seen as legitimate topics of literary studies, can be dated to the second half of the 20th century.[4] The factors that led to the field of Animal Studies emerging and the field itself also influence the twentieth-century literary depiction of animals, thus, they influence the portrayal of human-dog relationships in prose in this century.

Some scholars may even describe and compare the similarities between the movements mentioned above and Animal Studies. For example, similarly to women's studies, as Lynda Birke states, Animal Studies also grew "partly out of political movements of the 1970s, challenging different forms of oppression."[5] Not only do they both address a form of oppression, as Birke continues, but they also share other similarities. Both deal with the concept of rights, and both criticize Western cultures' tendency to distinguish between "us and others." However, both inevitably go in different directions as they pursue different concerns. Thus,

[1] Mario Ortiz Robles, *Literature and Animal Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2016), IX.
[2] Julia Kindt, "Review Article Capturing the Ancient Animal: Human/Animal Studies and the Classics," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 137, no. 1 (November 2017): 214.
[3] Kindt, "Review Article Capturing the Ancient Animal," 214.
[4] Marion W. Copeland, "Literary Animal Studies in 2012: Where We Are, Where We Are Going," *Anthrozoös* 25, no. 1 (2012): 91.
[5] Lynda Birke, "Intimate Familiarities? Feminism and Human-Animal Studies," *Society & Animals* 10, no. 4 (2002): 429.

women's studies generally do not focus on animals, and Animal Studies typically omit the issue of gender.[6] The concerns they share, especially distinguishing between "us and others," moral consideration of "others", and oppression, are crucial when analyzing human-dog relationships in prose.

As Geoff Hosey and Vicky Melfi observe, most papers published about human-animal relationships or human-animal interactions appear to be about companion animals in general or specifically about dogs or cats. Other common areas of study are, for example, laboratory animals, animals in the wild, and papers that do not restrict themselves to other areas. These were often published in journals such as *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *Anthrozoös*, or *Animal Welfare*. The number of publications is shown to have increased drastically since around 1993.[7] As Kindt remarks, this increase in various publications and journals concerning animal-related phenomena reflects: "an increased awareness in classical scholarship of the centrality of animals to numerous […] texts and contexts."[8] Moreover, some of the most prominent themes, according to Hosey and Melfi, in these papers are, for example, animal-welfare, characteristics of caretakers, and attitudes to animals.[9] The rise of publications regarding animals and some of the typical focuses or concepts also shows the growing importance and focus on animal welfare and, in turn, may influence the portrayal of animals in fiction in the 20th century.

As Kenneth Joel Shapiro states, the history of Animal Studies is restricted by the field's European and American perspectives, which determine the areas on which the field focuses. One of the first influences was the issue of laboratory animals, which was a central topic in the 19th century in the animal protection movement, then human-animal companion relationships, which was influenced by the growth of the popularity of companion animals in the 19th century, animals in agriculture, which started receiving worse treatment after the Second World War, and most recently also extinction rate of wildlife.[10] Furthermore, according to Copeland, the field emphasizes the existence of non-human animal sentience, languages, and complex communication among animals, which proves to be quite a controversial element of Animal Studies.[11] The ever-growing focus on animals and issues of animal welfare, as in the case of

[6] Birke, "Intimate Familiarities?," 429.
[7] Geoff Hosey, and Vicky Melfi, "Human-Animal Interactions, Relationships and Bonds: A Review and Analysis of the Literature," *International Journal of Comparative Psychology* 27, no. 1 (2014): 119–121.
[8] Kindt, "Review Article Capturing the Ancient Animal," 214.
[9] Hosey et al., "Human-Animal Interactions, Relationships and Bonds," 119–121.
[10] Kenneth Joel Shapiro, "Human-Animal Studies: Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, Troubling the Future," *Society & Animals* 28, no. 1 (November 2020): 804–805.
[11] Copeland, "Literary Animal Studies in 2012," 98.

laboratory animals and others, and the growing belief in at least some degree of sentience and intelligence of animals also influence works of fiction, such as Richard Adams' *The Plague Dogs* or Jack London's *White Fang* or *The Call of the Wild*.

Experts interested in this field come from different backgrounds. Thus, as Matthew Calarco observes, being concerned with diverse aspects, they introduce numerous approaches to Animal Studies, which leads to some debate among scholars about nomenclature and what the common goal is or should be.[12] Moreover, as Hosey and Melfi describe, the experts in the field work within their own contexts and have different "priorities, theories,[and] methodologies,"[13] however, some common themes are also present across the approaches.[14] As Calarco continues, these approaches, or frameworks, include Human-Animal Studies, Critical Animal Studies, and others. Human-Animal Studies is probably the most established and used approach to animal studies.[15]

As Matthew Calarco states, Critical Animal Studies and Human-Animal Studies are linked together by sharing similar theoretical foundations and history. However, they differ in their concerns. Critical Animal Studies focus on the ethico-political issues concerning non-human animals, and those connected to this framework generally value and care about animal rights and welfare. It is important to note that, as Matthew Calarco continues, scholars within this framework assert that the exploitation and maltreatment of non-human animals do not stem from any misconceptions. Instead, they are the results of the social and economical interests of the individuals from the various animal industries.[16] Thus, it can be inferred that the treatment of non-human animals is believed, in this framework, to be heavily dependent on anthropocentrism, which is one of the key aspects of Animal Studies that will be defined later in this thesis. However, as Calarco concludes, while the ethico-political issues are a key concern of Critical Animal Studies, it forms only a peripheral part of Human-Animal Studies.[17]

As Shapiro states, the recently emerged Human-Animal Studies, or HAS is defined by "its subject matter, not by any single methodological approach," with the subject matter being the complexity and variety of human-animal relationships as the framework's name suggests.[18] Shapiro further defines the term "relationship," which is important for the framework, as the space that exists between two entities. Despite being logical and self-evident, this definition is

[12] Matthew R. Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts* (New York: Routledge, 2021), ix–x.
[13] Hosey et al., "Human-Animal Interactions, Relationships and Bonds," 118.
[14] Hosey et al., "Human-Animal Interactions, Relationships and Bonds," 118.
[15] Calarco, *Animal Studies*, ix–xi.
[16] Calarco, *Animal Studies*, x.
[17] Calarco, *Animal Studies*, x.
[18] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 5.

not always respected in practice. It is also important to note that both entities in a relationship influence the relationship, at least to some degree. As Calarco continues, there are some issues with studying specifically a human-animal relationship. First, one of the issues stems from the fact that both studied entities are different species. Second, the relationship is more strongly influenced by one entity than the other. The third issue is that a relationship is typically thought to exist between two individual entities. However, in Human-Animal Studies, the relationships are also influenced by the studies of species.[19] As Garry Marvin and Susan McHugh suggest, some of the questions asked by the HAS scholars regarding human-animal relationships are for example "Why animals are represented and configured in different ways in human cultures and societies around the world; how they are imagined, experienced, and given significance; what these relationships might signify about being human."[20] The name of the field itself is problematic. As Kenneth Shapiro argues, many scholars dismiss the name "Animal Studies" and use "Human-Animal Studies" instead due to the possible confusion that usage of "Animal Studies" may lead to because the term is also used for other than human-animal-relationship phenomena.[21]

As was already mentioned, HAS is a relatively new field that, according to Calarco, is usually thought to have started in the 1970s or 1980s with the works *Animal Liberation* by Peter Singer and *The Case for Animal Rights* by Tom Regan.[22] According to Maha Mohamed Hosny Mostafa, the emphasis in HAS is placed on the study of relationships between humans and non-human animals and not on the study of animals themselves. This emphasis on the relationship distinguishes this field from other fields that focus on the study of animals, such as ethology, zoology, or primatology. It is one of the only fields and approaches, including CAS, that consider human-animal relationships seriously.[23] As Kenneth Joel Shapiro remarks, no field other than Human-Animal Studies examines and studies the human-animal relationships. Although there are fields that, for example, study the behavioral tendencies of non-human animals they never primarily focus on the relationships between humans and non-human animals.[24]

---

[19] Shapiro, "Human-Animal Studies: Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, Troubling the Future," 800–801.
[20] Garry Marvin and Susan McHugh, "In it together: an introduction to human-animal studies," in *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies*, ed. Garry Marvin and Susan McHugh (New York: Routledge, 2014), 2.
[21] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 8.
[22] Calarco, *Animal Studies*, 9.
[23] Maha Mohamed Hosny Mostafa, "The animal turn in fiction: An animal-centric analysis of A Dog's Purpose and Anthill," *International Journal of English and Literature* 6, no. 9 (September 2015): 151.
[24] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 1–5.

Another approach connected with Animal Studies is Literary Animal Studies, also called, as Roland Borgards states, Cultural Literary Animal Studies.[25] This approach, as Copeland summarizes, started at a similar time as most other approaches that are a part of Animal Studies, and it combines the focus of Human-Animal Studies and Animal Studies. Thus, because of the former, it analyzes the literary portrayal of human-animal relationship, however, because of the latter, the primary focus is usually on non-human animals rather than humans.[26] Many believe this form of literary criticism should not be seen as inferior to other approaches, such as feminist, Marxist, or post-colonial, as Shapiro and Copeland remark in their work.[27] According to Copeland, the previously mentioned controversial element of Animal Studies regarding the rising belief in non-human animal sentience and complex communication morphs into a fundamental question in Literary Animal Studies: whether non-human characters in literature are fantasy elements or elements of literary realism.[28]

As Borgards states, the distinction between real animals and literary animals has always been an "unquestioned assumption of literary criticism"[29] and is one of the assumptions that Literary Animal Studies questions. This form of literary criticism has, therefore, led not only to an increase in the number of scholarly articles being published but also to a "revision of the established concepts and terminology, especially concerning traditional dichotomies such as human and animal, subject and object, action and behavior, or culture and nature."[30] Thus, as Borgards continues, Literary Animal Studies focuses on three aspects. First, it introduces animals "as an independent topic of literary history."[31] Second, it questions traditional concepts, such as the dichotomy of human and animal. And third, it revises its own methods, which scholars can use to analyze literary animals.[32]

Surprisingly, as Laurie Adams Frost points out, fiction that contains the human-animal relationship is relatively uncommon despite the popularity of various guides for animal care and art books focused on animals.[33] Despite this, some fiction includes human-animal relationships. As Shapiro states, animals may be present in a range of fiction works, including

---

[25] Roland Borgards, "Introduction: Cultural and Literary Animal Studies." *De Gruyter* 9, no. 2 (September 2015): 155.
[26] Copeland, "Literary Animal Studies in 2012," 98.
[27] Kenneth Shapiro, and Marion W. Copeland, "Toward a Critical Theory of Animal Issues in Fiction," *Society & Animals* 13, no. 4 (December 2005): 343.
[28] Copeland, "Literary Animal Studies in 2012," 98.
[29] Borgards, "Introduction," 155.
[30] Borgards, "Introduction," 155.
[31] Borgards, "Introduction," 157.
[32] Borgards, "Introduction," 157.
[33] Laurie Adams Frost, "Pets and Lovers: The Human-Companion Animal Bond in Contemporary Literary Prose," *Journal of Popular Culture* 25, no. 1 (summer 1991): 39–40.

children's literature, young adult literature, and adult fiction. All of these may feature animals differently. Children's literature may omit human characters altogether, while adult fiction may feature animals via metaphorical utterances, in titular roles, or as an absent referent. Thus, it is possible to analyze a book using Literary Animal Studies as the framework regardless of the role the animal has in the particular work of fiction, and even when living animals are otherwise absent.[34] Because one of the focuses of Literary Animal Studies is, for example, the analysis of the, as Shapiro calls it, "reductive and disrespectful"[35] treatment of non-human animals. As Kenneth Joel Shapiro continues, this treatment may be obvious, for example, when the characters view an animal as a tool, but may be more subtle, present even in animals that are "given a name, a character, and a rich consciousness."[36] Because there are usually only a few behaviors specific to the species and personality traits, and the animal is almost a human covered in fur and actually "absent."[37] Thus, according to Shapiro, another focus of Literary Animal Studies is the evaluation of the degree to which the presented animal is actually represented as itself, as an individual, and as its specific species.

There are various important and key concepts of animal studies depending on the study's goal, focus, field, and other factors. The significant concepts in the following chapters have been chosen as they are essential for analyzing the human-dog relationship in 20th-century prose. These concepts are anthropocentrism, anthropomorphism, animal welfare, and speciesism. Some other concepts will also be described while analyzing these primary concepts.

[34] Shapiro, "Toward a Critical Theory of Animal Issues in Fiction," 343.
[35] Shapiro, "Toward a Critical Theory of Animal Issues in Fiction," 344.
[36] Shapiro, "Toward a Critical Theory of Animal Issues in Fiction," 344.
[37] Shapiro, "Toward a Critical Theory of Animal Issues in Fiction," 344.

ANTHROPOCENTRISM

The first key concept of Animal Studies that influences the depiction of the human-dog relationship in the selected primary literature is anthropocentrism. It is, according to Fiona Probyn-Rapsey, a core concept and problem in the field of Animal Studies that is not easy to define precisely. By many, it is seen as something inevitable and misunderstood, and by others, it is seen as a political problem that needs to be addressed.[38] Matthew Calarco describes it as an often criticized belief that non-human animals are inferior to human beings. Because of the human anthropocentric attitude, human existence is always the center of attention, and there is a strong tendency to demonstrate human exceptionality and remarkability.[39] As Helen Kopnina et al. state, anthropocentrism leads to non-human animals being seen as mere "means to an end" and values in nature being seen as centered around humans rather than non-human-centered.[40] A clear example of human anthropocentric attitude is shown by Dominic Pettman – when a person is asked "how a particular animal feels," the person is likely to answer how the animal appears to him or her, such as "furry" or "scaly," rather than how the animal may experience the world. Because the question can lead to both answers, and the anthropocentric tendency of people leads to the first answer being more common.[41] Anthropocentrism is an old belief that is particularly prominent in Western cultures. Typical features include a focus on human exceptionalism, belief in the existence of strict and clear differences between humans and animals, ranking humans over non-human animals because of human moral hierarchy, and the existence of institutions that protect beings that are seen as fully human.[42]

Regarding the distinctions between humans and non-human animals, as Calarco states, the characteristics that are thought to be human are usually said to be absent in animals, thus enforcing the anthropocentric view of human superiority and uniqueness and implying a certain degree of deficiency in animals. Among traits that are said to be lacking in animals are language, agency, mind, and rationality.[43] This belief that animals are deficient and lacking such crucial traits affects the human approach to animals and may also influence the portrayal of animals in literature.

---

[38] Fiona Probyn-Rapsey, "Anthropocentrism," in *Critical Terms for Animal Studies*, ed. Lori Gruen (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018), 47–52.
[39] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 18.
[40] Helen Kopnina, Haydn Washington, Bron Taylor, and John J. Piccolo, "Anthropocentrism: More than Just a Misunderstood Problem," *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 31, no. 1 (January 2018): 109–110.
[41] Dominic Pettman, "Affection," in *The Edinburgh Companion to Animal Studies*, ed. Lynn Turner, Undine Sellbach and Ron Broglio (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018), 31.
[42] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 18.
[43] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 19.

The effects of anthropocentrism can be seen in various other aspects and themes in the selected fiction, and they heavily influence the portrayal of the human-animal relationship in the story. The anthropocentric attitude influences the existence of companion animals, different types of relationships between humans and dogs, the differences made between domestic and wild animals, especially when it comes to hunting, the level of care that is provided to the animals based on the type of human-animal relationship, the differences made between dogs and other domestic animals, and other.

An interesting consequence of anthropocentrism is noticeable when analyzing the human-dog relationship in some of the selected primary texts. Regardless of the type of relationship between an owner and their dog, the former always sees his or her dog as more important than other animals, including other dogs. Even a human character that approaches his or her dog as a living sentient being with a certain level of individuality and cares about its welfare may readily disregard the needs of other animals. An example of this attitude can be seen in Walt Morey's *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, in which the boy protagonist rescues and saves Kävik's life several times although the dog is not his and grows quite fond of him. As a consequence of his injuries, Kävik is terrified of the other dogs in the town early on in the story. The canine hero allows the other dogs to bully him and flees before them despite his considerable strength and size, which frustrates the boy. Toward the end of the book, when Kävik returns to the boy, he no longer allows the stray dogs to bully him, and he kills one of them when they try to attack him. The boy is not distraught because of the stray dog's death nor because of the injuries the other dogs sustained. Instead, he is happy and "excited" that his dog won and cannot be called "a rabbit" by the townsfolk anymore: "[Andy] was shaking with excitement, and his voice was a little high. 'Did you call him Rabbit, Pinky? You still think he's a rabbit?'"[44]

In Wilson Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows*, a minor human character also expresses happiness when he believes that his dog will win the fight against the protagonist's dogs, and he allows his dog to attack them: "[Rubin] laughed, 'While my dog is whipping yours, I think I'll just work you over a little.'"[45] However, when the character realizes that it is his dog that may end up losing the fight, his attitude completely changes, and he wants to kill the dogs to save his: "Rubin darted over to one side, grabbed my ax from the ground, and said in a loud voice, 'I'll kill them damn hounds.'"[46] Similar examples may also be found in other selected

[44] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 187.
[45] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 125.
[46] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 125.

primary texts. For example, in *The Plague Dogs* it is said that pets are not frequently sold to the laboratories: "That's an exceptional situation, of course. In the normal way domesticated animals—people's pets—aren't easy to come by for this work, as you can well believe,"[47] which implies that people generally do not wish for their pets to suffer in the experiments, however, they do not care when the animals suffering are not theirs. In *White Fang*, Gray Beaver ignores the canine's suffering because he no longer belongs to him: "Gray Beaver looked on stolidly while the white man wielded the whip. He gave no protection. It was no longer his dog."[48] In the same book, the owner of Lip-lip does not mind his dog bullying White Fang, but it is implied he would react if someone punished his dog: "In the past [Mit-sah] had observed Lip-lip's persecution of White Fang; but at that time Lip-lip was another man's dog, and Mit-sah had never dared more than to shy an occasional stone at him."[49] These situations show the tendency of humans to view animals anthropocentrically based on not only their usefulness but also the relationship they formed with them, which then influences the value of animal life and the degree of ethical consideration that the animals are given. Thus, animals that the person connects with or owns are more worthy of life. And animals that belong to someone the character dislikes barely receive ethical consideration.

Anthropocentric attitudes in these works transpire through the human attitude toward other components of nature besides dogs. For example, early in the story of Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows*, when the protagonist's dogs are not yet proficient trackers and hunters, he promises them that once they trap their first raccoon in a tree, he will catch it regardless of the cost. However, when they manage to force a raccoon to climb up a tree, it chooses the largest and oldest tree in the area that the narrator describes as a "king": "the [tree] in which my dogs had treed was the giant of them all. […] Like a king in his own domain, it towered far above the smaller trees."[50] It was impossible for the boy to climb up because of the size of the tree, nor could he shoot the raccoon as he did not have a gun. Felling the tree would be challenging. After contemplating his options, he angrily decided to fell the tree: "A wave of anger came over me. Gritting my teeth, I said, 'I don't care how big you are, I'm not going to let my dogs down. I told them if they put a coon in a tree I would do the rest and I'm going to. I'm going to cut you down.'"[51] This situation can be seen as a result of an anthropocentric view. An ordinary teenage boy destroys an ancient and gigantic tree that is described as a "king" of the other trees

[47] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 196.
[48] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 161.
[49] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 141.
[50] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 70.
[51] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 71.

simply because the boy has the ability to do it and wants to catch a raccoon. This situation perhaps shows an attitude of the characters in the book that humans are perceived to be either much higher in the hierarchy than nature, even this "king," or that they are no longer part of such hierarchy, of nature, and thus able to do whatever they set their mind to regardless of what they may end up destroying. This situation also shows difference in human attitude toward wildlife and dogs, as the character is willing to go to great lengths to kill an innocent wild being simply because he made a promise to his dogs that he is determined to keep.

In the case of the previously mentioned sycamore tree, the plant that is called a "king", yet it still becomes a victim of human whims. It is evident that human beings in Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows* are perceived as a stronger, more important force. In the same book, the importance of human desires is emphasized also by nature, or God, aiding the boy when needed. Often, the boy would pray to God for help, such as in the case of felling the giant sycamore tree: "Please God, give me the strength to finish the job. I don't want to leave the big tree like that. Please help me finish the job,"[52] and his wishes more often than not come true. The wind helps him with felling the stubborn tree, and it seems to him that the wind is also frustrated when the tree tries to resist its force: "The wind itself seemed to be angry at the big tree's stubborn resistance."[53] The boy believes God helped him get his two pups because of his prayer: "I thought of the prayer I had said when I asked God to help me get two hound pups. I knew He had surely helped, for He had given me the heart, courage, and determination,"[54] God also helpes him, because of his prayer, save his dog when he falls through ice: "I asked for a miracle which would save the life of my little dog."[55] Moreover, it is, supposedly, God who takes his dogs' lives, for even God himself sees human families staying together as more important than the lives of non-human animals: "But I guess the Good Lord didn't want that to happen. He doesn't like to see families split up. That's why they were taken away."[56] It is irrelevant whether the incidents were indeed the works of God or whether it was just the boy's and his family's beliefs. Regardless, these situations show a heavily anthropocentric attitude of the human characters in the book. As is implied throughout the story and shown in the quotes above, the human characters believe that human beings and their desires are more important not only to other humans but also to God. In their anthropocentric view, the lives of other living creatures are inferior to those of human beings, and they believe that God agrees with this view.

[52] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 85.
[53] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 85.
[54] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 23.
[55] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 103.
[56] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 205.

Furthermore, they believe that it is not only their lives that are more important to God but also their desires, such as not wanting the family to be split for a time. Thus, the dogs dying for the family to be together is seen as the lesser evil and is believed to be seen as the lesser evil in God's eyes as well.

Although the sycamore tree's nickname, given to it by the main character in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* is "king", it is not seen as superior or overly important to humans and it eventually succumbs to human whims. It is the human beings who are in the selected works of fiction frequently seen as superior, reinforcing the anthropocentric view and the exceptionality of humankind. These titles that imply human superiority are perhaps the most noticeable in the case of Jack London's novel *White Fang*, in which the eponymous character starts his life without any knowledge of human beings and only meets a human when he is several weeks old. Their presence and power are described as "godlike" and "beyond natural": "To his mind this was power unusual, power inconceivable and beyond the natural, power that was godlike,"[57] because human beings are so much higher in the hierarchy than other non-human animals that they no longer resemble anything natural even to a small wolf-dog puppy. This quote is supposed to reflect only the mind of the animal in the work, yet it also reflects the attitude of the writer, who attributed these thoughts and beliefs in human superiority to the wolf-canine character. The superiority of humans over dogs in Jack London's works is not only heavily implied by the terms used, such as "god," "master," or "owner,"[58] but also explicitly stated throughout the books, for example, in *White Fang* humans are said to be "superior creatures of a verity, gods,"[59] and "lords" over all animals: "two-legged animal that was lord over living things."[60] Although the term "god" is not frequently used in other literature when describing the relationship between humans and dogs, the other mentioned terms are often used throughout the other selected works of fiction. In *The Plague Dogs,* the humans taking care of dogs are "masters": "I wish I could see my master just once again,"[61] as are the humans in *Where the Red Fern Grows*: "He was going home to the master he loved,"[62] and in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*: "and [he was] ready to lunge forward again at the command of his master."[63] In *The Incredible Journey,* the humans are "masters": "[Luath was] running as fast as his legs would carry him

[57] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 126.
[58] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 161, 55, 160.
[59] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 129.
[60] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 123.
[61] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 365.
[62] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 10.
[63] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 15.

towards his master,"[64] and also "owners": "Elizabeth was the self-appointed owner of the cat."[65] The anthropocentric attitude and belief in non-human animal inferiority is evident when considering the terms used for describing humans in the human-animal relationship.

Similarly, the terms used for the animals in human care also reveal the anthropocentric attitude. As Paul Waldau states, the relationship between humans and companion animals is a relationship of dominance, and the superiority of humans in such a relationship can be seen in the terms used for the companion animals, such as "pet" or even "domesticated animal."[66] The dogs and other companion animals in the selected primary literature are most often called "pets," such as in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*: "Andy had never had a pet to love before,"[67] in *The Incredible Journey*: "And above all they could not wait to see their pets,"[68] and in *Where the Red Fern Grows*: "Little Ann was my sisters' pet."[69] Furthermore, as Paul Waldau remarks, humans call the animals they bring into their homes companion animals. However, the term is never used for humans, even though humans are also animals that act as companions to non-human animals. As such, this term helps further divide the world into two parts, humans and non-human animals.[70] So, although the term could serve as a more neutral descriptor of the relationship between an animal that accompanies its human and vice versa, it is only used for animals. As such, it enforces the anthropocentric view of animals as inferior to humans. The term "companion" is seldom used in the selected texts and can be found only in Jack London's *The Call of the Wild*: "[Buck's] father, Elmo, a huge St. Bernard, had been the Judge's inseparable companion,"[71] which shows that terms that more strongly denote human superiority in the human-dog relationship are preferred when describing the animals. Furthermore, possessive pronouns used when talking about a companion animal, for example, in the already quoted passage from *Where the Red Fern Grows*: "Little Ann was my sisters' pet,"[72] also show a hierarchically structured relationship where one is in possession of the other. All of these, be it the possessive pronouns or the terms for humans or animals in the human-animal relationship, show an anthropocentric attitude as humankind is always in the superior position in such relationships, and dogs and domesticated animals are human property.

---

[64] Sheila Burnford, *The Incredible Journey* (London: The Book Club, 1961), 147.
[65] Sheila Burnford, *The Incredible Journey* (London: The Book Club, 1961), 22.
[66] Paul Waldau, *Animal Studies: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 26.
[67] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 82.
[68] Sheila Burnford, *The Incredible Journey* (London: The Book Club, 1961), 131.
[69] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 91.
[70] Waldau, *Animal Studies: An Introduction,* 19.
[71] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 24.
[72] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 91.

The belief in human superiority over non-human animals can be seen even in the term "animal" and, by extension, in the name of the field of Animal Studies, Human-Animal Studies, as well as in the approaches within the field of Animal Studies. As Shapiro remarks, the word "animal" is commonly used to refer exclusively to non-human animals, even though human beings belong to a subcategory of animals.[73] As Shapiro explains: "historically, the rationale […] for committing this categorical error was to enable the use of animals as a foil for understanding human beings,"[74] because "it was contended that unlike other animals, humans have unique capabilities,"[75] or, in other words, because humans were thought to be exceptional and separate from animals. Using the term "animals" without referring to humans means separating the human race from all other non-human animals. Therefore, as he continues, using the term "Human-Animal Studies" is "as incoherent as saying 'carrots and vegetables.'"[76] Some scholars and activists for animal rights prefer using the term "non-human animals" instead so as to show that human beings also belong to the category of animals. This "categorical error" is also present in literature and all of the selected works, for example, it can be seen in the following quote from *Kävik the Wolf Dog*: "'A vet doesn't doctor people,' Dr. Walker said, 'and I don't doctor animals.'"[77] As can be seen, anthropocentrism is a highly influential concept that affects human thinking regarding animals. It leads to the belief that humans are not related to animals in any way, enforced by rejecting their inclusion in the term "animal" despite humans biologically belonging to a subcategory of animals.

The importance of anthropocentrism in the field of Animal Studies and, consequently, in this thesis is indisputable. As Shapiro states in his book, anthropocentrism is generally a part of human perception of animals: "Our views of nonhuman animals in general and of a particular species […] are often prejudiced and anthropocentric, consisting of layers of ideological and linguistic biases that serve only human interests."[78] Not only is anthropocentrism present in all of the chosen primary literary sources regardless of whether there is a human or non-human animal protagonist, but its influence is also evident in various aspects and concepts of Animal Studies, such as, for example, anthropomorphism and speciesism.

[73] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 9.
[74] Shapiro, "Human-Animal Studies: Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, Troubling the Future," 802.
[75] Shapiro, "Human-Animal Studies: Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, Troubling the Future," 802.
[76] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 7.
[77] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 48.
[78] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 1.

ANTHROPOMORPHISM

The second key concept of Animal Studies is anthropomorphism. Matthew Calarco defines anthropomorphism as attributing human features and characteristics to non-human animals and other non-human beings.[79] According to Madhu Sharama, anthropomorphism can be seen as a consequence of humans' anthropocentric and egocentric views of the world. Human beings see themselves as the centers of the universe and perceive the world and all its components, living and non-living, as only having meaning in relation to them, which helps them feel in control of the world and minimize the effects of the fear of the unknown and unfamiliar. For humans, anthropomorphism is a method of getting power and control and a way of trying to understand and explain the behavior or nature of non-human beings and non-living objects.[80] As such, anthropomorphism is an influential tendency that affects the selected primary literary works and the portrayal of human-dog relationships.

The attribution of human characteristics to any non-human objects or animals, or anthropomorphism, is, for human beings, as Sharama states, a "universal tendency."[81] There are three main psychological reasons as to why and when people anthropomorphize, as Nicholas Epley et al. state: "elicited agent knowledge,"[82] "sociality motivation,"[83] and "effectance motivation."[84] They further explain these terms as follows. Elicited agent knowledge is the already acquired knowledge of a person about an object or animal. Effectance motivation is the desire to understand other agents. And sociality motivation is the desire for socialization with other humans. Furthermore, according to their theory, the tendency to anthropomorphize an object or non-human animal is high if the person's elicited agent knowledge is low, while effectance motivation and sociality motivation are high.[85] For example, as Sharama illustrates, if a child of working parents feels alone, he or she is more likely and more willing to connect with anthropomorphic toys.[86] Thus, some agents have stronger tendencies to anthropomorphize objects and animals.

---

[79] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 22.
[80] Madhu Sharama, "Animals as Humans: Psychological Reasons of Using Animal Characters in Children's Books," *Research Journal of English Language and Literature* 5, no. 4 (October 2017): 215–217.
[81] Sharama, "Animals as Humans," 215.
[82] Nicholas Epley, Adam Waytz, and John T. Cacioppo. "On Seeing Human: A Three-Factor Theory of Anthropomorphism." Psychological Review 114, no. 1 (November 2007): 864.
[83] Epley et al., "On Seeing Human," 864.
[84] Epley et al., "On Seeing Human," 864.
[85] Epley et al., "On Seeing Human," 864.
[86] Sharama, "Animals as Humans," 217.

The importance of these three factors for anthropomorphizing animals can be seen even in literary characters, for example, in Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows*. The protagonist and narrator of the story is a boy who has certain knowledge about dogs and their behavior, which is evident from the fact that he knows how to approach their training from the very beginning without being taught. He has a high desire to understand them because he likes them and wants to treat them well and be fair to them, which can be seen in the situation when he apologizes to Little Ann for doubting her once he realizes his mistake: "There was a lump in my throat as I said, 'I'm sorry, little girl, I should've known.'"[87] Moreover, it is also heavily implied that he does not socialize with other children of similar age often. As he does not understand their playing: "Staring goggle-eyed, trying to figure out what they were doing, I got a surprise,"[88] and is homeschooled: "[The boy asked:] 'You go to school at home?' I nodded."[89] Thus, he appears to have medium elicited agent knowledge, high sociality motivation, and high effectance motivation, allowing him to anthropomorphize his dogs and their behavior. For example, he tends to see his dogs, a female and a male, exhibit certain traits that are sometimes seen as stereotypical characteristics of men and women. He perceives the male dog as less relying on intelligence and more on brute force: "He was just acting tough because he was a boy dog,"[90] while the female dog is seen as relying on intelligence and avoiding fighting when possible: "I looked Little Ann over and couldn't see any scars. I laughed because I knew why. She was too smart to walk right up in the face of a fight. She would wait until Old Dan took hold and then dart in,"[91] and it is the girl dog that he chooses for a dog show because of her lack of scars as opposed to the boy dog's scarred head: "I started to untie Old Dan but, taking a closer look at him, I could see he could never win a beauty contest. His face and ears were a mass of old scars."[92] It appears that the three main psychological reasons for anthropomorphizing animals are also present in fictional human characters in literature, which influences their attitude toward animals.

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, due to anthropocentrism, real animals are often thought to lack certain characteristics that are considered exclusive to humans. These include language, agency, mind, and rationality. To some degree, this belief is also present in the selected primary literature, however, it is not very prominent. Whether a dog character has

[87] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 83.
[88] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 32.
[89] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 32.
[90] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 133.
[91] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 152.
[92] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 152.

or is portrayed as having these characteristics heavily depends on the degree of anthropomorphism. The more anthropomorphized a dog character is, or the more human characteristics are attributed to it, the more it is implied that the animal does have agency, mind, language, and rationality.

To analyze the features of this belief in the selected primary literature, it is necessary to identify what precisely these characteristics mean as concepts in the field of Animal Studies. First is the mind. As Calarco describes, the question of whether animals have minds started to be asked only recently, and until then, all behavior was thought to be pure instincts that are not conscious. Some issues considered regarding whether animals have minds are whether they are self-aware and can differentiate others and themselves, whether they can react to their environment in ways that are not instinctual or conditioned behaviors, and similar.[93] John Searle includes consciousness, intentionality, and thought processes in the concept of animal mind. And although nowadays, as he adds, few would argue that animals lack these entirely, most believe they do not have the capacity for intentionality or thought processes. Searle argues that such a fact seems improbable given the similarities between the brains of higher mammals.[94] Second is the language. According to Calarco, unlike some other characteristics that are now accepted as existing in animals, at least to some degree, many still believe language to be exclusively human. Although animal communication includes various actions such as vocalization, facial expressions, or gestures, it is argued that certain characteristics, if not all, that are typical for human language are missing in non-human animal communication. These include, for example, using language symbolically regarding objects that are not real or present. Thus, there have been various experiments to study animal capability to be taught human language and also various studies of how animals communicate among themselves. Such studies reinforce the anthropocentric perspective by analyzing animal communication based on features typical for human communication.[95] Last is agency. As Matthew Calarco claims, agency is seen as the ability to act and make choices that are not unconscious instinct behavior.[96] According to Hans-Johann Glock, agency, together with rationality, are tied to other concepts that include behavior, action, reason, intention, and goal. Questions asked when identifying agency and rationality are whether the animals act or only behave, whether they behave intelligently and rationally, whether the animals can reason, and whether there is some reason

[93] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 97–99.
[94] John R. Searle, "Animal Minds," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 19, no. 1 (1994): 206–208.
[95] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 89–92.
[96] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 7–8.

behind their behavior.[97] While frequently thought not to be present in real animals, these characteristics appear to be present, at least to some degree, in the literary ones.

The differences in the presence of these characteristics in the selected primary texts are especially visible when comparing *The Plague Dogs* with the other selected works. *The Plague Dogs* undoubtedly contains more anthropomorphism than the other works as the book features animals that are capable of speaking in a human language and in different dialects, and the dogs' own creation myth. It is evident that the canine protagonists, Rowf and Snitter, have their own minds as they are capable of forming their thoughts, have their own beliefs that are not results of their instincts, they can differentiate between themselves and the other animals, and they are self-aware. It is, for example, clear that Snitter can understand how the humans will behave once they see he and Rowf devoured a dead man: "The men will never rest now, never, until they've killed us; not after this,"[98] Rowf then proceeds to explain why the humans should understand it: "Because of the man? We were starving. They can't—,"[99] however Snitter knows they will not understand the dogs' point of view: "They won't see it like that."[100] This situation clearly shows the dogs' ability to understand another species' point of view and, by extension, theory of mind. Theory of mind is, as Derek Penn and Daniel Povinelli state, the ability to understand that other beings have their own mental states, perceptions, and beliefs that may be unobservable from the outside. Despite some research, there is no agreement between scientists on whether animals may possess such an ability, as there is a lack of evidence regarding this issue.[101] It is clear that Rowf and Snitter possess this ability, which points to the existence of the mind.

Furthermore, at some point, Rowf retells a story, which he was told by his mother and which other dogs know as well, that "there's a great dog up in the sky,"[102] and that "it was he, this dog, long ago, who had a great idea of creating all the animals and birds."[103] This story shows that the dogs have their own creation myth and God in which they believe. Thus, it is established that the dogs in this universe have their own God, self-awareness, and mind.

---

[97] Hans-Johann Glock, "Agency, Intelligence, and Reasons in Animals," *Philosophy* 94, no. 4 (October 2019): 645–646.
[98] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 318.
[99] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 318.
[100] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 318.
[101] Derek C. Penn et al., "On the lack of evidence that non-human animals possess anything remotely resembling a 'theory of mind,'" *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 362, no. 1 (2007): 731.
[102] Richard Adams, *The Plague Dogs* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2007), 124.
[103] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 124.

The dog characters also have agency, as they have various goals for where to go and what they want to achieve by doing specific actions, neither of which are results of instincts. Example of agency can be seen in the following utterance: "There's a place, Rowf, a place—secret, dry, out of the rain. I believe we couldn't be found there,"[104] which is said by Snitter, when he tries to persuade Rowf to hide in a cavern, which he believes is "secret" because "there were no signs of human use or occupation, no sounds from inside the cavern, no man-smells that he could perceive."[105] Thus, this situation shows that he is capable of choosing where to go, analyzing the situation, returning to his friend of his own volition, and explaining why hiding there is a good idea. Furthermore, the dogs can rationalize what is happening to them, why something did not work as intended, and how to do it correctly next time. This can be seen, for example, in the following situation: "The first sheep went down the fell because you dashed in too fast and panicked it. Hold back and let this one keep on along the trod."[106] These situations show that the dogs have agency as they are capable of creating complex plans, revising their ideas, and improving their plans when they fail.

Lastly, they, of course, also have a language as they are capable of communicating using the English language not only about their immediate surroundings but also symbolically about their future plans or past events. They can hypothesize and create relatively complex structures that show their understanding of grammar. This is shown, for example, in the following quote: "Rowf, we'll leave it till after the tobacco man's been round. Otherwise he'll only see me on your side and put me back, and that'll be the end of that. Let it alone, old Rowf."[107] As such, their language use appears to be identical to that of the human beings in the same book.

However, the rest of the selected primary texts do not contain anthropomorphism to such an extreme degree, where the dog protagonists can almost be replaced with human characters without drastic changes regarding their behavior and communication. With fewer human characteristics being attributed to the dog characters, there is also less evidence showing the animals do not lack the previously mentioned characteristics, typically thought to be human-exclusive.

The most evident distinction is language, as there is no dialog or monolog by an animal character to be found in the rest of the texts. Although the canine characters do interact with other dogs or animals, they do not appear to have any complex communication. The animals

[104] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 76.
[105] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 76.
[106] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 70.
[107] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 18.

communicate their immediate thoughts using body language, facial expressions, gaze, or simple vocalization, which can be seen, for example, in *The Incredible Journey*: "The Labrador walked down the driveway and stood at the curve, looking back as though inviting the others to come,"[108] and: "But when the old dog advanced with a hopeful wag of his tail, the cat, growling, retreated into the bushes with his prey."[109] In *Where the Red Fern Grows*, the dogs use such communication also with the human protagonist: "He growled at me and showed his teeth."[110] However, the animals in these works do not have language like the animals in Adams' *The Plague Dogs* as they are not described as, for example, communicating symbolically, such as about past events or possible future events. Therefore, they lack the characteristics of communication that are perceived as language. However, the human characters may occasionally attribute more complex thoughts and language to the animals. This can be seen, for example, in the following quote from *Where the Red Fern Grows*: "Old Dan swallowed his [food] down in one gulp, and looked at me as if to say, "Is that all?" Little Ann ate hers in a ladylike way. I could have sworn I saw a small grin on her face."[111] As such, animals in these works do not appear to possess language, yet the characteristics typical of human communication may still be attributed to them by the human characters, potentially as a result of anthropomorphism.

Regarding whether the animals in these works have a mind, it is more ambivalent and dependent on interpretation. It is also influenced by who the protagonist is because in the case of the canines being the main characters, there is a more significant degree of anthropomorphism than in the case of a human being the main character. Therefore, the existence of mind is perhaps most debatable in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* where the protagonist and the narrator is the owner of the dogs. Because the reader only ever sees the owner's point of view. In the rest of the works, the protagonists are canine characters. In these works, there appear to be more implications for dogs having minds. Some of these might, however, be seen as signs of anthropomorphism or instinctual behavior.

However, even in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* there are instances of the dogs, for example, showing awareness of how a different animal thinks or behaves: "It didn't take him long to realize that a smart old coon didn't always run in a straight line."[112] Examples of other potentially conscious behaviors are also in the other works. For example, in *Kävik the Wolf*

[108] Sheila Burnford, *The Incredible Journey* (London: The Book Club, 1961), 32.
[109] Sheila Burnford, *The Incredible Journey* (London: The Book Club, 1961), 37.
[110] Wilson Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows* (New York: Laurel-Leaf, 1961), 8.
[111] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 156.
[112] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 61.

Dog, the canine protagonist appears to know he has to hide behind an object not to be seen by the dog catchers: "He raced to the end of the alley and was confronted by a concrete wall. He turned. The uniformed man and another entered the mouth of the alley. Kavik flattened himself behind the garbage can, and waited." This situation, however, depends entirely on the interpretation of the behavior. As it might be argued that he cowered out of fear and happened to be behind the garbage can by chance.

When it comes to the works by Jack London, Aleksandra Hernandez states that his novels show his belief in the complexity of animals' emotional lives.[113] An example of a dog character's mind can be seen in *The Call of the Wild*, in which the main character, Buck, thinks about his life with his original family: "Sometimes he thought of Judge Miller's big house in the sun-kissed Santa Clara Valley, and of the cement swimming-tank, and Ysabel, the Mexican hairless, and Toots, the Japanese pug,"[114] or when Buck dreams in front of a fire: "Sometimes as he crouched there, blinking dreamily at the flames, it seemed that the flames were of another fire, and that as he crouched by this other fire he saw another and different man from the half-breed cook before him."[115] Another example may be found in *White Fang*, in which the protagonist has nightmares after being injured: "But there was one particular nightmare from which he suffered—the clanking, clanging monsters of electric cars that were to him colossal screaming lynxes."[116] However, as Hernandez points out: "Buck's thought-processes do resemble the narrator's anthropocentric logic too closely at times,"[117] and the same could likely be said about the canine hero White Fang and possibly about the canine protagonists from the other selected works of fiction. Once more, whether these examples can serve as evidence of the dogs having minds or whether they are cases of anthropomorphism depends entirely on the interpretation. As Hernandez argues: "Buck's dream could be read as an instance of egregious anthropomorphism in the story."[118] However, there does appear to be some implication that the dog characters in all of the selected literature do have a mind, at least to some degree, but less so than in *The Plague Dogs*.

An issue arises when analyzing agency in the selected primary texts, similar to when analyzing the presence or absence of mind. Whether the characters' motivations are purely based on instincts or whether they genuinely do have agency depends mainly on the

[113] Aleksandra Hernandez, "Jack London's Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication," *Journal of Modern Literature* 45, no. 1 (January 2021): 42.
[114] Jack London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004), 47.
[115] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 48.
[116] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 205.
[117] Hernandez, "Jack London's Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication," 41.
[118] Hernandez, "Jack London's Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication," 41.

interpretation. There are various situations in which the characters appear to behave independently of instinct. For example, in *Where the Red Fern Grows*, the dogs supposedly keep moving while waiting for their owner's arrival in order not to freeze to death: "'If they had ever lain down,' someone said, 'they would've frozen to death.' 'They knew it,' another said. 'That's why they kept running in that circle.'"[119] In Morey's *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, the canine understands that he has a chance to escape and a viable route to escape, and the forming of the plan in his head is implied in his change of posture and facial expression: "He turned his head. There was a window near the platform. His sharp ears shot forward; his yellow eyes opened wide and his big jaws snapped shut,"[120] because "tonight there was no chain to hold him back."[121] And similar instances can also be found in the rest of the selected literature.

However, the degree to which the behavior is independent of instinct is unclear. Even Buck in *The Call of the Wild* sometimes appears to be behaving independent of instinct, such as when he each year visits his dead master's home and "here he muses for a time, howling once, long and mournfully, ere he depart,"[122] yet London, as Hub Zwart mentions, emphasized that it is primarily instinct that drove Buck's actions.[123] Moreover, although London's actual descriptions of the canine protagonist White Fang portray him as intelligent, as shown, for example, here: "Denied the outlet, through play, of his energies, he recoiled upon himself and developed his mental processes. He became cunning; he had idle time in which to devote himself to thoughts of trickery,"[124] there are sprinkled some utterances that emphasize his inferiority to human intelligence, such as: "in his own dim way he learned the law."[125] And sometimes even utterances that inform the reader that his behavior was not the result of agency: "Not that he did this consciously, however. He did not calculate such things. It was all automatic."[126] Zwart describes these utterances as "disclaimers": "this impression [of White Fang's sensitivity, acuteness and intelligence] is corrected more or less in 'disclaimers.'"[127] As can be seen, there appear to be some signs of agency present in the dog characters in the selected primary texts. However, to what degree depends on the interpretation and, in the case of

[119] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 183.
[120] Walt Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog* (New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1968), 98.
[121] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 99.
[122] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 78.
[123] Hub Zwart, *Understanding Nature: Case Studies in Comparative Epistemology* (New York: Springer, 2008), 122.
[124] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 131.
[125] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 121.
[126] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 153.
[127] Zwart, *Understanding Nature*, 124.

London's works, also on whether the reader focuses more on the "disclaimers,"[128] as described by Zwart, or on the actual behavior and other descriptions of the canine protagonists. However, it is evident that the animal characters in *The Plague Dogs*, being the most anthropomorphized characters, show the most signs of these human characteristics.

Based on this analysis, it appears that whether an animal character is portrayed as having language, agency, mind, and rationality depends on how anthropomorphized it is. Which possibly strengthens the anthropocentric belief that real animals do not possess these characteristics. However, even when a writer describes his or her canine characters as realistically as possible and tries to avoid anthropomorphism, these otherwise human-exclusive characteristics are still present in the literary dogs' behavior, as seen in, for example, London's work. Regarding situations that may be interpreted as a coincidence rather than a sign of the animal possessing these characteristics, it can be argued that since these situations occur so often in the selected fiction, the chances of all of them being mere coincidences are somewhat low. Thus, dog characters in the selected primary literature appear to have agency, mind, and rationality, at least to some degree, and some also have language.

The motivation that influences animal behavior proves to be quite challenging to analyze because humans do not have access to the animals' inner lives, which leads, in some cases, to anthropomorphism, and, in other cases, to anthropodenial. As Calarco states, some critics of anthropomorphism believe that animal cognition is entirely different from human cognition, leading them to disregard any explanations of animal behavior that would imply the existence of human-like mental states in animals. While other researchers believe that it is reasonable to assume that two genetically similar species may have similar mental states when exhibiting similar types of behavior, thus justifying anthropomorphism in some instances. There is a problem tied with criticism of anthropomorphism, anthropodenial, which means rejecting any similarities between humans and non-human animals despite the possibility of such similarities existing.[129] Anthropodenial can be seen as a direct consequence of anthropocentrism because it, as Waldau states, helps separate humans from non-human animals and creates the illusion that humans are so high up in the hierarchy that they are no longer comparable with animals.[130]

When analyzing the selected primary texts, it appears that anthropomorphism is a much more common phenomenon in literature than anthropodenial when depicting dog characters.

[128] Zwart, *Understanding Nature*, 124.
[129] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 22.
[130] Waldau, *Animal Studies: An Introduction,* 156.

Anthropomorphized dogs and other animals can be seen in all of the selected works, while tendencies similar to anthropodenial can only be seen in some of them. Characters that do not appear to be seeing dogs as beings capable of having similar mental or emotional states to humans are present in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, in which Charlie sees dogs as "machines to do his bidding,"[131] *White Fang*, in which Beauty Smith abuses the canine protagonist: "Denied the expression of power amongst his own kind, he fell back upon the lesser creatures and there vindicated the life that was in him,"[132] and *The Call of the Wild*, in which some of the dogs are said to be missing any spirit in them because of the treatment they receive from the men: "The two mongrels were without spirit at all; bones were the only things breakable about them."[133] It is primarily the works of Jack London that appear to be containing anthropodenial to a more severe degree as he frequently inserts claims that deny that the canine characters could possess certain human characteristics. For example, in *White Fang*, it is mentioned that the protagonist is good at judging when to attack other dogs: "Another advantage he possessed was that of correctly judging time and distance," however, the statement is immediately corrected with the following utterance: "Not that he did this consciously, however. He did not calculate such things. It was all automatic. His eyes saw correctly, and the nerves carried the vision correctly to his brain."[134] The dog does not "consciously" think about when to attack. Instead, it is an "automatic" instinctive behavior, which is then described almost as if the dog were a machine as the "nerves" simply "carr[y] the vision to his brain." Thus, it eliminates any doubt about whether the animal might have similar mental states to human beings. As shown, anthropodenial does, in a way, also appear in some of the selected primary works. However, anthropomorphism is a much more common phenomenon.

A certain amount of anthropomorphism is present in each and every one of the selected works. In some, it is more extreme, such as in *The Plague Dogs*, and in some, it may be less noticeable, such as in *The Incredible Journey*. An example of anthropomorphism in *Where the Red Fern Grows* was already mentioned above; there, it is the unreliable narrator and protagonist of the story who attributes anthropomorphic characteristics to the dogs, such as the stereotypical differences between the male dog and the female dog, because of his personal bias. The rest of the selected works do not have a protagonist narrating the story and so have

[131] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 13.
[132] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 160.
[133] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 54.
[134] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 153.

more objective narrators. Despite this fact, anthropomorphism is also an important component of their stories.

Even books by Jack London contain anthropomorphism as a way of exaggerating the canine protagonists' abilities or as a way of creating a connection between the reader and the animal characters. Although the writer often includes utterances resembling anthropodenial, there is no doubt whether his works contain anthropomorphism. In *White Fang,* the eponymous protagonist may not think "in man-fashion,"[135] but he can feel "very proud of himself,"[136] the distrusting collie that belongs to Scott takes "advantage of her sex to pick upon White Fang"[137] and can feel more complex human-like emotions, such as being "angry."[138] And in *The Call of the Wild*, Buck can reminisce about his life with Judge Miller: "Sometimes he thought of Judge Miller's big house in the sun-kissed Santa Clara Valley,"[139] can have dreams: "blinking dreamily at the flames, it seemed that the flames were of another fire, and that as he crouched by this other fire he saw another and different man from the half-breed cook before him,"[140] and he and other dog characters can also feel complex emotions and even act out of spite: "They were angry because of the ill treatment they had received and the unjust load. Buck was raging. He broke into a run, the team following his lead."[141] These examples help show that while an author may try to counteract anthropomorphism by including statements that deny the existence of complex thoughts or human-like mental states in the animal character, some anthropomorphic features may still be present.

On the other hand, Richard Adams in *The Plague Dogs* does not try to counteract anthropomorphism, and the book contains, in fact, perhaps the most anthropomorphized animals out of the selected primary texts. The canine protagonists converse with each other in English and talk with various animals in the area, such as other dogs: "'Lay off!' cried Rowf angrily to the sheep-dog,"[142] or even a fox who has a different accent: "Who am Ah? Ah'm tod, whey Ah'm tod, ye knaw."[143] The dogs can smile: "Snitter grinned back,"[144] and can have

[135] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 122.
[136] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 122.
[137] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 192.
[138] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 195.
[139] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 47.
[140] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 48.
[141] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 53–54.
[142] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 62.
[143] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 88.
[144] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 98.

nightmares: “Oh, thank goodness! [It was just] a dream!”[145] Their mental processes clearly resemble those thought to be exclusively human.

Although the animal characters in the two remaining selected primary works, *The Incredible Journey* and *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, are not as prominently anthropomorphized as the characters in *The Plague Dogs*, similar examples of anthropomorphism to those in Jack London’s works can be found in them as well. For example, in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, the eponymous protagonist is capable of human-like problem-solving when the rope tied to his collar gets stuck between two stones: “He sat down and surveyed the situation. Then he calmly twisted his head, got the rope in his jaws, and with one snap bit it in two.”[146] Not only does he recognize the issue and the needed action to solve it, he does it in a human-like manner. Relying on his sight, which is a sense that is superior in human beings and not in dogs, he sits down and “surveys the situation.” Without any unnecessary chewing, curious or fearful biting of the rope, or digging near the stones, which would perhaps be some of the more typical behaviors an actual canine would exhibit, he splits the rope in two with a single purposeful bite as if clearly understanding how a rope works. Furthermore, at one point, Kävik expresses happiness not only by “wav[ing] his tail” but he also “grin[s].”[147] In Burnford’s *The Incredible Journey*, Bodger reacts out of not only pain but also hatred when a bear cub hits him with his paw: “He snarled faintly with pain and hatred when his shoulder was raked by the wicked claws of the excited cub,”[148] the cub's mother also appears to be feeling complex emotions when the cub is hurt: “In a blind, frustrated rage, maddened by the cries of her cub, the mother turned for something on which to vent her fury.”[149] The dogs are sad when Tao vanishes: “The two dogs were in very low spirits when they continued their journey without the cat. The old dog in particular moped badly,”[150] and when Tao returns to them, Luath can continue the journey “with a lighter heart.”[151] There are, of course, many other examples of anthropomorphism in all primary selected literature. However, even the limited selection mentioned here shows that anthropomorphism is a crucial feature of literature that contains animal characters and may be present in fiction in various forms.

Anthropomorphic animals are prevalent in children’s literature, which represents a large portion of books containing animal characters, including some of the primary selected works

[145] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 295.
[146] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 135.
[147] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 71.
[148] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 42.
[149] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 44.
[150] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 86.
[151] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 106.

such as *Where the Red Fern Grows*, *The Incredible Journey*, and *Kävik the Wolf Dog*. The frequent inclusion of anthropomorphic animals in children's literature is not a coincidence but rather a consequence of children's better acceptance of anthropomorphic animals. As Sharama states, this is a result of their inability to see themselves and others as separate entities and because of their natural playstyle, which often includes playing with toys as if they were living entities. Therefore, children's literature writers often include anthropomorphism in their works to connect to children with something natural to them.[152]

However, this is not the only reason why anthropomorphized animals are a common feature of children's literature. As Sharama describes, children's literature is often didactic, and it uses anthropomorphized non-human animal characters to point out specific issues that the writers do not intend for the children to learn through human characters.[153] As Keith Barker explains, this use of animals as a way of teaching children lessons about humans by using animals with human characteristics was the primary reason for featuring animal characters in early children's literature, in which the animals themselves were not important, and is still used in modern children's literature. Furthermore, animals may be used for stories that would otherwise be too difficult for child readers to comprehend. And lastly, animal characters are also used because of children's innate ability to connect with animals and identify with animals with human characteristics.[154] These reasons explain why anthropomorphized animals are so common in children's literature and why animal stories have been used since the early times.

Animals have been present in stories for children for a very long time, and their inclusion in literature has undergone some changes. According to Keith Barker, one of the earliest books to use animals as a way of teaching was written around 550 BC, and they are also frequently present in traditional rhymes.[155] As Susan McHugh remarks, "animals emerged as significant figures in English literature only in terms of metaphor."[156] As was already mentioned, early children's books used animals to teach children, and this use reached a peak, according to Keith Barker, in the Victorian era. According to Mostafa, the rise of animal-centric literature in the Victorian period is Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*.[157] As Barker describes, during the Georgian period, a favorite theme was animal cruelty. For example, from the Victorian era

[152] Sharama, "Animals as Humans," 216.
[153] Sharama, "Animals as Humans," 218.
[154] Keith Barker, "Animal Stories," in *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*, ed. Peter Hunt (New York: Routledge, 1996), 280.
[155] Barker, "Animal Stories," 279.
[156] Susan McHugh, "Literary Animal Agents," *PMLA* 124, no. 2 (March 2009): 488.
[157] Maha Mohamed Hosny Mostafa, "The animal turn in fiction: An animal-centric analysis of *A Dog's Purpose* and *Anthill*," *International Journal of English and Literature* 6, no. 9 (September 2015): 150.

comes a famous book of fables, *Fabulous Histories* by Sarah Trimmer, and others, including various moral fables. Moreover, the Victorian era later shows a major change in the attitude toward animals as "[t]he Victorians were probably the first real animal-loving generation […] and in their writings only the ignorant or ill-educated were shown abusing animals."[158] This attitude can be seen, for example, in *Black Beauty.* The change in attitude toward animals was, according to Martin Danahay and Deborah Morse, also affected by urbanization.[159] According to Barker, animal characters were a common feature of children's literature in the Victorian and Edwardian periods. And while some earlier authors might choose not to show children a too realistic depiction of animals and avoid including death, later writers no longer avoid this taboo topic.[160] A more reallistic portrayal of animals without avoidance of depicting death and brutality is present in many of the selected works of fiction, such as *White Fang*, *The Call of the Wild*, and *The Plague Dogs*. During this time, there also appear some works that present animals in a way that, according to Barker, readers "can appreciate but not feel is a parallel with their own lives,"[161] such as the works of Jack London, *White Fang* and *The Call of the Wild*, *Tarka the* Otter by Henry Williamson, or *The Incredible Journey* by Sheila Burnford. As Barker continues, the primary source of animal stories in the period between the World Wars was the USA and Canada. And in modern children's literature it is the picture books that most often feature animals. As Barker concludes, the animal story is unlikely to ever die as it can appeal to all ages and adapt to various cultural preoccupations.[162]

The dog stories in the second half of the 20th century, according to Michelle Superle, often contain dog characters that lead to the growth of the human characters and allow them to achieve fuller humanity. The role of dogs in dog stories changed in the 20th century. In the works written approximately before the 1960s, they were more frequently in the role of rescuers, while later, the role of rescuers started to be given to the child characters rather than to the dogs.[163] Some works that contain a dog saving a child or an adult are *The Call of the Wild* and *Where the Red Fern Grows*, but also other works such as *Old Yeller* written by Fred Gipson or *The Dog Crusoe and His Master* by Robert Ballantyne. Works that contain a child rescuing a

[158] Barker, "Animal Stories," 280–281.
[159] Martin Danahay, and Deborah Denenholz Morse, "The Emergence of Animal Studies," in *The Routledge Companion to Victorian Literature*, ed. Dennis Denisoff and Talia Schaffer (New York: Routledge, 2020), 344–345.
[160] Barker, "Animal Stories," 281–286.
[161] Barker, "Animal Stories," 286.
[162] Barker, "Animal Stories," 281–286.
[163] Michelle Superle, "Animal Heroes and Transforming Substances: Canine Characters in Contemporary Children's Literature," in *Animals and the Human Imagination: A Companion to Animal Studies*, ed. Aaron Gross, and Anne Vallely (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 174–180.

dog include, for example, Morey's *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, in which Kävik is rescued and nursed back to health several times by the main boy character despite Kävik not being his dog at the time. As Superle continues, dogs retain their status as the heroes established in the earlier works, but in the newer works, they perform a psychological or emotional rescue rather than a physical one.[164] Thus making the growth of the child protagonist and his or her family possible.

[164] Superle, "Animal Heroes," 180.

HUMAN-ANIMAL RELATIONSHIP

In this thesis, it is necessary to define not only the relationship between humans and dogs, but also between humans and other non-human animals. The subtleties of such relationships and the differences between various non-human animal species in the human mind affect the topic of this thesis.

As Kenneth Joel Shapiro states, there is an incredible variety of human-animal relationships due to the sheer number of non-human animal species on the planet and the different human viewpoints on various non-human animal species. Not only are there animals that evolved naturally in their typical environment and those that were domesticated, but the degree to which a non-human animal species has been selectively bred is also important.[165] Furthermore, as Geoff Hosey and Vicky Melfi state, the different approaches to animals can be distinguished into three historical stages: the predomestic era, the domestic era, and the postdomestic era. In the post-domestic era, most people have little to no direct contact with animals, especially those they eat, which leads to diverse approaches toward them, from perceiving them as threats to perceiving them as loved companions. This may lead to some paradoxical situations. For example, despite pet owners' love and care for their own companion animals and significant spending on veterinary care, millions of unwanted pet animals are being euthanized annually.[166]

As Shapiro mentions, the diversity in human-animal relationships is even more complicated once a division between the social constructs of animals and real animals is made. As human perception of a non-human animal species depends on how society tends to view them and what social constructs of them there exist, the human-animal relationship is influenced by these as well. This can be seen, for example, in the image of a wolf that can be perceived in several ways, a man-eating monster, a vermin that devours farmers' livestock, or a romanticized being.[167] However, as Borgards remarks, although there is a distinction between animals that are real and those that are only literary, it is not easy to pinpoint the differences. The literary versions seem to be born from the real ones, and the real versions seem to carry some characteristics of the literary ones.[168]

Another concept related to Animal Studies is the existence of companion animals. According to Péter Pongrácz, companion animals can be divided into three categories

[165] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 1.
[166] Hosey et al., "Human-Animal Interactions, Relationships and Bonds," 117.
[167] Shapiro, *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*, 1–10.
[168] Borgards, "Introduction," 156.

depending on what type of contact between the owner and the animal is expected and whether the animal is expected to reciprocate attentive behavior. The first category of companion animals contains animals such as fish, arthropods, large cats, and reptiles that do not interact with their owners. The second category of companion animals contains most animals typically perceived as pets. These animals and owners engage in mutually rewarding interactions that are not restricted to food-directed behavior. The last category is the most restrictive and refers to only cats and dogs. For an animal species to belong to this category, the majority of its specimens must be able to be kept without any restriction or confinement. Although more animals can be taught or kept without restricting their movement, other animal species show "great potential to go feral without restrictive measures imposed by humans,"[169] and thus cannot belong to this category.[170] This division of companion animals shows why the dog is such a commonly kept pet. It can partake in a mutually beneficial relationship, reciprocate affection, and generally stay with its owner even without any confinement or restriction of its movement. According to John Archer, cats and especially dogs are the most common pets in western society.[171] And as Paul Waldau remarks, it is generally dogs and cats that are thought of when the term companion animal is mentioned despite the fact that other animals may fulfill the role of a companion animal as well.[172]

It is important to note some more general information about the dog species: domestication and selective breeding and their consequences, such as the existence of distinct breeds, and others, in order to further analyze the relationship between humans and dogs in literature, as these aspects heavily influence said relationship even in the 20th-century prose.

The association between humans and wolves likely began, as Linda Kalof remarks, around the time when humankind started creating tools and building fires.[173] According to Archer, some of the earliest evidence for dog domestication comes from around 12,000 years ago.[174] There is a certain disagreement as to why dog domestication began. Some believe that the likeliest explanation for it is the use of dogs as hunting partners, as Kalof states,[175] while some believe this relationship may have started with dogs being kept as pets rather than for

[169] Péter Pongrácz, and Petra Dobos, "What is a companion animal? An ethological approach based on Tinbergen's four questions. Critical review." *Applied Animal Behavior Science* 267, no. 1 (October 2023): 3.
[170] Pongrácz et al., "What is a companion animal," 3.
[171] John Archer, "Why Do People Love Their Pets?" *Evolution and Human Behavior* 18, no. 1 (1997): 237.
[172] Waldau, *Animal Studies: An Introduction,* 26.
[173] Linda Kalof, *Looking at Animals in Human History* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2007): 7.
[174] Archer, "Why Do People Love Their Pets?" 243.
[175] Kalof, *Looking at Animals in Human History*, 7.

hunting purposes, as Archer mentions.[176] According to Waldau, there are also some disputes as to whether humans domesticated dogs or whether humans and dogs co-domesticated each other.[177] Regardless of how the co-existence started, the relationship between humans and dogs strengthened and started to be more varied in the later periods. Dogs started to be used for hunting, herding, as livestock, and as pets. The diversity of approaches toward dogs is reflected in literature of all periods, including 20th-century prose.

While the results of selective breeding are evident in most, if not all, domestic animals, the range of not only sizes but also body types is, according to McHugh, the largest in dogs, with some weighing less than 2 kg and some more than 80 kg.[178] Some breeds are characterized by an atypical shape of certain body parts, such as the egg-shaped head of the bull terrier. Furthermore, breeds also differ in their behavior and personality traits depending on what the breed was used for, which leads to some breeds having deep-rooted hunting instincts, such as the Airedale terrier, or herding instincts, such as the Old English sheepdog. These behavioral differences in breeding purposes lead to the division of dog breeds in various kennel clubs into groups, which are, for example, herding, hound, toy, non-sporting, sporting, terrier, and working group according to the American Kennel Club's official website.[179] The differences between individual breeds and even mutts are also observable in the selected primary texts. Thus, although selective breeding as such is seldom mentioned in fiction, the consequences of human influence on the biological aspects, physical and psychological, of the non-human animal characters are present in all selected texts.

When it comes to the human influence on the physical traits and appearance of dogs, various descriptions of the canine characters in all selected works show the results of selective breeding. Perhaps the most detailed summary of dogs' appearance is present in *The Incredible Journey,* which features two purebred dogs. Bodger, an old white English bull terrier, is described as having "slanted almond-shaped eyes, sunk deep within their pinkish rims,"[180] and a "naked, down-faced arc of his profile, [a] deep-chested, stocky body and whip-tapered tail."[181] Luath, a Labrador retriever, has a "powerful build, broad noble head and deep, blunt, gentle mouth."[182] The contrast between the two dogs' body types reflects, as it is also made clear in

[176] Archer, "Why Do People Love Their Pets?" 243.
[177] Waldau, *Animal Studies: An Introduction*, 27.
[178] Susan McHugh, *Dog* (London: Reaktion Books LTD, 2004), 7.
[179] "List of Breeds by Group," List of Breeds by Group, AKC, last modified June 1, 2023. https://www.akc.org/public-education/resources/general-tips-information/dog-breeds-sorted-groups/
[180] Sheila Burnford, *The Incredible Journey* (London: The Book Club, 1961), 14.
[181] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 14.
[182] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 14–15.

the book, what their breeds were used for. Luath's breed was used for retrieving game: "[Luath's] mouth had been bred to carry game birds, and the jaw structure, with its soft protective lips, was a disadvantage,"[183] and Bodger's for fighting as he is described as a "white, compact bundle of fighting art."[184] The physical appearance of the bull terrier in the book, and by extension in the 20th century, is different from the breed's physical appearance in the 21st century, which shows the effects of continuous selective breeding in dogs. As can be seen on the cover of the book and in the illustrations in the book, Bodger, being a purebred dog, had a flat head with no stop as was the standard for the breed in the early 20th century, as James Watson describes in the breed's standard,[185] however, he did not, yet, have the typical egg-shaped head that can be seen in bull terriers in the 21st century. Thus, this work's descriptions and illustrations help show the continuous selective breeding of dogs.

The other primary texts contain more general and less descriptive information about their canine characters' appearance or prefer to identify the breeds more based on their behavioral traits rather than their physical appearance. Often, authors only mention the canine character's breed. For example, black-and-white sheep-dogs[186] in *The Plague Dogs,* Blue tick hounds[187] in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* huskies[188] in *The Call of the Wild*, and a mastiff[189] in *White Fang*. The main characters are also often described rather faintly. In *The Plague Dogs*, Rowf is a "black mongrel"[190] with rough hair and a large build,[191] and Snitter has "a smooth-haired, black-and-white head—the head of a fox terrier."[192] In Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows*, the hunting dog breeds have a characteristic sound: "the deep baying of a coon hound,"[193] and a characteristic gait and ear length that are "the unmistakable marks of a hunting hound."[194] These traits are also present in the main canine characters, redbone coonhounds.

The physical attributes resulting from selective breeding also appear to be seen as superior to those of wild wolves. This is perhaps the result of an anthropocentric attitude, as the authors seem to perceive dogs bred by humans as superior to animals created by nature. In *The Call of the Wild*, the main character, Buck, a cross between a St. Bernard and a Scotch shepherd

[183] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 88.
[184] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 88.
[185] James Watson, *The Dog Book* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1905), 454.
[186] Richard Adams, *The Plague Dogs* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2007), 60.
[187] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 151.
[188] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 31.
[189] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 162.
[190] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 13.
[191] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 304.
[192] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 14.
[193] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 18.
[194] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 9.

dog,[195] has no typical breed characteristics. However, despite his resemblance to wolves, the human influence and selective breeding of his parents have resulted in a dog that resembles a wolf yet is superior to them: "His muzzle was the long wolf muzzle, save that it was larger than the muzzle of any wolf; and his head, somewhat broader, was the wolf head on a massive scale."[196] In the novel *White Fang* the main wolf-dog character is, similarly to Buck in *The Call of the Wild*, stronger and larger than wolves as he would always win in the dog arena when put against them. The superiority of human influence on White Fang's build as opposed to natural evolution can be seen in the following description, as White Fang's advantageous characteristics are inherited from his wolf-dog mother rather than from his wolf father: "[H]e far outweighed a wolf of corresponding size. From his mother he had inherited the heavier proportions of the dog."[197]

Appearance, size, and physical build not only affect the canine characters' physical features but also lead to different human behaviors being displayed toward the dogs and to different types of human-dog relationships. An example of this can be seen in the beginning chapter of *Where the Red Fern Grows*, as the human protagonist is angry when he sees other dogs attacking an older hunting hound precisely because it resembles the person's favorite breed and the protagonist's memories of his own dogs and he helps the hound: "By this time, my fighting blood was boiling. It's hard for a man to stand and watch an old hound fight against such odds, especially if that man has memories in his heart like I had in mine."[198] Similarly, in Burnford's *The Incredible Journey,* a group of Indians choose to help the group of main animal characters because of the appearance of Bodger, as he was seen as "the White Dog of the Ojibways, the virtuous White Dog of Omen."[199] Recognition of a breed also leads to a more welcoming attitude toward the main canine character in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, as generally all of the minor characters recognize that Kävik is a sled-dog breed, or rather a cross between a sled-dog breed and a wolf, because of his appearance and try to help him. For example, John recognizes that "[t]he dog in him could be malamute, Siberian husky or McKenzie River husky."[200] Kävik's appearance negatively influences his second owner's wife's reaction to him being in a house: "He looks like a wild animal to me. I won't have him running through this house[.]"[201] The size, muscular figure, and strength lead to Buck in *The Call of the Wild* being

[195] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 24.
[196] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 73.
[197] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 162.
[198] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 8.
[199] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 57.
[200] Walt Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog* (New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1968), 123.
[201] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 87.

used as a sled dog and to the eponymous hero of *White Fang* being used for dog fighting. On the other hand, no small breeds or dogs are ever used in dogfights in the selected works of fiction. Lastly, in *The Plague Dogs*, the minor human characters tend to react fearfully toward Rowf, the large mutt, and try to catch and help Snitter, the small fox terrier. Thus, it is clear that human behavior toward and relationship with the canine characters in the selected works of fiction are influenced by the dogs' appearance and size and whether or not the humans recognize a breed or traits of a breed.

The results of selective breeding of dogs are noticeable in these texts also in the behavior, personality traits, and in how the particular dogs are used by humans. In *The Incredible Journey*, a herding dog protects its herd from the main characters,[202] which results in a fight between the main canine characters and the herding dog. Luath, being a Labrador retriever, lacks "the instinct"[203] for fighting, while Bodger, a dog bred for fighting other dogs and an "unyielding fighter yet devoted and docile family pet,"[204] does not lack this instinct and helps his packmate: "Up to now he had merely been an interested spectator, taking a keen interest from a professional point of view, for a good fight is meat and drink to a bull terrier."[205] In the book *The Plague Dogs* a sheep-dog who helps his owner by herding sheep: "[A] black-and-white dog came racing out from among the crags, dodging in and out of the heather-clumps as it went. They watched it run in a wide half-circle before turning to descend towards the sheep, which thereupon changed direction and began to run downhill."[206] A herding dog in *The White Fang*, is instinctively wary of White Fang because "White Fang was to her a wolf, […] who had preyed upon her flocks from the time sheep were first herded and guarded by some dim ancestor of hers."[207] Similarly to *The Incredible Journey*, *The White Fang* also contains some dogfighting behavior. In a fight between White Fang and a bulldog, special attention is paid to the distinctive instincts of the bulldog that are a consequence of selective breeding for a dog-fighting breed as opposed to the typical behavior of dogs that White Fang would usually fight against. For example, the bulldog does not react to being bitten, which confuses White Fang: "Another disconcerting thing was that it made no outcry."[208] The bulldog is also surprised by White Fang's fighting style because "he had never fought before with a dog with which he

[202] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 88.
[203] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 88.
[204] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 14.
[205] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 88.
[206] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 60.
[207] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 189.
[208] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 165.

could not close. The desire had always been mutual."[209] In London's *The Call of the Wild*, Buck is taken aback by the behavior exhibited by the huskies when he first joins a sled-dog group because "he had never seen dogs fight as these wolfish creatures fought."[210] Lastly, breed history and behavioral tendencies also influence the skill potential of the animal characters in the books. For example, in the book *Where the Red Fern Grows*, the main canine characters show an aptitude for tracking and hunting because of their breed's use for hunting, while in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, the dog character has an aptitude for dog-sled racing because of his sled-dog ancestry. The dogs' aptitude for specific skills then further influences the human-dog relationship. Thus, it is clear that breed characteristics and, by extension, selective breeding strongly influence the human-dog relationship.

Another influence of selective breeding on the dog characters' behavior and abilities in these books can be seen especially in *The Incredible Journey*, but hints of it are also present in the other sources. Throughout the journey of the pet trio, the cat survives relatively easily, but the two dogs do not survive with such ease. This is evident from the very beginning of their journey, as the cat is immediately able to catch its prey without ever going hungry, while the dogs are not able to do so and they are hindered in this by their, in Bodger's case, age and in the case of Luath, breed's utilization: "[Luath] would have to be on the verge of starvation before the barriers of deep-rooted Labrador heredity would be broken down. For generations his ancestors had been bred to retrieve without harming, and there was nothing of the hunter in his make-up."[211] Bodger later collapses, and the cat, Tao, starts bringing him caught prey. The dogs' inability to thrive in the wilderness as opposed to the cat's ability to thrive in the same circumstances, results from selective breeding for different purposes. As Péter Pongrácz and Petra Dobos mention in their article, "dogs have become fully adapted to the anthropogenic niche that can be considered as their natural habitat,"[212] while "cats show a considerable potential to become feral."[213] As Pongrácz and Dobos continue, this is caused by the fact that while dogs have been bred for different functions since their domestication, cats' functions remained unchanged.[214] As was already said, hints of the same phenomenon are also found in other selected primary texts, such as *White Fang*. The canine protagonist, although as a pup appearing quite fearless and able to care for himself in the wild, becomes almost incompetent

[209] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 165.
[210] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 30.
[211] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 38.
[212] Pongrácz et al., "What is a companion animal," 4.
[213] Pongrácz et al., "What is a companion animal," 4.
[214] Pongrácz et al., "What is a companion animal," 4.

at surviving on his own once humans raise him. As Hernandez points out, this indicates he has forgotten his knowledge from living in the wild, as it is "a body of knowledge that proves useless under the protection of man."[215] And in *The Plague Dogs*, the main characters try to become wild animals for a large portion of the book with the help of a wild fox. However, toward the end of the story, they realize they do not have the ability to become genuinely wild, as is shown in the following dialog between Snitter and Rowf: "[Rowf:] 'You say we aren't wild animals any more?' [Snitter:] 'I don't think we were very good at it really, do you? Only when we had the poor tod.'"[216] Thus, it is evident that selective breeding forms a core part in the selected literature themes, regardless of whether or not it is the primary focus or whether it is explicitly mentioned.

Domestication and selective breeding also resulted in a different behavioral tendency in dogs compared to cats as they show, according to Pongrácz, "a clear social preference towards humans in comparison to conspecifics,"[217] and they have "a rich repertoire of human-directed behavior."[218] This phenomenon is observable in the selected primary texts as well. A recurring theme in some of these texts is the return of a lost pet to its owner or its favorite person, a desire to have an owner, and a preference for a human companion over being with its species. A lost pet searching for its owner is quite a typical theme in fiction that shows the anthropocentric view, as the animals often struggle through various hostile environments just to be reunited with their loved owners. It is present in the selected works, *The Incredible Journey*, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, and other works, such as Eric Knight's *Lassie Come-Home*. Another theme, the desire to have an owner, can be also seen as anthropocentric as the writers create animal characters that cannot imagine living without belonging to a human. It is explicitly present, for example, in Adams' *The Plague Dogs*, in which Snitter believes that "Dogs have to have men. We need masters,"[219] and he often has to persuade Rowf: "Don't be silly. Of course we've got to find a man to look after us. A dog has to have a master if he's going to live properly."[220] An inner desire of a canine protagonist to have an owner is present in other texts, although more implicitly than in *The Plague Dogs*, for example, in *Kävik the Wolf Dog* or *White Fang*. The tendency of canine characters to search for their lost owner or favorite person is a clear sign of preference for humans.

[215] Hernandez, "Jack London's Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication," 47.
[216] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 349.
[217] Pongrácz et al., "What is a companion animal," 4.
[218] Pongrácz et al., "What is a companion animal," 4.
[219] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 45.
[220] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 50.

The preference for humans rather than conspecifics of the canine characters is present in all of the selected texts. It can be seen, for example, in the previous quotes from *The Plague Dogs* or in *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, in which the dog protagonist, despite finding a wolf mate, still thinks about his favorite person and tries to direct the female wolf to reach the boy: "He thought of the boy and the home farther north, and tried to turn the female."[221] This preference is also observable in *The Call of the Wild*, where the dog protagonist does not give in to the call of the wild until his last favorite person dies, and even then, he returns each year to mourn him: "In the summers there is one visitor […] and here he muses for a time, howling once, long and mournfully, ere he departs."[222] Thus, this preference for humans in canine characters, which results from domestication and selective breeding, heavily influences the major themes of the selected works of fiction and other literature that focuses on and contains dogs.

Furthermore, the psychological characteristics and behavioral tendencies resulting from the selective breeding process also affect the relationships between dogs and humans in the primary texts, similarly to the effects of appearance and physical characteristics on the human attitude towards the canine characters. This is perhaps most evident in the fact that many dog characters in the selected books tend to be used for their breeds' original purposes. Thus, herding breeds are trained and used for herding, as can be seen in *The Plague Dogs*. Hunting breeds are trained for tracking and catching game, as evident especially in *Where the Red Fern Grows*. Breeds bred for fighting other dogs are often used for dog fights, as seen in *White Fang*, and breeds bred for their pet qualities are generally regarded as companion animals that are pampered by their owners, as can be seen in London's *The Call of the Wild*. It is, therefore, evident that human-dog relationships are influenced not only by the breeds' physical traits but also behavior and personality traits.

Although the results of selective breeding, appearance, and behavioral tendencies of dog characters heavily influence how a person might approach the dog, they are not the only aspects influencing the human-dog relationship. This relationship is also the result of the reason as to why the person owns or wants to own the dog and how he or she approaches the relationship. As Michael Dotson and Eva Hyatt state, a considerable amount of research exists about human-dog relationships. These studies may reach different conclusions and may distinguish different types of such relationships. [223] This thesis will use the classification done by Michael Fox

[221] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 151.
[222] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 78.
[223] Michael J. Dotson, and Eva M. Hyatt, "Understanding dog-human companionship," *Journal of Business Research* 61, no. 1 (May 2008): 458–459.

mentioned in Dotson's and Hyatt's study. According to Fox, there are four kinds of human-dog relationships. If a human views his or her dog only as a possession or object, then it is an object-oriented relationship. If an owner sees the dog as a source of income or other benefits through various means, it is a utilitarian or exploitative relationship. If the dog is seen as a replacement for a human being, it is a need-dependency relationship. Lastly, if the dog is respected and is of great significance to the owner's life, then it is an actualizing relationship.[224] Another influence on the human-dog relationship is the reason for dog ownership. Dotson and Hyatt mention another study done by Elizabeth C. Hirschman that analyzes this factor.[225] In the study Hirschman argues that there are six reasons for dog ownership: the dogs can be owned as objects, as ornaments, as symbols of status, as a hobby especially regarding exhibitions and shows, as equipment, and as companions.[226] A variety of human-dog relationships and reasons for dog ownership can be seen also in the selected primary texts.

Most of the selected texts contain a whole scale of dog-human relationships and reasons why a human character wants to own a dog, with certain types of relationships being seen negatively. There is, however, not always a clear border between the types of relationships, as there is often some overlap present. Most of the texts contain the object-oriented and the utilitarian or exploitative relationship or a mixture of them, except for *The Incredible Journey* and *Where the Red Fern Grows*. These types of relationships appear to be portrayed in the selected primary texts as undesirable, which can be seen, for example, in the way these human characters are portrayed, how they are compared with the owners that have actualizing relationships with the dog characters, or in the fact that the dog characters are either trying to escape from them or are not portrayed as missing them once they are not in their possession anymore. In Morey's *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, the main dog's breeder and first owner views the dogs in his possession only through his desire to win a dog sled competition. His approach to them reflects that he only sees them as possessions or equipment and not as sentient beings: "dogs were machines to do his bidding,"[227] and although he is not "deliberately cruel,"[228] he treats his dogs as insentient objects and often harshly punishes them for mistakes: "he used the whip, and sometimes his feet or a club, unsparingly when they did something wrong."[229] Before

[224] Michael Fox, "Relationships Between the Human and Non-human Animals," in *Interrelations Between People and Pets*, ed. Bruce Fogle (Illinois: Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd, 1981), 30–34.
[225] Dotson et al., "Understanding dog-human companionship," 459.
[226] Elizabeth C. Hirschman, "Consumers and Their Animal Companions," *Journal of Consumer Research* 20, no. 4 (March 1994): 617–618.
[227] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 13.
[228] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 13.
[229] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 13.

Kävik meets his second owner, he is for a while in the care of a boy who shows him kindness for the first time, and Kävik reciprocates the affection: "Then, for the first time in his life, he ran out his pink tongue and licked a human face."[230] This leads to him developing a bond with the boy and fleeing from any other person's care to return to him. Kävik's second owner sees him as an ornament for displaying and exhibiting, and as a status symbol. He never affectionately interacts with him nor exercises him, which is why when "he led Kavik into the roomful of people and up on a small platform,"[231] and "there he removed the chain and ordered the dog to sit,"[232] afterward Kävik, being off-chain for the first time, flees in order to search for the person who showed him affection. A similar relationship is also present in Jack London's *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang*.

In the two novels by Jack London, several human characters have object-oriented and exploitative relationships with dogs, and these relationships are once more seen as negative. For example, in *White Fang,* the canine protagonist's cruel owner, Beauty Smith, who uses him as a status symbol and as a piece of equipment for acquiring money through dog fights, is said to be small and ugly, and is shown to be cowardly as evident by his behavior after being punched: "Beauty Smith decided that the snow was the safest place for him, and lay where he had fallen, making no effort to get up."[233] He is also described as a "monstrosity."[234] In *The Call of the Wild*, for example, some of the cruel owners, who owned Buck and the rest of the dogs purely as equipment for dragging their sled, are portrayed as incompetent as they do not know anything about dog sledding. Their incompetence leads to them starving and exhausting their dogs, losing most of them. One of these owners, Mercedes, is not portrayed as outright abusing toward the dogs. Instead, she is shown to feel pity for the animals at the beginning of their journey. Despite her protecting the dogs from being whipped in the beginning, "Buck did not like her,"[235] perhaps recognizing the insincerity of her pity. As Hernandez states: "While London introduces many human handlers who physically abuse and harm Buck throughout the novella, London singles out the character of Mercedes in Call of the Wild as the type of dog owner that he does not want his readers to be."[236] And a bit different, yet still an exploitative and object-oriented relationship is present also in *The Plague Dogs*.

[230] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 65.
[231] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 98.
[232] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 98.
[233] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 122.
[234] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 158.
[235] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 53.
[236] Hernandez, "Jack London's Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication," 42.

In *The Plague Dogs*, these two types of relationships are present due to the use of dogs as test subjects in a laboratory. The unaffectionate approach can be seen in how the scientists address the dogs as "it," when talking about them: "When it definitely sinks and stops moving,"[237] and in what names the dogs have for the purposes of the experiments: "those two dogs—seven-three-two and eight-one-five,"[238] or, of course, the word "subject": "so that the subject stood wagging his tail while a hot iron was drawn along his ribs."[239] There is no doubt that the relationships between the scientists and the dogs in the book are exploitative as the dogs are used only to benefit humans and without any regard for their well-being. The term "it" shows that the dogs are viewed as objects by the scientists, as opposed to owners of companion dogs who refer to their dogs as "he" or "she." The negative nature of these relationships is clear. Lorraine Kerslake, for example, calls the portrayed relationship between most humans and the canine heroes in this book "unsettling."[240] So, as can be seen, object-oriented relationships and exploitative relationships are quite common in the primary literature.

Apart from four of the primary selected texts containing these relationships that do not look at dogs as companions, there are also relationships portrayed where the dog is seen as a companion and an intelligent, sentient creature. Although none of the texts contains a need-dependency relationship, as none of the dog characters is being kept as an alternative to a human friend or offspring, all contain actualizing relationships. These are most often present in the case of the human characters being the main character or one of the main characters, as is the case of Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows*, and the characters with which the dogs end up living at the end of the stories, as is the case in Jack London's *White Fang*.

Beginning with Adams' *The Plague Dogs*, an example of an actualizing relationship is the one between Snitter and Mr. Wood, his original owner, who lost Snitter when he got severely injured. When he, toward the end of the book, realizes that his dog is one of the plague dogs that are being hunted to be destroyed, he decides to go try to help him despite his still-existing injuries: "He looked wretchedly ill and explained that he still had a good deal of pain in his left leg."[241] Snitter describes his relationship from his perspective and clearly shows it to be exceptionally loving and respectful. This can be seen in how Snitter describes his companionship: "He used to scratch my ears and pat me and say I was a good dog and so on,"[242]

[237] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 8.
[238] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 107.
[239] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 20.
[240] Lorraine Kerslake, "Deconstructing Human-Canine Relations in Richard Adams' *The Plague Dogs*," *European Journal of English Studies* 27, no. 3 (2023): 410.
[241] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 366.
[242] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 160.

and even in Wood's reaction or lack thereof to Snitter biting him as a reflex due to pain: "I was growling and curling my lip and he just kept on talking gently and then suddenly I—I—nipped him—I couldn't help it. But he took absolutely no notice at all—just kept on talking away, the same as before, and looking at my paw."[243] Moreover, this is one of the only books out of the selected literature in which the owner of the dog risks his or her life to save his or her companion and gets hurt in the process and not vice versa: "And in the same moment my master ran out and grabbed me and threw me bodily right across into the opposite gutter; and as I fell I heard the lorry hit him."[244] A dog risking his life to save his human can be seen in, for example, in *Where the Red Fern Grows* as it ends with one of the main dogs dying from his injuries after saving his young owner: "I never saw my dogs when they got between the lion and me, but they were there,"[245] but also in other texts written in the 20th century such as, for example, *Old Yeller* by Fred Gipson "And here was Old Yeller, weak and crippled, trying to fight a mad [wolf]!"[246] In both cases, however, the main character whom the dog or dogs are protecting does try to help the dog or dogs, which shows that they do have an actualizing relationship with their dogs. The fact that Mr. Wood is willing to sacrifice himself and that several other human characters in the selected works of fiction try to help save their companions and are in distress after their deaths shows that the relationships between them and their animals are close, affectionate, and actualizing.

The dog characters in *Kävik the Wolf Dog, White Fang,* and *The Call of the Wild* are perceived similarly by those who have an actualizing relationship with them. For example, in the first work, the boy saves and helps Kävik several times, nurtures him back to health, is the first person who shows him affection, and fights for him to remain in his care. Martha and John, who take Kävik in because they think he is abandoned, let him leave when they see he wants to go: "Martha said. 'He knows where he's going. Let him go,'"[247] which shows that they respect him as a sentient individual and see his needs as above their wanting to keep him as a pet. In the second work, White Fang is rescued by Scott from the dog fight with Cherokee, as Scott yells: "'You cowards!' he cried. 'You beasts!'"[248] and is "in a rage himself—a sane rage"[249] when he sees the terrible treatment of White Fang. In the third work, Buck is saved in a similar manner by Thornton as White Fang was by Scott: "And then, suddenly, without warning,

[243] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 161.
[244] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 163.
[245] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 192.
[246] Fred Gipson, *Old Yeller* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956), 147.
[247] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 132.
[248] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 168.
[249] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 168.

uttering a cry that was inarticulate and more like the cry of an animal, John Thornton sprang upon the man who wielded the club."[250] Thornton is described by Hernandez as "an ideal owner."[251] In all of these cases, the owners perceive the dogs as beings that deserve respect and good care, are intelligent, and are not to be hurt or locked without access to the outside.

[250] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 59.
[251] Hernandez, "Jack London's Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication," 42.

OTHER CONCEPTS OF ANIMAL STUDIES

Another important concept of Animal Studies is animal welfare. As Calarco describes, although animal welfare is by some thought to be a relatively new phenomenon, it is a part of many various religious, cultural, and philosophical traditions. Several of which influence its modern form. Animal welfare usually refers to the well-being of non-human animals. Because of the broad range of approaches to animal welfare there is no single definition that would capture its nature fully.[252] As Caroline Hewson argues, the approach to animal welfare has also undergone some changes. In the past, an animal's welfare was measured based on physiological measures, and the body was considered the most important. However, such a focus may be misleading as an animal may appear satisfied when using these measures, even when the mental state of the animal is compromised. Thus, nowadays, the focus is also on satisfying animals' mental and behavioral needs.[253] According to Matthew Calarco, one of the recurrent features of animal welfare is an attempt to reduce animal-directed cruelty and violence and increase humane animal treatment. Animal welfarists have certain common goals such as supporting the adoption of animals instead of purchasing them, achieving more severe prosecution of animal abusers, rescuing wild and domestic animals, and aiming to abolish certain practices that are perceived as inherently cruel.[254] Corrado Carenzi and Marina Verga also argue that some of the major issues that form the concept of animal welfare are "the concepts of 'suffering' and 'need.'"[255] Similar concerns and focuses can also be seen in the 20th-century prose that features non-human animals.

In most of the selected works, animal welfare is a crucial theme, sometimes even central to the plot. In *The Plague Dogs*, animal welfare concerns are used to point out the inhumane procedures and treatment of laboratory animals and criticize experimentation on animals and the approach of scientists regarding this issue. A reaction that demonstrates the indifference of scientists toward the suffering of non-human animals can be seen in the following quote: "'Well, [the device is] not turning out all that humane, really,' said Mr. Powell, with a giggle of embarrassment,"[256] as giggling is not a standard reaction when talking about a device that causes inhumane deaths. The other scientist then stresses the cost of the device: "but remember

[252] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 12.
[253] Caroline J. Hewson, "What is animal welfare? Common definitions and their practical consequences," *The Canadian Veterinary Journal* 44, no. 1 (June 2003): 496–497.
[254] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 12–13.
[255] Corrado Carenzi, and Marina Verga, "Animal welfare: review of the scientific concept and definition," *Italian Journal of Animal Science* 8, no. 1 (2009): 23.
[256] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 95.

it's got to go on the market at an economic price,"[257] rather than emphasizing the importance of the device not causing suffering. Similarly, in the case of whether to use anesthetics when amputating guinea pig legs, the economic side is more important than what is ethical: "'Do we ever use anaesthetics?' 'Good God, no,' said Dr. Boycott. 'D'you know what they cost?'" This interaction also heavily implies that there are certainly no anesthetics being used at the moment when cutting off the guinea pigs' ears.

The question of whether or not the treatment of laboratory animals in the book allows them to flourish could be potentially answered with the condition Snitter, a dog used for brain surgeries, is in as a result of said treatment. Because of the surgeries, he frequently suffers from hallucinations to such an extreme degree that he cannot distinguish between what is real and what is not, and they sometimes put him in dangerous situations, such as when he sees a kind man: "He suddenly saw […] the figure of a man[…]. As the man nodded and bent to pat him, Snitter leapt round and jumped up at his knees, barking for joy. There was no one there, and he fell forward on the squelching peat."[258] His condition not only causes him to behave unpredictably in various situations, such as when he sees a figure of a man, which causes him to jump on Mr. Ephraim and kill him by pulling the trigger involuntarily: "Snitter, turning his head, caught sight in the driving mirror of the figure of a Wan striding down the hillside—a grey-haired man, carrying a walking-stick and wearing an old tweed overcoat and a yellow scarf. Barking loudly, he leapt for the door,"[259] his condition also damages his relationship with Rowf, who once even calls him "brain-sick."[260] His condition also causes him distress as he understands something is wrong with his mind: "I wish it would stop. I thought it had. It always takes me unawares. I never remember."[261] It is said that the aforementioned situation and death of Mr. Ephraim causes the hatred for the dogs to culminate: "It was after this that the bad things began,"[262] thus, his condition resulting from the inhumane experiments is the direct cause of the search that follows and almost results in both dogs' death. It is evident from these examples and from various other situations in the book that animal welfare is a crucial component of the story and a key theme of *The Plague Dogs*.

Similarly, Jack London's works, *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang*, heavily focus on animal welfare issues as they criticize dog abuse, dog fighting, and neglect. This can be seen in

[257] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 95.
[258] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 74.
[259] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 149.
[260] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 76.
[261] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 74.
[262] Adams, *The Plague Dogs*, 149.

the fact that White Fang is portrayed as having "no affection for Gray Beaver" as a result of his treatment: "He had no affection for Gray Beaver. True, he was a god, but a most savage god,"[263] or in the description given to Beauty Smith who tortured White Fang: "In short, Beauty Smith was a monstrosity."[264] Buck also does not like his handlers, such as Hal or Mercedes, and this is made clear when Thornton rescues him by beating Hal rather than growling at Thornton for hurting his master, he "licked his hand": "'You poor devil,' said John Thornton, and Buck licked his hand."[265] And Hal's treatment of Buck when the dog is unable to stand is portrayed as negative based on Thornton's reaction when he sees the abuse: "And then, suddenly, without warning, uttering a cry that was inarticulate and more like the cry of an animal, John Thornton sprang upon the man who wielded the club,"[266] which resembles "the cry of an animal" due to the savage nature of the abuse.

Morey's book *Kävik the Wolf Dog* also stresses the importance of the well-being of the canine protagonist and criticizes neglect and maltreatment, which is one of the reasons why Kävik develops such a strong bond with the first person who shows him kindness. The criticism of neglecting dog needs is shown, for example, in the interaction between Kävik and Tom McCarty, who speaks to Kävik when he sees him locked in a cage: "You don't belong in this cage […] anymore'n I do."[267] The only works that do not seem to be stressing any animal welfare issue or concern are *The Incredible Journey* and *Where the Red Fern Grows*. However, although animal welfare is not the key focus of the works, some animal welfare issues are also mentioned or present.

For example, although animal welfare is not a key theme of *Where the Red Fern Grows*, its presence in the book is still noticeable. Throughout the book, the boy owner of the dogs and narrator of the story keeps his dogs content, would never physically hurt them which the narrator explicitly states, and at some points in the story helps save them. His concern for the welfare of his pets is generally only implied by his behavior. However, near the book's beginning, one situation makes this concern for animal welfare much more explicit. When he, as an adult, helps save a stray hunting hound who is being attacked by a pack of stray dogs, he bathes him and feeds him, because he is starved and even goes to buy more food specifically for the stray dog: "I gave him a bath and rubbed all the soreness from his muscles. He drank quarts of warm milk and ate all the meat I had in the house. I hurried down to the store and

[263] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 143.
[264] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 158.
[265] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 59.
[266] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 59.
[267] Morey, *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, 90.

bought more."[268] The same day, he lets the hound go not because he would not be able to keep the dog, but because it would not be fair to him and because he would suffer psychologically without being allowed to hunt and run around: "I didn't have to let him go. I could have kept him in my back yard, but to pen up a dog like that is a sin. It would have broken his heart. The will to live would have slowly left his body."[269] Thus, this shows that animal welfare is more important to the protagonist than his own feelings or finances. The attitude toward animal welfare is influenced by the concept of speciesism.

Speciesism is another crucial concept of Animal Studies. Similarly to Animal Studies, the concept is, according to François Jaquet, roughly half a century old and is central to the field of animal ethics. Despite being criticized by many, it still has some defenders.[270] It is not a unified term and has various uses and meanings, depending on the speaker, as Oscar Horta and Frauke Albersmeier[271] argue. A short definition included in Horta's and Albersmeier's work is as follows: "Speciesism is the unjustified comparatively worse consideration or treatment of those who do not belong to a certain species."[272] As James Serpell states, the relationship and bond between a human and an animal depends on the animal's species, as attachments to animals other than pets tend to be more distant and are frequently avoided.[273] Horta and Albersmeier state that the term itself was first used and coined by Richard Ryder in the 1970s, who used it to describe a bias of humans against non-human animals because of human superiority.[274] Calarco argues that the term was later popularized by Peter Singer, who defined speciesism as a kind of prejudice based on species membership that leads to denying ethical similarities among humans and non-human animals.[275]

The term uses, as Calarco continues, the suffix "-ism" as a way of calling attention to the similarities with other discriminatory phenomena, such as sexism and racism. Some critics claim that while racism and sexism are undercut by the similarities between races and sexes, the differences between humans and non-human animals justify speciesism. However, scholars who are against speciesism claim that the dissimilarities typically mentioned by such critics are

[268] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 9.
[269] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 9.
[270] François Jaquet, "What's Wrong with Speciesism," *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 56, no. 1 (September 2022): 395.
[271] Oscar Horta, and Frauke Albersmeier, "Defining speciesism," *Philosophy Compass* 15, no. 11 (November 2020): 1.
[272] Horta et al., "Defining speciesism," 3.
[273] James A. Serpell, "The Human-Animal Bond," in *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, ed. Linda Kalof (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 91.
[274] Horta et al., "Defining speciesism," 1.
[275] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 124.

irrelevant to the question of whether animals should be granted the right of ethical consideration. Furthermore, the attributes relevant to this question, which include sentience, relationships, and subjectivity, are present in animals, thus making discrimination based on species membership unjustifiable.[276] It is, therefore, clear that speciesism is quite a controversial concept even in the 21st century.

However, speciesism does not concern itself only with the human-animal dichotomy, but also with the differences that are made between individual animal species. As Calarco mentions, the former is considered the old speciesism, while the latter is the new speciesism, which proves to be much more problematic.[277] Horta's and Albersmeier's more complex definition of speciesism reflects the issue of new speciesism:

> Speciesism is the unjustified comparatively worse consideration or treatment of those who are not classified as belonging to a certain species (or group of species) whose members are favored, or who are classified as belonging to a certain species (or group of species) whose members are disregarded.[278]

According to Calarco, in the new speciesism, some animals are granted at least some ethical consideration because they are the most similar to human beings, while other animals are not granted the same rights.[279] Thus, speciesism is about making differences between not only humans and animals but also among individual animal species due to anthropocentrism and human exceptionalism. Oscar Horta even argues that anthropocentrism may be perceived as a kind of anthropocentric speciesism.[280] And human exceptionalism is described by Stephen Newmyer as the belief that human beings have a higher moral value than any non-human animal because of their intellectual superiority, which means that humans are entitled to use non-human animals in order to serve their needs.[281] As such, speciesism, be it the old one or the new one, is very much present in all of the selected works of fiction, as well as other prose of the 20th century.

Regardless of whether all sentient animals should be granted ethical consideration or whether it is morally justifiable to differentiate between humans and animals when it comes to

[276] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 124–125.
[277] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 125.
[278] Horta et al., "Defining speciesism," 4.
[279] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 125.
[280] Oscar Horta, "What is Speciesism?" *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 23, no. 1 (August 2009): 261.
[281] Stephen T. Newmyer, "'Human Exceptionalism': The Greek Origins of a Modern Concept And Its Implications for the Lives of Animals," *Arhe* 19, no. 1 (2022): 183.

ethical questions, speciesism as such is evident in the selected texts. The old speciesism will be analyzed first. One example can be seen in *White Fang*, when the canine protagonist's first owner decides, as Hasina Wahida remarks, immediately without any hesitation that he is to be the owner of White Fang because his mother belonged to his late brother.[282] He says confidently: "I have spoken. He is my dog. For was not Kiche my brother's dog? And is not my brother dead?"[283] His utterances and actions are clear examples of speciesism as it is the human being only who is allowed to call himself a master over even half-wild animals, restrict their movement, force them to surrender themselves to his human will, and severely punish them when they disobey. There is no question of whether the following situation would be permitted to happen and be ignored later on by other onlookers if it was a human child seeking the safety of its mother who is being taken away from it, but as it is a member of a different, inferior species it is allowed:

> Even a man-animal, a god, White Fang ignored, such was the terror he was in of losing his mother. But gods are accustomed to being obeyed, and Gray Beaver wrathfully launched a canoe in pursuit. […] Holding him suspended with one hand, with the other hand he proceeded to give him a beating. And it was a beating. His hand was heavy. Every blow was shrewd to hurt; and he delivered a multitude of blows.[284]

Similar instances can also be seen in the other works, as the dog characters are always in someone's possession, and in several of the selected texts, the dogs receive beatings whenever the human characters desire. A different instance that shows speciesism happens, for example, in Jack London's short story *To Build a Fire*. Here, the main character uses his dog to measure the frozen water's safety: "Once again, however, he had a close call; and once, suspecting danger, he compelled the dog to go on in front. The dog did not want to go. It hung back until the man shoved it forward."[285] Thus, this implies that humans have a higher moral right to survive than dogs. Similarly, in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* there is a situation when the two canine characters get lost in a storm, and after looking for them for a while, the group of people, except for their boy owner, who then manages to persuade his father and grandfather, decide that it is too hazardous to continue looking for the dogs as "a man could freeze to death in this storm, and besides, [the] dogs will give up and come in."[286] Thus, human life is more important

[282] Hasina Wahida, "Romanticizing the right to exploit: Speciesism in Jack London's White Fang," *The Criterion* 12, no. 1 (February 2013): 3.
[283] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 124.
[284] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 124.
[285] Jack London, *To Build a Fire and Other Favorite Stories* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2008), .
[286] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 170.

than rescuing or trying to rescue two lost dogs. A more subtle example of speciesism can be found in *Where the Red Fern Grows*, in which the dogs, although loved by their owner, are forbidden from entering the family's home and are afraid of coming inside buildings as a result: "My dogs, never being allowed in the house, were scared to come in."[287] Based on these examples and other situations in the primary texts, it is evident that the old speciesism is undoubtedly present and is an important theme in the books.

Second, traces of the new speciesism can also be found in the selected works. It is unsurprising that dogs, and sometimes other animals seen as companion animals, are frequently granted more moral consideration than other animal species because, as David Huebert remarks: "As a species, humans tend to love dogs."[288] For example, in the texts, there are at least some people who believe that dogs feel pain, and so it is morally and ethically wrong to hurt them. This can be seen, for example, in Jack London's *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang*. In both of those texts, the canine protagonists are saved by such people, Thornton and Scott, respectively, in moments when they are being physically abused. In *Where the Red Fern Grows,* the human protagonist sometimes warns his dogs that he will punish them if they do not listen or do something. However, he never truly means it, as can be seen, for example, in the following quote: "Shaking my finger at her, I said, 'If you lay down and roll, I'll wear you out,' although I knew I wouldn't."[289] His reluctance to punish his dog implies he saw it as morally wrong to physically hurt the dogs. This proves that dogs are often granted at least some moral consideration as the same protagonist hunts and kills raccoons and other animals without hesitation or regret. Other animals, especially wild animals, do not seem to be granted the same rights in the selected works of fiction.

Speciesism can also be seen, for example, in how the deaths of the animals are portrayed. In these works, a dog's death is approached quite differently than the death of a different animal species. In *The Call of the Wild*, when the sled dog Dave begins to lose his health and strength and starts crying out in pain, "[a]ll the drivers became interested in his case. They talked it over at meal-time, and over their last pipes before going to bed, and one night they held a consultation."[290] And after seeing his reaction when a different dog was put in his position, they decide to keep him harnessed until he would no longer be able to pull as it would make him "content": "Also, they held it a mercy, since Dave was to die anyway, that he should die in the

[287] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 137.
[288] David Huebert, "The Dark Side of Dog Love: Homo-Canine Exceptionalism on Jack London's Great White Male Frontier," *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 28, no. 1 (winter 2021): 1270.
[289] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 152.
[290] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 49.

traces, heart-easy and content."[291] On the other hand, the death of wild animals in the same book is described in a matter-of-fact manner: "He could take a ptarmigan from its nest, kill a rabbit as it slept."[292] No person seems to hold a discussion over their well-being or care about whether they died while content. Moreover, there can also be seen differences between wild and domestic animals, as, for example, in *White Fang*, the killing of a chicken does result in the dog being punished: "Then he talked harshly to the unwitting culprit, and in his voice there was nothing but godlike wrath."[293] Similarly, in *Where the Red Fern Grows*, the dogs are mourned by their owner: "I laid her head in my lap and with tear-filled eyes gazed up into the heavens. In a choking voice, I asked, 'Why did they have to die? Why must I hurt so? What have I done wrong?'"[294] In Burnford's *The Incredible Journey*, the wild animals that fall prey to the cat protagonist are described as "morsels": "The purring cat joined them, carelessly dropping another succulent morsel by his old friend's nose."[295] These examples of how the death of the animals in the selected primary texts is approached and portrayed show the presence of new speciesism as there are apparent differences between dogs and other animals, as well as between domestic and wild animals.

This completely different approach to wildlife and to dogs can be seen especially in *Where the Red Fern Grows*, because speciesism is inherently present in the action of hunting animals, especially when using domestic animals to track or kill the wildlife. The book is about a man remembering his life as a young boy with hunting hounds. To afford to buy his hunting dogs, he would, for more than two years, among other things catch and sell wild animals, such as crawfish and minnows: "I caught crawfish with my bare hands. I trapped minnows with an old screen-wire trap."[296] Later, before being able to use his hunting hounds, he had to first catch a raccoon in a trap so that he would have a coonskin to train the dogs with: "I had to have a coonskin so I could train them,"[297] and afterward he would regularly set out to hunt raccoons with his hounds. When the first raccoon was caught in his trap, his mother called the animal "vicious": "'My goodness,' Mama said, 'you wouldn't think anything so small would be so vicious.'"[298] It can be assumed that such an adjective would not be used for a panicked and frightened human caught in a trap and trying to save his or her life or for a dog in such a

[291] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 49.
[292] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 74.
[293] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 195.
[294] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 202.
[295] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 47.
[296] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 22.
[297] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 51.
[298] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 59.

situation. The raccoon's violent death also does not warrant any mourning from any of the characters: "Papa whacked him again and it was all over,"[299] unlike the abovementioned death of the hound. These examples show that humans in this book see various animal species differently based on their use and grant them a different degree of ethical consideration.

Furthermore, usually unlike dogs, certain other animals are likely to be present in the texts as absent referents. As Richard De Angelis states, the term absent referent was coined by a feminist literary theorist Carol J. Adams, and it refers to "a subject whose identity becomes lost" which results in the subject both being there and being absent.[300] As Matthew Calarco describes, animals become absent referents when they are referred to by structures that deprive them of their unique subjectivity, which is especially common in meat production.[301] This can be seen in the abovementioned example from *The Incredible Journey*, in which the prey animals are sometimes simply "morsels,"[302] or in *White Fang* in which "meat hung within reach."[303] These descriptions of dead animals are strikingly different from the description of a recently deceased pet dog in Rawls' *Where the Red Fern Grows*: "Kneeling down by her side, I reached out and touched her. There was no response, no whimpering cry or friendly wag of her tail. My little dog was dead."[304] While in the other examples, the non-canine animals are simply absent referents, in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* the dead body of the companion dog still retains the individuality of the canine character. Thus proving that speciesism is an important and frequent theme in the selected works of fiction.

[299] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 59.
[300] Richard De Angelis, "Of Mice and Vermin: Animals as Absent Referent in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*," *International Journal of Comic Art* 7, no. 1 (2005): 232.
[301] Calarco, *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*, 2.
[302] Burnford, *The Incredible Journey*, 47.
[303] London, *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*, 197.
[304] Rawls, *Where the Red Fern Grows*, 202.

CONCLUSION

The portrayal of the relationship between man and dog in literature underwent many changes. In earlier works of literature, dogs and other animals were used only as a method of teaching lessons and the animals themselves were not really important in these works. These heavily anthropomorphized non-human animal characters were not a representation of real animals. Instead, they were used as alternatives to human characters which made it easier to teach about more intricate topics. These human-like animal characters whose only purpose is to teach morals to children or adults are still used in some works of the 20th and 21st centuries. However, in the Victorian era, animal characters portrayed in literature started to resemble real animals more.

This resulted from a significant change in human attitude toward animals that began in the Victorian era. By some, the victorian era is described as the first generation of true animal lovers. The literature written in this era shows a significant difference in human attitude toward animals. While in the Georgian period, a favorite theme portrayed in literature was animal cruelty, in the Victorian era, writers portrayed only those who were ignorant or uneducated as those abusing animals. This influenced the following generations as well, and the works of the twentieth-century prose show a similar attitude which, in the last several decades, may also be influenced by the growing interest in animal welfare and animals as such, and possibly by the emergence of the field of Animal Studies. Thus, in the 20th century, prose characters who are abusive toward animals are generally portrayed negatively, sometimes as cowards or simpleminded people, while those who help animals or treat them well are portrayed either neutrally or more positively.

As a result, the human-dog relationship portrayed in the 20th-century prose appears to promote a more positive attitude toward and treatment of dog companions. While particular works still contain abusive characters with exploitative or utilitarian relationships toward dogs, more focus tends to be given to those who treat dogs well and have actualizing relationships with them. The abusive characters often represent obstacles that must be overcome so the dog character may meet its rescuer. The abuser is never the final owner of the canine characters. In *White Fang*, the story is about the eponymous canine hero having to suffer through the ownership of abusers only to be eventually rescued by a considerate dog owner. In *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, the story focuses more on the journey of Kävik on his way home than his previous,

less agreeable owners. The twentieth-century prose focuses more on dog-loving human characters than abusers.

Dog characters themselves also underwent some changes, especially in children's literature, in the 20th century, and this also affected the portrayal of human-dog relationships. Their usual role in the works written approximately before 1960s was the role of a rescuer. They would help save their masters or family members and sometimes die as a result. This started changing approximately around 1960s when it started to be more common for children to be in the role of rescuers. An example of a book that shows this change is *Kävik the Wolf Dog*. However, even non-children's literature appears to contain this theme. In *The Plague Dogs,* it is the owner of one of the canine protagonists who risks his life in order to save his dog's life. While for an animal to be depicted as loving its human owner to such a degree that it willingly risks its life is not a new concept, a human rescuing an animal and risking his or her life while doing so does seem to be a reasonably new theme to be portrayed in literature.

Furthermore, the twentieth-century prose seems to be more aware of animal welfare issues in general. All of the selected texts contain this theme at least peripherally, and in some, it appears to be a central theme. *The Plague Dogs* criticizes inhumane methods and insensitive approaches regarding laboratory animals. *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang* condemn dog abuse and mistreatment. In *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, animal welfare is also an important theme that affects the story. And, while animal welfare is not a central theme in *Where the Red Fern Grows* or *The Incredible Journey*, it is, to a certain degree, still present. Thus, it is clear that animal welfare is an important component of stories that contain dog characters, and it heavily influences the portrayed human-dog relationship.

Furthermore, the portrayal of the human-dog relationship in the prose of the 20th century is also the result of speciesism. In the case of characters abusive toward dogs, it is the influence of the old speciesism that is most prominent. These characters behave as if they are superior to dogs and as if no moral consideration should be granted to dogs because of their inferior status. Be it the breeder of Kävik, who considers his dogs to be machines, or Gray Beaver, who claims that White Fang is in his possession without hesitation once he sees him with Kiche. However, speciesism also influences the behavior of those who have actualizing relationships with dogs. The new speciesism heavily affects the human-dog relationship as dogs are frequently granted more moral consideration than other animals, in real life and literature. Thus, it is often the case that the owner of a dog character does not approach other animal species with the same affection that he or she does when it comes to dogs. This is perhaps most visible in *Where the Red Fern Grows*, in which the human protagonist loves his dogs and treats them as well as he can,

sometimes explicitly stating that he would never physically punish them. He, on the other hand, readily hunts and kills other animals in order to gain money, especially raccoons. The new speciesism also influences how human characters approach the death or suffering of a dog and of a different animal species, especially wildlife. The portrayal of human-dog relationships and the approach of the human characters toward dogs and other animals is heavily influenced by speciesism.

Selective breeding of dogs and the large variety of dog breeds also affect the human-dog relationship. The physical build of a dog and its behavioral tendencies are influenced by selective breeding, and they, in turn, influence the attitude of human characters toward the canine character. The dogs from *The Call of the Wild* and *White Fang* were chosen for their roles as sled dogs and dogfighters, respectively, precisely because of their attributes. Similarly, in *Where the Red Fern Grows,* the protagonist purchases these particular canine characters because of their breed. In *The Plague Dogs* and *Kävik the Wolf Dog*, the appearance of the canine heroes influences whether humans approach or fear them. Thus, it is clear that selective breeding has a strong influence over human-dog relationships.

The last two concepts that heavily influence the portrayal of dogs and, by extension, the human-dog relationship are anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism. All selected works of fiction contain varying degrees of anthropomorphism, which influences whether and to what degree the canine characters have language, agency, mind, and rationality. These characteristics are more frequently attributed to literary animals rather than non-literary ones. A phenomenon opposite to anthropomorphism, anthropodenial, is also present in the texts. However, anthropomorphism appears to be much more common. Anthropocentrism is a core concept of Animal Studies that influences the portrayal of dogs and human-dog relationships in fiction, and many other concepts of Animal Studies. Not only do the portrayed human characters often believe humans are central and most important, the anthropomorphised dogs are attributed the same anthropocentric beliefs, and the portrayal of the dogs itself is heavily influenced by the authors' anthropocentric attitudes. Anthropocentrism can also be seen in the terms used for animals and humans. Both concepts, anthropomorphism and anthropocentrism, considerably influence the portrayal of dog characters and human-dog relationships in the selected works of fiction.

RESUMÉ

Tato diplomová práce si klade za cíl analyzovat způsob ztvárnění psích postav a vztah mezi člověkem a psem ve vybraných dílech 20. století. Mezi tato díla patří *The Call of the Wild* (*Volání divočiny*) a *White Fang* (*Bílý tesák*) od Jacka Londona, *Where the Red Fern Grows* (*Kde roste červené kapradí*) od Wilsona Rawlse, *The Incredible Journey* od Sheily Burnford, *The Plague Dogs* od Richarda Adamse a *Kävik the Wolf Dog* od Walta Moreyho. Práce je rozdělená do pěti kapitol a pro analýzu používá obor animal studies a s ním spjaté koncepty.

První kapitola je věnována představení teoretického rámce animal studies. Tento multidisciplinární obor je relativně nový a objevovat se začal v druhé polovině 20. století. V historii byl ovlivněn různými problematikami, například problematikou laboratorních zvířat. Odborníci spjatí s tímto oborem přichází z různých disciplín a mají rozdílné cíle i metody. Proto se v tomto oboru objevují různé rámce, například human-animal studies (HAS), critical animal studies (CAS) a literary animal studies. CAS a HAS si jsou podobné svou historií, ale liší se ve svých zaměřeních. CAS se zaobírá etickopolitickými problémy, které jsou v HAS vedlejší. Oproti tomu HAS se soustředí na vztah mezi lidmi a zvířaty. Literary animal studies se zaměřuje na analýzu zobrazení vztahu člověka a zvířat v literatuře, ale je v něm kladen důraz na složku zvířecí více než na tu lidskou.

Druhá kapitola je věnována prvnímu z klíčových konceptů tohoto oboru, antropocentrismu. Ten je často popisovaný jako lidská tendence vnímat člověka jako středobod vesmíru a přírody. Na přírodu a zvířata se tak nahlíží pouze s ohledem na lidské potřeby a s vírou, že člověk je jim nadřazen. Tento přístup ovlivňuje ztvárnění psích postav a vztah člověka a psa v literatuře i jiné koncepty animal studies. Ve vybraných dílech antropocentrismus způsobuje například i to, že postavy rozdílně přistupují ke svým a cizím či divokým zvířatům včetně psů. Člověk a jeho potřeby jsou důležitější než potřeby přírody či zvířat, což se projevuje v použití přivlastňovacích zájmen i v označeních používaných pro lidi a zvířata a popisu jejich vztahu. V knihách je domácí zvíře něčí majetek či mazlíček a člověk je majitel či dokonce bůh. Samotné rozdělení na lidi a zvířata dokazuje to, že člověk je vnímán jako nadřazený a zcela odlišný od zvířat, ač sám mezi zvířata také patří.

Třetí kapitola je věnována druhému klíčovému konceptu, antropomorfismu. Ten je definován jako přisuzování lidských vlastností zvířatům a je ovlivněn antropocentrickým pohledem. Antropomorfismus je univerzální lidská tendence, jež je ovlivněna různými psychologickými vlivy, což znamená, že každý člověk má k němu různě velký sklon. Antropomorfismus také vede k tomu, že jsou literárním zvířatům ve vybraných dílech, alespoň

do určité míry, přisouzeny ty lidské vlastnosti, které jsou často považovány jako výhradně lidské. Opakem antropomorfismu je koncept "anthropodenial," který je definován jako odmítnutí existence zvířecích duševních stavů, které by se podobaly těm lidským. Tato tendence se ve vybraných dílech také vyskytuje, ale je mnohem méně častá než antropomorfismus, který je v určité podobě součástí všech vybraných děl. Zvířecí postavy jsou velmi časté především v dětské literatuře, kde dochází k velké míře antropomorfismu například proto, že tyto postavy nereprezentují reálná zvířata, ale lidi a cílem dětské literatury je něco čtenáře naučit. Zobrazení zvířat v literatuře jako takové prošlo vývojem a důležitá je například změna v přístupu ke zvířatům ve viktoriánském období. Příběhy o psech také prošly změnou a to zhruba v 60. letech 20. století. Předtím to byly psí postavy, které fyzicky zachraňovaly své dětské majitele, v druhé polovině 20. století to byly děti, které zachraňovaly své psí společníky.

Čtvrtá kapitola je věnována konceptu vztahu člověka a psa. Vztah mezi člověkem a psem a člověkem a jinými zvířaty je rozmanitý. Závisí mimo jiné na živočišném druhu, zda se jedná o domestikované či divoké zvíře a do jaké miry je ovlivněné selektivním chovem. Souvisejícím konceptem je kategorie zvířat chovaných jako mazlíčci. Ty jsou rozděleny do třech kategorií podle toho, zda jsou mezi daným zvířetem a majitelem interakce a zda zvíře opětuje svému majiteli náklonnost. Od doby domestikace psa prošel tento zvířecí druh vývojem a vlivem selektivního chovu vzniklo mnoho rozdílných plemen. Ta se od sebe liší velikostí, vzhledem, ale i povahou a chováním. Pestré množství plemen a typů psů je přítomno i ve vybraných dílech. Tyto fyzické i psychické charakteristiky poté v daných textech ovlivňují jak ztvárnění psích postav, tak přístup lidských postav k nim a vztah mezi nimi. Selektivní chov vede i k odlišným schopnostem zvířat a potažmo i k rozdílnému ztvárnění psích a jiných zvířecích postav. Například v knize *The Incredible Journey* je zobrazeno to, že psi mají horší schopnost přežití v přírodě, zatímco pro kočky to není výrazný problém. Vlivem selektivního chovu mají psi oproti jiným domácím zvířatům také větší tendenci k vyhledávání lidského kontaktu a preferování člověka před svým vlastním druhem, což ovlivňuje jejich ztvárnění v literatuře a často i samotný příběh daných děl. Například v mnoha knihách psí protagonisté pátrají po svých majitelích. V literatuře se často vyskytují čtyři typy vztahu mezi člověkem a psem. Pes může být viděn jako náhrada za jiného člověka, pouhý objekt či stroj, zdroj zisku, nebo může být respektován jako jedinec s vlastními potřebami a tužbami. Ve vybraných dílech se vyskytují poslední tři zmíněné typy vztahů. Ty postavy, které vidí psy jako zdroje zisku či jako pouhé objekty jsou zpravidla zobrazeny záporně. Často to jsou padouchové či překážky, které psí postavy musí překonat a zpravidla nejsou jejich posledními majiteli. Naopak ty postavy, které respektují psy jako jedince, kteří mají právo na vlastní potřeby a tužby, jsou

naopak zobrazeny kladně. Psím postavám často zachraňují život a při jejich záchraně se nezdráhají riskovat svůj vlastní. Zpravidla jsou také jejich posledními majiteli a cílem, po kterém psí postavy pátrají.

Pátá kapitola je věnována zbylým, ale rovněž důležitým, konceptům, welfare zvířat a speciesismu. Welfare zvířat je koncept týkající se blaha a pohody zvířat. Dříve byl kladen důraz pouze na fyzický komfort, zatímco v současné době je větší tendence soustředit se také na psychickou pohodu zvířat. Ve většině vybraných děl je welfare zvířat stěžejní, v některých přímo ovlivňuje děj. Ale i v těch dílech, ve kterých se vyskytuje v menším měřítku, je na něj v určitých momentech kladen důraz. Je tedy v různých podobách přítomen ve všech vybraných knihách a tudíž také ovlivňuje zobrazení vztahu člověka a psa. Speciesismus je koncept, který má své odpůrce i příznivce. Mnozí odborníci rozlišují mezi starým a novým speciesismem. Starý speciesismus se týká rozdílného přístupu ke zvířatům a jejich blahu proto, že nepřísluší k lidskému druhu. Nový speciesismus se týká rozdílného přístupu ke dvěma rozdílným zvířatům, kdy jedno náleží k živočišnému druhu, který je zvýhodněn, zatímco druhé náleží k tomu, který je přehlížen. Oba typy speciesismu se ve vybraných dílech v různých podobách vyskytují a stejně jako ostatní zmíněné koncepty také ovlivňují zobrazení vztahu člověka a psa.

Analýza daných děl prostřednictvím výše zmíněných konceptů a rámců ukazuje, že v próze 20. století je tendence k podporování pozitivního chování a přístupu ke psům. Ač mnohá díla obsahují postavy, které psům ubližují a neplní jejich potřeby, tyto postavy tvoří víceméně překážky, které psí postavy musí překonat, aby se dostaly ke svému člověku, který se k nim chová s úctou a respektem. Ve vybraných dílech často lidské postavy těm psím pomáhají a zachraňují je z nepříznivých podmínek. I přes to, že jsou vybraná díla převážně o psích protagonistech, vyskytuje se v nich velká míra antropocentrismu a speciesismu, které vedou k vnímání lidí jako nadřažených psům i jiným zvířatům a rozlišování mezi jednotlivými živočisnými druhy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Richard. *The Plague Dogs*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2007.

AKC. "List of Breeds by Group." List of Breeds by Group. Last modified June 1, 2023. https://www.akc.org/public-education/resources/general-tips-information/dog-breeds-sorted-groups/

Archer, John. "Why Do People Love Their Pets?" *Evolution and Human Behavior* 18, no. 1 (1997): 237–259.

Barker, Keith. "Animal Stories." In *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature,* edited by Peter Hunt, 279–291. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Birke, Lynda. "Intimate Familiarities? Feminism and Human-Animal Studies." *Society & Animals* 10, no. 4 (2002): 429–436.

Borgards, Roland. "Introduction: Cultural and Literary Animal Studies." *De Gruyter* 9, no. 2 (September 2015): 155–160.

Burnford, Sheila. *The Incredible Journey*. London: The Book Club, 1961.

Calarco, Matthew R. *Animal Studies: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge, 2021.

Carenzi, Corrado, and Marina Verga. "Animal welfare: review of the scientific concept and definition." *Italian Journal of Animal Science* 8, no. 1 (2009): 21–30.

Copeland, Marion W. "Literary Animal Studies in 2012: Where We Are, Where We Are Going." *Anthrozoös* 25, no. 1 (2012): 91–105.

Danahay, Martin, and Deborah Denenholz Morse. "The Emergence of Animal Studies." In *The Routledge Companion to Victorian Literature*, edited by Dennis Denisoff and Talia Schaffer, 342–354. New York: Routledge, 2020.

De Angelis, Richard. "Of Mice and Vermin: Animals as Absent Referent in Art Spiegelman's *Maus*." *International Journal of Comic Art* 7, no. 1 (2005): 230–249.

Dotson, Michael J., and Eva M. Hyatt. "Understanding dog-human companionship." *Journal of Business Research* 61, no. 1 (May 2008): 457–466.

Epley, Nicholas, Adam Waytz, and John T. Cacioppo. "On Seeing Human: A Three-Factor Theory of Anthropomorphism." *Psychological Review* 114, no. 1 (November 2007): 864–886.

Fox, Michael. “Relationships Between the Human and Non-human Animals.” In *Interrelations Between People and Pets*, edited by Bruce Fogle, 23–40. Illinois: Charles C Thomas Pub Ltd, 1981.

Frost, Laurie Adams. “Pets and Lovers: The Human-Companion Animal Bond in Contemporary Literary Prose.” *Journal of Popular Culture* 25, no. 1 (summer 1991): 39–53.

Gipson, Fred. *Old Yeller*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.

Glock, Hans-Johann. “Agency, Intelligence, and Reasons in Animals.” *Philosophy* 94, no. 4 (October 2019): 645–671.

Hernandez, Aleksandra. “Jack London’s Poetic Animality and the Problem of Domestication.” *Journal of Modern Literature* 45, no. 1 (January 2021): 40–55.

Hewson, Caroline J. “What is animal welfare? Common definitions and their practical consequences.” *The Canadian Veterinary Journal* 44, no. 1 (June 2003): 496–499.

Hirschman, Elizabeth C. “Consumers and Their Animal Companions.” *Journal of Consumer Research* 20, no. 4 (March 1994): 616–632.

Horta, Oscar, and Frauke Albersmeier. “Defining speciesism.” *Philosophy Compass* 15, no. 11 (November 2020): 1–9.

Horta, Oscar. “What is Speciesism?” *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 23, no. 1 (August 2009): 243–266.

Hosey, Geoff, and Vicky Melfi. “Human-Animal Interactions, Relationships and Bonds: A Review and Analysis of the Literature.” *International Journal of Comparative Psychology* 27, no. 1 (2014): 117–142.

Huebert, David. “The Dark Side of Dog Love: Homo-Canine Exceptionalism on Jack London’s Great White Male Frontier.” *Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 28, no. 1 (winter 2021): 1269–1293.

Jaquet, François. “What’s Wrong with Speciesism.” *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 56, no. 1 (September 2022): 395–408.

Kalof, Linda. *Looking at Animals in Human History.* London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2007.

Kerslake, Lorraine. “Deconstructing Human-Canine Relations in Richard Adams’ *The Plague Dogs*.” *European Journal of English Studies* 27, no. 3 (2023): 410–426.

Kindt, Julia. “Review Article Capturing the Ancient Animal: Human/Animal Studies and the Classics.” *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 137, no. 1 (November 2017): 213–225.

Kopnina, Helen, Haydn Washington, Bron Taylor, and John J. Piccolo. “Anthropocentrism: More than Just a Misunderstood Problem.” *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 31, no. 1 (January 2018): 109–127.

London, Jack. *The Call of the Wild and White Fang*. New York: Barnes & Noble, 2004.

London, Jack. *To Build a Fire and Other Favorite Stories*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2008.

Marvin, Garry and Susan McHugh. “In it together: an introduction to human-animal studies.” In *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies,* edited by Garry Marvin and Susan McHugh, 1–9. New York: Routledge, 2014.

McHugh, Susan. “Literary Animal Agents.” *PMLA* 124, no. 2 (March 2009): 487–495.

McHugh, Susan. *Dog.* London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2004.

Morey, Walt. *Kävik the Wolf Dog*. New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1968.

Mostafa, Maha Mohamed Hosny. “The animal turn in fiction: An animal-centric analysis of *A Dog’s Purpose* and *Anthill*.” *International Journal of English and Literature* 6, no. 9 (September 2015): 150–162.

Newmyer, Stephen T. “‘Human Exceptionalism’: The Greek Origins of a Modern Concept And Its Implications for the Lives of Animals.” *Arhe* 19, no. 1 (2022): 183–206.

Penn, Derek C., and Daniel J. Povinelli. “On the lack of evidence that non-human animals possess anything remotely resembling a ‘theory of mind.’” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 362, no. 1 (2007): 731–744.

Pettman, Dominic. “Affection.” In *The Edinburgh Companion to Animal Studies*, edited by Lynn Turner, Undine Sellbach and Ron Broglio, 30–41. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018.

Pongrácz, Péter, and Petra Dobos. “What is a companion animal? An ethological approach based on Tinbergen’s four questions. Critical review.” *Applied Animal Behavior Science* 267, no. 1 (October 2023): 1–14.

Probyn-Rapsey, Fiona. “Anthropocentrism.” In *Critical Terms for Animal Studies*, edited by Lori Gruen, 47–63. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.

Rawls, Wilson. *Where the Red Fern Grows*. New York: Laurel-Leaf, 1961.

Robles, Mario Ortiz. *Literature and Animal Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2016.

Searle, John R. “Animal Minds.” *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 19, no. 1 (1994): 206–219.

Serpell, James A. “The Human-Animal Bond.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, edited by Linda Kalof, 91–108. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Shapiro, Kenneth Joel. “Human-Animal Studies: Remembering the Past, Celebrating the Present, Troubling the Future.” *Society & Animals* 28, no. 1 (November 2020): 797–833.

Shapiro, Kenneth Joel. *Human-Animal Studies: Growing the Field, Applying the Field*. Ann Arbor: Animals & Society Institute, 2008.

Shapiro, Kenneth, and Marion W. Copeland. “Toward a Critical Theory of Animal Issues in Fiction.” *Society & Animals* 13, no. 4 (December 2005): 343–346.

Sharama, Madhu. “Animals as Humans: Psychological Reasons of Using Animal Characters in Children’s Books.” *Research Journal of English Language and Literature* 5, no. 4 (October 2017): 215–220.

Superle, Michelle. “Animal Heroes and Transforming Substances: Canine Characters in Contemporary Children’s Literature.” In *Animals and the Human Imagination: A Companion to Animal Studies*, edited by Aaron Gross, and Anne Vallely, 174–202. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Wahida, Hasina. “Romanticizing the right to exploit: Speciesism in Jack London’s *White Fang*.” *The Criterion* 12, no. 1 (February 2013): 1–7.

Waldau, Paul. *Animal Studies: An Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Watson, James. *The Dog Book*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1905.

Zwart, Hub. *Understanding Nature: Case Studies in Comparative Epistemology*. New York: Springer, 2008.