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ABSTRACT

Thomas Hardy, Ellen Glasgow, and William Faulkner used the pastoral mode to show the contradictions, inconsistencies, and dangers in some forms of bucolic idyll. The ambivalence of their texts toward the rural world causes many critics to deny or overlook the presence of the pastoral mode in the work of these three novelists. A study of pastoral literature reveals that its characteristics have never been as fixed as many theorists would like to believe. Pastoral redefines, subverts, and reinvents itself as it interacts with different people, cultures, and languages.

The theories of Mikhail Bakhtin help us to understand textual ambivalence toward the pastoral mode, especially when employed in the novel. The novel is dialogic, allowing other voices to speak, thereby disrupting the authority of a single voice. Pastoral discourse may be used to impose a hegemonic culture through an authoritative discourse. Pastoral becomes an official ideology, legitimizing and reinforcing oppression by means of a bucolic myth. The dialogic nature of the novel allows the oppressed voices to speak, problematizing the idyllic aspects of pastoral life. Bakhtin's concept of carnival
permits us to see how laughter parodies and calls into question the idealism characteristic of many versions of pastoral.

The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner deal with characters and cultures which have inherited certain versions of pastoral myth. Their texts reveal how pastoral often becomes a discourse that encourages domination. Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner use class, gender, racial, and religious issues to problematize the idyllic aspects of pastoral.

The primary texts under consideration in this work are Under the Greenwood Tree, Far from the Madding Crowd, The Woodlanders, The Return of the Native, and Tess of the d'Urbervilles by Hardy; The Battle-Ground, Virginia, Vein of Iron, and Barren Ground, by Glasgow; and Absalom, Absalom!, Light in August, Go Down, Moses, and the Snopes trilogy, The Hamlet, The Town, and The Mansion by Faulkner. These plots, characters, and narrations reveal the difficulties experienced by societies and individuals when pastoral idealism meets the inconsistencies and contradictions within and without its own discourse.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In *The Country and the City*, Raymond Williams suggests that there were three periods in English literature when the longing for a pastoral Golden Age was at its height: the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the late eighteenth and early nineteenth, and the late nineteenth and early twentieth (291). The literary careers of Thomas Hardy, Ellen Glasgow, and William Faulkner span the last of these three eras. Between Hardy's first novel, *Desperate Remedies* (1871), and Faulkner's last novel, *The Reivers* (1962), both England and America were revolutionized by increasing urbanization, scientific discovery, and technological advancement. Modifications in belief and value systems, the transition from an agrarian to an urban society, and changes in race, class, and gender roles often produce fears that lead to an increased longing for a Golden Age, one characterized by stability and a simpler life in harmony with nature.

Poets and novelists turn frequently to the pastoral mode to express such apprehensions and desires. Although the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner share many similarities, one of the most noticeable is their use of the rural world as a setting. Their texts often express
nostalgic longings for a peaceful life in the country. Hardy and Faulkner both created fictional landscapes, Wessex and Yoknapatawpha, characterized by pastoral scenery and the passing of an agrarian manner of life. Glasgow also uses the rural landscape as a major component in her novels.

Reared on the Dorset countryside in a cottage with a thatched roof, Thomas Hardy was perhaps the most rustic of the three. In *Thomas Hardy: A Biography*, Michael Millgate describes Hardy's childhood familiarity with rural life:

> Traveling everywhere on foot—or at best on a wagon drawn by a slow-paced horse—he became familiar with the occupants of every cottage, the name of every field and every gate, the profile of every tree, the depth and temperament of every pond and stream. He knew, too, the histories of all these, their associations with old crimes or follies or family quarrels and whatever of legend or folklore might attach to them. (30)

Detailed descriptions of landscapes and the tales connected with them permeate Hardy's novels and the minds of his characters.

Although Ellen Glasgow lived most of her life in Richmond, Virginia, she was familiar with rural customs and pleasures. As a child, she spent most of her summers at Jerdone Castle, a seven hundred-acre estate about thirty miles from Richmond. In *The Woman Within: An*
Autobiography, Glasgow describes her childhood summers in this manner:

In the first summers Mammy was with me, and we ranged over the wide fields, some plowed and planted in corn or tobacco, but the greater part of them left to run wild in broomsedge, and scrub pine, and life-everlasting. Farther away, there was a frame of virgin woods, where small wild violets and heartsease and strange waxen blossoms pushed up from under the dead leaves of last winter. Every vista in the woods beckoned me; every field held its own secret; every tree near our house had a name of its own and special identity. This was the beginning of my love for natural things, for earth and sky, for roads and fields and woods, for trees and grass and flowers; a love which has been second only to my sense of an enduring kinship with birds and animals, and all inarticulate creatures. Mammy and I gave every tree on the big blue-grass lawn a baptism. We knew each one by name, from Godwin, the giant elm, to Charles, the oak, and Alfred, the shivering aspen. I remember running out at night, when I was only half dressed, to clasp my arms, as far as they would go, around a beech, because somebody had cut into the bark, and I was sure it was hurt. (26-7)

Many characters in Glasgow's novels have similar idyllic memories combined with the nostalgic longing for simpler, happier days close to the earth. The broomsedge, pine, and life-everlasting figure prominently in several of her novels, particularly Virginia, Barren Ground, and Vein of Iron.¹

Like Ellen Glasgow, William Faulkner also grew up in more privileged circumstances than Hardy, but he was familiar with the rural world. Ripley and Oxford,
Mississippi might not seem as pastoral as the Dorset countryside, but people in this area of the South were closely connected with the rural way of life. Furthermore, tales of the Golden Age of the antebellum South nourished Faulkner's pastoral spirit (Blotner 22). Though Faulkner spent most of his childhood in Oxford, there were frequent excursions to the country and the woods. In *Faulkner: A Biography*, Blotner describes Faulkner's education in rural folklore:

Sometimes the Colonel would take his four grandchildren out in the surrey to his farm in the country north of town. Billy would always seek out the negro blacksmith on the place, listening to the man tell about old times in the county as he hammered the glowing plowshare or ax head. And of course, Mammy Callie had her seemingly inexhaustible fund of stories--memories of her girlhood on the Barr plantation under "Ole Mistis" before the war, and eerie experiences involving wolves and other varmints in the Tallahatchie Bottom. (31)

Such tales became the basis for many of Faulkner's critiques of the Southern pastoral vision. The folklore and myth of African-American "mammies" was a common source of inspiration and information for both Faulkner and Glasgow.

There are many similarities between Hardy's Wessex, Glasgow's Virginia, and Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha. James W. Tuttleton points out the resemblances between Glasgow's
South, Virginia, and Queen Elizabeth County and Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha as a "topos or symbol of a metaphysical or philosophical interpretation of Reality" (579). Wessex, Virginia, and Yoknapatawpha are fictional settings upon which Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner utilize the pastoral mode.

Many critics refuse to acknowledge the presence of the pastoral mode in some novels, especially if they contain tragedy or "realistic" elements. At the center of this debate rages a dispute concerning the true characteristics of pastoral fiction. Almost every definition of pastoral that has ever been offered has been called into question. In *Theories of Pastoral Poetry*, J. E. Congleton admitted that "perhaps no genre is more difficult to define than the pastoral, and most readers readily admit that their conception of the pastoral is vague" (55). Annabel Patterson, in *Pastoral and Ideology*, suggests that critics stop trying to define pastoral, since it has been impossible to give a strict definition since the sixteenth century (7). In *The Echoing Woods*, E. Kegel-Brinkgreve argues that the pastoral as a genre ended with Wordsworth's "Michael" (579).
Though pastoral is defined often as nothing more than an idyllic description by shepherds of the tranquility of rural life, a closer analysis reveals that the pastoral has had many different forms, styles, characteristics, and themes. Pastoral has been a vehicle for social criticism which, in turn, produces a yearning for a lost age. Those who suggest that a novel cannot be classified as pastoral unless the whole work describes a life of perfect peace and harmony in the rural world, fail to recognize that some versions of pastoral would not exist unless there was some unhappiness caused by a sense of loss. Though some of the novels classified frequently as "pastoral" may contain tragedy, they usually include "pastoral interludes," brief scenes or dreams of rural tranquility, causing the characters to wish that such interludes could become their permanent experience. Even where these pastoral interludes are missing, the desire to return to a bucolic era of happiness pervades the minds of narrators and characters.

While many literary critics and theorists attempt to expand the definition of pastoral to accommodate a variety of works, others attempt to confine it. In 1730, Thomas Tickell wrote, "There are some things of an established nature in pastoral, which are essential to it, such as a
country scene, innocence, simplicity. Others there are of a changeable kind, such as habits, customs, and the like. Of course, the debate among critics concerns what characteristics of the pastoral are "of an established nature" and which are "changeable."

Some critics have refused to classify anything as pastoral unless it treats shepherd singers in Greece. John Fletcher in the preface to *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1609) argued that a pastoral was simply a "representation of shepherds" (15). Furthermore, he contends that the subject matter for the shepherds could not be very complicated since it could only deal with such matters as nature could be presumed to teach them (15). If one restricts the characters and subject matter of the pastoral to the narrow boundaries of Fletcher, then there is very little literature that one could classify as pure pastoral. Even Fletcher realized how difficult it was to confine the pastoral to those subjects. He used part of the preface to *The Faithful Shepherdess* to explain the pastoral's relationship to tragi-comedy.

Similarly, Michael Drayton in the preface of his *Pastorals* (1619) argues that not only must pastorals deal with herdsmen, but that the language itself must be "poor,
silly, and of coursest woofe" (517). Despite this definition, Drayton goes on to explain that he uses the pastoral to speak of "weightie things" (517). Fletcher, Drayton, and others, in order to retain the purity of the classic pastoral form established by Theocritus and Virgil, try to defend the pastoral from being corrupted by inappropriate subjects and language.

Yet, such critics seem distressed that not even the writers who supposedly set the ancient pattern follow the standard characteristics of the pastoral. Alexander Pope agrees that the pastoral should deal with shepherds and rural tranquility, using the pastorals of Theocritus and Virgil as models. Pope is so narrow in his view of the pastoral that he criticizes even Theocritus and Virgil when they use characters other than shepherds and treat themes which are out of accord with the peacefulness of rural life (300).

Even among more contemporary critics, the attempt to limit the definition of pastoral continues. Trying to save the pastoral from those who would broaden its definition, W. W. Greg contends that even if a work contains rustic laborers and the tranquility of rural life, it cannot be a
pastoral unless there is a shepherd (3). Accordingly, Greg refuses to categorize any of Hardy's work as pastoral.

While not quite as restrictive in his definition as Greg, Charles May hesitates to classify any work as pastoral unless the writer's philosophy espouses the idea that there is "a ground of meaning and value inherent in the natural world" (150). For May, the pastoral depicts a "world of benign nature and human content" (155).

If one follows these definitions of pastoral, then none of the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, or Faulkner would qualify, except possibly Hardy's *Far from the Madding Crowd* which does contain Gabriel Oak, a shepherd. There would be little else to commend even this work as pastoral since there is not much tranquility in the book's rural environment.

Attempting to respond to these narrow descriptions of pastoral, many writers try to broaden its definition. Since Greek and Latin writers did not leave precise definitions of pastoral, strict analysis of style, form, and themes of the pastoral began in earnest during the Renaissance. Kegel-Brinkgreve refers to works before the Renaissance, such as those by Theocritus and Virgil, as "bucolics," reserving the term "pastoral" for those works
which conformed to the more strict definitions that were developed later (315). The works of Rene Rapin and Bernard de Fontenelle began a discussion of pastoral which resulted in its characteristics being somewhat broadened. In *Dissertatio de Carmine Pastorali* (1659), Rapin argues that pastorals should describe the innocent love of shepherds. He did not consider some of Theocritus’s work pastoral since it did not confine itself to these subjects (qtd. in Loughery 40-1). Fontenelle, in *Digression sur les Anciens et les Modernes* (1688) proposed that pastoral life appeals to humanity’s innate laziness, the desire to have the greatest pleasure with minimum effort. Therefore, pastorals should be confined to descriptions of peaceful lives of ease in the country (qtd. in Loughery 46). Kegel-Brinkgreve points out that the primary difference between Rapin and Fontenelle is that Rapin based his view of pastoral on classical poetics, whereas Fontenelle based his on what he perceived to be human nature (563). Fontenelle’s views opened the way for a more liberal interpretation of pastoral which many writers began to imitate. Alexander Pope, intent upon prohibiting the intrusion of any unhappiness into the pastoral, advocated the concealment of anything that might be unpleasant about
a shepherd's life (302). Though Pope insisted that he was following the arguments of Rapin and Fontenelle, he was actually more restrictive in his definition.

Such critiques fail to recognize that problems of the historical moment are not absent from some versions of pastoral. Pastoral texts often present history and time as enemies of the pastoral world. Even though Pope would have eliminated Virgil's Eclogues One and Nine from a pastoral classification, they actually show that the pastoral is not always free from disaster. Michael Squires notes that the pastoral frequently combines with realism, as evidenced by Theocritus, Virgil, Spenser's "August" and Sidney's Arcadia (3). Pope's brand of pastoral is not the only pastoral tradition. Robert Drake writes,

As I read it, traditional English pastoral (whether poetry or fiction) always assumes a Serpent in the Garden, a dualism in the natural world corresponding to the dualism in the human heart; and the struggle between these light and dark powers gives to it a pertinence it would not have if, as is often assumed, pastoral involved a "retreat" from reality. (251)

While some versions of pastoral may provide a means of escape from the problems of urban life by creating a myth in the region of the mind for the world-weary listener or reader to retreat, even the pastorals of Theocritus and Virgil commented on the pressures, threats, and changes
caused by urbanization. After all, though the conceit is that the pastoral is the song of a shepherd, it is actually the song of a social critic in the guise of a shepherd. Although Theocritus wrote of herdsmen and their songs, "higher" literary forms find expression even in these pastoral works. Kegel-Brinkgreve calls Theocritus's writing a "cross-breeding of genres" (38). The words of the shepherd singers are not provided by rustics, but by well-educated literary professionals who make political and cultural commentary. Even Theocritus was born in Syracuse and lived in Alexandria.

Pastoral has been used to provide an opportunity for a discussion of a broad array of topics. In 1589, George Puttenham said that the Eclogue concealed certain aspects of rural life, "not of purpose to counterfeit or represent the rusticall manner of loves of communications: but under the vaile of homely persons, and in rude speeches, to insinuate and glance at great matters" (53). The pastoral can contain criticisms of war. It affords a pulpit to suggest ways to return to Eden or Arcadia. It provides a forum to describe what has been lost, why it was lost, and how to regain it. While the pastoral mode may often express longings for the perfect, ideal, pastoral world,
the story is told from, or about, a world that is less than perfect. The pastoral frequently describes a world that is departing increasingly from a pastoral ideal, while retaining some of its characteristics. There is usually a plea to halt the disintegration as a society moves farther from some version of a pastoral norm.

Trying to arrive at a definition of pastoral that will satisfy everyone, some have attempted broad definitions. J. A. Cuddon, expands the concept of pastoral by defining it as

a nostalgia for the past, for some hypothetical state of love and peace which has somehow been lost. The dominating idea and theme of most pastoral is the search for the simple life away from the court and town, away from corruption, war, strife, the love of gain, away from "getting and spending". In a way it reveals a yearning for a lost innocence, for a pre-Fall paradisal life in which man existed in harmony with nature. (689)

While this definition would describe some versions of pastoral, it would not be narrow enough, nor broad enough to satisfy other versions. Even this definition of pastoral needs to be modified in some sense when applying it to the novel. Since the novel has a broader scope than many examples of pastoral poetry, it may seem to depart from the strict definitions imposed on the pastoral's poetic form.
Some critics have tried to avoid the problems of defining pastoral by making a distinction between "genre" and "mode." The only sense in which critics such as Paul Alpers will apply the word "pastoral" to a novel is in the sense of a mode:

It seems neither useful nor plausible to claim for the pastoral novel the literary motivation or generic coherence of older forms. Rather, a piece of fiction can be called pastoral when its author—for whatever reason, with whatever awareness, and concerned with whatever subject or theme—has recourse to usages which are characteristic of older pastorals and which in turn make a tale or novel pastoral in mode. (376)

Alastair Fowler distinguishes between "genre" and "mode" in the following manner: "By genre I mean a better defined and more external type than mode. Genres each have their own formal structures, whereas modes depend less explicitly on stance, motif or occasional touches of rhetorical texturing" (202). As Louis Montrose puts it, "'pastoral' as a noun is a modal form, while 'pastoral' as an adjective (as, for example, pastoral eclogue, elegy, or romance) is genre specific" (453). Paul Alpers distinguishes between genre and mode as follows:

A genre is conceived as a literary form that has clear superficial features or marks of identification and that is sufficiently conventional or rule-governed to enable us to say, for example, that a given work is a pastoral elegy or a Petrarchan love poem or a verse satire or a Plautine comedy or an encomium, and not another thing. Literary pastoral includes many genres
so conceived. It includes not only the whole range of formal eclogues—pastoral elegies, love complaints, singing contests, and the like—but also pastoral romances, pastoral lyrics, pastoral comedies, and pastoral novels. If all these are pastoral, then we are certainly right to say that pastoral is not a genre. Rather, it seems to be one of the types of literature—like tragedy, comedy, novel, romance, satire and elegy—which have generic sounding names but which are more inclusive and general than genres proper. We seek to recognize that pastoral is one of these literary types, when we say that it is not a genre, but a mode. (46)

Alpers goes on, however, to explain that the term "mode" really has no meaning apart from the historical conventions of the genre which inform it (47-8). Such a distinction between genre and mode would allow a more flexible use of the term pastoral, but we are still left wondering about the characteristics of the genre that give meaning to the mode.

Michael Squire's definition of the "pastoral novel" takes some of these differences between mode and genre into account when trying to define the pastoral novel:

We should . . . define the pastoral novel as the sub-genre of the novel, developing out of the pastoral tradition, which idealizes country life by using many of the elements and techniques of traditional pastoral—principally, the contrast between city and country; the re-creation of rural life from both urban and rural viewpoints; the implied withdrawal from complexity to simplicity; the nostalgia for a Golden-Age past of peace and satisfaction; the implied criticisms of modern life; and the creation of a circumscribed and remote pastoral world. This remote pastoral world features harmony between man and
nature, idyllic contentment, and a sympathetic realism which combines elements of idealization and realism and by means of which country life, stripped of its coarsest features, is made palatable to urban society. (18)

As well-rounded as this definition might be, it does not contain all the characteristics of every version of pastoral, especially in a novel. The novel embraces many versions of pastoral, while never confining even those versions to a closed set of characteristics.

As this brief summary of various descriptions of pastoral indicates, there is no one definition of pastoral which has been universally accepted. Various cultures and writers have developed different versions of pastoral. Those versions may, or may not have, certain characteristics in common. Many versions of pastoral have been developed, each reflecting either a school of thought about pastoral or a particular culture's vision of pastoral. When authors, critics, or readers see the word "pastoral," their ideas about it have already been formed by "presuppositions and reading experience" (Kegel-Brinkgreve 378). Paul Alpers argues that our views on pastoral have been shaped by "representative anecdotes," (16), or certain meaningful definitions and models that have been accepted as pastoral:
The history of pastoral criticism can be described as a series of representative anecdotes. Rapin's Golden Age and Fontenelle's innocent love; childhood and maturity in Schiller's *On Naive and Sentimental Poetry*, and, in our own time, Poggioli's pastorals of innocence and happiness and Empson's social encounter of courtier and rustic. (18)

Sometimes, a writer breaks away from the established pattern and adds new dimensions to the pastoral mode. A certain version of pastoral may become the dominant one for an entire culture for an extended period of time.

The novels that I have chosen to examine deal with certain versions of pastoral. I have chosen Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner because they deal with similar pastoral versions and themes from unique perspectives. That critics perceive that Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner used the pastoral mode in some form is evidenced by the many articles and books which deal with their writings as pastoral. Their texts reflect and react to certain pastoral visions which their cultures inherited. Alpers's writes that "our idea of pastoral will be determined by what we take to be its representative anecdote" (21). These writers share certain representative anecdotes of pastoral which have been informed by their culture and their own reading. In their writings, we encounter such versions of pastoral as bucolic, nostalgic, erotic,
romantic, Christian, pagan, modern, and Darwinian, just to name a few. From these representative anecdotes we can recognize "pastoral conventions," or similar themes, concepts and symbols that occur frequently in a culture's or particular generation's adaptation of the pastoral mode. These texts are sometimes supportive, subversive, skeptical, critical, and always ambivalent toward these various versions and conventions of pastoral.

Although some definitions of pastoral have become so broad as to include almost anything, it is not my purpose to establish a new, broader, or stricter definition. Rather than seek a universal definition of pastoral that satisfies everyone, it is probably best to recognize that there have been many versions of pastoral. Paul Alpers points out that "essentialist assumptions still hover around most discussions of genre" (439). Wishing to avoid such essentialist assumptions, I will utilize the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin to show how the novel, with specific references to Hardy, Glasgow and Faulkner, expands, subverts, and parodies some traditional views of the pastoral, in whatever form it might take. A Bakhtinian understanding of genres helps us to understand that totalizing definitions of genres and modes are difficult,
if not impossible. Genres, even language itself, seek to
escape narrow definitions. The novel's tendency to permit
many voices to speak from within the mode prohibits such
totalization. Jacqueline Howard argues that Bakhtin's
theories allow us to see that while cultures define generic
parameters, the novel shows the inconsistencies,
contradictions, and mutability of concise definitions:

Certain conventions may become institutionalized
within a culture as recurring generic features, but
this is a contingent business, subject to change.
Bakhtin's notion of "heteroglossia" or "multi-
voicedness" in the novel takes us away from holistic
notions of genre and allows us to acknowledge freely
the disparate discursive structures. (2)

Bakhtin demonstrates that the novel, by its very nature,
subverts the received traditions of genres and modes,
especially those that have poetic origins. Poetic genres
tend to be, in Bakhtin's terms, monologic, speaking with
one, unified, authoritarian voice:

The language of the poetic genre is a unitary and
singular Ptolemaic world outside of which nothing else
exists and nothing else is needed. The concept of
many worlds of language, all equal in their ability to
conceptualize and to be expressive, is organically
denied to poetic style. (Dialogic 286)

The novel, on the other hand, is dialogic, allowing other
voices to speak, thereby escaping conformity to strictly
coded definitions of form and style. Holquist understands
Bakhtin's dialogism as "a constant interaction between
meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others" (426). Strict definitions of the pastoral are attempts at totalization, but the novel's dialogic heteroglossia resists any such closure. Bakhtin explains,

In the majority of poetic genres, the unity of the language system and the unity (and uniqueness) of the poet's individuality as reflected in his language and speech, which is directly realized in this unity, are indispensable prerequisites of poetic style. The novel, however, not only does not require these conditions but (as we have said) even makes of the internal stratification of language, of its social heteroglossia and the variety of individual voices in it, the prerequisite for authentic novelistic prose. (Dialogic 264)

Past attempts to classify certain works as "pastoral" try to do so by applying strict patterns based on received traditions of certain poetic forms. Bakhtin would simply argue that even in the time of Theocritus and Virgil, the pastoral was being "novelized." The competing voices were already finding expression. As Michael Holquist writes, "'Novel' is the name Bakhtin gives whatever force is at work within a given literary system to reveal the limits, the artificial constraints of that system" (31). Thus, from the beginning, there were forces in the pastoral that were seeking to escape the narrow constraints of that form. Recent studies of pastoral, such as Judith Haber's, reveal
that the pastoral has always been filled with contradictions that resist strict definitions:

In looking back at classical pastoral . . . I found not a stable origin from which later works deviated, but a mode that worked insistently against itself, problematizing both its own definition and stable definitions within its texts; from the beginning of the genre, presence, continuity, and consolation have been seen as related to—indeed as dependent on—absence, discontinuity, and loss. (1)

The novel's use of the pastoral enhances this problematizing, further destabilizing traditional definitions and concepts of pastoral.

Refusing to classify certain works as pastoral because various predetermined elements are either present or absent is a way of insisting upon a monologic reading of the text, a reading that the novel itself defies. What Jahan Ramazani has said of the elegy is also true of the pastoral:

The genre changes at an accelerated pace, challenges traditional norms, shatters old decorums, and combines with other forms. But like other genres, it has always been evolving, hybridizing, self-subverting, so that its modern mutations constitute something less than a total departure from the generic past. (24)

Bakhtin's theories help to explain why there are so many arguments concerning the generic classification of certain novels. The novel defies classification and subverts the genres which it uses. Holquist explains:
As formerly distinct literary genres are subjected to the novel's intensifying antigeneric power, their systematic purity is infected and they become "novelized". . . . [The] novel can include, ingest, devour other genres and still retain its status as a novel, but other genres cannot include novelistic elements without impairing their own identity as epics, odes or any other fixed genre. (xxxii)

These observations help to explain contradictions that appear when novelists use the pastoral mode. At times the text seems to endorse a return to primitivism, at other times a belief in progress. At some points, the text looks to the past with loving affection, at other times, with disgust and hatred. Sometimes, texts depict nature as a benevolent mother, at other times a devouring monster. While Glasgow disparages the traditional romantic plot of the South and the myth of marriage, she still has difficulty divorcing herself completely from an attraction it held for her. While Faulkner criticizes the Southern past, especially the horrors of slavery, his texts reveal an admiration for the Southern aristocracy that he so often criticizes and parodies. Thus, the novel will, of necessity, contain an atmosphere of ambivalence in its use of the pastoral mode. This ambivalence toward the idyllic aspects of the pastoral makes it difficult to come to any firm conclusions about a text's ultimate meaning concerning the idyllic aspects of pastoral. One of the reasons why so
many critics come to contradictory conclusions concerning the meaning of the novels examined in this dissertation is due to the way novels lend themselves to diverse explanations because of the many, often conflicting voices, that speak within the novel. Bakhtin believed that there was a tendency in literary criticism to reduce the different views that might be embraced in a novel "to a systematically monologic whole, thus ignoring the fundamental plurality of unmerged consciousness which is part and parcel of the artist's design" (Poetics 9). Bakhtin called such novels "polyphonic," that is, a "plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses" (Poetics 6). These plots, characters, consciousnesses, and narrations are the location of ideological conflicts which defy closure. Hardy seems to have embraced this understanding of language and literature. In the preface to his volume of poems, Winter Words, Hardy wrote, "I also repeat what I have often stated on such occasions, that no harmonious philosophy is attempted in these pages--or in any bygone pages of mine, for that matter" (Complete Poems 834). Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner use class, gender, racial, and religious issues which point to the ideological contradictions and
dangers within some versions of pastoral, but without necessarily resolving the inherent tensions.

Explaining Bakhtin's view of the novel, Patricia Yaeger writes:

Bakhtin argues that we are accustomed to think of the novel in terms of thematic unities or structural polarities but that the novel is neither univocal nor dialectical in structure. . . . The novel . . . is polyphonic; it is composed of various styles, speech patterns, and ideologies that interact dynamically as "heteroglossia," or many-languaged discourse. In the novel various stratifying forces come together and diverge, styles speak or argue with one another, barely constrained by the shifting framework of the author's intentionality. (141-2)

In the novel, "social heteroglossia" prevents the unchallenged hierarchical domination of a single voice, even when that voice has achieved the status of cultural myth.

The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner deal with characters and cultures that have received certain versions of pastoral. These versions strive to be monologic, resolving contradictions and inconsistencies, while eliminating threats and obstacles. In such monologic versions, goals and doctrines must be universalized. Bakhtin writes:

All of European utopianism was likewise built on this monologic principle. Here too belongs utopian socialism, with its faith in the omnipotence of the conviction. Semantic unity of any sort is everywhere
represented by a single consciousness and single point of view. (Poetics 82)

The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner reveal the difficulties experienced by societies and individuals when pastoral idealism meets the inconsistencies and contradictions within and without its own discourse. Each new definition of pastoral and each new attempt to establish the ideal, pastoral world meet with the same tensions because of the resistance of language itself to such totalizing definitions. These texts show the impossibility of sustaining a monologic, authoritarian vision of the pastoral world.

Bakhtin's theory concerning the dialogic nature of the novel is especially helpful in examining the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner. The dialogic multivoicedness of the novel contributes to the textual ambivalence toward certain versions of pastoral found in these texts. These works evidence clearly a love for the rural world and a distrust of urban culture. Yet, in spite of their love for the rural world and many features of their respective cultures' pastoral vision, they also see the lies and cruelty which fostered and perpetuated various versions of pastoral.
It is not my aim to reveal the authorial intent of Hardy, Glasgow, or Faulkner to support or attack a particular pastoral vision. Rather I attempt to show how the dialogical nature of the novel permits many voices to speak in relation to pastoral ideology, sometimes in spite of the author’s plan. Writing of Bakhtin’s contribution to the understanding of the many voices operating in the novel's structure, Stephen Ross writes:

Voice need not reintroduce a personal author, with all the attendant theoretical problems of psychology and intent, if voice is expanded into an ideological phenomenon gathering to itself all the historical, cultural, and discursive currents that flow through the individual. . . . Bakhtin rejects the notion of a single authorial voice as an object of study in the novel. He stresses that the ideological multiplicity . . . is, in the novel, foregrounded within the discourse itself. . . . Each single voice has its own will, point of view, and consciousness, though its singularity is not so much personal as ideological. Voice is revealed through parody and caricature, through the presence of recognizable institutional discourse, through mere implication (in which a voice is "hidden" but still affects other voices), as well as, of course, through characters. For Bakhtin the concept of voice in prose fiction is inherently a culturally contingent mix within the fiction's discourse and constitutive of that discourse. (10)

Regardless of authorial intent, these texts challenge certain codified assumptions of their cultures' vision of pastoral, and even explode some of the myths. Writing of Dostoevsky's novels, Bakhtin points out that even the characters in the novels are not "voiceless slaves" but
"free people, capable of standing alongside their creator, capable of not agreeing with him and even of rebelling against him" (Poetics 6). The novel provides a means to call into question the language and presuppositions of the pastoral myth. As Doty notes, challenging myths is difficult unless the attempt comes from outside the mythic framework:

To the extent that myths are regarded as expressing lasting nodal points of human significance, they present unquestionable truths, which are considered unfalsifiable so long as sympathetic retelling or ritual reinforcement continues to evoke emotional participation. It is when someone from another framework calls into question the reality of the mythic framework that we begin to feel its nature as something human-made, imposed upon the world. (27)

In Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, the mythic framework of pastoral is devastated by the dialogic nature of the novel, showing that preconceptions about the pastoral are not heaven-sent, but man-made after all. Hardy's texts subvert the kind of pastoral that saw nature as a benevolent goddess. Glasgow's and Faulkner's novels subvert the kind of pastoral that was dependent upon slavery for its existence. These texts often employ the pastoral to portray what seems to be an idyllic setting, but then dismantle it by showing the horror that lies beneath the surface of such a "Golden Age." Versions of pastoral can
become pathological, as illustrated by several failed quests of their fictional characters. Though these works appear, at times, to be supportive of a culture's vision of pastoral, "alongside verbal-ideological centralization and unification, the uninterrupted processes of decentralization and disunification go forward" (Bakhtin, Dialogic 272).

Totalizing definitions of pastoral often fail to take into account the changing versions of pastoral that coincide with the self-interests of a dominant class. George Wotton points out that "one of the major functions of the ideological formations of a dominant class is to universalize that class's own interests and represent them as the interests of the generality" (11-2). Pastoral discourse can be viewed as an attempt to monologize society through the perpetuation of an authoritative discourse. William Empson refers to the ability of pastoral to function as the ideological means of oppression as "the trick of old pastoral" (11). In this version of pastoral, texts present rich and poor living in harmony with one another, the rich taking care of the poor, while the poor work happily to support the needs of the upper classes. Louis Montrose writes that Empson's work suggests that
"pastoral forms may not only embody individual psychological accommodation to the social order . . . but may also mediate class differences and ideological contradictions, so as to make a particular version of the social order possible" (417). Raymond Williams argues that "it was precisely . . . this point that the 'town and country' fiction served: to promote superficial comparisons and to prevent real ones" (54). Some versions of pastoral were deliberately set up to show this contrast between the town and the country, only to legitimize preying upon the rural world and its people, to blind people to the "brief and aching lives of the permanently cheated: the field labourers whom we never by any chance see; the dispossessed and the evicted; all the men and women whose land and work paid their fares and provided their spending money" (Williams 54). In such versions, the poor are happy and content, but the rich are not exploitive. Montrose argues that Elizabethan pastoral encoded a culture in which a theory of social fixity was contradicted by the evidence of social flux, in which the putative coincidence of virtue, honor, and gentility with lineage, status, and wealth was continually placed in question. The primarily courtly pastoral of the Renaissance puts into play a symbolic strategy, which, by reconstituting the leisureed gentleman as the gentle shepherd, obfuscates a
fundamental contradiction in the cultural logic: a contradiction between the secular claims of aristocratic prerogative and the religious claims of common origins, shared falleness, and spiritual equality among men, gentle and base alike. When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then a gentleman? Elizabethan pastoral participates in the ideological process of providing evasive answers to such pointed questions. (432)

The practice of romanticizing the lives of the rural poor has existed in pastoral literature since the Hellenistic and Latin poets (Kegel-Brinkgreve 15). Horace's "Epode II" envies the lives of the country laborer: "Happy the man who, far away from business cares, like the pristine race of mortals, works his ancestral acres with his steers from money-lending free" (365). Such pastoral texts establish the idea that the poor are far happier and content than the rich. Bakhtin writes, "Thus a unitary language gives expression to forces working toward concrete verbal and ideological unification and centralization, which develop in vital connection with the processes of sociopolitical and cultural centralization" (Dialogic 271). The pastoral mode often uses mythic language to justify the oppression of those who may seem to be obstacles to the construction of a new paradise. Totalizing discourses present themselves as "eternal" or "natural." The dialogic nature of the novel, regardless of authorial intent, reveals these
discourses to be culturally and historically contingent. Versions and visions of pastoral change as the dominant discourse seeks to perpetuate a hegemonic agenda. The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner reveal how pastoralism becomes a discourse that encourages domination. The definitions and aims of pastoral discourse necessarily change as the needs of power structures change. Yet, in spite of the culture's use of the pastoral to encourage domination and oppression, the pastoral cannot remain consistent with itself, especially when its language is appropriated or invaded by another class or culture.

Since their literary careers overlap and succeed one another, they confront and develop many of the same issues. It would be possible to show how Glasgow and Faulkner borrowed from Hardy. Glasgow admired Hardy and his work and even paid him a personal visit. Faulkner had copies of some of Hardy's books in his library (Blotner, Library 67). David Jarret has noted, "Faulkner's borrowings from Hardy are on a greater scale than has previously been realized" (174). Glasgow was familiar with Faulkner's works, once writing, "Only a puff of smoke separates the fabulous Southern hero of the past from the fabulous Southern monster of the present--or the tender dreams of James Lane
Allen from the fantastic nightmares of William Faulkner" ("Heroes" 163). Glasgow does not appear to borrow from Faulkner as much as she revolts from the violence of his novels. Judith Wittenberg has noted that Faulkner was familiar with Glasgow's writings: "The connections between the work of Ellen Glasgow and William Faulkner merit serious consideration, for she was among his most influential predecessors in American fiction, conceivably offering him inspiration at a number of levels" ("Women Writers" 284). Therefore, both Glasgow and Faulkner were familiar with Hardy and with one another. But rather than emphasize borrowings or dependence, I will show that these three authors "novelize" the same pastoral themes, allowing various voices to contradict the pastoral from within itself and expand its boundaries.

Critics have noted the similarities between these three authors as pastoral writers. Comparing Hardy and Faulkner, Millgate observes:

Though firmly grounded in reality, Wessex remains essentially fictional, 'an imaginative Wessex only'. It is an artificiality, a deliberately created fictional world. . . . The closest parallel, at least among novelists writing in English, would seem to be with William Faulkner, the creator of Yoknapatawpha County. (Career 345)
Comparing the use of pastoral in Hardy and Faulkner, Rabbetts writes that their similarity is "not of a simple Arcadian perspective but of a common emphasis upon irony and ambivalence. . . . Each constantly reminds his readers that the apparent 'simplicity' of rural life is more apparent than real" (116). These same pastoral themes are found in Glasgow's texts. I wanted to add Glasgow to the discussion for her unique perspective concerning gender issues in the pastoral mode. Judith Wittenberg observes that for many years it was not permissible to mention Faulkner and Glasgow together, since Faulkner's works were considered so much superior ("Fortunes" 592). I believe that future comparisons of Glasgow and Faulkner will yield interesting dialogues for discussions, not only of Southern pastoral, but race, class and gender issues as well.

Another reason I chose these three authors is due to their common portrayal of idealists who want to create an idyllic pastoral environment. These idealists have accepted a particular version of pastoral, emphasizing idyllic aspects of rural life. All three authors portray the tragedies that accompany these idealists.

These writers also use rustic characters to laugh at the idealists. One of Bakhtin's useful theories in
analyzing literature is his concept of "carnival."

Especially in his book, Rabelais and His World, Bakhtin shows how the country people, those immersed in the world of folklore, laugh at dominant ideologies. Showing how carnival mocks ideological dogmatism, Bakhtin writes that carnival "is opposed to that one-sided and gloomy official seriousness which is dogmatic and hostile to evolution and change, which seeks to absolutize a given condition of existence or a given social order" (Poetics 160). Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner often use rustic characters to laugh at this dominant ideology and its idealistic promoters. Through the course of this dissertation, I will demonstrate how the rustic characters "carnivalize" the idyllic aspects of pastoral, holding it up to laughter.

My use of Bakhtin's concepts of dialogic and carnival may be even broader than that intended by Bakhtin, since he often classified novels, such as those by Tolstoy, as monologic. Recognizing that some novels may be more dialogic than others, I believe that Bakhtin's own theory contains the seeds of seeing dialogic and carnival relationships throughout language and literature. For example, Bakhtin wrote:

Dialogic relationships exist among all elements of novelistic structure; that is, they are juxtaposed
contrapuntally. And this is so because dialogic relationships are a much broader phenomenon than mere rejoinders in a dialogue, laid out compositionally in the text; they are an almost universal phenomenon, permeating all human speech and all relationships and manifestations of human life—in general, everything that has meaning and significance. (Poetics 40)

Since all language and relationships reflect dialogic relationships, one can expect to find them in novels other than those by Dostoevsky.

Similarly, one could expect to find examples of carnival, not only in Rabelais, but in many areas of life where lofty, spiritualized ideals are brought low by laughter. Bakhtin believed that "carnivalization is combined organically with all the other characteristics of the polyphonic novel" (Poetics 159). The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner demonstrate the dialogic nature of the novel and the ability of novelistic discourse to carnivalize idealistic versions of pastoral.

Although I mention some of their other novels, the primary texts under consideration for this dissertation are Under the Greenwood Tree, Far from the Madding Crowd, The Woodlanders, The Return of the Native, and Tess of the d'Urbervilles by Hardy; The Battle-Ground, Virginia, Vein of Iron, and Barren Ground, by Glasgow; and Absalom.

In Chapter 2, "Wessex, Virginia, and Yoknapatawpha: Paradise Lost Again," I deal with the fictional regions created by Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner. When paradise is lost, writers often try to present a story of the fall, trying to understand how the pastoral world became the opposite of what it was intended to be. Hardy's Wessex tales demonstrate how class structures mythologize and demoralize those who live in the pastoral environment. Glasgow and Faulkner show how the South tried to build the new paradise. The Battle-Ground and Absalom, Absalom! contain characters such as Thomas Sutpen, who try desperately to create a paradise, but fail because of a flaw in their original design. Both Glasgow and Faulkner point to slavery and "the problem of the South" as sources of the failure to build the new paradise. The tales of Wessex, Virginia, and Yoknapatawpha also reveal the difficulty of historically documenting the fall from paradise.

Chapter 3, "Eustacia Vye, Eula Varner, and Virginia Pendleton: Romance, Morality, and Marriage in the Pastoral World," attempts to show the disillusionment and despair...
encountered by women when their visions of pastoral bliss conform to or confront patriarchal and capitalistic codes of marriage and morality. These texts reveal the inconsistencies and consequences of the patriarchal pastoral vision. Eustacia Vye dies either by accident or suicide. Eula Varner is definitely a suicide. Virginia Pendleton loses her identity because she builds her life based upon the Southern myth of womanhood.

Chapter 4 also deals with women who encounter hardship in supposed pastoral environments, but nevertheless exhibit a strength which enables them to endure the despair. I will show how Hardy's Tess Durbeyfield, Faulkner's Lena Grove, and Glasgow's Ada Fincastle continue to survive, despite their encounters with several disappointing versions of pastoral.

In Chapter 5, "Bathsheba Everdene and Dorinda Oakley: Independent Women and the Pastoral," I show how Hardy's Bathsheba Everdene and Glasgow's Dorinda Oakley confront certain versions of pastoral as strong, independent women. Their independence, while admired in some respects, is problematized by both texts.

Pastoral literature often contains literal, or symbolic shepherds. The Return of the Native, Light in
August, Go Down, Moses, and Virginia contain accounts of men who, in some way, function as allegorical pastoral shepherds. In Chapter 6, "Failed Shepherds: Idealists Seeking the Pastoral," I try to show how these shepherds become parodies of their cultures' standard for shepherds. The stories of Clym Yeobright, Gail Hightower, Ike McCaslin, and Gabriel Pendleton demonstrate the inconsistencies and contradictions within the Christian pastoral and its secular or pagan alternative.

Chapter 7, "The Woodlanders and Go Down, Moses: Elegies for the Pastoral," deals with the demise of the pastoral world and the laments that Hardy and Faulkner construct in its memory. As mourners wept over funeral biers in pastoral elegy, Hardy's and Faulkner's narrators mourn the loss of the wilderness and its way of life.

Dangers and obstacles attend some versions of pastoral. The energy created by the desire for Paradise has generated everything from the wonders of modern medicine to the horrors of Nazi Germany. Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner show that the pastoral dream often ends in cruelty, neurosis, disillusionment, or tragedy. The pastoral mode may reinforce optimism or destructive delusions.
The hope that England, New England, the South, or the entire United States would one day be a new Eden became a highly-developed myth. As dominating power structures sought to achieve this paradise, many people endured the cruelty of hierarchical oppression. Since the anguish and agony imposed upon others would eventually bring in the Golden Age, at least for some, the pastoral myth justified the pain. The novel provided one of the means through which to dismantle the mythic language and structure that developed. Bakhtin explains:

The resistance of unitary, canonic language, of a national myth bolstered by a yet-unshaken unity, is still too strong for heteroglossia to relativize and decenter literary and language consciousness. This verbal-ideological decentering will occur only when a national culture loses its sealed-off and self-sufficient character, when it becomes conscious of itself as only one among other cultures and languages. It is this knowledge that will sap the roots of mythological feeling for language, based as it is on an absolute fusion of ideological meaning with language; there will arise an acute feeling for language boundaries (social, national and semantic); from behind its word, forms, styles, nationally characteristic and socially typical faces begin to emerge, the images of speaking human beings. (Dialogic 370)

Pastoral language is ennobled language. Very often, it is patriarchal, hierarchical, elitist, sexist, and racist. In the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, the voices of women, the poor, and minorities speak within the pastoral
so that this "verbal-ideological decentering" can take place. Monologic pastoral language encounters other cultures and languages. Patricia Yeager defines "ideology" as "a set of beliefs that allows individuals to experience themselves as unified or coherent in a society that is neither" (148). The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, through the dialogic nature of the novel, reveal the impossibility of maintaining or reifying Utopian versions of pastoral, despite the desperate attempts of cultures to preserve a monologic ideology.

Endnotes

1 For a detailed examination of Glasgow's view toward animals see Catherine Rainwater's "Consciousness, Gender, and Animal Signs in Barren Ground and Vein of Iron."

2 Although I am dealing with the pastoral mode in several of these authors' texts, the following critics have difficulty seeing the pastoral in some of these works. Michael Squires in The Pastoral Novel would not classify The Return of the Native as pastoral. Paul Alpers, in What Is Pastoral? calls The Woodlanders a "nonpastoral novel" (419).

3 For example, even if we accept a basic definition such as, "pastoral is a mode that reflects a nostalgic longing for an idealized rural life," critics such as Kegel-Brinkgreve counter with "feelings like nostalgia and a critical attitude toward urban civilisation, giving rise to admiration of the herdsman's poetic existence, may account to some extent for the acclaim with which the bucolic poems of Virgil and Theocritus were greeted, but they can be voiced in other literary genres as well; and the intermittent interest in bucolic goes to show that they need not automatically result in yet another set of eclogues" (178).

Paul Alpers has a specific "representative anecdote" which he finds in all pastoral. He writes that "we will have a far truer idea of pastoral if we take its representative anecdote to be a herdsmen and their lives, rather than landscape of idealized nature" (22). I see these "representative anecdotes" as shifting and changing with time, cultures, and writers. What may be the representative anecdote of pastoral for one writer, may not be for another.

Raper suggests a further kinship between Glasgow and Faulkner exemplified by a comparison of Faulkner's Nobel Prize acceptance speech when compared with some statements in Glasgow's "What I Believe" and "I Believe" (Doubts xiii).

Wittenberg in "Faulkner and Women Writers" contends that Faulkner may have based several of his stories and characters on Glasgow's works, including *Absalom, Absalom!* and *Light in August*.
Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner created fictional landscapes as a background on which to portray cultural crises happening in England, the United States, and the South. Each of these areas of the world had been designated as the new paradise, or at least, with some work and hard effort, it was believed that these places could become the new Eden. In the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, each of these places emerges as anything but new paradises. Characters and narrators try to explain what went wrong with the vision or founding of the new Eden. From the beginning, there was a serpent in the garden. The texts try to identify the serpent, explain the temptation, and describe the fall and its consequences.

In these writings, many of the characters have a nostalgic longing for a supposed, idyllic past. The texts describe what Bakhtin calls "historical inversion":

The essence of this inversion is found in the fact that mythological and artistic thinking locates such categories as purpose, ideal, justice, perfection, the harmonious condition of man and society and the like in the past. Myths about paradise, a Golden Age, a heroic age, ancient truth, as well as the later concepts of a "state of nature," of natural, innate rights and so on, are all expressions of this historical inversion. To put it in somewhat
simplified terms, we might say that a thing that could and in fact must only be realized exclusively in the future is here portrayed as something out of the past, a thing that is in no sense part of the past's reality, but a thing that is in its essence a purpose, an obligation... The present and even more the past are enriched at the expense of the future. (Dialogic 147)

These texts describe what happens to characters and societies when they encounter this historical inversion. These past Golden Ages never existed in reality, and the future pays the price for this backward looking.

These writings examine race, class, religious, and gender issues that informed the different versions of pastoral ideology which their cultures saw as ideal in the past. A return to the idyllic pastoral was possible only if people conformed to the ideals of the past which had been codified in a myth that now had the status of dogma. In these systems of belief, the races, classes, and genders had to perform preassigned roles as they had existed in the past, or else the pastoral dream would never be realized.

While these texts challenge the natural and eternal status of such myths, they also suggest possible solutions, or new ways, perhaps, in which the pastoral dream might be realized. Some of the texts show the impact of idealists who have a new vision of the pastoral. Much of the disagreement among critics regarding these texts focuses on
whether these authors were advocating the course of action taken by the characters or the narrators, or whether the authors were showing the futility of all attempts to return to the pastoral ideal. Bakhtin's concept of the dialogic prevents us from endorsing dogmatically any one view. Bakhtin's theories allow us to see not only the ambivalence in the text regarding the reasons for the failure to achieve the new paradise, but also the ambivalence toward the supposed solutions. These texts can never consistently disparage the failures of the past nor give unqualified approval to proposed new methods of regaining a pastoral paradise.

**Under the Greenwood Tree:**
The Beginning of the End

English literature has a long history of pastoral allusions. Nineteenth-century writers, such as Thomas Hardy, could draw from a literary heritage which delighted in extolling England as a heaven on earth. John of Gaunt's famous words in Shakespeare's *Richard II* praise England as a secluded haven:

This royal throne of kings, this secp't'red isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy breed of men, this little world,
This precious stone set in the silver sea,
Which serves in the office of a wall
Or as a moat defensive to a house,
Against the envy of less happier lands;
This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this
England. (2.1.40-50)

England's self-consciousness as a pastoral paradise was
informed not only by famous Shakespearean monologues, but
also by the landscape itself. Louis Montrose points out
that in Elizabethan England, sheep may have outnumbered
people by three to one (421). The pastoral conventions
used by British writers were heavily influenced by such
writings as Sidney's pastoral romance Arcadia, Spenser's
Shepherd's Calendar and Colin Clout's Come Home Again,
Marlowe's The Passionate Shepherd to His Love,
Shakespeare's plays, Milton's Paradise Lost, L'Allegro, and
Lycidas; and Marvell's "Mower" poems. These writings
coupled with images of shepherds and sheep, combined to
form an idyllic vision of England as a pastoral paradise.

Hardy's literary heritage and upbringing provided the
basis for many of his pastoral allusions. Hardy was
familiar with ancient models of pastoral as well. In one
of his notebooks, he wrote himself a reminder to compose a
poem based on his childhood days: "Cf. Theocritus & the
life of Bockn when I was a boy--in the wheatfield, at the
well, cidermaking, wheat weeding, &c." (Millgate, Biography
While his writings show his love for the rural world, they also demonstrate a characteristic ambivalence toward certain pastoral visions. Hardy's ambivalence toward the rural world can be seen in his first pastoral novel, *Under the Greenwood Tree*. More than any other novel, perhaps, *Under the Greenwood Tree* reveals Hardy's nostalgia for a way of life that is passing. Also, all of the values that are connected with the traditional portrayal of the superiority of the country over the city are reflected in this text: harmony with nature and the seasons, the value of simple work done by farmers and craftsmen, an organic community, and even a bucolic wedding to end the novel. The book is divided into five sections, "Winter," "Spring," "Summer," "Autumn," and "Conclusion," reflecting the harmony of life with the seasons, typical in many versions of pastoral. In *The Early Life*, Hardy refers to the novel as an "idyll" (113).

Critics, almost without exception, seldom hesitate to classify *Under the Greenwood Tree* as pastoral. Langbaum refers to it as "pure pastoral" (ix) and "a masterpiece of pastoral comedy" (70). Though Dick Dewy and Fancy Day encounter some problems and obstacles, in the end they
marry. The title, Under the Greenwood Tree, is taken from Shakespeare's As You Like It, where Amiens sings:

Under the greenwood tree
Who loves to lie with me,
And turn his merry note
Unto the sweet bird's throat,
Come hither, come hither, come hither.
Here shall he see no enemy
But winter and rough weather. (2.5. 1-7)

As the novel ends and Dick and Fancy ride away from their wedding, Fancy hears a nightingale making the sound, "Tippiwit! Swe-e-et! Ki-ki-ki! Come hither, come hither, come hither!" (198).

At first glance, the novel seems to demonstrate the victory of the pastoral over the urban manner of life. Fancy and Dick ride away into the sunset, all problems resolved as in a pastoral comedy. Many critics, on the other hand, disagree concerning the degree to which this work exemplifies the happiness and resolution achieved by a Renaissance pastoral comedy. David Wright remarks that "the environment is not a pastoral ideal but rural reality" (18). Michael Millgate observes that "each gain . . . has its counter-balancing loss, each happiness its sadness, each despair its triumph" (Career 49). Langbaum writes that in Hardy's later novels problems are more serious, but in pastoral comedies such as Under the Greenwood Tree, the
problems are treated lightly so that they can be "quickly resolved" (74). However, one wonders if the problems between Dick and Fancy have been resolved. Other critics have argued that Hardy was not writing an escapist idyll. Norman Page points out that the subtitle, "A Rural Painting of the Dutch School," and the title's reference to Shakespeare's As You Like It, suggest both pastoral romance and realism (40-1). Other critics, such as J. Hillis Miller, believe that even in Hardy's works such as Under the Greenwood Tree, "there is always some dark strand woven into the texture of the story which renders the ending ambiguous" (153). Casagrande argues that one should be careful not to view Under the Greenwood Tree as an uncomplicated idyll since "the elements of disorder, implacable and immune to human means of remedy, are simply kept beneath the surface, though they threaten to break through at every turn" (Unity 85). Gattrell, in his introduction to Under the Greenwood Tree, posits that the novel portrays the permanence of the village life, while David Wright contends that its "grand subject . . . was the decline and fall of the rural culture of England" (18).

These opposing views embraced by many critics, each trying passionately to establish a coherent philosophy or
theme in Hardy's work, demonstrate Hardy's ambivalence toward his own pastoral creations. Rabbetts notes that for both Hardy and Faulkner it was their third novel (Sartoris for Faulkner and Under the Greenwood Tree for Hardy) that began to reflect their "ambivalence" and "inner division" for their native regions represented by Yoknapatawpha and Wessex (106). While Hardy's first pastoral novel may be less disturbing than his later novels, the text develops many of the ideas that Hardy will expand in later narratives. While the results in future novels will be more explicitly tragic for the characters involved, Greenwood Tree is far from a pure idyll. Hardy's characteristic ambivalence is already evident.

Many of Hardy's novels and short stories take place in a region of England which he called "Wessex." While Greenwood Tree does not contain the designation, "Wessex," later novels reveal that Wessex is the setting for it. Hardy created this fictional landscape to portray the rural aspect of British life and the impact of certain ideologies upon it. Hardy's Wessex is in a transitional period, when an agricultural manner of life is passing away, along with the trades of craftsmen, or, the liviers, as Hardy called them. Hardy uses this transitional phase to describe
conflicts caused by class consciousness and social mobility. This class consciousness spells the beginning of the end for this version of the pastoral world. Ambition and social mobility begin to exert their destructive forces. In As You Like It, Amiens and Jaques sing a song promising contentment for him "Who doth ambition shun" (2.5.33). In Under the Greenwood Tree, ambition is already beginning to play an important role. Like other characters in Hardy's work, Fancy Day's father sends her away from the bucolic world to get an education in order that she might marry well. Recasting a theme which goes back to Longus's Daphnis and Chloe, when Dick Dewy asks for Fancy's hand in marriage, Mr. Day refuses to give her to Dick because he has determined that she will marry no one inferior. In this novel, love appears, momentarily at least, to conquer these class considerations. In later novels, love's inability to withstand class considerations becomes more pronounced. Even at the end of this novel, we are uncertain whether the words of the bird saying, "come hither, come hither" indicate that Fancy has conformed to Dick's concept of pastoral bliss. The words remind her of the secret that she is hiding from Dick—that she accepted the vicar's proposal (someone of a higher class) after she
had accepted Dick's. One finds it difficult to escape what J. Hillis Miller calls, "the dark, ironic undertones" (151), in the conclusion of this novel.

Class considerations also deprive the old choir of its function. Mr. Maybold, the new vicar from a higher social class, and Fancy, aspiring to a higher class, combine to replace the choir with an organ, which Fancy will play in church from now on. Hardy's nostalgia for these days is seen in the 1896 preface to Under the Greenwood Tree:

One is inclined to regret the displacement of these ecclesiastical bandsmen by an isolated organist (often at first a barrel-organist) or harmonium player; and despite certain advantages in point of control and accomplishment which were, no doubt, secured by installing the single artist, the change has tended to stultify the professed aims of the clergy, its direct result being to curtail and extinguish the interest of parishioners in church doings. (4)

Efforts to be progressive, to create a pastoral paradise by new innovations actually defeat the very purposes they are designed to accomplish.

Also, the stable community and its trades are on the verge of experiencing a radical change because of new economic forces. Rapid economic changes force the people of Mellstock to adapt, in a Darwinian fashion, in order to survive. Thus, the text provides a social commentary on
the class and economic tensions that are invading the pastoral idyll.

Blaming wealth and class mobility for the loss of paradise has a long tradition in literature. Poggioli believes that "the Golden Age, unlike Eldorado and the Gilded Age, is a dream of happiness without being a dream of wealth" (8). Many versions of pastoral idealize the simple life of the humble poor. In these versions of pastoral, if there is any unhappiness for these simple people, it is brought about by oppression from the outside. Poggioli writes:

In the pastoral dispensation the humble and the poor lead a life that is almost safe from internal disorder; yet their harmless happiness is all too often threatened by the encroachments of the proud and powerful, by the incursions of those who roam the wild, or by the oppressions of those who dwell within the city walls. (194)

While enjoying the bucolic life, the pastoralist often expresses a fear that their way of life may be destroyed. As Michael Squires writes, "The theme of eviction or dispossession of property, realistic and threatening as it is, occurs twice in Virgil's *Eclogues* [1 and 9], and provides a model for realistic pastoral" (152).

There was a tendency in British literature to idealize the lives of the rural poor in England, but Hardy often
wrote of the true condition of these people. Sometimes, in nonfiction works such as "The Dorsetshire Laborer," he tried to make the plight of these people evident as urban technology and industrialism were beginning to take away their livelihood. Being familiar with the rural poor himself, he realized that some versions of pastoral did not constitute a Golden Age. The idealized past of England, with its happy people working in the agrarian mode of life was an illusion. Raymond Williams writes:

But the social order within which this agriculture was practised was as hard and as brutal as anything later experienced. Even if we exclude the wars and brigandage to which it was commonly subject, the uncountable thousands who grew crops and reared beasts only to be looted and burned and led away with tied wrists, this economy, even at peace, was an order of exploitation of a most thoroughgoing kind: a property in men as well as in land; a reduction of most men to working animals, tied by forced tribute, forced labour, or "bought and sold like beasts", "protected" by law and custom only as animals and streams are protected, to yield more labour, more food, more blood; an economy directed, in all its working relations, to a physical and economic domination of a significantly total kind. (37-8)

As Williams points out, these agricultural laborers always worked under the threat and fear of having their lands taken away from them. The rise of capitalism saw the emergence of a new kind of oppression (39).

What we have in Hardy's England of the 1800s and in Glasgow's and Faulkner's South is "a mystified agrarian
capitalist order." These writers subvert this agrarian capitalist version of the pastoral.

Though the traditional pastorals had criticized the urban world and its greed and corruption, that greed and corruption is found now in the natives of the rural world. In Hardy's novels, a few outsiders come to the rural world and hasten its destruction, but the groundwork was already established by natives who had embraced the economic and class considerations that characterized the urban. One of the ways that the pastoral bliss of the country is subverted in these novels is by showing that the contrast between the innocence of the country and the greed and corruption of the city is not as great as often portrayed in the more modern pastorals.

In Hardy's Wessex plots, he focuses on the effects of farming within the rural world itself. The picture of the threshing machine in Tess may at first seem to be merely a criticism of the impact of urban industrialism on the rural environment:

Close under the eaves of the stack, and as yet barely visible, was the red tyrant that the women had come to serve—a timber-framed construction, with straps and wheel appertaining—the threshing machine which, whilst it was going, kept up a despotic demand upon the endurance of their muscles and nerves. A little way off there was another indistinct figure; this one black, with a sustained hiss that spoke of strength.
very much in reserve. The long chimney running up beside an ash-tree, and the warmth which radiated from the spot, explained without the necessity of much daylight that here was the engine which was to act as the primum mobile of this little world. By the engine stood a dark motionless being, a sooty and grimy embodiment of tallness, in a sort of trance, with a heap of coals by his side: it was the engineman. The isolation of his manner and colour lent him the appearance of a creature from Tophet, who had strayed into the pellucid smokelessness of this region of yellow grain and pale soil, with which he had nothing in common, to amaze and to discompose its aborigines. (315)

Even though this does appear to be a criticism of urban industrialism, science, and technology, we have to remember, as Raymond Williams points out, that this threshing machine "stands in that field and works those hours because it has been hired, not by industrialism but by a farmer" (212). Again, it is a farmer, someone within the pastoral environment, who is turning the pastoral world into a hell populated with creatures from Tophet.

The pastoralist usually expresses a fear that urban dwellers will destroy the pastoral landscape. But Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner point to more than just the encroachment of urban civilization upon the pastoral landscape. After all, Southern slavery was located primarily not in the urban areas, but in the rural, "bucolic" landscape. Just as the horrors of agrarian capitalism are seen in perhaps its ultimate horror in
Southern slavery, Hardy also saw how the pastoral landscape was being destroyed not by urban industrialists, but by farmers who were adopting the agrarian capitalistic modes of production. Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner subvert the kind of pastoral associated with the house owned by the country gentleman, the plantation, and the slave-holding institutions. On the surface, Hardy's pastoral novels may appear to be merely criticisms of the urban world, but much of the rape of the land takes place at the hands of the country-dwellers themselves. Hardy emphasizes repeatedly the effects of farming upon the landscape and the social consequences of farming. Like Faulkner in *Go Down, Moses*, it is not merely the urban bankers who are criticized, but the small farmers who continually plough the land and encroach upon the wilderness further.

The impact of this capitalistic agrarian order extends to love relationships. Though much has been written about false views of romance and repressive Victorian social codes, the blame for these failures in love for Hardy resides primarily in the class structures of his day. Hardy uses the relationships of men and women in the pastoral environment to highlight his criticism of class structures. In the unhappy relationships of Bathsheba
Everdene and Gabriel Oak, Clym Yeobright and Eustacia Vye, Tess Durbeyfield and Angel Clare, Grace Melbury and Fitzpiers, as well as many others in Hardy's other novels, class consciousness plays a major role in disrupting the potential love and happiness of these couples. Even in Under the Greenwood Tree, class distinctions have made their way into the pastoral world of Hardy.

Thus, while repressive sexual codes and marriage conventions share the blame for the loss of the bucolic ideal, the root of this problem in many of Hardy's texts can be traced to class consciousness. Sexual and marriage codes have been imposed upon people by class hierarchies. Hardy’s The Woodlanders will further develop the theme of class consciousness on love relationships. Douglas Brown observes that in The Woodlanders, "social status is integral to the pattern of the story; its protagonists each love 'above' himself or herself. That, too, indicates one facet of the impending collapse of the closed, compact agricultural communities" (73). In The Woodlanders, Grace's father is particularly concerned with issues of class and status. Brown writes that "Mr. Melbury appears a more subtly observed character than his forerunner, Mrs.
Yeobright. Hardy grasps so well the strong country passion for 'betterment', and its bitter outcome" (88).

Hardy's novels express the fear of the pastoralist that the urban world destroys a way of life. But within this context, Hardy's texts also express the view that much of the rural manner of life should be destroyed. J. Hillis Miller writes that Hardy's narrator "undercuts what he describes. He destroys it in the act of celebrating it" (152). The pastoral ideology was often used by people in power to ignore the plight of the poor, convincing themselves that peasants were really happy in their poverty. Alexander Pope, in describing the pastoral said, "We must therefore use some illusion to render a pastoral delightful; and this consists in exposing the best side only of a shepherd's life, and in concealing its miseries" (299). Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner refuse to do this. They see, along with Poggioli, that

primitive man was not cursed by the vice of social organization, which through the institution of poverty would later legalize injustice itself. The final effect of the social contract, by which the individual exchanged freedom for security was to establish social and economic inequality. (28)

As society became more and more stratified, and the structure of power solidified, the institutions were put
into place which would become the means of keeping the poor permanently in their condition.

In the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, we see these characters, not in an idealized light, but in their joys and miseries as they really were. The texts portray them as victims, not of urban exploitation, but pastoral exploitation.

Hardy emphasizes the role that class consciousness played in the destruction of the English paradise. Nevertheless, Hardy's own ambivalence toward class issues finds expression in his texts. This ambivalence has a long history in pastoral literature. Kegel-Brinkgreve observes that "the town-dweller cannot but remain conscious of his own sophistication and worldly wisdom as well; consequently he may also feel superior to the naive creature of his imagination" (384). While Hardy admires his rustic characters, his very use of dialect indicates his superiority. While Hardy seems to glorify the rural past and its workers, there is no question that Hardy also was a social climber himself who desperately wanted to escape his rural past.

The text does more than mourn for a passing manner of life. Greenwood Tree also criticizes pastoral idealism
itself, not in a vicious manner, but in an ambivalent tone that both loves and hates the object of its criticism. The text employs rustic characters to offer a running commentary on the lofty aspirations of the tradesmen, laughing at the ridiculous idealism often embraced by those who have become wealthier or more educated. Kevin Moore writes:

Exceeding simplistic formulations of aesthetic disinterestedness, Hardy's nonrational narratives are Rabelaisian, in Bakhtin's sense of a writing on the frontiers of cultural collapse. . . . Wessex is a baroque or carnivalesque narrative space where the novels represent the desire for poetic faith and the demand for the suspension of all such faiths as forms of "bad faith." It is my understanding that Hardy's nostalgia (as a form of reverence) and skepticism impart to his writing its unique character. . . . Confined within a cultural space of collapse, a black hole of skeptical writing which envelops idealistic texts to feed its own bizarrely inverting energies. (46-7)

Moore's analysis of Hardy's writing demonstrates the ambivalence Hardy had for the old manner of life that was passing away. That culture is "collapsing." Hardy looks nostalgically at that collapse in terms of poetic faith, realizing at the same time that the faith which established and maintained the pastoral myth was, in many ways, a "bad faith." A carnivalesque form of humor pervades this novel as the text laughs at the idealists and the rustics.
These texts seem to simultaneously call for the death and the resurrection of the old ideals. Bakhtin points out that carnivalesque humor is suited for such an expression because carnival laughter is ambivalent:

Deeply ambivalent also is carnival laughter itself. Genetically it is linked with the most ancient forms of ritual laughter. Ritual laughter was always directed toward something higher: the sun (the highest god), other gods, the highest earthly authority were put to shame and ridiculed to force them to renew themselves. All forms of ritual laughter were linked with death and rebirth, with the reproductive act, with symbols of the reproductive force. Ritual laughter was a reaction to crises in the life of the sun (solstices), crises in the life of a deity, in the life of the world and of man (funeral laughter). In it, ridicule was fused with rejoicing. (Poetics 126-7)

Although Hardy’s texts laugh at the overly serious idealists, they treat them with a measure of respect, even harboring a desire that some of the ideals would be reborn in a better form.

The happy ending of Greenwood Tree is carnivalized because Dick and Fancy’s future is based on deception. The novel thus becomes “a tale of the consequences of the loss of living faith” (Seymour-Smith 138).

One of the most important methods the text employs to carnivalize the aspirations of the idealists is the conversations of the rustic characters. While Millgate proposes that the conversations of the rustics “are by no
means essential to the 'story'" (Career 51), the novel would actually be incomplete without them. These rustic characters who enjoy liquor and music, bring low the ideals of people such as Parson Maybold and Fancy Day. After visiting Mr. Maybold to ask if the choir might continue for a while, Reuben, one of Hardy's rustics, brags:

The fact is . . . 'tis how you take a man. Everybody must be managed. Queens must be managed; kings must be managed; for men want managing almost as much as women, and that's saying a good deal. . . . Pa'son Mayble and I were as good friends all through it as if we'd been sworn brothers. Ay, the man's well enough; 'tis what's put in his head that spoils him, and that's why we've got to go. (89)

Throughout Hardy's novels, the common people are made to suffer because of "what's put in the heads" of the upper classes and those who seek advancement in social standing. The choir "has to go," and so do many other features of the pastoral world, because of certain idealistic notions that the ambitious accept. Nevertheless, the ambivalent laughter of the rustics permeates the novel. Bakhtin writes:

Thus, the medieval feast had, as it were, the two faces of Janus. Its official, ecclesiastical face was turned to the past and sanctioned the existing order, but the face of the people of the marketplace looked into the future and laughed, attending the funeral of the past and present. The marketplace feast opposed the protective, timeless stability, the unchanging established order and ideology, and stressed the element of change and renewal. (Rabelais 81)
The rustics laugh at the death of the old choir, but also realize that such events are part of the constant process of renewal. This ambivalent, carnivalesque humor is illustrated perfectly in Hardy's 1896 preface to *Under the Greenwood Tree*. Hardy describes the practice of inserting secular songs in the books used for the playing of church music:

It was customary to inscribe a few jigs, reels, hornpipes, and ballads in the same book, by beginning it at the other end, the insertions being continued from the front and back till sacred and secular met together in the middle, often with bizarre effect, the words of some of the songs exhibiting that ancient and broad humour which our grandfathers, and possibly grandmothers, took delight in, and is in these days unquotable. (4)

In these songbooks, the sacred and secular meet. Hardy speaks of the "bizarre effect," akin to Bakhtin's concept of "grotesque realism" in carnival humor. In these "sacred" books, there was humor which could not be printed in Hardy's day because of Victorian propriety. The juxtaposing of sacred songs with secular, "unquotable" songs, exemplifies the ability of carnivalesque humor to both celebrate and denigrate religious ideals.

Thus, Hardy's Wessex becomes a place for subverting the idealized pastoral landscape, especially that fostered by the upper classes. By adding realism to carnivalesque
laughter, Hardy's texts hold up the pastoral myth to an ambivalent ridicule. Writing of how myths die, Bakhtin observes that

the myths died, for the conditions that had given them birth (that had created them) had died. They continued to exist, however, in moribund form, in the lifeless and stilted genres of "high" ideology. It was necessary to strike a blow at the myths and their gods, so that they might "die comically". (Dialogic 220)

Hardy's texts subvert and parody the "high ideology" of pastoral idealism. Glasgow and Faulkner use similar methods in their works.

Gattrell points out that Hardy made revisions to the text of Under the Greenwood Tree in the 1896 and 1912 editions which altered the tone of the novel, bringing it more into line with his later works ("Notes" xxvi). Thus, when one reads Under the Greenwood Tree, one is reading three different novels simultaneously, each reflecting the author's accentuations and reaccentuations in the text, thus making it more difficult to assign a philosophical unity to the text. In his Introduction to Under the Greenwood Tree, Gattrell argues that in 1872, when Hardy originally wrote the novel, he had more hope for the survival of that pastoral world (xxii). Gattrell sees the marriage of Dick and Fancy as "true pastoral" (xx),
depicting "the renewal of village life" (xxi). However, others have seen the text's ambivalence toward this version of the pastoral idyll. Martin Seymour-Smith argues that the novel is "a lament for the old order, but with a sting in the tail: its 'romantic' end consists of a future based on a lie" (137-8). The implication could be that the romantic pastoral mode as a whole is based upon deception.

Langbaum argues that "Fancy remains an Eve who, as a character in pastoral comedy, never goes so far as to bring on the fall through too much moral scrupulousness" (78). The text, however, suggests that maybe Fancy does bring about a fall. When Fancy returns to her native environment of Mellstock, the church band of rustics is playing a song with the words:

Remember Adam's fall,  
O thou man:  
Remember Adam's fall  
From Heaven to Hell.  
Remember Adam's fall,  
How he hath condemn'd all  
In Hell perpetual  
There for to dwell. (32)

Although this hymn ends with the happy Christmas story of redemption, the link between Fancy's return and the fall of Adam is unmistakable. Peter Casagrande writes of Fancy: "As a teacher, as musician, and as wife, she presides, in a distinctly amusing way, over the 'fall' of a traditional
order" (Unity 82). The text’s repeated emphasis on class consciousness and Fancy’s secret which she must keep from Dick, indicate that a fall has already taken place. Millgate remarks that "for all the celebration of vanished woodland days and ways it is necessary to acknowledge that if Under the Greenwood Tree is an idyll it is one in which, at the end, many things are less than idyllic" (Career 54). John Danby argues that by 1912 Hardy knew that the comic resolution for Under the Greenwood Tree "required the assumption that the village of Mellstock Quire would always be there. And already it was vanishing" (12). The pastoral world of Wessex has already seen the beginning of the end, a fact that its own creator and narrator admitted in the 1912 preface.

The Battle-Ground: The Fall of the Aristocratic Pastoral

Although Ellen Glasgow created no Wessex or Yoknapatawpha, the Virginia of her fiction becomes a representation of the South, and in some cases, of the United States as a whole. Like Hardy and Faulkner, she describes a land which was viewed by many people as a pastoral paradise. Her novels frequently portray the delusions created to sustain such a myth. Glasgow also
tries to deal with questions concerning the cause of these failed attempts to reconstruct the pastoral paradise.

Since the immigrants to the New World came primarily for religious reasons, and most early literary works published in America were sermons and theological treatises, it should not be surprising that America would define itself in terms of religion, especially Protestant Christianity. The literature of Christianity and the culture of frontier revivalism so permeated the southern portion of the United States, that all attempts to define the South and understand it through literature must sort through Biblical language and imagery.

At first, the literature of the New World resembled exotic travel logs, describing the flora, fauna, and "primitive" societies of the Native Americans. Accounts by Columbus, Samuel de Champlain, John Smith, and many others, portrayed the New World as an unspoiled garden of God. This literature was written by Europeans, for Europeans. The images of America as a land of endless opportunity for exploration and discovery permeate this early literature. Gradually, the idea arose that this continent was a new garden of Eden, an Arcadia where the simplicity of the pastoral life could be recaptured.
This kind of language was especially used concerning the colonizing of Virginia, the setting for most of Glasgow's novels. In *Hakluytus Posthumus, or Purchas His Pilgrimes* (1625), Samuel Purchas refers constantly to the "virgin" status of the land: "All the rich endowments of Virginia, her Virgin-portion from the creation nothing lessened, are wages for all this worke" (140). Later, in the same treatise, enumerating some of the reasons for settlement, he writes:

Secondly, this Climate as it promiseth wealth, so it doth health also, enjoying the temper of the most temperate parts, even of that in which Adam, Abraham, with the Prophets and Apostles were bred in, and received as an Earthly priviledge; and in which Christ conversed in the flesh. And thirdly for extension, if covetousnesse gape wide, ten Judeas, and a hundred Paradises, may be equalled for quantitie in Virginia. (141)

These descriptions of Virginia and the American continent in general became a kind of propaganda to entice "new Adams" to come to the new land and help create a heaven on earth. After these utopian dreams fail to be realized, writers begin to analyze the causes for its failure.

In Glasgow and Faulkner, inhumane forms of greed and capitalism destroy the pastoral bliss of the South. From the beginning of America's exploration and discovery, the colonizing propaganda contained the seeds of devastation.
for this new pastoral landscape. Even after praising the virgin, unspoiled land, Purchas writes, "Haile then, al-haile Virginia, hope of our decayed Forrests, Nursery of our timbers, second supply to our shipping, the succenturiateae copiae in distresse of Navall materials" (142). Oddly enough, Purchas mixes the appeal of an unspoiled paradise with an exhortation to deplete its forests, which had already been done in England.

The idea of the South as an unspoiled pastoral garden is a current throughout much of Southern literature. MacKethan explains that the characteristics of this pastoral version of the South as a new Arcadia took hold from the time of Reconstruction and was largely accepted with "an unquestioning faith" (Arcady 3). The South, however, added slavery as a component in the equation of bucolic idyll and materialistic success. The pastoral itself was used to legitimize economic exploitation and slavery. Southern novels abound with descriptions of the plantation and the happy slaves keeping the master's beautiful pastoral garden. Faulkner and Glasgow deal with this fiction and use the pastoral mode to show how this idyllic version of the South was ruined by slavery.
Earlier Southern writers had to justify the existence of slavery and other evils in their defense of the Southern pastoral garden. In *The Dispossessed Garden: Pastoral and History in Southern Literature*, Lewis Simpson describes the frustration of the Southern intellectual elite who tried to maintain the pastoral myth in spite of the shadow of slavery which hovered over it (39). Novels such as John Pendleton's *Swallow Barn* tried to reconcile the pastoral and slavery. The pastoral ideal was a burden to the Southern writer because it was a difficult task to make slavery fit inside that pastoral ideal. Renato Poggioli writes,

> Foremost among the passions that the pastoral opposes and exposes are those related to the misuse, or merely to the possession, of worldly goods. They are the passions of greed: cupidity and avarice, the yearning after property and prosperity, the desire for affluence and opulence, for money and precious things. (4)

From the time of its origins, the pastoral mode was ideally suited to criticize the philosophy of materialism, but the Southern version of pastoral tried to find a way to reconcile the pastoral with a form of materialism which depended on slavery for its maintenance. The pastoral version of the leisurely gentleman was evident in English poetry from the eighteenth century (Kegel-Brinkgreve 578).
Writers in the antebellum South tried to create a pastoral image that could include slaves. Glasgow and Faulkner show the impossibility of such a task.

As far back as William Byrd's letter to Lord Orrery, we can see the introduction of the slave into the pastoral environment, and also, the attendant problems inherent in such a situation:

Like one of the patriarchs, I have my flock and herds, my bondmen and bondwomen, and every sort of trade amongst my own servants, so that I live in a kind of independence on everyone but Providence. However, though this sort of life is without expense, yet it is attended with a great deal of trouble. I must take care to keep all my people to their duty, to set all the springs in motion, and to make everyone draw his equal share to carry the machine forward. (Marambaud 147-8)

Although this description employs the pastoral imagery of flocks and herds, the system of slavery necessary to maintain this patriarchal paradise is already beginning to spoil the peace of the bucolic idyll.

The Eden that the South was looking for, was an Eden that had slaves, working to make a paradise for the master of the plantation, the lord of the manor. Here is an attempt by the rich to escape from the curse of the fall (by the sweat of the brow), by getting others to provide an Eden for them while they gain their bread by the sweat of the brow of slaves.
The worries expressed in the letter by William Byrd to Lord Orrery are expressed in Glasgow's *The Battle-Ground*. The two major families in the novel, the Amblers and Lightfoots, fret about stories of slave uprisings, and even the discontent of the lower white classes. Governor Ambler comes to think that the life of the slave is more pastoral than the pastoral existence he was trying to preserve through the institution of slavery. As he watches one of the old slaves, Mahaley, die, he thinks:

> Here in this scant cabin things so serious as birth and death showed in a pathetic bareness, stripped of all ceremonial trappings, as mere events in the orderly working out of natural laws—events as seasonable as the springing up and the cutting down of the corn. In these simple lives, so closely lived to the ground, grave things were sweetened by an unconscious humour which was of the soil itself; and even death lost something of its strangeness when it came like the grateful shadow which falls over a tired worker in the field. (250)

Though the plantation is located in a rural environment and seems to be genuinely pastoral, materialistic obsession presents a unique set of problems in justifying this form of the idyll. The plantation, with its great house in the country is out of place in a bucolic idyll. In Glasgow's novels, the texts show the disintegration of the pastoral plantation which thrived because of slavery. Many texts imply that although the
South could have been the new Arcadia, slavery, territorial expansionism, greed, and ultimately, the Civil War, destroyed the pastoral world of the South. Poggioli points out that

poverty emancipates man from the slavery of desire . . . and relieves man from the burden of wealth, the chief of which is having charge of a host of servants. The old shepherd is the patriarch but not the master of his clan, and this is why he lives in peace without the responsibilities and worries of a taskmaster.

(11)

The pastoral dream of the South was doomed from the beginning because it sought to establish an Arcadia based on materialism which depended on economic exploitation. Poggioli writes, "The shepherd enjoys the blessings of idleness even more than the rich man, whose servants hardly lighten his burdens and whose cares never allow him to rest" (6).

Describing the pastoral dream of the early settlers in Virginia, C. Hugh Holman writes:

Perhaps few of these Tidewater explorers and colonizers carried within their veins the dream of noble families, but most of them carried within their brains the dream of noble orders; and the Cavalier tradition in government, the Episcopal tradition in religion, the pragmatic profit motive in philosophy, and the hedonistic aim in social customs helped to establish along the Atlantic seaboard a South of hierarchical values and class and caste distinctions.

(11-12)
Glasgow believed that the settlers of Virginia wanted to create a hedonistic paradise:

What distinguished the Southerner, and particularly the Virginian, from his severer neighbors to the north was his ineradicable belief that pleasure is worth more than toil, that it is worth more even than profit. Although the difference between the Virginian and the far Southerner was greater than the distance between Virginia and Massachusetts, a congenial hedonism had established in the gregarious South a confederacy of the spirit. (Certain Measure 135)

These descriptions of the intent of the Virginia settlers sound remarkably like Poggioli’s description of the pastoral as exalting “the pleasure principle at the expense of the reality principle” (14), or as “a utopian projection of the hedonistic instinct” (16). Glasgow seems to agree that an aristocratic hedonism was a basic component of the Tidewater pastoral.

Glasgow’s novel, The Battle Ground, deals with the racial and class issues which never allowed the Southern aristocracy to rest in its version of pastoral. The novel describes life on two neighboring plantations: Chericoke owned by the Lightfoots and Uplands owned by the Amblers. When someone suggests the abolition of slavery, Major Lightfoot exclaims, “Nonsense! Nonsense! Why, you are striking at the very foundation of our society! Without slavery, where is our aristocracy, sir?” (63). This
pastoral aristocracy sees itself as totally dependent upon
the institution of slavery. \textit{The Battle-Ground} examines
this form of pastoral ideology and its consequences.

Like many Southern writers, Glasgow cannot distance
herself completely from a nostalgic longing for the days of
the old South, but in \textit{The Battle-Ground} she makes her first
attempt to question the values of the old aristocracy which
oppressed other races and the lower classes (Harrison 17-
18). After \textit{The Battle-Ground}, Glasgow calls the
aristocratic ideals into question more frequently, although
she still writes sympathetically of the Old South (Ekman
40). Because Glasgow tends to treat some aspects of
Southern life with respect, some critics tend to view \textit{The
Battle-Ground} merely as her attempt to write the
traditional Civil War novel, complete with plantations and
love scenes under the magnolias. Although Glasgow makes
use of these pastoral devices, one must not fail to notice
the irony and humor she invests in these images. Writing
of the comic novel, Bakhtin point out that one may find
"those parodic stylizations of generic, professional and
other languages . . . , as well as compact masses of direct
authorial discourse--pathos-filled, moral-didactic,
sentimental-elegiac or idyllic" (\textit{Dialogic} 302). Bakhtin
believed that the shift from the common language to the parodic stylizations could be abrupt or gradual. Glasgow's work abounds with these parodies of pastoral setting and Southern romances. Even such chapter titles as "The School for Gentlemen" and "How Merry Gentlemen Went to War," when read in the context of the novel, demonstrate Glasgow's parodic treatment of inherited fictional styles. Though the authorial voice may seem to lapse occasionally into a moral-didactic authorial voice, approving of the old aristocracy, this voice slips quickly into a comic, ironic, or, in Bakhtinian terms, a carnivalesque mode.

The Battle-Ground is a far more realistic treatment of the Civil War than was usually written in this era. In this novel, magnolias are more associated with the sounds of cannons and the smells of gunpowder than romantic interludes (363). In Without Shelter: The Early Career of Ellen Glasgow, Julius Raper writes, "Of all the novels of the Civil War written between 1885 and 1924, it [The Battle-Ground] is considered the first and best realistic treatment of the war from the southern point of view" (Shelter 150). Betty Ambler, the heroine of the novel, is not a beauty, like her sister, Virginia. Rather, Betty emerges as the heroine because she has the strength to
survive, unlike Virginia, a traditional Southern belle who
dies because of her inherent inability to face reality. In
a pattern that Glasgow will repeat many times in her
novels, the heroine, Betty Ambler, is also stronger than
the men of the novel. Dan Montjoy, her lover, will reveal
himself as a disillusioned idealist. In the end, he will
be totally dependent upon Betty, the strong woman. Raper
points out that in Glasgow's subsequent novels, the
postwar South is a matriarchal society devoted to
worshipping two feminine ideals, the Old South and the
purity of southern woman; one in which figurehead
'colonels,' 'generals,' 'judges,' and 'governors' are
propped up by puritanically hard and industrious
women; the war was sexual suicide for the Southern
male. (Shelter 168-9)

In her later novels, Glasgow's women will exhibit the vein
of iron that enables them to work and survive, while
idealistic males flounder in a sea of depression and
disillusionment.

In the course of The Battle Ground, Glasgow subverts
many of the stereotypes propagated by the traditional
Southern version of pastoral romance. The opening section
of the novel is entitled, "Golden Years." This term seems
to alert us to the possibility that this novel will tell us
what happened to the lost Golden Age of Southern pastoral
existence. These years are those before the Civil War, and
the novel seems to display the typical attitude that everything was a paradise in the South before the war. This novel contains some stereotypical images, justifications, and defenses of slavery. For example, when Major Lightfoot tells his black slave, Congo, of his fear that the Northern Republicans are going to free the slaves, Congo replies, "Don' you min', Ole Marster, we'll des loose de dawgs on 'em, dat's w'at we'll do" (87). Some versions of the Southern pastoral defended slavery through the language of the slaves. As MacKethan writes:

The most amazing fact of the matter is not merely that the Negro, associated as he is with the South's guilt and humiliation, is present in the scheme, but that he is absolutely essential to it. He is the central figure and most often the chief spokesman in post-Civil War portrayals of the antebellum Arcadia. The problem of how to deal with the question of the presence of slaves in Arcady was solved by having the black man plead the cause of his former master. (Arcady 11)

The novel contains such images of the happy slaves under Ole Marster who do not want to be freed. Most of the slaves in this novel are faithful to their masters before, during, and after the Civil War. But a closer reading of the text reveals that these years were not as "golden" as they appear on the surface. Glasgow did not believe the life of slaves was idyllic. In A Certain Measure, she wrote that
in the old South, this inherited culture possessed grace and beauty and the inspiration of gaiety. Yet it was shallow-rooted at best, since, for all its charm and good will, the way of living depended, not upon its own creative strength, but upon the enforced servitude of an alien race. (13)

Nevertheless, in The Battle-Ground, the plantation often appears to be the most ideal of places. The narrator describes Governor Ambler looking out over his plantation:

The master of Uplands was standing upon his portico behind the Doric columns, looking complacently over the fat lands upon which his fathers had sown and harvested for generations. Beyond the lane of lilacs and the two silver poplars at the gate, his eyes wandered leisurely across the blued green strip of grass-land to the tawny wheat field, where the slaves were singing as they swung their cradles. The day was fine, and the outlying meadows seemed to reflect his gaze with a smile as beneficent as his own. He had cast his bread upon the soil, and it had returned to him threefold.

As he stood there, a small, yet imposing figure in his white duck suit, holding his broad slouch hat in his hand, he presented something of the genial aspect of the country—as if the light that touched the pleasant hills and valleys was aglow in his clear brown eyes and comely features. Even the smooth white hand in which he held his hat and riding whip had about it a certain plump kindliness which would best become a careless gesture of concession. And, after all, he looked but what he was—a bald and generous gentleman, whose heart was as open as his wine cellar. (45)

At first glance, this description of the content, complacent slave owner, Governor Ambler, may seem to be a typical justification of the Southern pastoral at the expense of slavery. The slaves sing happily in the fields.
He is content with all that he possesses. The novel reveals that he is of such a compassionate heart, that he buys slaves who are going to be sent further South and mistreated. He buys one slave just so the slave won't be separated from the woman he wants to marry. Governor Ambler is no cruel taskmaster who splits up or sells members of families down the river. Yet, if one reads the entire book, we find that all is not well with the "master of Uplands." After this peaceful description of Governor Ambler, Glasgow begins to portray his uneasiness with the system of slavery. The oppressive system of which he is a master will ultimately bring disaster to himself and his family.

The idyllic description of Governor Ambler as the benevolent, Southern gentleman-slaveholder is as ironic as the term "golden years." Glasgow's sentimental treatment of the Southern aristocracy is juxtaposed with the cruelties of slavery and the resulting tragedy of the Civil War and its aftermath. Although the text describes the benevolence of one master giving the old slave, Levi, freedom, the latter cannot forget the horror of his wife, Sarindy being sold down the river. His emancipation cannot
undo the sorrow of having to live a lifetime without his spouse.

Although the major characters of this novel are slave owners, they have doubts about its practice and cannot consistently hold the logic to justify its existence. Major Lightfoot cannot respond to the arguments of Mr. Bennet, the Northern tutor who openly defies the system of slavery. Mrs. Ambler displays a "timid wonder that the Bible 'countenanced' slavery" (69). Even the quotation marks around the word "countenanced" speak of the narrator's sarcasm for those who use the Bible to justify slavery. Toward the end of the Civil War, in dreams of delirium, Dan Montjoy remembers how he had told Major Lightfoot that when he grew up he would free all of the slaves (467). These various contradictions within the narrator and characters do not lend themselves to a firm conclusion as to what Glasgow was saying about slavery or the old Southern aristocracy. Bakhtin writes:

For if the ideas contained in each separate novel—the planes of the novel being determined by the ideas lying at their base—were in fact arranged as links of unified dialectic sequence, then each novel would form a completed philosophical whole, structured according to the dialectical method. We would have in the best instance a philosophical novel, a novel with an idea (albeit a dialectical idea); in the worst instance we would have philosophy in the form of a novel. (Poetics 25-6)
Glasgow's ambivalence toward the Southern aristocracy prevents assessing any individual novel as a philosophical whole.

As in Faulkner, Glasgow's texts often present the idea that the pastoral world of the old South was destroyed by a form of punishment, causing the South to pay for the crimes of slavery. Throughout the text, even some of the aristocrats share the haunting feeling that they will be punished through the vengeance of natural law. When Governor Ambler first hears the story of the Harper's Ferry uprising, his reaction is described as follows:

A dim fear, which had been with him since boyhood, seemed to take shape and meaning with the words; and in a lightning flash of understanding he knew that he had lived before through the horror of this moment. If his fathers had sinned, surely the shadow of their wrong had passed them by to fall the heavier upon their sons; for even as his blood rang in his ears, he saw a savage justice in the thing he feared—a recompense to natural laws in which the innocent should weigh as naught against the guilty. (243)

Governor Ambler has always known that slavery was wrong, and now he feels that justice must be exacted upon him and the South. Although he is afraid and ready to fight to defend Virginia and the right to hold slaves, he thinks there was some wild justice in the thing he dreaded, in the revolt of an enslaved and ignorant people, in the pitiable and ineffectual struggle for freedom which would mean, in the beginning, but the power to go forth and kill. It was the recognition of this
deeper pathos that made him hesitate to reproach even while his thoughts dwelt on the evils—that would, if the need came, send him fearless and gentle to the fight. For what he saw was that behind the new wrongs were the old ones, and that the sinners of to-day were, perhaps, the sinned against of yesterday. (247)

Glasgow uses the slavery of African-Americans to develop a theme that she will probe in later novels—the slavery of women. At some points, the novel seems to endorse the old patriarchal views of women. Mrs. Ambler would rather make shirts for men than wear them herself. She says that she is quite content with her assigned role, but even this is said "half in jest, half in wifely humility" (48). This text subverts the happiness of marriage on the plantation. Governor Ambler sighs as he look at his wife, knowing that she had drooped daily and grown older than her years. The master might live with a lavish disregard of the morrow, not the master's wife. For him were the open house, the well-stocked wine cellar and the morning rides over the dewy fields; for her the cares of her home and children and of the souls and bodies of the black people that had been given into her hand. (48)

This chapter title, "A House with an Open Door," is also ironic, for this description of the happy home applies only to the males. Women, denied fulfillment in other areas, were confined to the home, supposedly finding their pastoral happiness there. Glasgow's women are unsuccessful in their search for happiness in home and garden. Although
Mrs. Ambler has performed her duties with quiet submission, the “golden years” of being the plantation mistress destroyed her youth.

Marriage as a form of slavery is a theme that Glasgow develops in greater depth in Virginia, but she hints at it even in The Battle-Ground. For example, Major Lightfoot, after an argument about the abolition of slavery, remarks, “When I hear a man talking about the abolition of slavery, . . . I always expect him to want to do away with marriage next” (63). When Betty Ambler tells Dan Montjoy that she might belong to him just as the slave, Big Abel does, Dan replies, “Oh, you couldn’t, you’re white, . . . and, besides, I reckon Big Abel and the pony are as much as I can manage. It’s a dreadful weight, having people belong to you” (67).

The Battle-Ground also contains one of Glasgow’s many spinsters, Aunt Lydia, who spends most of her time trying to find peace in a flower garden:

Since her girlhood she had tended bountiful gardens, and dreamed her virgin dreams in the purity of their box-trimmed walks. In a kind of worldly piety she had bound her prayer book in satin and offered to her Maker the incense of flowers. She regarded heaven with something of the respectful fervor with which she regarded the world—that great world she had never seen; for “the proper place for a spinster is her father’s house,” she would say with her conventional
primness, and send, despite herself, a mild imagination in pursuit of the follies from which he so earnestly prayed to be delivered. (51)

Aunt Lydia tries to be a saint, teaching black children the catechism and trying to resist the temptations of the flesh. Nevertheless, she finds men "very engaging" (58), and she cannot resist the temptation of wearing a bonnet from New York, though she considers such cities "a modern Babylon" (51). When she feels as though she is forgetting her place, she retires "to read St. Paul on Woman" (53). Obviously, the narrator's ironic use of characters such as Aunt Lydia underscores the harmful effects of the patriarchal form of the Southern pastoral. These women are enclosed within a male version of the pastoral garden, from which they long to escape, while at the same time, trying to submit to its demands and constrictions.

Garden imagery becomes a very important feature in this novel, as well as in later novels by Glasgow. Annette Kolodny’s studies have shown how women found themselves confined to metaphorical gardens not of their own making (The Land before Her 6-7). Women writers tried to redefine the pastoral garden in terms of their own experience, but found it to be a difficult task. Like Aunt Lydia, Betty Ambler also seeks comfort in the small cultivated garden
women were allowed to keep. But Betty's garden work is characterized by independence. In an interesting scene where Dan Montjoy tries to express his love for Betty, the imagery of Betty's independence and Dan's disapproval finds expression. Betty is gathering rose leaves to put among her clothes, when Dan comes to confess his love. Dan, like many other men in Glasgow's work, thinks of women in terms of flowers. In this scene, she strews rose leaves as he tries to tell her how he feels. Dan tells her that he knew that he loved her when he had seen her kneeling by a fire. Betty objects, "But I can't always kneel to you, Dan" (194). As she continues to play the coquette, Dan begins to "cut brutally the flowers growing at his feet" (195). Betty's independence enrages Dan so much that he destroys the flowers which he normally associates with her. In Glasgow's Betty Ambler we see the attempt of women seeking to redefine themselves in terms of the pastoral garden, but not in the imagery of the usual masculine text. Glasgow will pursue this vision of woman in a new pastoral garden in much more detail in Barren Ground.

The Battle-Ground, far from being another moonlight and magnolias Southern romance, is rather a subversion of such texts. Some early scenes in the novel are reminiscent
of the moonlight and magnolia style. When Betty Ambler sees Dan Montjoy, she is reminded of childhood memories of gathering buttercups (119). Falling in love with Dan carries her to a pastoral setting of the early spring, "the roving impulse that comes on April afternoons when the first buds are on the trees and the air is keen with the smell of the newly turned earth" (119). But these pastoral scenes are juxtaposed with the harsh realities concerning love and marriage. Major Lightfoot is a man who knows "all his world, indeed, except his wife" (16). Dan Montjoy's mother disregarded her family's wishes to marry a man who later abused and killed her. In Glasgow's fiction, there is little marital happiness in the "golden years" before the war or afterward. A close reading of the text reveals the manner in which Glasgow subverted the traditional pastoral description of life in the antebellum South.

Glasgow's treatment of the old Southern aristocracy causes many critics to make assessments which fail to take into account the textual ambivalence. Thiebaux, for example, believes that though Glasgow considered slavery a violation of natural law, she continued "to portray them as more or less contented to serve" (Thiebaux 53). But Santas points out that while the idyllic descriptions of Southern
life fill the first pages of the novel, which deal with the time before the war, the text, nevertheless, reminds us of the unpleasant aspects of this life (49-50). In a sense, both Santas and Thiebaux are correct. Although Glasgow's work may not be as dialogic as that of Dostoevsky, Bakhtin's description of material "distributed among several worlds and several autonomous consciousnesses" applies here (Poetics 16). The narrator's voice combined with the self-contradictions, ambivalence, and inconsistencies of the characters "are presented not within a single field of vision but within several fields of vision, each full and of equal worth" (Poetics 16). The dialogic nature of the novel allows these disparate voices, both sympathetic and critical, to exist within the novel without being merged in one philosophical conclusion about the old aristocracy.

This text questions the validity of Southern pastoral ideology not only through its descriptions of slavery and marriage, but also by its portrayal of the Civil War itself. Glasgow's representation of the fighting in the Civil War actually carnivalizes the idealism which drove the South to secede and fight. The chapter title, "How Merry Gentlemen Went to War" is obviously an ironic phrase,
poking fun at the arrogant and foolish idealism of the Virginia aristocracy. An earlier chapter entitled, "The School for Gentlemen" is filled with the conversation of the aristocracy bragging on the superiority of the state of Virginia, the mother of presidents. When the men go to war, they are described as "men in whom the love of an abstract principle became, not a religion, but a romantic passion" (284).

Dan Montjoy tries to remain a Southern gentleman during the fighting, even carrying along his servant, Big Abel. Contact with rustic characters of the lower classes shakes Dan's aristocratic idealism. When Dan makes statements such as "I prefer to remain a gentleman" (286) the rustic soldiers repeat his words in a mocking chorus. The other soldiers from the lower classes, such as Pinetop, carnivalize the idealism of the Southern aristocracy. Bakhtin says "We cannot understand cultural and literary life and the struggle of mankind's historic past if we ignore that peculiar folk humor that always existed and was never merged with the official culture of the ruling classes" (Rabelais 474). Dan suffers under the indignity of this kind of humor and says that he "didn't enter the army to be hectored by any fool who comes along" (288).
After Dan's first taste of battle, he begins to lose his illusions about the glory of war and heroism. As he views the dead and wounded, he has difficulty understanding Governor Ambler's observation that "it was a glorious victory" (315). Throughout the battle scenes, the text juxtaposes the carnage of war with pastoral scenes of meadows and flowers. Placing slaves in pastoral plantations and the carnage of war in bucolic fields demonstrates the contradictions and inconsistencies in the Southern pastoral vision.

Glasgow's description of the poor white soldier, Pinetop, provides an opportunity for Glasgow to criticize the Southern aristocracy. Like Hardy, Glasgow often used the rustic poor such as Pinetop to reveal the hypocrisy and inadequacy of aristocratic idealism. Describing his reaction to the first battle, Pinetop says:

You see I ain't never fought anythin' bigger'n a skunk until to-day; and when I stood out thar with them bullets sizzlin' like fryin' pans round my head, I kind of says to myself; "Look here, what's all this fuss about anyhow? If these here folks have come arter the niggers, let' em take 'em off and welcome." I ain't never owned a nigger in my life, and, what's more, I ain't never seen one that's worth owning. (323)

Though Pinetop is not an aristocratic idealist, even he reveals that he has embraced some of the Southern idealism,
for he gets his courage to fight because the Yankees were setting their feet on "Ole Virginy" (324). If slavery was not worth fighting for, the state of Virginia was.

Glasgow juxtaposes these brave sentiments of dying for the state of Virginia with the death of Virginia Ambler, Betty's sister. Virginia in The Battle-Ground is Glasgow's first "Virginia," a name that she will give to the main character in a later novel bearing that name as its title. In both cases, the names are obviously symbols for the state. She is an ideal Southern woman, but cannot face reality. Virginia marries Jack Morson, who is wounded during the war. At first, Virginia was very impressed with all of the military parades and viewed the war as nothing more than entertainment. But after she hears that Jack is wounded, she tries to find him in the hospitals in Richmond. As she views all of the wounded and torn bodies, all of her illusions are shattered. The smell of magnolias sickens her. The shock of the horrors of war literally kills her. This is one of Glasgow's first attempts to portray the deadly nature of the evasive idealism which characterized the state of Virginia even after the war. Not only does Virginia, the idealist, die, but also the state of which she is the symbol.
The text subtly suggests that people died in the civil war due to an idealized version of the pastoral South. Santas points out that "for both Dan and Pinetop, Virginia is always the given ideal . . . " (59). Such a myth had been created that the South was a new Eden, that poor whites such as Pinetop were willing to die for it even though they owned no slaves. Presbyterian and Episcopal theologies were brought in to help defend the South and its cause, to reinforce the idealization of the South (Raper Shelter 170).

In The Battle-Ground, Dan Montjoy comes to realize that his aristocratic attitudes toward life are an illusion. His awakening occurs largely because he is thrown into battle with, and is dependent upon, poor whites such as Pinetop, who becomes his trusted friend. Throughout the novel, Montjoy is put in situations where he is dependent on the help of slaves, women, and lower-class whites. Toward the close of the war, the narrator describes Dan in this manner: "In the tatters of his gray uniform, with his black hair hanging across his eyes, he might have been one of the beggars who warm themselves in the Southern countries" (463). Before the novel ends, he
is completely dependent on a strong woman, all of his aristocratic idealism having been shattered.

Throughout the battle scenes, Dan Montjoy continues to think of home, Chericoke and Uplands in their pastoral setting. He always imagines Betty coming to him as she walks through a garden. All of the aristocratic soldiers dream of returning to the pastoral existence after the war. Dan finally sees Betty during the middle of the war, but it is not in the glowing, pastoral scenes he had envisioned. Both of them look older and pale. There is no beautiful spring scenery to enhance their reunion, rather the golden leaves of autumn.

Through this criticism of the old aristocracy, Glasgow shows how the old order, from the beginning, was based on deception. The ending of the novel suggests that there will be a new form of aristocracy to replace the old one. The text represents Dan Montjoy as an aristocrat who has learned his lesson. For Thiebaux, the novel implies that the younger generation will be able to easily dismiss the past (52). Dan Montjoy, however, still thinks of the past in terms of an old romance. He knows that his view of the past was an illusion, but there still seems to be a hint of nostalgia for those old days. Glasgow’s subsequent novels
do not depict a people who were able to easily dismiss the past. Instead, she portrays future generations of Southerners who continue to live as though the old illusion was still true, what Santas calls “a grotesque and living past” (48). This grotesque past which was still very much alive in Glasgow’s South is parodied, subverted, and “carnivalized” throughout Glasgow’s fiction. Glasgow’s novels, and especially those of William Faulkner reject the notion that future generations will find it easier to dismiss the past. Both the nostalgia and the burden of guilt become obsessive in the succeeding generations.

As Dan Montjoy and his regiment are marching toward the end of the civil war, Dan asks, “How long have we been marching, boys?” Someone from the crowd answers, “Oh, I reckon we left the Garden of Eden about six thousand years ago” (463). The war had been an expulsion from a paradise to which they would never return, but which future generations looked upon with ambivalent longing.

**Absalom, Absalom! and Go Down, Moses:**
The Cursed Pastoral Landscape

Many versions of pastoral are examples of monologic idealism. The dialogical nature of language, and of consciousness itself, makes it very difficult to maintain monologic ideology. The novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and
Faulkner demonstrate that their can be no true monologue. When an ideology comes into contact with other discourses, the meaning of words even in the authoritative discourse become conditioned and contingent, thereby resulting in a dialogic form of communication.

Perhaps no other work of Faulkner's demonstrates the dialogical nature of the novel better than Absalom. Absalom! The many narrators, all reacting to one another's narrations, guesses, and conclusions demonstrate how all language and history are informed by the discourse of others. As these narrators examine other people's narrative histories, they not only seek the truth concerning what actually happened in the past, but what the other narrators were attempting to say. These characters demonstrate Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia, a term meaning that

at any given time in any given place, there will be a set of conditions--social, historical, meteorological, physiological—that will insure that a word uttered in that place and at that time will have a meaning different than it would have under any other conditions. (Holquist, "Glossary" 428)

Heteroglossia thus makes it difficult, if not impossible to form any firm conclusions concerning historical accuracy or authorial intentions. Eyewitnesses relate their oral histories to future narrators who try to understand the
primary sources while at the same time incorporating these histories into their own language formats, even with the help of others who were neither eyewitnesses nor closely connected with the primary sources. Then, the reader approaches the text with his own understanding of words and events. Bakhtin wrote, "Heteroglossia, once incorporated into the novel . . . is another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way" (Dialogic 324). Our concept of historical reality or authorial intention is altered by viewing it through the medium of another's discourse. In Absalom, Absalom!, the text incorporates an omniscient narrator, the accounts of Miss Rosa Coldfield and Mr. Compson as interpreted by Quentin Compson, and the joint piecing together of these narrations by Quentin and Shreve, Quentin's Canadian roommate.

Faulkner is not very concerned about obvious contradictions and inconsistencies in his novels, for they are just an attempt of various narrators to understand. Their accounts differ from others, and sometimes the narrators themselves are inconsistent, but that is a process in myth-making, where we interpret, reinterpret, come to a better understanding of events. Absalom,
Absalom! becomes an example of history and the revision of history. C. Hugh Holman observes:

At the heart of what Faulkner does is the historical myth which is most plainly told in Thomas Sutpen's story. None of the characters that tell it know quite what it means. . . . And this is, I think, true for the reader, as, I suspect, it must have been for Mr. Faulkner himself. Sutpen in Absalom, Absalom! meant something about the history of the South. Just what, none of us know. (46-7)

In Absalom, Absalom! stories and myths are assembled, and narrators try to distinguish between truth and untruth, between what is actually known as fact and what is only assumption.

Absalom, Absalom! examines the history of Thomas Sutpen in this heteroglot environment, trying to arrive at a unified explanation of the major events in his life. One of the explanations sought by Absalom's narrator is that of how Thomas Sutpen's design for a utopian paradise failed. In telling his story to General Compson, Sutpen says:

You see, I had a design in my mind. Whether it was a good or a bad design is beside the point; the question is, Where did I make the mistake in it, what did I do or misdo in it, whom or what injure by it to the extent which this would indicate. I had a design. To accomplish it I should require money, a house, a plantation, slaves, a family--incidentally of course, a wife. I set out to acquire these, asking no favor of any man. (329)
In this sense, Sutpen's story becomes an allegory of what went wrong in the Southern design to create a pastoral paradise.

*Go Down, Moses* also demonstrates the dialogical nature of the novel, as different stories are woven together to explain the loss of the Mississippi wilderness. Ike McCaslin, one of the main characters and narrators, intertwines his own understanding of Southern history with oral and written texts in order to find an explanation of the devastation of the wilderness and to form a unifying philosophy by which he can live. Both novels, *Absalom, Absalom!*, and *Go Down, Moses*, describe the loss of a pastoral dream and seek explanations for its demise. Both narratives emphasize the abuses that took place on the land. In *The Country and the City*, Raymond Williams writes that "very few titles to property could bear humane investigation, in the long process of conquest, theft, political intrigue, courtiership, extortion and the power of money" (50). In *Absalom, Absalom!* and *Go Down, Moses*, Faulkner's characters examine the acquisition and maintenance of property, and the consequences of the land-holding systems in the South. Perhaps, more than any other Southern novelist, Faulkner seeks an answer to the
question, "What went wrong?" In these texts, Faulkner examines the dreams that Southerners had of creating a pastoral paradise and the curse which prevented them from achieving their goal.

The text portrays Sutpen as a god-like creator, and at the same time as a demon. As Quentin Compson hears Miss Rosa's story, he imagines how Sutpen and his slaves overrun suddenly the hundred square miles of tranquil and astonished earth and drag house and formal gardens violently out of the soundless Nothing and clap them down like cards upon a table beneath the up-palm immobile and pontific, creating the Sutpen's Hundred, the Be Sutpen's Hundred like the oldentime Be Light. (5)

The hundred square miles that Sutpen attains are noted as being tranquil until he arrives. Yet, he is pictured as bringing this house and gardens out of "Nothing" in the way that God is described in the first chapter of Genesis bringing cosmos out of chaos simply by speaking the words, "Let there be light." Sutpen is a god-like creator, but in the process of trying to create a paradise in the midst of one that is already there, he becomes a demon who destroys the paradise that already exists.

Miss Rosa Coldfield thinks of Sutpen in the following manner:

Out of quiet thunderclap he would abrupt (man-horse-demon) upon a scene peaceful and decorous as a
school prize water color, faith sulphur-reek, still in hair clothes and beard, with grouped behind him his band of wild niggers like beasts half tamed to walk upright like men, in attitudes wild and reposed, and manacled among them the French architect with his air, grim, haggard, and tatter ran. (4-5)

Miss Rosa pictures Sutpen as entering upon a scene that is already pastoral in its tranquility, but Sutpen arrives like a demon in this peaceful world to shatter it. He is a demon who captures and manacles blacks, probably taking them from another pastoral paradise, to help create his own version of paradise. He rapes the land just as the whole American continent had been raped by those who wanted to create another garden of Eden here. As in the case of Hardy's and Glasgow's pastorals, paradise was destroyed by Sutpen, and like many European settlers before him, he accepts an anti-pastoral philosophy to implement his new paradise. When he encounters something that doesn't fit his design, he discards it, thereby ensuring that his paradise will never become a reality.

Sutpen embodies the demonized philosophy and ideals of the South which ruined the pastoral paradise. Quentin Compson believes that Miss Rosa tells him the Sutpen story to explain the atonement that was necessary to pay for abuses of men like Sutpen:
It's because she wants it told he thought so that people whom she will never see and whose names she will never hear and who have never heard her name nor seen her face will read it and know at last why God let us lose the War; that only through the blood of our men and the tears of our women could He stay this demon and efface his name and lineage from the earth.

One of the recurring themes throughout *Absalom, Absalom!* and *Go Down, Moses* is the curse that resides upon the Southern landscape because of slavery. The South was dispossessed because of the incompatibility of the pastoral with what Lewis Simpson calls "the garden of chattel" (51). Quentin believes that the Sutpen story depicts the wrath of God upon the South for slavery, and that Southern men died as atoning sacrifices in the Civil War to expiate the guilt. In Old Testament language, the only way that blood can be atoned for is by the blood of the person who spilled it, otherwise, the land itself continues to lie under a curse: "So you shall not pollute the land where you are; for blood defiles the land, and no atonement can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed on it, except by the blood of him who shed it" (Numbers 35:33). The men of the South themselves had to pay the debt for the blood of slaves. As in Hardy's and Glasgow's novels, the pastoral world is destroyed, not by urban intrusion, but by a form
of agrarian capitalism that depended on slavery for its existence.

Thomas Sutpen is an example of those who accept a monologic version of the pastoral and try to impose that vision upon others. Throughout this novel, Thomas Sutpen is presented as a speaker who refuses to listen to or consider the thoughts of others. Oratory is inherently monological in both form and intent, for it articulates certainty.

Quentin Compson experiences the guilt that the South continues to feel because of the past. Although we may view *Absalom, Absalom!* as an example of the dialogic nature of the novel, each of the narrations strives to be monologic, achieving one coherent, unified explanation for past events. In *Fiction's Inexhaustible Voice*, Stephen Ross shows the importance of oratory in Faulkner's work, especially in *Absalom, Absalom!*. Oratory, particularly the Southern variety, is primarily monologic in character, seeking to impose a unified explanation upon a listening audience (Ross 213). Quentin is presented throughout *Absalom* as essentially a listener. Although he tries to resolve the contradictions and inconsistencies of the Sutpen story in a dialogic manner, he cannot escape the
monologic implications of the Southern rhetorical style. As Ross points out, "the return to the dialogic that usually effects Quentin's escape into an imagined realm may free him from the monological discourse but it does not free him from its consequences--from the violent and deadly word" (232). Monologic discourse, even that as contained in pastoral ideology, can have devastating consequences.

Quentin Compson has difficulty dealing with the authoritative word that has come down to him from the fathers. Bakhtin writes:

The authoritative word demands that we acknowledge it, that we make it our own; it binds us, quite independent of any power it might have to persuade us internally; we encounter it with its authority already fused to it. The authoritative word is located in a distanced zone, organically connected with a past that is felt to be hierarchically higher. It is, so to speak, the word of the fathers. Its authority was already acknowledged in the past. It is a prior discourse. It is therefore not a question of choosing it from among other possible discourses that are its equal. It is given (it sounds) in lofty spheres, not those of familiar contact. Its language is a special (as it were, hieratic) language. It can be profaned. It is akin to taboo, i.e., a name that must not be taken in vain. (Dialogic 342)

Quentin has so many conflicting voices within himself that he is divided in his personality, both loving and hating the South. The narrator explains that Quentin is familiar with all of the stories and names of people who tried to create and defend the Southern philosophy:
His childhood was full of them; his very body was an empty hall echoing with sonorous defeated names; he was not a being, an entity, he was a commonwealth. He was a barracks filled with stubborn back-looking ghosts still recovering, even forty-three years afterward, from the fever which had cured the disease.

Throughout his life, Quentin cannot get rid of the voices, many of them contradictory, resounding in his mind constantly repeating, in different versions the story of the South. All of these voices demand monologic acceptance. Quentin's and the South's inability to reject the monologic discourse for ambivalent, dialogic acceptance results in a tragic, psychological impasse.

Quentin believes that the guilt of the South has continuing consequences for his generation. As he listens to Miss Rosa's story of Sutpen, he thinks, "What is it to me that the land or the earth or whatever it was got tired of him at last and turned and destroyed him? What if it did destroy her family too? It's going to turn and destroy us all someday, whether our name happens to be Sutpen or Coldfield or not" (10). The land not only grew weary of Sutpen, but all of the families in the South who bore the consequences of trying to create a paradise with the blood of slaves.
Since the past has continuing significance, it is important for people to try to understand the past. Therefore, telling, retelling, and revising the past become important pastimes. Sutpen's life affected the lives of the narrators, just as the history of the South still has continuing importance for all the residents of the region. While Quentin Compson tells Sutpen's story to Shreve, he thinks:

Yes. Maybe we are both Father. Maybe nothing ever happens once and is finished. Maybe happen is never once but like ripples maybe on water after the pebble sinks, the ripples moving on, spreading, the pool attached by a narrow umbilical water-cord to the next pool which the first pool feeds, has fed, did feed, let this second pool contain a different temperature of water, a different molecularity of having seen, felt, remembered, reflect in a different tone the infinite unchanging sky, it doesn't matter: that pebble's watery echo whose fall it did not even see moves across its surface too at the original ripple space, to the old ineradicable thinking Yes, we are both Father. Or maybe Father and I are both Shreve, maybe it took Father and me both to make Shreve or Shreve and me both to make Father or maybe Thomas Sutpen to make all of us. (327)

Quentin's thoughts reflect both monologic and dialogic forms of discourse. The monologic discourses of narrators such as General Compson are so powerful, the hearers may become nothing more than representations, duplicates of the narrators. By listening to General Compson's story, Quentin and Shreve may become nothing more than clones of
the General. By listening to these tales of the old South and imbibing them, the past is never finished. A particular historical account exists within the listeners. Though the ripples of the original story may add different nuances, they have their common source in the pebble that fell into the pool, the original narrator. To Quentin, it seems that the old narrations and consequences can never be eradicated.

But Quentin's thoughts also recognize the dialogic quality of these narrations. Quentin realizes that Shreve and he both "make" General Compson. The General is what Shreve and Quentin interpret him and his narrations to be. General Compson, Shreve, Quentin, and Thomas Sutpen continue to create and react with one another, each responding to one another's stories. Thomas Sutpen's design has a continuing effect on all of them, like the pebble dropping in the pool. The pastoral design of Sutpen and the South continues to urge a monologic consensus, but the dialogic nature of discourse subverts it as people realize that each person is responding not to an eternal truth, but to a dialogue that they have helped to create.

One of the most important themes in *Absalom, Absalom!* is Sutpen's design. In some ways, his design represents
the design of the South. The narrators also discuss the flaw in the design which represents the flaw in the design of Southerners to create a paradise.

Sutpen's design is born because as a member of the lower white class, while still a boy he was turned away from the front door of a wealthy land owner. In his boyhood, Sutpen never imagines a world of "land divided neatly up and actually owned by men who did nothing but ride over it on fine horses or sit in clothes on the galleries of big houses while other people worked for them" (276). As a child, Sutpen lives in the kind of world envisioned by Ike McCaslin who dreamed of a world where no one owned land. Sutpen lived in a region of what is now West Virginia where "the land belonged to anybody and everybody and so the man who would go to the trouble and work to fence off a piece of it and say 'This is mine' was crazy" (276). The world where Sutpen grows up is a pastoral environment where people do not worry about possessions or class consciousness:

He did not even imagine then that there was any such way to live or to want to live, or that there existed all the objects to be wanted which there were, or that the ones who owned the objects not only could look down on the ones that didn't, but could be supported in the down-looking not only by the others who owned objects too but by the very ones that were looked down on that didn't own objects and knew they never
would. . . . and as for objects, nobody had any more of them than you did because everybody had just what he was strong enough or energetic enough to take and keep. (276)

Sutpen does not remember, but he speculates that his father moved him and his family after the death of Sutpen's mother because of "hope in his father's breast or nostalgia" (278). Sutpen's father was on a quest for some kind of pastoral existence, "some easy place or time, some escape form the hardship of getting food and keeping warm in the mountain way" (279).

As they look for this paradise, they do not realize that, in a sense, they are already in it. Reminiscent of the description of Lena Grove, oblivious to the passing of time while riding in wagons across Alabama and Mississippi, Sutpen and his family travel from place to place in a cart without cognizance of the passing of time or the seasons (280-1). During these travels Sutpen begins to develop the class consciousness and racism which will shape the rest of his life. On these journeys through hamlets and villages he learns the difference "not only between white men and black ones, but he was learning there was a difference between white men and white men" (282). He later begins to spy on a man
who owned all the land and the niggers and apparently
the white men who superintended the work, lived in the
biggest house he had ever seen and spent most of the
afternoon . . . in a barrel stave hammock between two
trees, with his shoes off and a nigger who wore every
day better clothes than he or his father and sisters
had ever owned and ever expected to, who did nothing
else but fan him and bring him drinks and he . . .
lying there all afternoon while the sister would come
from time to time to the door of the cabin two miles
away and scream at him for wood or water, watching
that man who not only had shoes in the summertime too,
but didn't even have to wear them. (284)

This plantation which captivates Sutpen is in the Tidewater
region of Virginia, the setting for most of Glasgow's
writings. C. Hugh Holman calls Glasgow "the spokesman for
the Tidewater South" and Faulkner, the "writer dealing with
the Deep South" (xiii). Many settlers dreamed of
fashioning a Tidewater pastoral in Mississippi.

The black servant tells Sutpen to never come to the
front door of the rich man's house, but always to come to
the back. Until this moment, Sutpen has had a kind of
pastoral innocence that he has not even known he has.
Quentin's grandfather, General Compson, mentions Sutpen's
"innocence" several times, an innocence which makes it
difficult for him to understand class and racial
distinctions because he had "nothing to measure it by"
(291). After he is turned away from the door, he knows
that "he would have to do something about it in order to
live with himself for the rest of his life and he could not decide what it was because of that innocence which he had just discovered he had, which (the innocence, not the man, the tradition) he would have to compete with" (292). As a result of coming into contact with this other culture, the culture of the rich, a dialog begins to take place within Sutpen's mind (292). Sutpen determines that he will never again be turned away from the front door of the rich. He will be the owner of the great house and plantation one day. He realizes that he is in a war with the rich. Using a rifle analogy, he thinks to himself:

"If you were fixing to combat them that had the fine rifles, the first thing you would do would be to get yourself the nearest thing to a fine rifle you could borrow or steal or make, wouldn't it?" And he said Yes. "But this aint a question of rifles. So to combat them you have got to have what they have that made them do what he did. You got to have land and niggers and a fine house to combat them with. You see?" and he said Yes again. He left that night... He never saw any of his family again. (297)

Through this dialogue with himself, Sutpen devises a monologic scheme which he is determined never to relinquish. Sutpen embarks on the dream to become rich and powerful, no matter the hard work or the people who must be hurt in order to make that dream come true.
Dirk Kuyk has argued that Sutpen's design was not merely to form a dynasty, but a special kind of dynasty that would get revenge on the patriarchal dynasties of the South. This revenge would come by becoming a better dynasty that would take in the poor little white-trash boys that come to his door. The moral ambiguity of Sutpen's design results in the ambivalence that the South feels for these kinds of utopian designs. Even the best motives can destroy the pastoral paradise, because there is still so much that is wrong and immoral in those who want to do good. Sutpen may be merely another destructive idealist. As Quentin says of Sutpen, based on his grandfather's testimony, "His trouble was innocence" (274). Like the European settlers who came to this continent ostensibly to evangelize the Indians, they harbored prejudices against them as savages, and felt it was justifiable to kill them and take their land. Sutpen is still a demonic idealist. Though he may have a noble motive, it is mixed with so many societal and cultural prejudices, that he wreaks as much havoc and cruelty as the patriarchal society that he desires to overcome. If Sutpen has a desire to make some kind of egalitarian paradise, it is frustrated because it is only for pure, rich whites.
Part of the flaw in Sutpen's design is that he does not respect the humanity and feelings of people in his pursuit of his goal. All of the people in his life are merely instruments to be used. This is not only a criticism of him, but of the South, and American society as a whole. Sutpen, like other slave-owners in the South, did not consider the feelings of the slaves, but only their usefulness for his personal gain. Any deviation from his design, whether in the form of ideas or persons, cannot be accepted. Bakhtin writes, "Idealism recognizes only one principle of cognitive individualization: error. . . . True judgments are not attached to a personality, but correspond to some unified systemically monologic context" (Poetics 81). Sutpen evaluates people and ideas in terms of truth and error based on his monologic design. Even as a boy, he did not see blacks as people, but only as the "balloon face," representing the power and wealth of the white men who owned them. After Sutpen is turned away from the door of the rich man, he thinks of how the rich must view poor whites like himself:

The rich man (not the nigger) must have been seeing them all the time—as cattle, creatures heavy and without grace, brutally evacuated into a world without hope or purpose for them, who would in turn spawn with brutish and vicious prolixity, populate, double treble
and compound, fill space and earth with a race whose future would be a succession of cut-down and patched and made-over garments bought on exorbitant credit because they were white people, from stores where niggers were given the garments free, with for sole heritage that expression on a balloon face bursting with laughter which had looked out at some unremembered and nameless progenitor who had knocked at a door when he was a little boy and had been told by a nigger to go around to the back. (293)

For Sutpen, the rich man represents a creator of the pastoral landscape. In this version of pastoral, the rich can treat other people, even whites, as animals, especially if they are poor. From this time and with this image in view, he begins to form his design of the kind of pastoral dynasty he will construct. His subsequent actions toward Eulalia Bond and her child seem entirely consistent when one considers the version of pastoral he designs. Since his model treated him as an animal, he does the same. Sutpen rejects and leaves Eulalia Bond and his child by her when he realizes that she has black blood. Since a black heir does not fit the design, he merely leaves them to come to Yoknapatawpha to pursue the design elsewhere: "I found that she was not and could never be through no fault of her own, adjunctive or incremental to the design which I had in mind, so I provided for her and put her aside" (300). Sutpen marries Ellen Coldfield because she is "adjunctive to the forwarding of the design" (315).
Even Miss Rosa is a victim of Sutpen's design. When Sutpen suggests that they see whether she can produce for him a male heir before they marry, she is outraged because she realizes that he cares nothing for her, but only his design to produce a dynasty. Even at the end of Sutpen's life, he makes the same mistake by trying to have an heir by Milly Jones. When she gives birth to a daughter, Sutpen says, "Well, Milly; too bad you're not a mare too. Then I could give you a decent stall in the stable" (357). Wash Jones kills Sutpen because Sutpen treats Milly like an animal. One of the basic flaws in the pastoral design of the South was the tendency to use human beings as animals. Sutpen wants to leave his mark upon the world, but he does not realize that other people want to leave a mark as well. The only design that matters is his design. Sutpen and the South fail to realize that their actions have continuing consequences for generations to come upon other people. Sutpen represents the Southerners who could not understand that their dream of a pastoral garden could not possibly find fulfillment because slavery was not compatible with a pastoral environment. Both Sutpen's dream and that of the South come to bloody ends because neither has respect for the human condition.
One of the main features of Sutpen's monologic pastoral ideology is the need to establish a pure white lineage. This component of his design allows him to treat anyone with any degree of black blood as a nonentity. Sutpen's first son has black blood. Therefore, he deserts his wife and child and comes to Yoknapatawpha to try to create a dynasty by having a son that will be pure in his racial heritage. Sutpen represents the South's prejudice and fear of other races, especially the fear of miscegenation. Springing out of this fear is the desire to protect the purity of Southern womanhood. Above all, she must be protected from the taint of black blood. Charles Bon comes to the university in Mississippi and befriends his half-brother, Henry Sutpen. Not knowing that Charles is their half-brother, Henry encourages a romance between his sister Judith and Charles Bon. When Henry discovers that Charles is their half-brother, he is willing to allow the marriage to proceed. But when he discovers that Charles has black blood, he murders Charles before the wedding can take place. Henry can deal with incest, but not miscegenation, the ultimate taboo.

The South prided itself on racial purity, yet the slave owner intermingled white blood with that of the
slaves, as Sutpen does more than once. Charles Bon is the son of a white man, and even looks white, but the presence of the black blood still results in Sutpen's rejecting him as a son, though Bon is both learned and sophisticated. Sutpen does the same thing to Bon that the plantation owner did to Sutpen when he had him turned from the door.

Although any person who contradicted Sutpen's monological version of pastoral was expendable, his treatment of women and blacks reflected poignantly the South's abuses of those two groups. Faulkner's and Glasgow's novels repeatedly deal with the consequence of a monologic, patriarchal version of pastoral.

Though Sutpen tries to establish a pure white dynasty that will fulfill his design, he dies without any "pure" white children. His son, Charles Bon, has a child, Charles Etienne de Saint Valery Bon, by an octoroon mistress. Charles Etienne leaves behind an idiot son, Jim Bond, by a black woman. Thomas Sutpen had another daughter, Clytemnestra, by a slave woman. She dies in the fire with Henry Sutpen the night Quentin takes Miss Rosa to the old Sutpen mansion. Judith Sutpen dies without having any children. Jim Bond is the only Sutpen descendant left. As the novel ends, Shreve tells Quentin:
So it took Charles Bon and his mother to get rid of old Tom, and Charles Bon and the octoroon to get rid of Judith and Charles Bon and Clytie to get rid of Henry; and Charles Bon's mother and Charles Bon's grandmother got rid of Charles Bon. So it takes two niggers to get rid of one Sutpen, dont it? . . . . Which is all right, it's fine; it clears the whole ledger, you can tear all the pages out and burn them, except for one thing. And do you know what that is? . . . . You've got one nigger left. One nigger Sutpen left. Of course you cant catch him and you dont even always see him and you never will be able to use him. But you've got him there still. You still hear him at night sometimes. Dont you?" (470-1)

Quentin Compson is not the only Southerner who continues to hear the wails of the Jim Bonds. Jim Bond becomes the ultimate expression of the punishment that rests upon the South. The Bible states that the sin of the Fathers would be upon the children to the third and fourth generations. Jim Bond is the fourth generation of Sutpen. Sutpen's only survivor is an idiot of racial mixture, howling unintelligibly around the ruins of the burned mansion, a far cry from the dynasty that Sutpen labored so hard to create. Rollyson writes, "Quentin's tragedy lies precisely in this fact that his vision of the past has usurped all of his emotional and intellectual faculties. He now can see life only in terms of the past. . . . Sutpen's family line has finally degenerated into the idiot, Jim Bond, who has no consciousness of the past" (64).
Slavery and miscegenation bring the Southern version of paradise to an end. Sutpen fears the results of miscegenation for his design, yet his slaveholding system perpetuates the miscegenation he fears rather than the pure dynasty of his design.

The title of the novel, *Absalom, Absalom!* recalls the Biblical story of David, the shepherd-boy who left the pastoral world of the flocks to become king of Israel. Many parallels can be made between the story of David and Sutpen: David=Sutpen; Charles Bon=Absalom; Henry=Absalom; Charles Bon=Amnon; Judith=Tamar. All of these parallels reveal interesting similarities, but they are not exact allegorical correspondences. For my purposes, the main parallel is David and Sutpen, who try to form pastoral dynasties, but have enormous difficulties because of their children. As Faulkner himself said, *Absalom* was "the story of a man who wanted a son and got too many, got so many that they destroyed him. It's incidentally the story of Quentin Compson's hatred of the bad qualities in the country he loves. But the central character is Sutpen, the story of a man who wanted sons" (Gwyn 71). Like Sutpen, David fails to consider human feelings. He has Uriah the Hittite killed in order that he might possess Bathsheba.
Though God forgives David, God says that the sword will never depart from his house. He and his children will continue to suffer the consequences of his sin. In many ways the suffering that follows is like that of Sutpen. The consequences of David's sin in his family are rebellion, incest and murder. Absalom revolts against his father as Henry does against Sutpen. Amnon rapes his sister Tamar. Charles Bon plans to marry Judith even though she is his half-sister. Henry kills Charles as Absalom kills Amnon. Absalom dies in a revolt against his father, bringing from David the cry, "O my son Absalom—my son, my son Absalom—if only I had died in your place! O Absalom my son, my son!" David had known a pastoral existence before he became king of Israel. The plaintive wail for Absalom comes from the lips of the man who had once written, "The Lord is my shepherd / I shall not want. / He maketh me to lie down in green pastures / He leadeth me beside the still waters" (Psalm 23:1-2).

These narrators go over the same stories repeatedly in an attempt to understand the loss of paradise. Because the South based its economy on slavery, when slavery came to an end, the Southern vision of paradise also came to an end. Dreams of a pastoral paradise usually involve the dream of
leisure. In the South, the life of leisure depended upon slavery. William Shurr writes:

> It is impossible to cite any culture where such leisure was achieved without ruthlessness and exploitation. . . . [A]s early as 1782, de Crevecoeur drew a bitterly descriptive picture of the contrast between the luxury of the citizens of Charleston and the misery of the slave culture that supported it. (109)

Quentin represents the guilt that the South continues to feel, though generations removed form the crime of slavery itself. Shreve's question, "You still hear him at night sometimes. Dont you?", reflects the continuing reminders to the South of the injustices of racism. "The problem of the South" which occurs regularly in Glasgow and Faulkner, is ever present.

All of the characters appear to be trying to escape or outwit time. Mr. Compson believes that humanity is helpless, that everything is fated. Sutpen tries to turn time back, but he can't. He realizes that time is running out so he turns to Miss Rosa and finally, Milly Jones to produce an heir for his dynasty. But Wash Jones decapitates Sutpen with a scythe. Wash Jones with the scythe in his hands is Father Time, symbolizing that time for Sutpen to establish his dynasty has come to an end. Quentin believes that he must escape time altogether,
refusing to leave any heirs behind, who would inherit the curse. The curse that is upon the land can only be absolved by death.

Sutpen senses this curse even while he is trying to become rich in the West Indies. As he has to defend his life against a slave revolt, the sugar cane is burning. Mr. Compson said: "He said how you could smell it, you could smell nothing else, the rank sweet rich smell as if the hatred and the implacability, the thousand secret dark years which had created the hatred and the implacability, had intensified the smell of the sugar" (310). Like the South, the West Indies had been cursed by the blood of slaves. General Compson describes the West Indies in these terms:

A spot of earth which might have been created and set aside by Heaven itself . . . as a theatre for violence and injustice and bloodshed and all the satanic lusts of human greed and cruelty, for the last despairing fury of all the pariah-interdict and all the doomed—a little island set in a smiling and fury-lurked and incredible indigo sea, which was the halfway point between what we call the jungle and what we call civilization, halfway between the dark inscrutable continent from which the black blood, the black bones and flesh and thinking and remembering and hopes and desires, was ravished by violence, and the cold known land to which it was doomed, the civilised land and people which had expelled some of its own blood and thinking and desires that had become too crass to be faced and borne longer, and set it homeless and desperate on the lonely ocean—a little lost island in a latitude which would require ten thousand years of
equatorial heritage to bear its climate, a soil manured with black blood from two hundred years of oppression and exploitation until it sprang with an incredible paradox of peaceful greenery and crimson flowers and sugar cane sapling size and three times the height of a man and little bulkier of course but valuable pound for pound almost with silver ore, as if nature held a balance and kept a book and offered a recompense for the torn limbs and outraged hearts even if man did not, the planting of nature and man too watered not only by the wasted blood but breathed over by the winds in which the doomed ships had fled in vain, out of which the last tatter of sail had sunk into the blue sea, along which the last vain despairing cry of woman or child had blown away.

(313)

Sutpen goes from the West Indies, a land cursed by the blood of slaves, to the South, to help participate in the cursing of the Southern landscape. Just as the West Indies had been a garden of the Lord corrupted by violence, the South repeats the same tragic mistake. The text draws the comparison between the West Indies and the South. Both were perceived as paradises, beckoning fortune-hunters who wanted to enjoy wealth and utopia. The West Indies and the South became places of bloodshed where the dream of paradisal wealth and tranquility were made possible by slavery. General Compson's comparison between the jungle and "what we call civilization" points to his own ambivalence toward a "civilized" culture which barbarously slaughtered another to create its own. The beauty of the pastoral landscape contains a paradox. The land and its
produce were beautiful, but they had been fertilized with blood. The crimson flowers are a reminder of the red blood that nurtured them.

General Compson believes that the land kept an account of the cruelties which had happened upon it. The land would one day require a reckoning. The beautiful pastoral landscape itself was a constant reminder that the South would one day pay a price for that beauty. Therefore, the people of the South could view the pastoral landscape only with ambivalence, appreciating its beauty, apologizing for its source, and dreading the approaching judgment. The West Indies were destroyed because of greed for sugar. After Sutpen smells all of the sugar cane burning just before he left the West Indies, he remarks that he could never stand the smell or taste of sugar. Virginia Ambler in Glasgow's *The Battle-Ground* is sickened by the smell of magnolias after the war begins. The symbols of pastoral wealth acquire a disgusting character when one realizes the price that was paid to enjoy that kind of lifestyle. Sutpen believes that the earth is "kind and gentle" (314), but the earth itself rebels against the South because of the blood of slaves. Sights and even smells of the landscape cause a sense of revulsion.
This theme of the land being cursed is also felt by Ike McCaslin in _Go Down, Moses_. Ike sees the fundamental cause underlying the loss of the pastoral world as not merely abusing the land, but even in the ownership of land. Ike envisions a new pastoral void of property ownership, or at least void of the concept that humanity owns nature, or any part of it. Ike demonstrates the firmness of his belief by relinquishing the land that he is to inherit. Ike wants no part of a land that has been tainted with incest and the blood of slaves and Native Americans.

For Ike, racism and rapacity caused the destruction of the new Eden. Ike describes God's punishment because of the shedding of innocent blood in these terms:

Dispossessed of Eden Dispossessed of Canaan, and those who dispossessed him dispossessed him dispossessed, and the five hundred years of absentee landlords in the Roman bagnios, and the thousand years of wild men from the northern woods who dispossessed them and devoured their ravished substance ravished in turn again and then snarled in what you call the old world's worthless twilight over the old world's gnawed bones. . . . And Grandfather did not own the land nevertheless and notwithstanding because he permitted it, not impotent not condoning and not blind because He ordered and watched it. He saw the land already accursed even as Ikkemotubbe and Ikkemotubbee's father old Issetibbeha and old Issetibbeha's fathers too held it, already tainted even before any white man owned it by what Grandfather and his kind, his fathers, had brought it into the new land which He had vouchsafed them out of pity and sufferance, on condition of pity and humility and sufferance and endurance, from that old world's corrupt and worthless twilight as though
in the sails of the old world's tainted wind which drove the ships... and no hope for the land anywhere so long as Ikkemotubbe and Ikkemotubbe's descendants held it in unbroken succession. Maybe he saw that only by voiding the land for a time of Ikkemotubbe's blood and substituting for it another blood, could He accomplish His purpose. Maybe He knew already what that other blood would be, maybe it was more than justice that only the white man's blood was available and capable to raise the white man's curse when... He used the blood which brought in the evil to destroy the evil as doctors use fever to burn up fever, poison to slay poison. (258-9)

Ike traces the whole course of European and American history in terms of possession and dispossession and the accompanying greed and bloodshed. Though the Europeans came to the New World to create a new paradise, their enterprise was doomed from the beginning because they brought the curse of possession and dispossession with them. Edens and Canaans cannot continue to exist as long as possession and dispossession are the chief features of humanity's existence.

When Ike goes to Fonsiba to try to give her the share of inheritance belonging to her, he says,

Dont you see?... Don't you see? This whole land, the whole South, is cursed, and all of us who derive from it, whom it ever suckled, white and black both, lie under the curse? Granted that my people brought the curse onto the land: maybe for that reason their descendants alone can--not resist it, not combat it--maybe just endure and outlast it until the curse is lifted. Then your peoples' turn will come because we have forfeited ours. (278)
Fonsiba tries to argue that this land is the new Canaan characterized by freedom and liberty. The narrator describes Ike's reaction as follows:

"Freedom from what? From work? Canaan?" He jerked his arm, comprehensive, almost violent: whereupon it all seemed to stand there about them, intact and complete and visible in the drafty, damp, heatless, negro-stale negro-rank sorry room—the empty field without plow or seed to work them, fenceless against the stock which did not exist with or without the walled stable which likewise was not there. "What corner of Canaan is this?" (279)

Ike knows that the Canaans which Europeans tried to establish in the New England and South were failures. Instead of creating the garden of Eden, they have brought the contagion of death with them, spoiling what was left of the pastoral world.

Ike sees the curse upon the land, but does not see any hope for the curse to be lifted, at least for many thousands of years. When he is twenty-one, he has a shamanic vision in the wilderness, much like the one he had had of the deer when hunting with Sam Fathers. His vision with Sam Fathers was of a gigantic buck, a symbol of the pride and strength of nature and the wilderness. Ike's vision, years later, is of a rattlesnake, the destroyer of paradise:

The old one, the ancient and accursed about the earth, fatal and solitary and he could smell it now: the thin
sick smell of rotting cucumbers and something else which had no name, evocative of all knowledge and an old weariness and of pariah-hood and of death. . . . he put the other foot down at last and didn't know it, standing with one hand raised as Sam had stood that afternoon six years ago when Sam led him into the wilderness and showed him and he ceased to be a child, speaking the old tongue which Sam had spoken that day without premeditation either: "Chief," he said: "Grandfather." (329-30)

Ike realizes that his spiritual grandfather, the father of the people who destroyed the pastoral world is the serpent of old who destroyed the Garden of Eden. The fatality of death must come upon the Southern landscape because of the sins of the fathers.

The ambivalence that many people feel toward the South is seen in the conclusion of both Go Down, Moses and Absalom, Absalom!. The last picture we have of Ike McCaslin in "Delta Autumn" is his shivering in a cot after his encounter with his nephew's black mistress. Though critics such as Stephen Ross see Ike as "Faulkner's most successful affirmative hero--the only one among his protagonists who refuses to be victimized by the discourses that have created him" (163), the text lends itself to another interpretation that Ike is indeed a victim of the historical texts which gave birth to his moral consciousness. Ike uses the Bible and old ledgers to create a monologic philosophy of life. Although he
realizes that the land is cursed, his flight from reality is based on a monologic conclusion, which he tries throughout his life to keep intact. When Ike tries to convince Cass Edwards that he has just cause for relinquishing his inheritance, it appears that there is a genuine dialogic encounter between the two. A close reading of the text reveals that Ike is talking, but not listening, an attitude that he will assume throughout the rest of his life.

Ike has come to his understanding of the curse through a dialogic encounter with the oral histories of the past, the Bible, and the old ledgers. But his reaction and subsequent philosophy are monologic. We view Ike’s decision with ambivalence because his moral insight is coupled with an inadequate response to what he has discovered. Stephen Ross believes that Ike’s encounter with the ledgers suggests that written texts are more reliable than oral histories (166). Although it is true that the ledgers give Ike a moral certainty in his own consciousness, the text also reveals that Ike takes liberties with his interpretation of the ledgers in the same manner as he concocts individualistic interpretations of the Bible. Though Quentin commits suicide, there is no
great difference between his response to oral texts and Ike's response to written texts. Neither can escape the voices of the past or form an adequate resolution to the conflicts and inconsistencies in their response to them. In a later chapter, I will discuss in depth the inadequacy of Ike's moral resolution. Ike cannot escape his own racism nor the consequences of Southern racism as a whole.

Nor can Quentin Compson escape this burden of the curse of the past. After Shreve asks Quentin, "Now I want you to tell me just one thing more. Why do you hate the South?", Absalom closes with a description of Quentin, also shivering as he realizes the burden of guilt: "I don't hate it," he said. I don't hate it he thought, panting in the cold air, the iron New England dark: I don't. I don't! I don't hate it! I don't hate it! (471). We know from a previous novel, The Sound and the Fury, that Quentin Compson commits suicide while attending Harvard. The Southerner from one failed pastoral paradise, dies a suicide in another failed pastoral paradise—New England. Quentin seems to conclude that there can be no escape from the consequences of history except death. Once the pastoral paradise has been spoiled, there is no redemption.
for people such as Quentin who inherit the burden of guilt for despoiling the pastoral world.

Faulkner’s and Glasgow’s treatments of the South exemplify this love/hate relationship which many Southern writers expressed. Speaking of Glasgow’s ambivalence toward the South and its pastoral dream, C. Hugh Holman writes:

The Tidewater culture introduced into America the dream of the British aristocracy. It flourished in a dream of chivalric glory. The Tidewater and Low Country South gave order, leadership, and intellectual guidance to an agrarian culture. But, as Miss Glasgow demonstrates by personal example, by reiterated statement, and by dramatic presentation, it had reached the stage by the 1930's where its virtues were of the past, its strength in legend and not facts, and its structure honeycombed with the dry rot of time and custom. Not to love it was, for Miss Glasgow at least, impossible; and yet to fail to subject it to ironic analysis would be to succumb to its worst failings. (25)

Both Faulkner and Glasgow laugh at these chivalric pretensions, realizing that the design of the Tidewater version of pastoral was flawed from the beginning.

In these texts, Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner indicate that there was a serpent in the pastoral paradise. Whether it is Hardy’s Wessex, Glasgow’s Virginia, or Faulkner’s Yoknapatawpha, a flaw in the original design for the pastoral design secured its doom. The designs themselves
are displayed in such a way as to encourage ambivalent laughter.

Sutpen formulates his design in the Tidewater area of Virginia, the location of most of Ellen Glasgow's stories. Glasgow, especially in *The Battle-Ground* shows how the genteel society of Virginia began to crumble. Sutpen tries the Tidewater experiment again in Mississippi, with the same results. Writing of this attempt to establish a Tidewater aristocracy in Mississippi, Holman writes, "There in the sub-tropics the combination of rich soil and an imperfectly transmitted dream of plantation glory gave to the Deep South a somewhat distorted version of the characteristics of the Tidewater world" (5). Then we could describe Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha pastoral as a grotesque, carnivalized version of Glasgow's Tidewater pastoral.

The rustic characters in Hardy and Glasgow hold up the aspirations of pastoral idealists for ambivalent laughter. In some ways, Thomas Sutpen is one of the greatest of all carnivalesque characters. He is a rustic who acts like an aristocrat, affecting the talk, the swagger, the plantation, the marriage, the slave owning of the true aristocrats. The people resent him because he is the comic embodiment of the ideals they hold precious. Sutpen, and
the rest of the rustic characters we find in Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner juxtapose the serious pastoral idealism with their own comic portrayal.

Endnotes

1 Some critics, such as Geoffrey Grigson believe that the title comes from a folk song, rather than Shakespeare's play. If so, the ambiguity of the title and plot is further increased. However, the allusion to the nightingale and the presence of greenwood tree under which Dick and Fancy's wedding takes place, make it clear that Shakespeare's play was in mind. Michael Millgate, in Thomas Hardy: His Career as a Novelist, points out that Hardy seemed fascinated by As You Like It, particularly a version of the play in which Mrs. Scott-Siddons played Rosalind.

2 For an excellent discussion of the kinds of trades people were engaged in during the time of the writing of Hardy's novels, see John Rabbetts's From Hardy to Faulkner: Wessex to Yoknapatawpha, p. 7-22.

3 In Book III of Daphnis and Chloe, Chloe's foster-father, Dryas, does not want to give her to Daphnis because he wants her to marry into a better class than that represented by the native rustics.

4 See Jan Bakker's Pastoral in Antebellum Southern Romance for an analysis of the way pastoral was used to describe the antebellum pastoral. Bakker reveals that these texts also were more ambivalent than normally thought.
CHAPTER 3
ROMANCE, MORALITY, AND MARRIAGE
IN THE PASTORAL WORLD

Women figure prominently in most versions of pastoral. Male-authored texts often present an erotic fantasy where females serve the sexual needs of men without any of the consequences encountered in the real world. The male-authored texts and narrators in Hardy and Faulkner treat various gender issues in the context of patriarchal versions of pastoral. These texts demonstrate that when women accept monologic versions of pastoral, the results can be disastrous. Glasgow also considers these issues, dealing with women who are trying to create a source of identity; their quests involving various versions of pastoral. The next three chapters will examine some of the more famous female characters in the writings of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner to see their various responses to different versions of pastoral.

Eustacia Vye: Romantic Idealism Meets the New Pastoral Environment

In Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics Bakhtin suggests that when reading Dostoevsky, he became aware that he was not reading the thoughts of just one author, but several "author-thinkers" (5). Bakhtin believed that the novel
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could not contain merely one ideological stance, because
the narrator and the characters interact in dialogue with
themselves and one another in such a fashion that
ideological closure is an impossibility. In Hardy's The
Return of the Native, the reader encounters several of
these author-thinkers who have a relationship to a new kind
of pastoral environment proposed by the narrator. Clym
Yeobright, Thomasin Yeobright, and the rustic characters of
Egdon Heath approach this new pastoral environment from
different ideological perspectives, though they are natives
of the heath. In this section of my study, I will
concentrate upon an "outsider," Eustacia Vye, and her
particular ideological response to this new pastoral
environment. I will discuss briefly other characters, as
well, to examine the way in which the novel brings in
"disparate, contradictory philosophical stances each
defended by one or another character" (Bakhtin, Poetics 5).
These characters are not only in dialogue with one another,
but with themselves, dealing with their own inner conflicts
and contradictions.

The description of Egdon Heath in The Return of the
Native does not sound like the traditional versions of the
pastoral environment:
The face of the heath by its mere complexion added half an hour to evening; it could in like manner retard the dawn, sadden noon, anticipate the frowning of storms scarcely generated, and intensify the opacity of a moonless midnight to a cause of shaking and dread. (3)

Because of this gloomy description of the landscape, some critics refuse to see the pastoral element in this novel. Michael Squires argues, "To extend the term pastoral to such novels as these would be to strip it of the specialized meaning which, despite its recent broadening, the term should retain to be critically useful" (20). Langbaum, on the other hand argues that The Return of the Native is "a complex pastoral because the heath remains the novel's most powerful presence and because the major events take place outdoors on the heath" (111). These widely divergent attempts at generic classification illustrate Bakhtin's view that a novel, even language itself, resists final closure.

Since discrepancies and contradictions with some versions of pastoral exist within the text, some critics refuse to see the pastoral elements within a particular work. The Return of the Native suggests a new kind of pastoral in dialogue with itself and other versions of pastoral. Describing the manner in which other genres, such as the pastoral, are novelized, Bakhtin observes:
They become more free and flexible, their language renews itself by incorporating extra literary heteroglossia and the "novelistic" layers of literary language, they become dialogized, permeated with laughter, irony, humor, elements of self-parody and finally--this is the most important thing--the novel inserts into these other genres an indeterminacy, a certain semantic openendedness, a living contact with unfinished, still-evolving contemporary reality (the openended present). (Dialogic 7)

The Return of the Native incorporates the heteroglossia of urban and rural characters, as well as the scientific language of the Victorian era that dismantled so many of the previous conceptions of the pastoral world. The pastoral model continues to evolve, so that the pastoral element survives even in the bleakness of Egdon Heath. The word "evolve" has particular relevance for a novel such as The Return of the Native, since Darwin's theories concerning evolution have a bearing upon the development of new aspects of pastoral itself. The Return of the Native lends ambivalent support to a Darwinian pastoral. Modern thought is simultaneously a creator and destroyer of the pastoral world.

While some pastoralists would use only the bucolic atmosphere of sun-soaked hillsides, flower-filled meadows, and perfect weather, Hardy chooses the opposite kind of landscape for this pastoral environment. The narrator of The Return of the Native takes one of the traditional
descriptions of a bucolic idyll and describes a rural opposite, not in an attempt to abandon hope for bucolic happiness, but to describe a pastoral world that would be more in keeping with modern life and thought. Even this new version of pastoral, however, is not without complications and contradictions. In *The Return of the Native*, the text, at times, seems to blame the modern thought of the town for the unhappiness of characters such as Eustacia Vye and Clym Yeobright. Modern people find it difficult to achieve happiness, even in a bucolic pastoral environment, because they have been disillusioned by the discovery of natural laws (169). Scientific discoveries prevent the modern person from viewing nature in the idyllic light of past civilizations. Science has shown that nature is neither benevolent, nor evil, but simply neutral and uncaring. With such an understanding of nature, the quest for the Golden Age seems to have come to an end.

When Adam and Eve were cast out of the Garden of Eden, God "placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen. 3:24). A return to the pastoral world was impossible because of the guardians that had been
placed to bar their entrance. For the modern person, the Cherubim and flaming sword are the heightened consciousness and awareness of the true character of nature, what David Jarret calls "the most apt physical manifestation of what the advanced modern mind perceives intellectually" (168).

Yet, Hardy does not suggest that we deny modern scientific discoveries, or return to a blissfully ignorant primitivism. Rather, The Return of the Native describes how the modern person with his or her knowledge of the world as it really exists, can still achieve a sense of wholeness and well-being.

Modern thought is a liberator which could hold the key to living at peace in the contemporary pastoral environment. The text suggests that the current thought of Darwin, for example, with its realistic view of nature, could teach the characters how to achieve oneness with the natural order. That oneness will not have the same characteristics or effects as some versions of pastoral promised, but the harmony will be more in keeping with reality. The pastoral world for the modern person cannot be one of complete and total bliss, dancing in the throes of ecstasy, and exulting in the praise of the goodness of a benevolent Mother Nature. Nor should we be content with a
bitter pessimism based on our current knowledge. If Clym is guilty of a blind love for the heath, Eustacia is guilty of a hateful rebellion. Both attitudes are out of place in the modern pastoral. Eustacia abhors the heath and people. When Clym tells her that she should not hate people, but what produced them, Eustacia replies, "Do you mean Nature? I hate her already" (187). However, the feelings of people for nature in the modern version of pastoral will be neither total love, nor total hatred. In order for the modern person to find happiness in nature, there must be an acceptance of both the joys and tragedies that nature and life bring.

In Hardy's time, assumptions about humanity, reality, and nature changed drastically. Since nature is such an integral part of the pastoral, we can assume that changes in attitude toward nature would change the characteristics of the pastoral itself. Besides, nature does not always have to be a friendly component in the pastoral. Even in the traditional pastoral, nature could wear a frightening aspect. Since the publication of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, however, it has been much easier to see nature as neutral, unfriendly, or even threatening.
The Return of the Native suggests that human beings can never adapt to this new version of pastoral until they realize that nature has no feeling, no ethics, and no morality. The mistake that people have made through the centuries is trying to find religious and moral meanings in nature. They have tried to see an overriding purpose in all that nature does. But Darwin and the new science have shown that nature has no ethics or morality. Nevertheless, nature and human beings can coexist and survive.

The Return of the Native suggests that even if modern thoughts of nature no longer permit us to view nature as a benevolent mother, people can love a place such as Egdon Heath, because it is more in harmony with the true nature of life itself. The narrator suggests that former conceptions of beauty will not be acceptable to the modern mind:

Indeed, it is a question if the exclusive reign of this orthodox beauty is not approaching its last quarter. The new vale of Tempe may be a gaunt waste in Thule: human souls may find themselves in closer and closer harmony with external things wearing a sombreness distasteful to our race when it was young. The time seems near, if it has not actually arrived when the mournful sublimity of a moor, a sea, or a mountain, will be all of nature that is absolutely in keeping with the moods of the more thinking among mankind. And ultimately, to the commonest tourist, spots like Iceland may become what the vineyards and myrtle-gardens of South Europe are to him now; and
Heidelberg and Baden be passed unheeded as he hastens from the Alps to the sand-dunes of Scheveningen. (4-5)

Peter J. Casagrande's analysis of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* explains that one of Hardy's major themes in his novels is the questioning of orthodox beauty. The narrator in *The Return of the Native* suggests that what was formerly considered ugly will now become the orthodox standard of beauty. In *Life and Works*, Hardy defines the "beauty of association" as seeing "the beauty in ugliness" (124). In *Early Life*, Hardy wrote, "To find beauty in ugliness is the province of the poet" (279). Since inescapable ugliness characterizes the world, those who use their minds to genuinely think will realize that the brightness and gaiety of former definitions of beauty are incongruous with reality. By dreaming of such a world, people damn themselves to disillusionment. The old pastoral definitions will not work in the modern world that can no longer delude itself with prescientific sentiments that nature is a benevolent being conducive to idyllic tranquility.

According to the narrator, when the human race was younger, beauty was typified by the vale of Tempe, a valley between Mount Olympus and Mount Ossa, sacred to the god Apollo (Barrineau, *Return* 414). The narrator in *Return*
prophesies that the modern person will see beauty in Thule, a wasteland north of Britain which ancient geographers considered the northernmost part of the world (Barrineau, Return 414). Former generations found pastoral tranquility in such resorts as Heidelberg and Baden, but future generations will see that the barrenness of a sand dune is more in keeping with the reality of life. The pastoral symbols of vineyards and wines, so common to the Western associations of pastoral love and bliss, must be replaced by the symbol of a frozen tundra.

Some versions of pastoral thrive on a sense of loss, a sense acutely developed by Hardy's narrators. Hardy's narrators mourn the loss of youth, health, innocence, and love. However, these texts do not advocate a return to a former Golden Age, as though it were possible to recapture the beauty of some pastoral visions. These texts promote embracing the beauty of ever-increasing ugliness, or, as Casagrande puts it, recognizing the inevitability of loss and "endowing it with beauty and thus making it a source of pleasure" (Beauty 28).

Modern humanity would be out of place among the old symbols and environments of pastoral tranquility. Simon
Gattrell observes that the heath is "emblematic as a pattern for modern man" (xvi). Hardy's narrator explains:

The qualifications which frequently invest the facade of a prison with far more dignity than is found in the facade of a palace double its size lent to the heath a sublimity in which spots renowned for mere prettiness are utterly wanting. Gay prospects wed happily with gay times, but alas if times be not gay. Men have oftener suffered from the mockery of a place too smiling for their reason than from the oppression of surroundings over-sadly tinged. Haggard Egdon appealed to a subtler and scarcer instinct, to a more recently learnt emotion, than that which responds to the sort of beauty called charming. (4)

For the narrator, modern times are not gay times, therefore gay surroundings would be incongruous with humanity's real situation. Pleasant surroundings only serve to throw humanity's unpleasant lives into stark relief. In like manner, dreaming of the Golden Age in terms of the old symbols causes suffering. Even if one were to return to the orthodox Golden Age, one could not experience the happiness promised by former dreams of the pastoral world, because the modern mind has learned a new emotion sustained by the somber realities of life.

The narrator does not advocate the total abandonment of pastoral tranquility; however, as Casagrande puts it, "Hardy's unorthodox notion that in art, as in life, beauty can dwell with ugliness is really a talent for producing a species of the grotesque, for exacting of his readers a
mixture of thoughts that at once disturb and please" (Beauty 44). There can be no return to the former vision of the pastoral, but one can find pleasure in the newer, ugly symbols of paradise.

The narrator's description of the new pastoral is an example of Bakhtin's "grotesque realism." The idealistic, spiritualized versions of pastoral bliss are degraded by this ugly version of the pastoral environment. As Bakhtin writes in Rabelais and His World, "The essential principle of grotesque realism is degradation, that is, the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract" (19). The intent of this degradation is "to bury, to sow, and to kill simultaneously, in order to bring forth something more and better" (205). Former versions of pastoral are replaced by the landscapes of Egdon Heath.

The Return of the Native allows us to view several different consciousnesses and their response to this new type of grotesque, pastoral environment. In this version of pastoral, happiness will require taking a more realistic and less idealistic attitude toward life. In the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, some form of idealism is usually responsible for the unhappiness and tragedy encountered by the characters. Bakhtin writes,
"Ideological monologism found its clearest and theoretically most precise expression in idealistic philosophy. The monistic principle, that is, the affirmation of the unity of existence, is, in idealism, transformed into the unity of the consciousness" (Poetics 80). In these novels, many of the characters try to adapt and live by an idealistic version of pastoral. They attempt to achieve a unity of consciousness in agreement with it. But the texts reveal that these monologic positions cannot be maintained.

In The Return of the Native, Eustacia Vye's romantic idealism encounters the grotesque pastoral. Wotton calls Eustacia "the embodiment of philosophical idealism" (115). Eustacia's idealism is a combination of Victorian morality and historical romance novels. Her romantic idealism, however, is not her true nature. While she tries to live by her own version of romantic idealism, the text indicates that she is well-suited to find happiness in the new version of an erotic, Darwinian pastoral. The text describes her as a sensuous savage, an Olympian goddess compared to Hera, Artemis, and Athena. She is a temptress and a witch who has the power to summon men at will and cast spells over them. Eustacia is a composite figure.
informed by the Bible, mythology, literature, Victorian expectations, and male narrators. But most of all, she is a romantic who prays, "O deliver my heart from this fearful gloom and loneliness: send me great love from somewhere, else I shall die" (67). She has "mentally walked round love, told the towers thereof, considered its palaces" (66-7). She affects the broken-heart: "The only way to look queenly without realms or hearts to queen it over is to look as if you had lost them; and Eustacia did that to a triumph" (66). The narrator describes her one ambition: "To be loved to madness--such was her great desire" (66). She is so obsessed with the ideal of a great love, that she is not really interested in the lover, but in the idea of romance itself (66).

Even Clym sees this tendency toward romanticism in Eustacia. When she expresses her disappointment that the Little Trianon would look like English shrubbery, Clym replies, "Then you could keep to the lawn in front of the Grand Palace. All about there you would doubtless feel in a world of historical romance" (199).

Eustacia is a town-dweller who comes to Egdon Heath, a rural world that seems totally incompatible with a pastoral vision of any kind. Eustacia, like many other characters
in Hardy and Glasgow, views romantic love as her only hope for happiness. Her thinking had been shaped by idealized memories of her life before she came to Egdon: "There was no middle-distance in her perspective: romantic recollections of sunny afternoons on an esplanade, with military bands, officers, and gallants around, stood like gilded uncial upon the dark tablet of surrounding Egdon" (65). These "uncials" are a romantic discourse in conflictual relationship with the somber realities of Egdon Heath.

Literature also helped to form Eustacia's romantic views concerning love:

Her high gods were William the Conqueror, Strafford, and Napoleon Bonaparte, as they had appeared in the Lady's History used at the establishment in which she was educated. Had she been a mother she would have christened her boys such names as Saul or Sisera in preference to Jacob or David, neither of whom she admired. At school she had used to side with the Philistines in several battles, and had wondered if Pontius Pilate were as handsome as he was frank and fair. (67)

Eustacia has accepted an authoritative word, implanted in her mind by literature and other forms of authoritative discourse. Langbaum writes, "Like Clym's, Eustacia's idealism derives from reading and is expressed through alienation from the heath. The difference is that Eustacia's reading makes her idealise far-away places; her
imagination is alienated. . . ." (97). When she comes to Egdon Heath, her romantic idealism enters a dialogic relationship with the grotesque pastoral.

In many versions of pastoral, the characters seek love as the realization of their deepest desires, while they view unrequited love as life's most devastating circumstance. These views concerning love and romance are promulgated through various forms of media including novels and histories. Pam Morris writes, "It is possible to recognize the ideological contours of one social discourse by outlining it against other discourses. In this way any monologic truth claims made by one social language will be relativized by the existence of other views of the world" (16). Romantic ideology often imposes itself in a monologic manner as an eternal, natural, and authoritative word. In Hardy's *The Return of the Native*, the ideology of the romantic pastoral is juxtaposed with other social discourses, including those of conflicting visions of pastoral and the discourse of country rustics who provide a counter-word to the idealistic characters such as Eustacia Vye and Clym Yeobright.

Eustacia accepts the monologic definition of the romantic pastoral. With these kinds of sentiments
informing her thinking, Eustacia encounters nothing but discouragement in her romantic search in the rural environment of Egdon heath. In Eustacia, the discourse concerning Egdon Heath is outlined against Eustacia's Victorian, romantic ideology to demonstrate that such ideology is relative, not a final authoritative word. Bakhtin points out that "characters are polemicized with, learned from; attempts are made to develop their views in finished systems. The character is treated as ideologically authoritative and independent; he is perceived as the author of a fully weighted ideological conception of his own" (Poetics 5). In this case, the grotesque pastoral and Eustacia's romantic ideology polemicize with each other. But even these "fully weighted ideological conceptions" will be shown in the text not to be totalizing in and of themselves.

As in some versions of pastoral, the modern life of the town, especially its views concerning romance, class, and marriage, infects Eustacia, making her unfit for a Darwinian version of pastoral. She blames her depression on the atmosphere of the heath, plus her memories of better days in Budmouth, a "fashionable seaside resort" (73). When Wildeve ascribes her depression to hypochondriasis,
Eustacia replies, "Or else it was coming into this wild heath. I was happy enough at Budmouth. O the time, O the days at Budmouth" (65). She dreams constantly of Paris and "those town pleasures she was so well fitted to enjoy" (242).

This infection results in Eustacia's inability to see the beauty of the heath and her own similarity to it. Though Eustacia occasionally sees something of beauty in the heath, it is, nevertheless a prison and cruel taskmaster to her (89, 187). Eustacia says of the heath: "'Tis my cross, my shame, and will be my death" (82). Her abhorrence of the heath is so intense that she cannot understand Clym's love for it (116). In short, Eustacia cannot see the beauty in the ugliness of the heath. In Life, Hardy wrote:

So, then, if Nature's defects must be looked in the face and transcribed, whence arise the art in poetry and novel writing? which must certainly show art, or it becomes merely mechanical reporting. I think the art lies in making these defects the basis of a hitherto unperceived beauty, by irradiating them with "the light that never was" on their surface, but is seen to be latent in them by the spiritual eye. (44-5)

The person who would find pastoral tranquility in the modern world must, like the artistic novelist, look beyond the surface of the loss and tragedy that characterize our world, and see the beauty in them.
Eustacia Vye does not realize that the heath, just as it is, without any changes in it or its inhabitants, is the new vale of Tempe, perfectly suited to her personality. As Linda Austin observes, "Eustacia has the inscrutability, wildness, and rage of the heath. She is not merely 'like' the heath, she is a figure 'in' and 'of' the heath, and she suggests depth correspondent to its expanses" (218).

When we first see Eustacia, the narrator describes her as a shadowy figure who seems a projection of the heath itself. The text refers to her as "Queen of Night", and as such, she should have harmony with the heath which is described as "a near relation of night" (12). She is so in tune with the landscape that her emotions, actions, and sounds blend perfectly with those of the heath:

The bluffs, and the bushes, and the heatherbells had broken silence; at last, so did the woman; and her articulation was but as another phrase of the same discourse as theirs. Thrown out on the winds it became twined in with them, and with them it flew away. (52)

Eustacia never considers, as does Ellen Glasgow's Dorinda Oakley, that to be truly free a woman must stop looking for the male hero to deliver her from Hades. She must, instead, seek an independence that comes from the land. Eustacia claims to have independence, but her whole life revolves around three men: Diggory Venn, Clym Yeobright,
and Damon Wildeve. She feels powerless against Venn, while Clym and Wildeve disappoint her hopes for love and the future. Although Eustacia claims to be her own mistress (201), she is anything but. However, according to the narrator, a proper acceptance of the heath could have led to independence:

To dwell on a heath without studying its meanings was like wedding a foreigner without learning his tongue. The subtle beauties of the heath were lost to Eustacia; she only caught its vapours. An environment which would have made a contented woman a poet, a suffering woman a devotee, a pious woman a psalmist, even a giddy woman thoughtful, made a rebellious woman saturnine. (68)

Despite this natural harmony with the heath, Eustacia longs to escape its confines, because the heath and the people within it, especially the men, do not fit her romantic idealism, though she rejects three opportunities to escape.

The narrator presents Eustacia as a sensual, erotic goddess who has been ruined by romantic ideology: "As far as social ethics were concerned Eustacia approached the savage state, though in emotion she was all the while an epicure. She had advanced to the secret recesses of sensuousness, yet had hardly crossed the threshold of conventionality" (92). This key sentence expresses not only Eustacia's dilemma, but that of Victorian society in general. The narrator suggests that by nature, human
beings are sensuous, longing for unbridled erotic fulfillment. The conventionality of Victorian society makes impossible a return to this kind of existence. Eustacia is a tamed savage who can be at home neither in the wild nor in Victorian society. Bruce Johnson observes that Eustacia "stands against the meaning of the heath and of the 'survivals' largely because she characteristically has this refining, epicurean, overcivilizing if antisocial quality to her every thought and action" (True 119). This "overcivilizing" tendency is blamed for many disasters in Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner. The heath is congenial to the sensuous savage, but not to the conventional epicure. Eustacia's repression separated her from the creative life the heath affords. She romanticizes about Budmouth and Paris, but neither would have been as liberating as an acceptance of the heath. The narrator says, "A narrow life in Budmouth might have completely demeaned her" (66).

The Return of the Native often suggests that Eustacia has all the makings of a sensual lover who would fit the masculine fantasy of a pastoral lover, but who has been ruined by romantic idealism. She does not want the conventional kind of love. She tells Wildeve, "Don't you offer me tame love, or away you go" (80). The text implies
that her erotic longings could have been satisfied in the
heath, especially with Wildeve. In sexually suggestive
imagery, the narrator describes the oneness of Wildeve and
Eustacia with the heath: "They were as two horns which the
sluggish heath had put forth from its crown, like a
mollusc, and had now drawn in again" (82).

Though Eustacia longs for romantic love, she knows how
quickly it vanishes (197). This very recognition of the
brevity of romantic love would have made her an ideal
pastoral lover in its erotic version. In this version of
pastoral, the lover acknowledges and accepts the brevity of
passion. After Eustacia's marriage to Clym, the couple
enjoys several weeks of pastoral bliss: "When it rained
they were charmed, because they could remain indoors
together all day with such a show of reason; when it was
fine they were charmed, because they could sit together on
the hills" (241). Even in the midst of this romantic
environment, Clym begins to have doubts that such feelings
can last:

Yeobright did not fear for his own part; but
recollection of Eustacia's old speech about the
evanescence of love, now apparently forgotten by her,
sometimes caused him to ask himself a question; and he
recoiled at the thought that the quality of finiteness
was not foreign to Eden. (241)
An Eden characterized by romantic love must sooner or later experience a tragic Fall. The kind of passion experienced by Wildeve and Eustacia for one another is in harmony with the wildness of the heath, but Eustacia refuses to give in to these impulses because of her romantic vision of Paris. Furthermore, Wildeve does not measure up to her idealistic expectations. Eustacia submits to a marriage with Clym that she knows will not provide the erotic fulfillment she would have had with Wildeve, but Wildeve cannot provide her with an escape from the heath.

In order to escape the heath, she submits to the convention of marriage to a man who will provide her with neither erotic fulfillment nor an escape. Victorian views of romance and marriage led to an expectation of domestic tranquility; but the erotic pastoral has never been able to survive in conjunction with marriage. Describing how many versions of pastoral avoid portrayals of marriage, Poggioli writes:

It is exactly because of this unwillingness to accept fully the realities of the sexual condition of man that family life and conjugal love appear so rarely within the framework of the pastoral. . . . Bucolic poetry may show us quite often a wedding ceremony, as a kind of alluring vision of a charming festivity; but it never dwells at length on the life of days and nights. This is only natural, because in the pastoral married love and wedded bliss are almost contra-
dictions in terms. No pastoral poet, at least when
keeping his inspiration within the bounds of the
genre, has felt any inclination to raise his humble
eclogue to the level of a solemn epithalamium, or to
drown the quiet music of his idyll under the noise of
wedding bells. (55)

Eustacia wants a romantic hero to marry her and rescue her
from the heath.

She hopes that Clym will be that hero (131). She
admits that she saw Clym "wrapped in a sort of golden halo
... a man who knew glorious things, and had mixed in
brilliant scenes—in short, an adorable, delightful,
distracting hero" (258). Eustacia believed that after her
marriage to Clym, she could persuade him to return to
Paris. She thinks that now that she is his wife, she
should have some voice in the decision making, but Clym
merely tells her that "there are some things which are
placed beyond the pale of discussion" (249). She never
finds an adequate hero to deliver her. She is drawn to
potential heroes such as Clym, but none of her heroes
provides her deliverance from bondage.

If modern romanticism obscured Eustacia's pastoral
vision, marriage to Clym Yeobright sealed her fate.
Although she affirms that she loves Clym, and denies
constantly that she married him just to get away from the
heath, she loses interest in Clym when he begins to go
blind. She develops a new interest in Wildeve as soon as he comes into a fortune. She admits that she would probably not have married Clym if she had known she would have had to spend one more month on the heath (245).

Eustacia also looked to marriage as a means of increasing her social standing. Though she was more sexually compatible with Wildeve, he was not worthy of her affections. Marriage to Clym was to raise her social standing, especially as she envisioned herself strolling through the boulevards of Paris. Though Clym is happy furze-cutting to make a living, it was "degrading to her, as an educated lady-wife" (255). Clym, like a true pastoral shepherd, is perfectly content to live in poverty as long as his lover is with him. Eustacia overhears him singing a little French song from a comic opera by Charles-Guillaume Etienne (255). Barrineau translates the song as follows:

Daybreak restores the beauty of our groves;
Flora is more beautiful at its return;
The bird takes up a soft song of love;
Everything in nature praises daybreak.
Daybreak sometimes brings great pain;
How short the nights for the shepherd burning with love,
Forced to leave the one he loves at daybreak!
(Barrineau 436-7)
Eustacia cannot bear to hear him singing, because it means that he does not mind being a social failure. The irony here is that by singing a song from a French opera, Clym personifies the culture that Eustacia longs to embrace. Her inability to hear this language parallels her inability to hear the language of the heath. In Clym, Paris and the heath combine, yet Eustacia fails to understand. Though Clym might be the pastoral shepherd still singing songs of love, even in French, she admits:

Yes, I fear we are cooling—I see it as well as you . . . . And how madly we loved two months ago. You were never tired of contemplating me, nor I of contemplating you. Who could have thought then that by this time my eyes would not seem so very bright to yours, nor your lips so very sweet to mine. Two months--is it possible? Yes, 'tis too true! (256)

By employing this heteroglossia of an extra-literary source, the pastoral description of Clym singing his shepherd song becomes a parody of the erotic pastoral. While he sings in contentment, Eustacia fumes in indignation. Whether Eustacia admits it or not, her feelings for Clym diminish because of monetary and class considerations. Romantic love, marriage, and class consciousness are alien to the pastoral environment, especially the modern view in The Return of the Native which levels all of its creatures to the same status.
Eustacia has one other opportunity to realize how close she is to the pagan environment of the heath and its dwellers. After her feelings for Clym begin to cool, she decides to go to a dance. Describing their dancing, the narrator says, "For the time paganism was revived in their hearts, the pride of life was all in all, and they adored none other than themselves" (262). When Wildeve asks her to dance, she feels guilty since they had been former lovers. Nevertheless, she overcomes her conventional attitudes, realizing that "since she had come out to seek pleasure, she was only doing a natural thing to obtain it" (262). Wotton writes, "In their periodic outbursts of 'pagan' celebration the workfolk throw off the impositions of sobriety and respectability in a spontaneous rebellion against social order in which anyone who partakes becomes involved" (65). For once, Eustacia gives in to her natural sensuousness and becomes one with the people of the heath. For Wildeve and Eustacia, "the dance had come like an irresistible attack upon whatever sense of social order there was in their minds, to drive them back into the old paths which were now no longer regular" (264). Lack of "social order" provides a brief moment of bucolic bliss. This theme of paganism versus the moral restraints of
Christianity appears in Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner. Though their attitude toward both paganism and Christianity is ambivalent, the texts indicate that Christianity is a contributing factor to the unhappiness of many of the characters.²

After this fleeting pastoral interlude, Eustacia returns to brooding over her plight as an eternal dweller on the heath. When she hears of Wildeve's good fortune, she begins to think that perhaps she may escape after all. Wildeve proposes to make her his mistress, or short of that, at least to supply her with money so that she can get to Budmouth, and from there, to Paris.

Eustacia considers taking Wildeve's money, but she does not think that a woman with pride would submit to taking his money without submitting to be his mistress. She must have the money to get away, yet she is too proud to accept it without paying for it in some manner. The inability to resolve this dilemma results in her accident/suicide. The text's ambiguity concerning the cause of her death resists even further a cohesive explanation of Eustacia's character and actions.

As in other Hardy writings, the text carnivalizes the idealism of characters such as Eustacia. The discourse of
the rustics contradicts Eustacia's romantic ideology.

After the scene where Eustacia comes to the barrow on the night of the bonfires, the narrator then introduces the rustics. Wotton writes:

> Into this motionless structure in which immobility is the chief characteristic, into the isolation of Eustacia's private, idealizing world, the workfolk intrude, and the queen of the solitude is displaced, the kingdom of the mind overthrown. . . . The figures "intrude" upon the perceiving consciousness to interrupt, disturb and subvert the smooth flow of empathy between the perceiving subjects, those silent onlookers. . . . The workfolk's bonfire . . . does not celebrate the triumph of the spirit, of consciousness, but the triumph of the flesh. (62)

At the same time Hardy introduces the idealizing Eustacia, he describes the rustic characters who will provide a running commentary for the rest of the novel on the idealists. The rustics appear around a festival bonfire, supposedly to celebrate Guy Fawkes' Day. The narrator makes it clear, however, that the bonfires have a more ancient origin in the pagan festivals that celebrated the birth of winter. Bakhtin writes frequently of the ambivalent symbol of fire, especially festival bonfires (Poetics 126). In Rabelais and His World, Bakhtin writes of "the carnival bonfire which renews the world" (17).

The text gives detailed descriptions of the rustics as they gather around these bonfires. These fires cause the
rustic characters to be cast in grotesque figures, one of the chief ingredients in a carnival atmosphere. Their grotesque figures are juxtaposed with the idealists of the text. Characters such as Eustacia and Clym are idealists and dogmatists, but the rustic characters undercut this dogmatism. Bakhtin contends that in serio-comical genres, carnival humor weakens the serious dogmatism of idealists (Poetics 107). As these rustic characters take on grotesque features, they provide a regenerative mockery of the idealists that are encountered throughout the rest of the text. As Wotton remarks these bodily images take on "Gargantuan proportions" in the light of the bonfire: they degrade the abstract idealism of someone such as Eustacia (63). These grotesque images represent the flesh, whereas people such as Eustacia and Clym represent spirit. Throughout Hardy's work, the work folk become a grotesque representation that degrades those who have the disease of "taking thought" (Wotton 63). The rustics have a carnivalized sense of the world. This does not mean that the text advocates rusticity as a solution to all problems. Carnival itself does not maintain such totalizing concepts. Bakhtin explains that carnivalistic thought is not concerned with the resolution of ultimate questions.
Carnival humor brings the abstract into the sensual and concrete (Poetics 134).

The text goes so far as to carnivalize Eustacia's death. This technique should not be considered cruel or insensitive. Since Eustacia's death is brought about by romantic ideology, one should not be surprised to find such a death carnivalized. The description of the 1895 edition of the novel is even more melodramatic than the 1912 edition so I will quote it here:

"Can I go, can I go?" she moaned. "He's not great enough for me to give myself to--he does not suffice for my desire! . . . If he had been a Saul or a Bonaparte--ah! But to break my marriage vow for him--it is too poor a luxury! . . . And I have no money to go alone! And if I could, what comfort to me? I must drag on next year, as I have dragged on this year, and the year after that as before. How I have tried and tried to be a splendid woman, and how destiny has been against me! . . . I do not deserve my lot!" she cried in a frenzy of bitter revolt. "O, the cruelty of putting me into this ill-conceived world! I was capable of much; but I have been injured and blighted and crushed by things beyond my control! O, how hard it is of Heaven to devise such tortures for me, who have done no harm to Heaven at all!"

Langbaum writes, "She is in love with her tragic destiny; it is her only real love. Thus, she refuses two offers to leave the designated scene of her tragedy" (109).

Although Eustacia's death is the great tragedy of this novel, one cannot fail to miss the narrator's comic
treatment. The novel engenders parody, as Bakhtin often points out. Eustacia's speech, again appears to be a memorized rendition from a historical romance novel. She has tried so hard to be a "splendid woman," though she would be willing to break her marriage vow for someone with the stature of a Saul or Napoleon. She insists that she is not to blame for her fate. Cruel, heavenly forces have plotted against her. Life on the heath is so horrible, immorality is unthinkable (at least with Wildeve), and poverty is unacceptable. She has no more options.

Though the text, at times, seems to advocate modern Darwinian thought, a return to primitivism, the casting away of moral restraint, and stoic acceptance of nature’s ways, the novel subverts every one of these solutions as adequate for a new version of pastoral. Bakhtin's work shows that it is not wise to offer such totalized interpretations of a particular work. Bakhtin argues that a plot or a character does not "serve as a vehicle for the author's own ideological position," nor is it possible to reduce the consciousness of a character to a closed, simple object (Poetics 7). Neither the narrator, nor characters such as Eustacia and Wildeve embody a consistent ideological position that acts as a solution for a return
to pastoral bliss. While the narrator seems to use certain characters to embody an ideological stance, their lives and thoughts are filled with contradictions and inconsistencies. Robert Evans argues that Hardy failed in his attempt to create in Eustacia a tragic hero (251). David Eggenschwiler, on the other hand, argues that Hardy deliberately portrayed Eustacia as a tragic heroine and a foolish romantic (444). Whether this was Hardy's original intention is a matter of debate, but there is no doubt that the text maintains a consistent ambivalence toward Eustacia.

Many critics have argued that Hardy's text suggests the throwing off of all social restraint as the key to enjoying, or returning to the bucolic idyll. The person in Return who comes closest to casting off all restraint is Damon Wildeve. He loves the thought of dancing with another man's wife (264). He has no "moral" convictions to keep him away from a married woman (282). Yet, amorality leads to his death as surely as an obsession with social convention does for Eustacia. The survivors in The Return of the Native are neither those who defy convention or abide by it. The survivors are those who know how to live in harmony with the heath.
If Eustacia's chances for happiness are ruined by romantic ideology, the person who would seem most compatible with the heath is Clym Yeobright. He is like the heath. He is one of "the more thinking among mankind" (4). Since he knows the truth about the true character of nature, he would seem to be perfectly suited to find happiness on the heath. Yet, he is merely another one of Hardy's idealists who becomes a rather pathetic character. I discuss Clym's character in more detail in another chapter, but suffice it to say at this point that modern thought can be either a curse or a blessing. In Clym's case, it turns out to be a curse.

While some have pointed to the happy ending involving Thomasin and Diggory Venn, the text carnivalizes their happiness. Diggory Venn has achieved a status where he looks down upon the rustics. But one of the conventions of carnival is the way it levels the classes. The narrator carnivalizes Diggory and Thomasin's marriage in the following manner:

As the fly passed, the group which had run out from the homestead shouted "Hurrah!" and waved their hands, feathers and down floating from their hair, their sleeves, and the folds of their garments at every motion, and Grandfer Cantie's seals dancing merrily in the sunlight as he twirled himself about. The driver of the fly turned a supercilious gaze upon them; he even treated the wedded pair themselves with something
of condescension; for in what other state than heathen could people rich or poor exist, who were doomed to abide in such a world's end as Egdon?

Thomasin showed no such superiority to the group at the door, fluttering her hand as quickly as a bird's wing towards them, and asking Diggory, with tears in her eyes, if they ought not to alight and speak to these kind neighbours. Venn however suggested that, as they were all coming to the house in the evening, this was hardly necessary. (406-7)

Thomasin shares the carnival spirit with the rustics. She does not see herself as above them, but wants them to join them in their celebration. Bakhtin explains that during carnival distance and inequality among people no longer exist (Poetics 122-3). The driver of the fly, seeing rich and poor, high and low classes mingling together on Egdon heath, realizes that folkloric celebration of the rustics has the ability to bring people together, regardless of social class.

Lest we take the happy ending of the novel as advocating a particular ideological position, one should remember that this ending was an afterthought, probably a yielding to the public demand for a happy ending. Hardy's original manuscript did not have the marriage between Diggory and Thomasin. In the 1912 preface to the novel, Hardy wrote:

The writer may state here that the original conception of the story did not design a marriage between Thomasin and Venn. He was to have retained his
isolated and weird character to the last, and to have disappeared mysteriously from the heath, nobody knowing whither—Thomasin remaining a widow. But certain circumstances of serial publication led to a change of intent. Readers can therefore choose between the endings, and those with an austere artistic code can assume the more consistent conclusion the true one. (Barrineau, Return 472)

Though Barrineau believes that this is "Hardy wishing to have his cake and eat it" (473), the statement does suggest Hardy's own ambivalence toward the happy ending, even encouraging the reader to remain ambivalent as well."

Bakhtin said that Dostoevsky "brought together ideas and worldviews, which in real life were absolutely estranged and deaf to one another, and forced them to quarrel" (Poetics 91). In Hardy's texts, the narrator's view of the modern pastoral, romantic idealism, philosophical positivism, rustic stoicism are all made to quarrel with one another. One constantly encounters dialogic opposition. One should refrain from trying to reconcile the contradictions within the text, for in Hardy's novels, the contradictions point to the irreconcilability of many human dilemmas, especially when one is trying to reconcile certain contradictions with a particular version of pastoral. Hardy's novels, and The Return of the Native in particular, do not represent a philosophical whole.
Hardy's description of the heath and its relationship to humanity's future sounds incredibly pessimistic. Actually, Hardy is not as pessimistic as he sounds. The narrator says that the heath was "perfectly accordant with man's nature—neither ghastly, hateful, nor ugly; neither commonplace, unmeaning, nor tame; but, like man, slighted and enduring; and withal singularly colossal and mysterious in its swarthy monotony" (5). One hears an echo of Faulkner's tribute to African-Americans, and humanity in general—"they endured." The heath is a perfect symbol for this endurance. While the novel may contain no absolute solution to survival in the Darwinian pastoral, romantic versions of pastoral cannot endure the encounter with it. A monologic acceptance of the romantic version of pastoral leaves one with no options.

The ancient symbols of the pastoral, modern romance, and marriage are incompatible with the new pastoral depicted by the heath. Bakhtin writes that "the novel has become the leading hero in the drama of literary development in our time precisely because it best of all reflects the tendencies of a new world still in the making" (Dialogic 7). The dialogic nature of the novel allows The Return of the Native to show the various definitions of
pastoral life in conflict with one another. The text suggests an indeterminacy of the pastoral definition which allows us to define it in terms of our evolving knowledge of both human beings and nature, rather than in terms of the man-made conventions of marriage and morality.

Eula Varner: Male Narrators
Preserving the Erotic Pastoral

Whether Faulkner wanted his readers to notice the similarities between his Eula Varner and Hardy's Eustacia Vye is conjecture, but he seems almost playful in nudging the reader to observe the resemblance. The initials of both characters are "E. V." Both first names begin "Eu." The names of their husbands, "Clym," and "Flem," rhyme (Jarret 163). Both of the characters are compared to goddesses. If Eustacia's death was, in fact, a suicide, then both commit suicide because of unhappy marriages and extramarital affairs.

Whereas The Return of the Native explains why a woman fitted for a new kind of pastoral could not achieve it because of romantic idealism, the Snopes trilogy portrays Eula Varner as a woman who was indeed so fleshly that she would fit into a kind of natural, physical, erotic pastoral. Though Eula is not confined by any kind of repressive ideology, she commits suicide.
On the surface, Faulkner's Yoknapatawpha County, especially Frenchman's Bend, contains many elements that seem to reflect the ancient Greek, erotic pastoral, such as gods, goddesses, satyrs, fauns, and nymphs. The Hamlet contains a myth that at one time Frenchman's Bend closely approached the ideal of the Golden Age. The Old Frenchman who had settled the place created fertile fields from what had once been a cane-and-cypress jungle, much as Thomas Sutpen does in Absalom, Absalom! But history has invaded this isolated place, and Frenchman's Bend is moving further from certain versions of the pastoral ideal, the cane and cypress having reasserted their hold of the land, much as the furze does in Hardy's Egdon Heath. Nevertheless, there are still a few remnants of the pastoral life even at this late point in history. At least some residents of Frenchman's Bend are trying to keep alive a myth of what is left of an erotic Arcadia.

Throughout the Snopes trilogy, especially The Hamlet and The Town, Faulkner and his male narrators tell and re-tell the story of Eula Varner, constructing and reconstructing the myth of a sexual goddess who fits perfectly into their fantasy of the erotic pastoral. Panthea Broughton observes that although so much of The
Hamlet is about Eula, it "is essentially a novel about men" (181). The Hamlet is particularly about the narrative of men and their attempt to construct an erotic pastoral. The erotic pastoral was described in J. C. Scaliger's Poetics (1564) as one of the chief features of the Golden Age:

Subjects may vary greatly. Love-songs may well have been the oldest, however, for various reasons. Love is a primeval force, instituted by nature to preserve the species. The sexes of all living beings live in promiscuity, and the sight of copulating animals excited people. . . . Venus is the goddess of both joy and love, and song is a source of joy. Youth, being well-fed with milk and meat, encouraged by the clement season and solitude, and having no experience of sorrow, fear, or hate, very easily enters upon sexual intercourse, the more so because they went mostly naked or were only partially clad, not only the boys but the girls as well. One need but look at pictures of nymphs with bare arms and legs. The origin of this type of garment must have been that goatskins were the first form of clothing—which is still in use in satyr-plays. And what else were these young people to do, being without care, well-fed, and with robust and athletic bodies. (qtd. in Kegel-Brinkgreve 372).

The narrators of Frenchman's Bend express an ambivalent longing for this kind of erotic fantasy. While the male inventors of the myth want the woman to function as an erotic goddess, they expect her to exist also as a model of Southern, Victorian, or perhaps some other cultural myth of womanhood. They are torn between what they want her to be and what they think she ought to be.
One purpose of pastoral eroticism is to give expression to a form of sexual freedom denied by the culture. As Poggioli explains, the pastoral thrives when society restrains the natural expression of sexuality. In other words, "the pastoral declines and disappears when the authority of society in matters of sex becomes more lenient and indulgent, and the sanctions against transgression elapse or relax" (59). When there are more restrictions against sexuality, such as those imposed by Protestant Christianity, fantasies of the erotic pastoral flourish.

The Frenchman's Bend and Jefferson males are torn between their desires to possess Eula and their desires to live according to Christian dogma. Even their narrations strive to reconcile their vision of Eula as both a sexual goddess and virtuous woman.

In *The Hamlet*, Labove, the young school teacher, is a man torn between his sexual instincts fueled by pastoral myth, and his desire to fit the Southern model of a gentleman. He invests Frenchman's Bend, and especially Eula, with the myths he has encountered in his readings of Greek and Latin classics. For teacher and male students alike, Eula's presence in the country classroom transforms "the very wooden desks and benches themselves into a grove
of Venus" (114). Even when Eula is doing nothing more than eating a cold potato, Labove has a vision of Eula as "that ungirdled quality of the very goddesses in his Homer and Thucydides: of being at once corrupt and immaculate, at once virgins and the mothers of warriors and of grown men" (113). She is like one of the "immortals eating bread of Paradise on a sunwise slope of Olympus" (123). Eula is paradise, and to possess her sexually is to be restored to Eden, Arcadia, or Utopia. The first morning that Labove sees Eula, he observes, "a face of eight years old and a body of fourteen with the female shape of twenty . . . ." (113).

The obsession of the Frenchman Bend males with Eula Varner conforms to the masculine construct of woman in the erotic version of pastoral. In one of his narrations in The Town, Charles Mallison describes Eula:

She wasn't too big, heroic, what they call Junoesque. It was that there was just too much of what she was for any one human female package to contain, and hold: too much of white, too much of female, too much of maybe just glory, I dont know: so that at first sight of her you felt a kind of shock of gratitude just for being alive and being male at the same instant with her in space and time, and then in the next second forever after a kind of despair because you knew that there never would be enough of any one male to match and hold and deserve her; grief forever after because forever after nothing less would ever do. (6)
Though Mallison says that Eula is not Junoesque, his attitude toward Eula is nothing less than worship. He and others construct in their minds a goddess out of the raw material of divinity. In *The Oaten Flute*, Poggioli writes that the pastoral "is a private, masculine world, where woman is not a person but a sexual archetype, the eternal Eve" (16).

For the narrators of her story, Eula appears most often, not as a person, but a sexual object who unconsciously exudes erotic temptation. She is a sexual being almost without mind, will, or emotions. She is breasts, buttocks, legs, and little more. From the time her family sends her to school, there is "too much of leg, too much of breast, too much of buttock; too much of mammalian female meat" (*The Hamlet* 100). Eula Varner was simply an entity who "supplied blood and nourishment to the buttocks and legs and breasts" (100). Her entire appearance, especially her breasts, recalls "the old Dionysic times" (95) of revelry and uninhibited sexuality.

These descriptions of Eula are a carnivalized image of the erotic pastoral. In *Rabelais and His World*, Bakhtin remarks how carnival images exaggerate everything, especially the body, to grotesque proportions. Karl Zink
notes that Eula is a "Rabelaisian caricature" (140). Bakhtin writes that the function of these grotesque images is to degrade and materialize (Rabelais 20). These grotesque images of the body produce an ambivalent laughter at all idealistic pretensions. Eula's grotesque body degrades both the pastoral and Christian mores of these male narrators.

Although the men may long for the age of Dionysus, they are trapped in the world of Christian codes of sexuality. The tension between belief in Christian principles of morality and nostalgia for Greek hedonism both inflames and infuriates the patriarchal culture of Frenchman's Bend. Labove wrestles with his feelings for this woman-child, trying to convince himself to stay away and pursue his career, but he cannot resist the temptation to return to Frenchman's Bend to be near Eula. He is a monk, an anchorite, even a Christ-figure who believes Frenchman's Bend to be his Gethsemane and Golgotha (The Hamlet 118). Thus, in Eula and Labove, one finds the conflict between Greek paganism and Christian virtue—between Arcadia and Golgotha. The two cannot find a peaceful coexistence.
Just as Eustacia Vye exerted a control over men's lives that seemed to dictate their choices, these men feel powerless before Eula though the constraints of morality compel them to resist her. Such considerations, on the other hand, do not bind Eula. She has no strict moral codes of sexuality. Like Eustacia, she would have made the ideal pastoral lover in its erotic version. Although the school in which Labove teaches may have been dedicated to instilling the principles of Protestant Christianity, Eula brings to the school "a moist blast of spring's liquorish corruption, a pagan triumphal prostration before the primal uterus" (The Hamlet 113-4).

The narrator sees the males as victims of time and history, while Eula exists totally outside time. The pastoral environment is conducive to inner peace because it permits a life of laziness, unhhampered by the pressures of time. As Thomas Mann describes the pastoral world in Der Zauberberg, a person in the pastoral world can experience "oblivion itself, the blissful arrest of very motion, the innocence of timelessness . . . the daydreamlike apotheosis of each and every denial of the Western imperative of action" (qtd. in Poggioli 14). Those who have been corrupted by the urban world have become the unhappy and
tragic slaves of this "Western imperative of action."
Those people who can escape this vicious master of
materialism and embrace "love and laziness" can find the
peace of the pastoral world.

Several of Faulkner's characters exhibit this kind of
timelessness, people who seem to live in oblivion and feel
no compulsion to act for the sake of action or for the sake
of material gain. Eula seems to have been born with the
innocence of timelessness. The narrator of The Hamlet
describes her in the following manner:

She seemed to be not a living integer of her contem­
porary scene, but rather to exist in a teeming vacuum
in which her days followed one another as though
behind sound-proof glass, where she seemed to listen
in sullen bemusement, with a weary wisdom heired of
all mammalian maturity, to the enlarging of her own
organs. Like her father, she was incorrigibly lazy,
though what was in him a constant bustling cheerful
idleness was in her an actual force impregnable and
even ruthless. She simply did not move at all of her
own volition, save to and from the table and to and
from bed. (95)

Eula experiences stages of life in no particular order.
She waits for nothing, and wants nothing, thus time has no
bearing on her. Whereas Eustacia Vye walked about with a
telescope and an hourglass, symbols of space and time, Eula
seems to be divorced from both.

Eula lives with an attitude of indifference toward
time, change, and even sexuality. Even when she was a
child, "... she already knew there was nowhere she wanted to go, nothing new or novel at the end of any progression, one place like another anywhere and everywhere" (95). Labove, who is such a creature of time, becomes more enraged as he realizes how Eula exists outside time and history:

The class she was in ceased to have either head or foot twenty-four hours after she entered it. Within the year there even ceased to be any lower class for her to be promoted from, for the reason that she would never be at either end of anything in which blood ran. It would have but one point, like a swarm of bees, and she would be that point, that center, swarmed over and importuned yet serene and intact and apparently even oblivious, tranquility abrogating the whole long sum of human thinking and suffering which is called knowledge, education, wisdom, at once supremely unchaste and inviolable: the queen, the matrix. (115)

Labove, on the other hand, cannot escape constant considerations of time. He thinks continually of what he will do in the future and how many more years he will allow himself to teach at Frenchman's Bend. After he attacks Eula, time becomes an important matter to him as he stares at the clock that he has so religiously carried to and from school every day. But as he waits for Jody Varner to defend Eula's honor, he realizes that Eula is one of the immortal goddesses of Olympus, not even worried by time and the events of history.
Eula is not a conscious temptress as Hardy's Eustacia Vye deliberately tried to be. Eula is unaware of her beauty and the sexual longings she produces in others, and her indifference infuriates her brother, Jody Varner. When he decides that she should no longer ride astride the horse, it amazes him that she is unaware that the exposing of her legs is sexually provocative, and that she is totally indifferent to any effect that such exposure might cause (The Hamlet 101). Even after Labove attacks her, and he waits in fear for Jody's reprisal, it finally dawns on him that Eula had not even told Jody, simply because the whole event was totally meaningless to her.

It is obvious from these descriptions of Eula, that the narrators have tried to monologize her as a goddess in their version of erotic pastoral. Yet in spite of their attempts to monologize her character, she escapes the narrators. Many critics are critical of Faulkner's later portrayal of Eula, but these texts merely emphasize the inability of the narrators to monologize Eula as a goddess in a male construct of erotic pastoral.

Although the narrators try to portray her as a pastoral goddess, living outside time itself, she kills herself, as did Eustacia. The one who lives outside time
becomes a victim of it. Protestant codes of morality, the patriarchal institution of marriage, and capitalistic mercantilism bring a goddess into the destructive forces of history. Goddesses must exist outside space and time, or else they age and grow corrupt as time saddles them with the frailties of human mortality. As a final insult, after her death, Flem names a new subdivision, "Eula Acres." As Basset writes, "The land of The Sound and the Fury and the earth goddess of The Hamlet are converted into a suburban subdivision" (227). Perhaps nothing could be so incongruous to the worship of a goddess as to have a subdivision named in her honor.

Since the pastoral myth begins to break down because the effects of time and history finally have their way with Eula, the narrators must reconstruct a myth to resurrect the sacred memory of their goddess. The narrations of Gavin, Ratliff, and Mallison are typical of the way myths are handed down. In the process of myth-making there are often substitutions, deletions, changes, and additions made to the "original" myth (Doty 12). Stevens, Ratliff, and Mallison must create a myth to explain several contradictions which militate against their construction of Eula as a goddess. They must explain her extramarital
affairs, one of which results in the birth of Linda, her daughter. Such affairs do not fit well with the construction of a Southern goddess. As Basset writes,

In *The Mansion* Ratliff establishes one metaphor of Eula as a maiden citadel ravaged in three miniatures by her whole gang of suitors, and another metaphor of McCarron as a wild buck, the "unique big buck" mounting the prize sheep that the "local trespassing rams" had been unable to tame. The entire sequence, culminating in a tall tale about how large and quickly things grow in Texas, where Linda is born, is Ratliff's attempt to create a nature myth out of the birth of Linda Snopes. (226)

This myth elevates the story of Eula's loss of virginity to save her from being compared with any other young girl whom the citizens might simply call immoral for what she did.

Not only must the narrators justify her premarital affair with McCarron, they must also excuse her extramarital affair with De Spain. Again, the myth of Snopes enters the explanation. The men who are "worthy" of such a goddess are valiant warriors, practically gods walking among men, not impotent opportunists like Snopes. McCarron awakens Eula sexually by fighting off a gang which is trying to attack her. He makes love to her though he must permit the heroic act of re-breaking his arm to consummate their passion. De Spain, Eula's other lover, is from a long line of warrior heroes. Eula gets involved with De Spain because he is obviously something of a mythic
creature himself. He has the kind of heroic background
which makes a fitting lover for a goddess.

Though the narrators take Eula's life and death quite
seriously, their narrations carnivalize her and her life.
Not that they demean her story in any way, for, as Bakhtin
points out carnival is not cruel, but life affirming.
Rather, these carnivalized narratives provide an
opportunity to laugh, especially at the serious pretensions
of the narrators. Though the narrators are obsessed with
Eula's body and endlessly praise it, the descriptions of
her body approach the grotesque realism of carnival. She
has "too much" of everything. The descriptions of the
"primal uterus," the "enlarging of her organs," and her
doing little more than eating remind us that Eula is flesh,
aligned with "the lower body stratum." Her body is a
symbol of life and abundance.

Even her affairs ultimately become a subject for
laughter rather than tragic moral sermonizing. The
narrators describe Eula's affair in terms of the pastoral.
Gavin Stevens is typical:

You see you can't beat it: the town itself officially
on record now in the voice of its night marshal; the
county itself had spoken through one of its minor
clowns; eighteen years ago when Manfred de Spain
thought he was just bedding another loose-girdled
bucolic Lilith, he was actually creating a piece of buffoon's folklore. (319)

Here, the aspect of carnival enters once again. As Bakhtin writes, "One of the main attributes of the medieval clown was precisely the transfer of every high ceremonial gesture or ritual to the material sphere; such was the clown's role during tournaments, the knight's initiation, and so forth" (Rabelais 20). Thus, the noble and spiritualized notion of Eula's virtue is reduced to laughter. She has an affair with a clown and her story will be told by buffoons. This, however, does not demean her, for as Bakhtin points out, carnival laughter is not cruel satire but an affirmation of life, an affirmation of the material body principle.

Bakhtin writes,

Not only parody in its narrow sense but all the other forms of grotesque realism degrade, bring down to earth, turn their subject into flesh. . . . The people's laughter which characterized all the forms of grotesque realism from immemorial times was linked with the bodily lower stratum. Laughter degrades and materializes. (Rabelais 20)

In spite of the attempts to create a sacred myth of the goddess, the whole story is carnivalized by the presence of clowns and buffoons. Stevens realizes that Eula's story will become the stuff of parodic myth.

Gavin Stevens says that De Spain and Eula are an example of "the divinity of simple unadulterated
uninhibited immortal lust." Stevens' definition of lust strays from the Christian concept. Certainly, in Christian terms, the word "divine" would not describe carnal lust. But this is another aspect of carnival. In carnival, "lust" is ambivalent. In times of carnival, lust can be divine. If Christian constraints had contaminated Eula, her lust would not have been simple or uninhibited. The fact that their lust is immortal shows its primal origin. While the constraints of Christianity might have a beginning and an end, lust is immortal. Lust has always been a common feature of life and there is nothing that can eradicate or confine it. Also, their lust is at home in the pastoral world. It is simple, as eroticism in the pastoral world should be.

Gavin Stevens purifies Eula's affairs in the following summary:

She had no more been seduced from the chastity of wifehood by the incorrigible bachelor flash and swagger of Manfred de Spain than she had been seduced from that of maidenhood by that same quality in that boy--youth--man--McCarron--back there in her virginity which he was convinced she no longer even remembered. She was seduced simply by herself: by a nymphomania not of the uterus: the hot unbearable otherwise unreadable itch and burn of the mare or heifer or sow or bitch in season, but by a nymphomania of a gland whose only ease was in creating a situation containing a recipient for gratitude, then supply the gratitude. (272)
A real Southern goddess could never be seduced. She can only allow herself to be received as a holy, unblemished gift. But Gavin's attempt to spiritualize her is not successful.

These narrators must also explain why their pastoral goddess marries Flem Snopes. Not only do the men find it difficult to accept how their goddess could marry into a despised family such as Snopes, they must also explain how she could marry a man who is the opposite of human sexuality. Therefore, the narrators not only develop a myth of Eula, they also produce a myth of Snopes. Bassett contends that Gavin Stevens created the myth of Eula as a virtuous goddess because he "cannot at this point accept sexuality as a natural part of life and mature woman as something other than whore or virgin" (221).

The inconsistencies in the narratives concerning Eula result from contradictions about Southern womanhood which exist within the male narrators themselves. They are in dialogic conflict with themselves and their own narrations.

Part of the reconstructed myth of Eula as pastoral goddess, is the conclusion that she was simply born at the wrong time, in the wrong environment. Frenchman's Bend is no longer a pastoral world conducive to the kind of sexual
pleasure that she could have brought to it. A form of
capitalistic materialism invades Frenchman's Bend,
personified by Flem Snopes, which reduces Eula to nothing
more than a piece of property. The Varner family considers
Eula property from her childhood. For them, she is a
"contrary filly too young yet to be particularly valuable,
though which in another year or so would be, and for which
reason its raging and harried owner does not whip it" (The
Hamlet 98). The Varners see Eula as property to be kept
from damage because she might come in handy one day as a
tool for barter and trade. Though Hardy and Faulkner
frequently succumb to the male tendency to objectify women
as property, even their texts often demonstrate the horrors
of patriarchal mercantilism.

Of course, one of the most difficult jobs the myth-
makers have is explaining why their goddess committed
suicide. They cannot ascribe this to motives as mundane as
guilt or despair. Ratliff and Stevens conclude that she
must have committed suicide simply because of boredom:

"Yes," he [Stevens] said. "She was bored. She loved,
had a capacity to love, for love, to give and accept
love. Only she tried twice and failed twice to find
somebody not just strong enough to deserve it, earn
it, match it, but even brave enough to accept it.
Yes," he said, sitting there crying, not even trying
to hide his face from us, "of course, she was bored." (359)
The goddess could never find a mortal man worthy to love or to love her. To confine her to marriage or to tawdry affairs with men was to condemn her to a life of boredom.

Feminist critics have seen the texts in the Snopes trilogy as displaying the tragedy that results when patriarchal society equates woman with nature. As feminist criticism has shown, the equating of land with woman in male-authored texts has had disastrous consequences for both women and the natural landscape. Labove, the young school teacher who is obsessed with Eula, sees her as "the fine land rich and fecund and foul and eternal and impervious to him who claimed title to it . . . " (119). The narrators equate her with land, and then with the desire to possess and conquer that land. There is something in nature, something in Eula, that stirs hatred. Although male-authored texts include complimentary comparisons of woman with the land, woman and the land are also "foul." Male-authored texts often view woman as cold, indifferent, just like nature, while man is the opposite. The dichotomy made frequently by male authors appears throughout this trilogy: man is culture and woman is simply nature. Cleanth Brooks oversimplifies Faulkner's view of women by positing that Faulkner's women are beyond
good and evil, not having to agonize over moral decisions because they are close to nature (Vision 61). While a superficial analysis of some of Faulkner’s women such as Eula Varner and Lena Grove might lead one to accept this theory about Faulkner’s women, the texts are too ambivalent to reduce them to such sweeping categorization.

This masculine myth of woman being one with nature often results in violence toward women and rape of the pastoral landscape. Woman-authored texts also describe a close harmony of woman with nature, but there is a difference between the male construct of woman being equivalent to nature, and the woman-authored texts of women finding harmony with nature. In the male-authored texts the dominant culture attacks the natural woman, and in the end destroys her, as in the cases of Hardy’s and Faulkner’s "natural" women such as Eustacia, Tess, and Eula Varner. In Glasgow’s texts, urban society attacks women when they leave the rural world, but they gain wisdom from the experience. They return to the pastoral world, and achieve a new harmonious relationship with it. On the other hand, this tendency in the male authored text to equate woman with nature seems to always lead to disaster.
Since Flem is the personification of American capitalism, Eula's story becomes an allegory of the way in which settlers and opportunists claimed, owned, and exploited the land, particularly the South. As mercantilism destroyed Eula's pastoral beauty, it also corrupted the beauty of the American landscape. Eula's marriage to Flem Snopes is a business transaction between Flem and the Varners. Flem, sexually impotent, has no feelings of love or sexual attraction for Eula. Labove was correct in his prophecy that Eula's eventual husband would be "a dwarf, a gnome, without glands or desire, who would be no more a physical factor in her life than the owner's name on the fly-leaf of a book" (The Hamlet 118). Labove knew that he could never get the Varners' consent to marry her because all he had to offer was love and devotion. The Varners knew that Eula's "exchange value" (118), the "asking price" (118), would be much more than love. Labove sees that when Eula marries, she will not give herself to a man in love, but rather, a man will own her because of "the single strength which power gave, the dead power of money, wealth, gewgaws, baubles, as he might own, not a picture, statue: a field say" (119).
The combination of patriarchal marriage with capitalistic mercantilism leads eventually to Eula's tragic suicide. Nothing could be more incongruous for a goddess than a marriage to Flem Snopes. Flem Snopes is an emblem of sterile materialism. This kind of materialism, which is concerned only with money and acquisition, is foreign to the erotic versions of pastoral. Marriage to the wrong partner, a theme which is constantly present in Hardy, appears in Faulkner, as well.

Certainly, these interpretations have a measure of truth in them, but like most totalizing interpretations of novels, they sometimes fail to see the ambivalence contained within the text. Faulkner shows the inconsistencies and contradictions within the pastoral myth by allowing several different narrators to reconstruct the details of a story. But perhaps his greatest attempt to dismantle the pastoral myth was through parody. As Bakhtin says, "The novel parodies other genres (precisely in their role as genres); it exposes the conventionality of their forms and their language. . . ." (Dialogic 5). In Faulkner's story of Ike Snopes and the cow, the conventional language of the pastoral is used, but the parodic element is evident when compared with the similar
conventional language used about Eula. Faulkner's description of Ike Snopes' love for the cow becomes a devastating parody of the pastoral which also shows the ridiculous attempt to equate woman with nature.

Cleanth Brooks suggests that the story of Ike and the cow is a criticism of capitalism, or an attempt to advocate a return to the pastoral environment through primitivism. Brooks says that the relationship of Ike to the cow is to point out the difference between the relationship of the other, inhuman Snopes, Flem, to Eula Varner (First Encounters 98-9). Ike is an idiot, but at least he has love and devotion for the cow. Brooks sees Flem as an example of how finance capitalism divorces itself from nature, while Ike is at least in communion with it: "Flem is not just a small sharp trader, but a convincing symbol of big business as it proceeds to take over an essentially pastoral domain and to bilk a fundamentally decent but too gullible yeomanry" (First Encounters 122). In Ike, Brooks sees Faulkner's respect for the man who is close to nature. An idiot such as Ike is more human, more loving than a man like Flem, corrupted by mercantile capitalism. Ike could enjoy a pastoral moment with a cow, but Flem is so far from nature, that even when he is married to a woman who is a
sexual goddess, he has no feelings for her. Perhaps this is a comment on how far from nature modern America has been removed. To find a true act of loving worship, one must observe the love between an idiot and a cow.

Cleanth Brooks points out that since Faulkner was so concerned with rural life, idiots, and children, many people have seen Faulkner as advocating a return to a form of romantic primitivism, but, as Cleanth Brooks points out, "Faulkner does not consider the natural and instinctive as automatically and necessarily good" (Vision 63). These scenes with Ike and the cow could suggest that humanity's problem is separation from nature, but one must not miss the quality of subversion. If we push this analogy too far, we would make Faulkner say something like, "Oh, if only men were idiots and women were cows!" The text is a parody showing the similarity between Ike's desire for the cow and the men of Frenchman's Bend desire for Eula.

The description of Ike's relationship to the cow is another form of grotesque realism. By describing Ike's view of the cow in almost the same terms as the Frenchman's Bend narrators describe Eula, the narratives are carnivalized, bringing their high-minded idealistic
versions of Eula to the fleshly level of Ike and a beast. Bakhtin writes that grotesque imagery is a bodily and popular corrective to individual idealistic and spiritual pretense. Moreover, it is the popular corrective of laughter applied to the narrow-minded seriousness of the spiritual presence (the absolute lower stratum is always laughing); it is a regenerating and laughing death (Rabelais 22).

Eula Varner is not the only pastoral goddess in The Hamlet. She must share that honor with Houston's cow. Ike Snopes, or at least the narrator of the story, invests the cow with much the same erotic characteristics as the male authors invest Eula. Ike pursues the cow with the same kind of obsession as the men of Frenchman's Bend pursue Eula. Jody Varner said that when Eula walked down the street,

If you could arrange to have a man standing every hundred feet along the road, she would walk all the way home! She's just like a dog! Soon as she passes anything in long pants she begins to give off something. You can smell it! You can smell it ten feet away! (The Hamlet 99)

Grotesque imagery is used concerning the sights and smells of the cow. When Ike waits for the cow in the early morning hours, the narrator says, "He would smell her; the whole mist reeked with her" (165). Ike lies in the grass, "smelling and even tasting the rich, slow, warm barn-reek milk-reek, the flowing immemorial female" (165). The text uses the word "mammalian" to describe both the cow and
Eula. The cow is the "mammalian attar," sending forth what is for Ike, a sweet, attractive fragrance.

Ike's relationship to the cow is one of both love and worship. Ike's lovemaking with the cow takes place on the earth which has received the remains of "Helen and the nymphs and the snoring mitred bishops, the saviors and the victims and the kings" (181). The cow's eyes are like those of Juno, while Ike himself fits the description of a faun. They walk toward the sun as though in worship of Apollo. Again, the abstract idealism of the narrators is brought down to the level of the flesh.

Ike's relationship with the cow is a grotesque fulfillment of the primal union that the male seeks in his vision of erotic paradise. Ike and his lover retreat to the hills, far away from any constraints of civilization. They enjoy picnics together, and he eats from the same basket as the cow, though as a human being he should not enjoy such food. But Ike has not been corrupted by the customs of modern civilization which classify certain foods as good or bad. Echoing Hardy's view that man is too civilized, the narrator says that Ike can enjoy the cow feed or anything that

the weary long record of shibboleth and superstition had taught his upright kind to call filth, neither
liking nor disliking the taste of any thing save that of certain kinds of soil and the lime in old plaster and the dissolved ink in chewed newspapers and the formic acid of stinging ants, making but one discrimination. (*The Hamlet* 182)

They spend the day together at an unhurried pace, just enjoying nature and one another's company. He makes a garland of daisies for her and crowns her with it as in the mythic crowning of a May queen. One of the key elements of carnival is the crowning of that which is not usually crowned. In carnival, the people in actual authority are brought low, whereas the wise and fools are crowned. In this narration, it is not Eula who is crowned, but the cow.

Ike has a fascination for the cow's bag which is similar to the obsession that the males have about Eula's breasts. Not only does the air of the countryside reek with the cow's milk, so does Faulkner's entire description of Ike's relationship with the cow. The desire for the breast and the milk symbolizes the male longing to be at one with the female, with the mother. Milk is associated with Paradise because the time at the mother's breast typifies their fantasies of a carefree existence. The narrator specifically compares the odors of cows and milk with the man's desire for woman. Ike breathes in the reek, the odor of cows and mares as the successful lover does that of a room full of women, his the
victor's drowsing rapport with all anonymous faceless female flesh capable of love walking the female earth. (181)

Ike, the cow, and Eula are not bound by time, history, and the moral codes of Protestant Christianity:

There is no work, no travail, no muscular and spiritual reluctance to overcome, constantly war against; yesterday was not, tomorrow is not, today, is merely a placid and virginal astonishment. (166)

Ike's love affair with the cow functions in the same manner of grotesque realism Bakhtin saw in carnival. In times of carnival, man-made laws and restrictions no longer apply.

While it may be tempting to view these texts as advocating a return to the primitive, actually they are merely carnivalized images of love being brought to the level of flesh. These texts are a parody of that kind of pastoral world which envisions bliss as the rural world away from the cares of life, and one that makes a bovine use of woman. This vision of the pastoral which shows the similarity between the sexual longing of a man for a cow and the sexual worship of the men of Frenchman's bend for Eula must be understood as a parody of the erotic pastoral, much as those of Charles Sorel, the author of Le Berger extravagant. The nostalgia for an erotic, pastoral world is often as absurd as this love between Ike and the cow. Ike is prevented from enjoying his relationship with the
cow by the standards of the Frenchman's Bend society, much in the same way that the men of Frenchman's Bend are denied the fulfillment of their sexual fantasies with a woman such as Eula.

The description of Ike and the cow is an example of the longing to get back to nature, but such attempts in the modern world border on the absurd. The scenes are actually a condemnation of such nostalgic longing. Bakhtin writes:

A fusion of authorial intentions with the image may alternate abruptly with complete reification of an image, and this within the space of a short section of the work. . . . The curve tracing the movement of authorial intentions may be more or less sharp, the prose image may be both less fraught and better balanced. Under changed conditions for perceiving an image, the curve may become less sharp and may even be stretched out into a straight line: the image then either becomes entirely or directly intentional, or (on the contrary) it may become purely reified and crudely parodie. (Dialogic 419-20)

Regardless of the narrator's original intent, whether that of Faulkner, or the narrators of the text, the reader and interpreters of the text reify the images. In this text, the stories of Eula and the cow may be reified to become either tragic or parodic, and in this case, probably both. Even if the image of Ike and the cow were not grotesque enough to destroy any image of pastoral eroticism, the conclusion of the story removes any hope that such a world
could be sustained, any more than the erotic fantasies of the men concerning Eula.

As Grace Melbury and Marty South in Hardy's *The Woodlanders* make pilgrimages to the grave of Giles Winterbourne, Eula Varner's worshipers make their way to her grave to sing her elegy. The elegy eulogizes her, making her a virgin goddess, protecting her from any hint of promiscuity or prostitution. Yet, it is an elegy much like that of *The Woodlanders*. The elegy contains little hope for a rebirth of the goddess, or for the existence of any future goddesses.

Though pastoral literature often contains a description of erotic bliss, an elegiac sadness mourning the loss of erotic enjoyment usually follows. The urban world, with its detailed systems of sexual morality, destroys the erotic haven of the pastoral environment. Thus, the pastoral poem makes a perfect vehicle for describing frustrated love, gender conflict, and differences between the sexes. The pastoral becomes an angry elegy that laments the loss of the bucolic world and lashes out against the societal forces that destroyed it.

In David Jarrett's comparison of Eula Varner and Eustacia Vye, he notes that the elegiac tone of both Hardy
and Faulkner was caused by the "sense of loss that the embodiment of fertility can bring into lands that grudging of their fruits and into societies whose 'new men' are impotent" (174).

In a sense, Stevens, Ratliff, and Mallison, and other Jefferson males, gather around Eula's grave, reconstruct her myth, and sing elegies in her honor. By doing so they think they will keep her memory as a sexual goddess intact. This is the only way that they experience the pastoral world themselves. Poggioli contends that when male pastoralists realize that their erotic idyll can exist nowhere except in the imagination, he "projects his yearning after free love, his longing for sexual freedom and even license, into a state of nature that exists nowhere, or only in the realm of myth" (43). But no matter how many times they tell the story, their myths cannot remain consistent or defy reinterpretation. Basset writes that Eula's story, like the interpretations regarding her cemetery monument will continue to change (224).

In The Town, V. K. Ratliff describes the monument erected in the cemetery for Eula. Gavin Stevens had a medallion with the likeness of Eula's face in it carved on the monument. The interpretation and reinterpretation of
the medallion's significance reflect the impossibility of ever confining Eula's story to a single meaning. The medallion, like the story of Eula itself, is open to many interpretations by those who look at it. Each man will have a different interpretation, and the generations that come afterward will add their own interpretation to the story of Eula. Ratliff's description of the monument sounds like a pastoral elegy, but it becomes a parody of an elegy. The epitaph on the monument itself is a parody of Eula's life:

Eula Varner Snopes
1889 1927
A Virtuous Wife Is a Crown to Her Husband
Her Children Rise and Call Her Blessed

Those who knew Eula's story recognize the irony and mockery in the inscription taken from the book of Proverbs. The glaring inconsistency between Eula and the virtuous wife of Proverbs 31 is just another example of how the modern pastoral tale within the Southern moral environment becomes a tragic parody.

Many critics complain about how Eula's character changes between The Hamlet and The Town. In The Hamlet she is an erotic goddess; in The Town she is a conventional, middle-class housewife, so concerned about her reputation
and her daughter's disapproval that she commits suicide.\textsuperscript{7}

We could explain this change of character in pastoral terms: Eula marries and leaves the rural world. In both romantic and erotic versions of pastoral, a sexual goddess could not survive such a change.

On the other hand, this change in Eula's character could be explained better as a demonstration of the dialogic nature of the novel, showing that no one view of Eula tells the whole story about her. Millie Kidd writes that "no perspective in \textit{The Hamlet}, even that of the external narrator, is totally independent or final; instead, each perspective gains meaning only through the opposition to others and through the tensions that arise from that conflict" (320). Narrators in \textit{The Hamlet} and \textit{The Town}, as well as literary critics, try to understand Eula in a monologic manner, but Eula, and all human beings are too complicated for such closure.\textsuperscript{8} Linda Prior, for example, finds it "difficult to reconcile the comic view of her childhood with the more mature, stately Eula at other times" (238). This attempt to reconcile the traits and ideological philosophies of novels and characters meets with little success, especially in a series such as the Snopes trilogy. Like Eustacia Vye, Eula Varner has been
inscribed by many texts: the romantic pastoral, the erotic pastoral, narrators, the Bible, Greek myths, and the interpretations and reinterpretations of countless characters, readers, and critics. In the preface to The Mansion, Faulkner admitted that there were contradictions in the various texts:

This book is the final chapter of, and the summation of, a work conceived and begun in 1925. . . . The purpose of this note is simply to notify the reader that the author has already found more discrepancies and contradictions than he hopes the reader will--contradictions and discrepancies due to the fact that the author has learned, he believes, more about the human heart and its dilemma than he knew thirty-four years ago; and is sure that, having lived with them that long time, he knows the characters in this chronicle better than he did then. (n. pag.)

The Eula Varner of The Hamlet is not a different person from the Eula of The Town. The two narrations show the ambivalence toward women who must function as both goddesses and middle-age housewives trapped in world of conventional morality.

The contradictions within the texts arise because of the multivoicedness of the novel. The pastoral world is beautiful; it is absurd. The pastoral elevates women; it degrades and destroys them. The solution is primitivism; primitivism is a dead end. In the novel, the pastoral cannot speak with the unified voice which it once had. The
novel infects its purity, so the questions and contradictions are inevitable. Whether it was authorial intent or not, the text allows us to hear the voices of Eula, Mallison, Stevens, Ratliff, Ike, and the other characters of Frenchman's Bend, all making comments about the pastoral. If then we add our own re-accentuations of the texts as we reify the images in the light of our own contemporary situation, we see the contradictions of the pastoral image which emerge. The dialogic and carnivalesque features of the Frenchman's Bend narratives prevent this kind of closure.

Virginia Pendleton: Southern Pastoral's Ideal Woman

Bakhtin argues that the novel evolved with its own unique characteristics among other genres and took its present form because of "a very specific rupture in the history of European civilization: its emergence from a socially isolated and culturally deaf semipatriarchal society, and its entrance into international and interlingual contacts and relationships" (Dialogic 11). Ellen Glasgow's writings reflect this change as she questions the patriarchal values of Southern society. Glasgow describes a culture still trying to cling to the pastoral definitions of a Southern society that is losing
its hold on its people as the South moves from
Reconstruction into the modern era. Glasgow uses the
pastoral mode, and at times, seems to endorse the
patriarchal standards within it. Her own inability to shed
her heritage, plus the burden of using a mode laden with
patriarchal imagery, cause the various contradictions
within her work.

Josephine Donovan, describing the difficulty women
writers have with using old modes, argues,

Located on the margins, in unofficial zones, women
used form derived from their everyday familiar world,
form that expressed a paratactic nonsubordinating
sensitivity, and which, finally, registered a
resistance to the hierarchical subordinations of
official modes, the "word of the fathers". In this way
women contributed enormously to the creation of the
dialogic counterhegemonic consciousness that Bakhtin
saw embodied in the novel. (90)

Glasgow, using a mode of the fathers, the pastoral,
juxtaposes the male vision of pastoral bliss with the
suffering that such a view caused for women. However,
Glasgow's novels do not always seem to speak with a unified
voice against the constraints of patriarchy, because of the
novel's inherent resistance to such totalization and the
difficulty of using a mode which has already been
determined by patriarchal norms.
Glasgow's novel, *Virginia*, reveals the self-contradictions and ambivalence of women writers toward the cultures and literary forms imposed by patriarchal standards. In this novel we come into contact with several different consciousnesses which prevent us from forming an absolute solution to the problems the text proposes. Glasgow's criticism of the Southern patriarchal structures yet contains some nostalgic longing for the very days that produced these difficulties. Though this novel revolves around the life of one female character, *Virginia* has a scope beyond the struggles of women under patriarchal codes. As the story of Eula Varner depicted in some ways the exploitation of land, so the story of Virginia concerns the problems faced by a society entrenched in pastoral idealism. The very title, *Virginia*, nudges us to look for an application not only to a woman named Virginia, but to the state of Virginia itself. Matthews observes that *Virginia* is

the personal story of the prototypical virginal woman and the political story of her native state, whose name echoes that of the virginal monarch and whose ideological base rests upon solid patriarchal principles of sexual and racial oppression. . . . The body of the woman--'Virginia'--becomes the body politic, the state of Virginia, to be exploited as it tries to construct (or reconstruct) itself in the turbulent years following the Civil War. (73)
The story of Virginia Pendleton reveals not only the dangers of Southern pastoralism, but also the perils of mercantile capitalism as it invades the South.

Whereas Eula Varner is an example of an erotic pastoral lover in conflict with the codes of Southern morality, Glasgow's text, at times, suggests that Virginia Pendleton represents the attempt of Southern society to redefine the pastoral woman in terms of Southern morality. The Southern pastoral myth is not in harmony with the traditional myth inherited from the Greeks and Romans. The Southern myth imposes Southern standards of womanhood and marriage while still longing for some characteristics of the Greek pastoral. This vision of the pastoral does not recognize the impossibility of pastoral happiness in the Southern world, but excises and adds certain features to the pastoral myth to make women conform to the model. In this model of pastoral, an obedient, submissive wife is an essential ingredient.

In *Virginia*, Glasgow describes a woman, Virginia Pendleton, who grows up accepting the Southern pastoral myths, especially those regarding love, marriage, and the role of the woman. Growing up in the time of Southern
Reconstruction, she is "the Victorian lady, Southern style" (Santas 83). The text describes her as follows:

Her eyes, very far apart and set in black lashes, were of a deep soft blue--the blue of wild hyacinths after rain. By her eyes, and by an old-world charm of personality which exhaled like a perfume, it was easy to discern that she embodied the feminine ideal of the ages. To look at her was to think inevitably of love. For that end, obedient to the powers of Life, the centuries had formed and coloured her, as they had formed and coloured the wild rose with its whorl of delicate petals. (4-5)

Virginia is a flower within the Southern pastoral garden, produced by centuries of proper breeding to give herself sacrificially for her husband and children. Before her marriage to Oliver Treadwell, he makes the offhand remark, "I've always had a tremendous sympathy for women because they have to market and housekeep. I wonder if they won't revolt some time?" (54). This statement shocks Virginia and she views even the notion of women rebelling against their sphere as "heretical."

Education, parents, and the community of Dinwiddie, Virginia, shaped Virginia's views concerning love and marriage. Virginia receives her formal education from Miss Priscilla Batte, who operates a school to instruct the well-bred girls of the town. This method of education is so successful, Virginia gives unquestioned allegiance to the myth of the Southern pastoral woman. The text
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describes Virginia’s education in detail, demonstrating that she was shielded from any kinds of dangerous information that might have made her think or question her predetermined function in life, “to make her a more desirable companion to a man” (17). The ironic tone used to describe her education is obviously a criticism of the education of Southern women of this era, but the censure becomes even sharper by authorial commentary: “The chief object of her upbringing, which differed in no essential particular from that of every other well-born and well-bred Southern woman of her day, was to paralyze her reasoning faculties” (17). The purpose of her education was to ensure the complete acceptance of the Southern pastoral myth. From the beginning of this novel, Glasgow begins to subvert the traditional pastoral, and even to mock it. Miss Priscilla Batte has a bird cage at her school, and the text describes Virginia as listening "in silence to the querulous pipes of the bird and the earnest exhortations of the teacher on the joys of cage life for both bird and lady" (5). The life of the Southern pastoral woman is a prison.

This novel shows how difficult it is for a woman to redefine herself after she imbibes this kind of teaching
for a lifetime. Even the contradictions within Glasgow's body of work as a whole reveal the difficulty for women to see certain standards of behavior as merely male-defined, cultural mores. As Doty puts it:

Frequently myth tends to become so thoroughly internalized and intrasubjective that its inventiveness no longer is recognized but it is considered as "the way things are literally." Then mythical concepts are considered not as expressing tensile relations between concept and reality, not as metaphorical approximations to complex mysteries, but as literally functioning systems. (21)

Virginia will gradually see through these delusions, but she will be unable to live by any alternate system of philosophy. Virginia's story takes place during Reconstruction, and her attempts to reconstruct herself become a metaphor for the attempt of Southern society to reconstruct itself after their dreams of a Southern Eden have come to an end (Matthews 74).

Virginia's mother also implants the same patriarchal lessons in her daughter. Giving her advice before her wedding, Mrs. Pendleton says,

Your first duty now, of course, is to your husband. Remember, we have always taught you that a woman's strength lies in her gentleness. His will must be yours now, and wherever your ideas cross, it is your duty to give up, darling. It is the woman's part to sacrifice herself. (150)
The counsel of Miss Priscilla and Mrs. Pendleton forbids either independent thinking or revolt. Virginia's life must revolve around her husband. This counsel, reinforcing the patriarchal values of Southern society, which comes not from men, but from women, illustrates the difficulties that women experience as they try to break away from these codes in order to redefine themselves.

Virginia is reared in a society that views the South before the Civil War as being the Golden Age. Her father, Rev. Gabriel Pendleton, believes that departing from ideals of the past causes all the evils of modern life:

Unhappy marriages, like all other misfortunes of society, he was inclined to regard as entirely modern and due mainly to the decay of antebellum institutions. "I don't remember that I ever heard of a discontented servant or an unhappy marriage in my boyhood," he would say when he was forced against his will to consider either of these disturbing problems. Not progress, but a return to the "ideals of our ancestors," was his sole hope for the future. (27)

Gabriel Pendleton exhibits the pastoral characteristic that Raymond Williams calls "retrospect as aspiration" (42).

Writing about efforts people make to valorize the past, Bakhtin remarks:

Everything incorporated in this past was simultaneously incorporated into a condition of authentic essence and significance, but therefore also took on the conclusiveness and finality, depriving itself, so to speak, of all rights and potential for a real continuation. Absolute conclusiveness and
closedness is the outstanding feature of the temporally valorized past. (Dialogic 16)

Glasgow's text, in a dialogical and carnivalesque manner, questions the authenticity and essence of this valorized past.

The town where Virginia lives, Dinwiddie, Virginia, commits itself to maintain the past myths and keep from its citizens anything that might question those myths:

Of the world beyond the borders of Virginia, Dinwiddians knew merely that it was either Yankee or foreign, and therefore to be pitied or condemned according to the Evangelical or the Calvinistic convictions of the observer. Philosophy, they regarded with the distrust of a people whose notable achievements have not been in the direction of the contemplative virtues; and having lived comfortably and created a civilization without the aid of science, they could afford not unreasonably to despise it. It was a quarter of a century since "The Origin of the Species" had changed the course of the world's thought, yet it had never reached them. (11)

Whereas in The Return of the Native, Hardy advocates a pastoral world in the light of Darwin, Dinwiddie residents try to build their pastoral world by denying the theories of modern science and philosophy.

Nineteenth-century understandings of the Christian faith also shaped Virginia's attitudes toward love and marriage. Virginia is a product of the Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, especially the ideology contained in its marriage ceremony. She reads the marriage service of the
Book of Common Prayer every day between her engagement and her wedding, the words containing, in her view, "the canonical vision of woman," finding her one happiness in marriage (153). Again, the tone of this passage is almost carnivalesque, as we almost laugh at Virginia's naivety. As in carnival, the high and religious are brought low. The text's ironic tone degrades the language and philosophy of the Book of Common Prayer. Glasgow is particularly interested in showing the ridiculous nature of teaching women that pastoral bliss can be found in the Southern form of patriarchal marriage. As Virginia contemplates her future married life with Oliver, she describes it with all the familiar images of pastoral happiness:

Her thoughts brooded in a radiant stillness on the life of love which would begin for her on the day of her wedding. A strange light—the light that quivered like a golden wing over the autumn fields—shone, also, into the secret chamber of her soul, and illumined the things which had appeared merely dull and commonplace until to-day. Those innumerable little cares which fill the lives of most women were steeped in the magic glow of this miraculous charm. She thought of the daily excitement of marketing, of the perpetual romance of mending his clothes, of the glorified monotony of pouring his coffee, as an adventurer on sunrise seas might dream of the rosy islands of hidden treasure. . . . One by one, she lived in anticipation of all the exquisite details of their life together, and in imagining them, she overlooked all possible changes that the years might bring. (154)
Though the narrator describes Virginia's sincere thoughts about her married life, the text obviously depicts the absurd nature of the life that Virginia envisions. The narrator uses autumn light, rather than spring light, to color Virginia's dreams. Autumn is the time of death and decay, not birth and life. Furthermore, the reader doubts the possibility of women performing all of the mundane tasks of life with religious ecstasy. Before the end of the novel, the reality of the actual lives of women shows that the monotony of their existence cannot be "glorified." Marriage destroys the pastoral dreams of many women characters who inhabit Glasgow's books.

Oliver also accepts the myth that pastoral paradise is to be found in marriage. He sees in Virginia the fulfillment of his pastoral paradise, "that strange vision of a heaven on earth which has haunted mortal eyes since the beginning of love" (114).

Their views on romance doom Eustacia, Oliver, and Virginia in their search for the pastoral paradise. Virginia "was tutored after the fall to believe in an enduring Southern Eden" (Santas 85). The narrator says that Virginia "had sprung from the dreams of Adam and had been preserved in the eternal forms of religion and legend"
The Pendletons and people like them, are myth-makers concerning the pastoral, and in their case, the making of the myth is tragic, especially for women such as Virginia. The novel questions the hierarchical myths of the past by parodying and carnivalizing these unquestioned ideologies. Bakhtin writes:

The idealization of the past in high genres has something of an official air. All external expressions of the dominant force and truth (the expression of everything conclusive) were formulated in the valorized-hierarchical category of the past, in a distanced and distant image (everything from gesture and clothing to literary style, for all are symbols of authority). The novel, however, is associated with the eternally living element of unofficial language and unofficial thought (holiday forms, familiar speech, and profanation). (Dialogic 20)

The residents of Dinwiddie have tried to maintain a pastoral myth with an official air about it. Novels such as Glasgow's, however, question that distant image. Her story of Virginia actually profanes the sacred myths of pastoral womanhood.

A subtle way Glasgow subverts this idealized notion of marriage is by indirectly comparing it with the institution of slavery in the South. The novel shifts from descriptions of an approaching marriage to descriptions of former slave markets and the effect of slavery (Matthews 77). Throughout the novel, Virginia's dreams of pastoral
bliss within marriage are interrupted by thoughts concerning the condition of African-Americans, referred to as "the problem of the South." The text juxtaposes her romance with Oliver Treadwell with a description of a former slave market. Just as the state of Virginia disregarded the effects of slavery for African-Americans, Virginia Pendleton ignores evidence that the myth of Southern marriage might be false, as well. Juxtaposing these two images, pastoral marriage and slavery, equates the position of women and slaves.

But in her youth, Virginia is completely blind to everything but the pastoral ideal. She becomes a symbol of the kind of evasive idealism which dominates not only women, but the entire South. The myth of the antebellum Golden Age causes the South to ignore the hideous features of that era and their abiding consequences. The continuance of this myth depended on "perfected 'looking away'" (Santas 85). Virginia, the Pendletons, Dinwiddie, and the entire South must ignore all that is ugly or unjust in the myth.

This kind of evasive idealism was not only characteristic of the South, but of the nation as a whole.
Speaking of the idealism that existed during World War I, Raper writes:

Timid Virginia, not rebellious Eve, is the fitting female companion of the American Adam. Published in the year when idealism was proclaimed the official mental stance of the nation in the person of President Woodrow Wilson and on the eve of that great orgy of romantic idealism which became World War I, *Virginia*, an anatomy of the virgin mind, was perhaps the best informed and least mitigated fictional assault on American innocence since Melville's *Benito Cereno*. Within the limits of one character's life and town, it manages to suggest something of the sexual, familial, artistic, racial, and economic tragedies of a nation of people who innocently assume that idealism is a moral position and forget that, at base, it is an ontological commitment which they lack the courage or (in Dinwiddie, at least) the intelligence to examine. (*Shelter* 241-2).

The dimwit Dinwiddians metaphorically represent all cultural myths that refuse to see the falsity and destructiveness of their own pastoral delusions.

At first, Virginia accepts the myth of pastoral bliss within marriage with such religious devotion, that she will not allow herself to think otherwise even when confronted with evidence that such a vision might not be true. When she looks at her mother, and other Southern wives, she refuses to believe that life will be any different from her pastoral vision: "A glorious certainty possessed her that her own life would be different from anything that had ever been in the past" (25). Later, when she looks at her
mother, she cannot bring herself to look at Mrs. Pendleton in a realistic light and see what could become of her if she follows the same example. As in the case of Eula Varner, age and experience bring an end to the pastoral myth.

This "looking away" is illustrated by Virginia's idealistic views concerning marriage, and her refusal to see anything that might refute her conceptions: "There appeared something positively reprehensible in a person who could go sighing upon so kind and beautiful a planet" (111). Later, when she experiences the "supreme moment of love" with Oliver in the garden, the narrator surmises that not even Aristotle could have persuaded her that her dreams were an illusion (116).

Glasgow presents Virginia as a person, who, because of her upbringing, cannot help the blindness which causes her to ignore history or experience (Matthews 82). Oliver Treadwell and Virginia had plenty of examples of unhappy marriages around them to show that this dream of pastoral bliss within marriage was an illusion. Belinda Treadwell's union with Cyrus Treadwell is called "five-and-thirty penitential years" (66). Though Cyrus and Belinda enjoy a moment of April passion, Belinda awakes one morning to
realize that her marriage has resulted in absolute personal misery (70).

Her husband, Cyrus Treadwell represents the opposite of the pastoral world. Like Flem Snopes, he is the personification of American capitalism, bringing capitalistic finance to Dinwiddie in the form of railroads, tobacco, and lumber: "He was at once the destroyer and the builder--the inexorable foe of the old feudal order and the beneficent source of the new industrialism" (55). Francesca Sawaya suggests that Glasgow's novel shows the tension between the naturalism of the Treadwells and the sentimentalism of the Pendletons (144). The sentimentalism of the old South is being shattered by the forces of economic change. However, the text also reveals that the capitalistic forces of the new South are just as oppressive as the idealism of the old, power still being located in white males. Cyrus Treadwell knew the feelings of sentimental romance at one time. There was a time when he fell in love and embraced the "April" delusion of love, but his love for money corrupted his temporary vision of romance. Like Flem Snopes, he views love and marriage in terms of economic gain (273).
Oliver Treadwell, his nephew, sees himself as the opposite of Cyrus. Oliver fancies himself an artistic playwright who needs very little to live. When Cyrus refuses to help Oliver financially, Oliver believes that his marriage to Virginia will make up for any lack of material possessions. Characters in *Virginia* are either pastoral idealists or greedy capitalists. The dilemma for the South was whether to choose greed or idealism (McDowell *Ironic* 119).

Oliver, too, has warnings that his dream of marital bliss is just that: a dream. When Oliver thinks of how Cyrus and Belinda "sailed the chartless seas of romance," he realizes that nothing remained of their ship except "a stark and battered hulk wrecked on the pitiless rocks of the actuality?" (135). Like many of the idealists in Glasgow, Hardy, and Faulkner, Oliver cannot see the consequences of his own idealism even when confronted with premonitions of the future.

The previous examples show that the text of *Virginia* openly attacks the myth that marriage can result in pastoral bliss. Glasgow's text also subverts the notion that Nature is the friend of pastoral lovers, especially since male-authored texts imply the oneness of woman with
nature. As in the case with Eula Varner, the male characters equate Virginia with nature, especially with the pastoral environment itself. Oliver views Virginia as the embodiment of his pastoral lover, equating her with nature. When Oliver Treadwell thinks of Virginia, "the thought of Virginia lay always like an enclosed garden of sweetness and bloom. To think of her was to pass from the scorching heat of the day to the freshness of dew-washed flowers under the starlight" (136). This is the kind of woman that Oliver had always dreamed of having: "He wanted companionship. He wanted the smile and touch of a woman. He wanted to fall in love with a girl who had blue eyes and a mouth like a flower" (94). Throughout the book, the text compares Virginia to a garden and a flower. Even at the end, when life completely devastates Virginia, "Her submission was the submission of a flower that bends to a storm" (370). These constant descriptions of Virginia as a flower begin to sound absurd, but this is part of the parodic tendency of the novel. Bakhtin writes, "Those genres that stubbornly preserve their old canonical nature begin to appear stylized. In general any strict adherence to a genre begins to feel like a stylization, a stylization taken to the point of parody, despite the artistic intent
of author" (Dialogic 6). Certainly, this patriarchal view of woman as a flower is parodied by the text. In A Certain Measure, Glasgow admits that she started out to write Virginia as a parody of the ideal Southern woman. The longer she worked on the novel, the more she felt sympathy for the character, especially since the character was so much like her own mother (A Certain Measure 77-96). The text reveals the ambivalence of respect and parody for this version of Southern womanhood.

Some of Glasgow's descriptions of love appear to follow the typical vision of the pastoral lovers in harmony with nature. As in most pastorals, nature appears to be a friend, the aid of lovers. At times, Glasgow uses the pastoral convention that people are in harmony with nature, so much so that nature is both influencing and directing their decisions. In several of her novels, love seems to flourish in the spring and die in the fall or winter. Nature supports and adds to the feelings of the characters. Nature is just as much a protagonist in the lives of hero and heroine as they are themselves. Even when they do not realize it, nature uses the environment in combination with their feelings to manipulate and accomplish its own purposes. When Virginia worries that she might not be
making a romantically adequate impression on Oliver, she is
not aware that nature has taken over, and the result, now,
is entirely out of her hands:

What she did not know was that the spring was calling
to him through her youth and sex as it was calling
through the scented winds and the young buds on the
trees. She was as ignorant that she offered herself
to him through her velvet softness, through the glow
in her eyes, through her quivering lips, as the flower
is that it allures the bee by its perfume. So subtly
did Life use her for its end that the illusion of
choice in first love remained unimpaired. (53)

At this point, Oliver and Virginia seem nothing more than
pawns in the hand of nature. What she desires is conveyed
to him not through words, but through skin, breezes, and
buds. Oliver and Virginia think that they are in control
of the situation, but in reality, nature is in control.

Oliver and Virginia fall in love in a garden, and all
of the pastoral conventions are present: roses, wind,
flowers, scented breezes (118). Yet, the text juxtaposes
these emblems of pastoral bliss with white moths being
drawn to their destruction (116). The narrator remarks
that these moths "also, obeyed an unconquerable instinct
which told them that happiness dwelt in the flame above
which they were whirling" (116). While these powerful
instincts and myths promise happiness, they end in death.
Glasgow continues to subvert this pastoral convention by describing how nature gradually becomes the enemy, especially of the woman who accepts the Southern pastoral myth. Even Priscilla Batte, who tries to instill the convictions of the Southern myth into the girls of Dinwiddie, has times of reflection when she realizes that none of the paradisal dreams of Southern women come true (19). As Virginia approaches middle age, she will have some of the same thoughts as Miss Priscilla. She will discover that Nature, which had held out so much promise, will betray her when the gift of Nature turns out to be the loss of her beauty. Thiebaux writes, "Patriarchal culture, religion, principles of female education, and Southern gentility conspire with the law of the species to devour the heroine" (110).

When Oliver falls in love with Virginia, he thinks, "Whatever happened to him, he could never be separated from the bliss of that instant when he had held her" (141). Pastoral love is always the bliss of an instant. "April brevity" characterizes pastoral love and cannot endure the long years of marriage.

After all of their dreams of pastoral bliss within marriage, Oliver and Virginia leave Dinwiddie and move to
Matoaca City, West Virginia. The text uses nothing but letters from Virginia to her mother to tell the second part of the novel. Seven years elapse before Oliver and Virginia return to Dinwiddie. In these letters, we first find indications that Virginia is having to argue within herself to keep alive her ideas of love, marriage, and motherhood. Bakhtin points out that the novel often uses literary devices such as letters to permit other voices to speak. In these letters, we find a voice still trying to justify the myth of Southern womanhood, but having difficulty making the myth agree with the facts.

In West Virginia, Virginia encounters women who do not share the myth of Southern womanhood. For the first time, Virginia's consciousness enters into a dialogic encounter with an opposing point of view. She finds women who are bold enough to criticize their husbands and even speak of women's rights. Oliver begins to want to spend time away from her, a situation that she has trouble reconciling with her view that two people in love should want to spend every moment together. Then, Virginia gets pregnant, and Oliver's attitude disturbs her because he does not seem happy about it. When she gets pregnant again, she is afraid to tell Oliver.
When they move back to Dinwiddie seven years later, Virginia is still the devoted wife, giving herself sacrificially for a husband and three children. Oliver spends more time in New York trying to get a play produced. Age is already beginning to make itself known in Virginia; nevertheless she maintains a look of "angelic sweetness" (195). Later, the narrator observes, "Though she was not yet thirty, the delicate, flower-like bloom of her beauty was already beginning to fade" (253). The equating of woman with Nature, especially through the male gaze, ends tragically for the woman when her youth begins to fade.

Virginia perceives that a woman's enjoyment of the pastoral moment in this male construct is only during a time of youth (239). She realizes that the pastoral world is a male construct designed for the pleasures of men. Virginia's thoughts are similar to those of Poggioli's assessment of the pastoral world, who argues that in the erotic version of pastoral, men, no matter how old they are, feel it their right to fulfill their fantasies through beauty of a younger woman (50). In Glasgow's The Romantic Comedians, Judge Gamaliel Honeywell exemplifies this chauvinistic trait. After the death of his first wife, Judge Honeywell marries a younger woman instead of the
childhood sweetheart he had always wished he had married. Now that he was free from his first wife, he realizes that his first love had grown old, so he sets his sights on a young woman and marries her. Like the traditional pastoral man, he is looking for a younger woman to fulfill his need of pastoral bliss, no matter how old he happens to be. Poggioli contends that "in the bucolic view, a woman no longer young is by definition no longer beautiful, but even ugly" (49). In *The Romantic Comedians*, Glasgow even demolishes this myth of how the male always has a chance at the pastoral, no matter his age. Judge Honeywell is a fool who continues to delude himself with thoughts that younger women prefer older men.

In *Virginia*, Glasgow has created a woman who is the feminine ideal. She is even "Madonna-like" (200). She approaches life, love, and marriage as she was taught: "From the first, love meant to her the opportunity of giving rather than the privilege of receiving, and her failure to regard herself as of supreme consequence in any situation had protected her from the minor troubles and disillusionments of marriage" (201). Despite being the embodiment of all the Southern virtues, her marriage ends in disaster. Linda Wagner observes that in *Virginia*,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Glasgow emphasizes "the dangers of being dutiful, obeisant, and subordinate" (42). While Virginia has always believed that these "virtues" would make her the ideal wife, they become counterproductive in her relationship with Oliver.

Her dreams of marital bliss begin to crumble because Oliver becomes bored with her. He is a modern man, and he begins to have longings for a modern woman, although he realizes that Virginia is exactly what he had always wanted. When he thinks about her, he muses,

As a wife, Virginia was perfect; as a mental companion, she barely existed at all. She was, he had come to recognize, profoundly indifferent to the actual world. Her universe was a fiction except the part of it that concerned him or the children. (231)

Ellen Glasgow said in a letter to Allen Tate that the theme of Virginia was "the fate of perfection in an imperfect world. Virginia is the incarnation of an ideal, and the irony is directed, not at her, but at human nature which creates an ideal only to abandon it when that ideal comes to flower" (Rouse Letters 134). In an article entitled "Feminism" Glasgow wrote:

The womanly woman of the earlier novelists was wholly contented with her immemorial position as the spectator of man: and when she wasn't womanly, and wasn't contented, she was inevitably... hunted to her destruction. Because it has pleased man to imagine that woman is passive and hates change, no English writer of fiction before George Meredith--or, I may say, instead, before Mr. Hardy--ever dared to
recognize that she is, and has always been, in her heart at least, the adventurous sex. (28)

Virginia Pendleton was "the womanly woman." Glasgow expresses her admiration for Hardy in breaking away from this convention, but Glasgow wanted to employ her ironic energies on this womanly woman before she finally turned to strong characters such as Dorinda Oakley and Ada Fincastle. The womanly woman is the perfection of Southern pastoral idealism, but she is also a terrible bore.

Oliver is so bored, he wants to be away from Virginia more often. Getting his plays produced absorbs all his time and attention. When their infant child dies, the failure of one of his plays is more devastating than the death of the child. Virginia is powerless to understand his attitude. Finally, she realizes that "Love, which had seemed to her to solve all problems and to smooth all difficulties, was helpless to enlighten her" (217). Her education as a Southern woman has not equipped her to deal with what she is facing. Virginia is another of those characters who cannot deal with changes in the myth. She has no other education, nothing to fall back upon. She cannot remythologize. As Doty writes:

Myths are resolutely chauvinistic in such matters: whatever cannot be related to origins in the primal accounts will have to be justified by often elaborate
secondary interpretation. . . . Cognitive dissonance arises whenever the contemporary social setting differs so radically from that presupposed in the foundational document that sufficient reinterpretation seems impossible. (26)

Virginia cannot resolve this cognitive dissonance arising from the inconsistencies between marital reality and pastoral illusion. The only way that she can comfort herself in the light of Oliver's behavior is by using the old excuse taught her from the beginning: men are different (203, 219, 221, 304).

Whenever Oliver begins to change, she immerses herself in the care of her three children and gives herself sacrificially to them. Yet, despite her devotion, Jenny, Lucy, and Harry rebel against her and the teaching of the old South. Jenny sees through the old education, especially that of Miss Priscilla. Jenny has adopted the ideas of the new science, and she argues with her mother about the role of women, but Virginia cannot change, saying, "I can't help it, dear, it is the way I was taught . . . and I am too old to change my way of thinking" (322). The narrator concludes that Virginia knows that Jenny is right, but "she merely accepted the truth of Jenny's inflexible logic; and with that obstinate softness which is an inalienable quality of tradition, went on believing
precisely what she had believed before" (322-3). Glasgow's text reveals that the new science is a liberator, but not for women whose minds have been denied the ability to redefine themselves.

Virginia believed that life had meaning by serving and loving her husband and children. This text reveals what Linda Wagner calls "the final reductio ad absurdum" of the self-effacement practiced by Virginia (43). The day comes when she realizes that neither her husband nor her children need her (332). Because Virginia has allowed a patriarchal culture to completely define her role, she no longer has any way to define herself when the ingredients of the former definition are taken away.

Susan Treadwell, Virginia's lifelong friend, has more of the attitude toward life exemplified by Hardy's rustics. Susan and Virginia grew up with the same kind of teaching, but when they reach middle age, Susan's life is serene. Looking back over their lives, Susan concludes that "it was good to have been young; it was good to be middle-aged; and it would be good to be old. For she was one of those who loved life, not because it was beautiful, but because it was life" (336). Virginia is heartbroken because life was not as beautiful as it should have been.
Other than Susan, the person who comes closest to experiencing any kind of happiness or content in the novel is the kind of character that Glasgow portrays frequently in her novels—the stoic who struggles with life and does not ask too much of it. In *Virginia*, that character is Miss Willy Whitlow. Miss Willy Whitlow is very similar to Hardy's Oily Dowden and Thomasin Yeobright in *The Return of the Native*. Both Oily and Thomasin seem to have the kind of stoic acceptance which "puts up with life" and yet relishes its joys. Oily Dowden seems to have one of the characteristics of people who live in harmony with the pastoral world. She makes heath brooms or besoms, deriving her living from the heath itself. In this respect, Oily Dowden resembles some female characters of Ellen Glasgow who achieve harmony with nature by deriving their living from it. Unlike Clym, Cyrus Treadwell, or Oliver Treadwell who wanted to do great things with their lives, Oily Dowden is happy with all the world for just "letting her remain alive" (28). Virginia thinks of Miss Willy Whitlow in those terms:

I used to pity Miss Willy because she was obliged to work . . . but now I almost envy her. I wonder if it is work that keeps her so young and brisk? She's never had anything in her life, and yet she is so much happier than some people who have had everything. (339)
Miss Willy Whitlow is one of Glasgow's female characters who finds happiness, not in love or marriage, but in work. Perhaps Glasgow is already beginning to suggest that women should not be defined by men, but by their work.

Yet, stoicism is not a solution for Glasgow, as her novel *Vein of Iron* ironically demonstrates. Life "as a thing to be put up with" was not the final solution for either Hardy or Glasgow, despite their seeming admiration for rustic stoicism.

In an interesting subversion of the pastoral, Virginia must go to the city to learn the destructive nature of the myth she has accepted. Santas writes, "Only the alien city is brutal enough to thrust the truth upon her" (93). She goes to New York to confront Margaret Oldcastle, her husband's new lover. Margaret reveals to Virginia what the "civilizing" forces of the South have done.

Margaret Oldcastle is the strong, modern woman produced by evolution. She has gone beyond Eula Varner, Eustacia Vye, and Virginia Pendleton. These women could not break free of the old constraints of Protestant morality and cultural myths of womanhood. Margaret Oldcastle is the strong, Darwinian woman who survives. Thiebaux says that in Margaret and Oliver, "the 'structure
of life' has bred the natural instinct to adapt and survive. They are the force of the future" (108).

Similarly, Francesca Sawaya argues that the entire novel is a Darwinistic account where "biologically determined types who become outdated are crushed by those who are biologically determined to move with the times and succeed" (136). Virginia and her mother are a dying species that cannot survive in the Darwinian struggle.

When Virginia meets Margaret, she realizes the difference between them:

With first sight of Margaret Oldcastle, as she looked into that smiling face, in which the inextinguishable youth was less a period of life than an attribute of spirit, she realized that she was fighting, not a woman, but the very structure of life. . . . She stood not only for the elemental forces, but for the free woman; and her freedom, like that of man, had been built upon the strewn bodies of the weaker. The law of sacrifice, which is the basic law of life, ruled here as it ruled in mother-love and in the industrial warfare of men. Her triumph was less the triumph of an individual than of the type. The justice, not of society, but of nature, was on her side, for she was one with evolution and with the resistless principle of change. (364)

Virginia resembles one of Hardy's tragically "overcivilized" people. When she meets a "natural" woman like Margaret Oldcastle, "she recognizes Margaret's superior natural force, against which her own civilized, socially conditioned submissiveness is helpless" (Thiebaux
107). Margaret is not the South's "natural" woman, but the natural woman of Darwin fitted to survive despite cultural myths. Like Hardy and Faulkner, Glasgow shows the necessity for the natural woman to overcome the constraints of civilization and breeding. Eustacia Vye and Eula Varner were unable to adapt or survive.

On the way back to Dinwiddie from New York, Virginia hears two men arguing about an event that would be a "great menace to civilization" (391). Virginia thinks to herself, "How absurd of him to get so angry about it, . . . as if a civilization could make any difference to anybody on earth" (391). Virginia now sees through the myth of civilization, but she does not know how to redefine herself.

Glasgow is not advocating a return to primitivism, any more than Hardy or Faulkner. The text does expose the ridiculous nature of trying to return to a pastoral Eden of the antebellum South, but the narrator does not advocate the total destruction of civilized order (Santas 96-7). In the words of Bakhtin we can accept "this multileveledness and contradictoriness as an essential aspect of its very construction and creative design" (Poetics 20).

At the end of the novel, Virginia and Nature are no longer one as they had been in her youth. Spring comes
again, but she cannot return to spring: "All nature seemed joining in the resurrection of life, all nature, except herself, seemed to flower again to fulfillment. She alone was dead, and she alone among the dead must keep up this pretense of living which was so much harder than death" (373). Novelistic time has overtaken mythological time.

Bakhtin explains:

The only cyclical time known to ancient literature was an idealized, agricultural, every day time, one interwoven with the times of nature and myth (the basic stages of its development are Hesiod, Theocritus and Virgil). Novelistic everyday time differs sharply from all these variants of cyclical time. First and foremost, novelistic time is thoroughly cut off from nature and from natural and mythological cycles. (Dialogic 127-8)

While these novels often begin as though they will follow a typical pastoral of seasons, lives in harmony with nature, before the novel is finished, this pastoral harmony is novelized and the characters have been cut off from nature and the mythological.

The book ends with Virginia all alone, filled with nothing but despair, not believing that even civilization itself has any meaning or importance. But when she gets home from New York she finds a note which reads, "Dearest Mother, I am coming home to you, Harry." That is the last sentence in the book. Critics have argued about the
conclusion of this novel. Has Virginia's life been worthwhile after all because at least her son needs her? Being needed is not Glasgow's vision of the fulfilled woman. This ending points out that for a woman like Virginia, life has no other meaning. As Matthews writes, "The 'chain' of enslavement to patriarchal culture is the tradition that triumphs in this novel, a victory made painfully clear by the conclusion" (85). The text ends mercifully for Virginia, with the hope that at least she will have strength to go on living because her son is coming home.

In spite of this devastating portrayal of the pastoral myth, some critics, such as Santas, see Glasgow as still advocating some features of the myth (Santas 95-6). However, Santas may be going a little too far in her conclusion. We need to resist the temptation, as Bakhtin says, to see these stories and characters as "a monological sermon and thereby reducing characters to the status of simple illustrations to the sermon" (Poetics 13). While it may be true that Glasgow does not go far enough in her denunciation of the Southern codes which produced women such as Virginia, the text points to the difficulty that women have in defining themselves and breaking free from
the imposed patriarchal definitions. In *Virginia*, we hear the voice of women trying to cling to myths and at the same time break away from them. Matthews points out that Glasgow came to see that women such as Virginia Pendleton could never be otherwise than what these patriarchal codes had defined them to be (74).

If we hear different, conflicting voices in Glasgow, it is because she is trying both to condemn the passivity of women in the past while valorizing them for what they had to endure. The standards of the society are so conclusive in the mind of Virginia Pendleton, and many other women, that they are closed off from any redefinition of themselves.

In some versions of pastoral, the drudgery of daily life after marriage is never depicted. The pastoral romantics marry and "they live happily ever after." *The Return of the Native*, *The Hamlet* and *The Town*, and *Virginia* take us past the wedding. The first part of *Virginia* is entitled "The Dream." The second part of the novel, dealing with life after the wedding is entitled, "The Reality." Glasgow takes us past the early days of bliss before the facts about the true nature of marriage begin to take shape in the character's consciousness.
Though other characters had married in Hardy’s earlier novels, *The Return of the Native* is the first of his novels to really examine the consequences of marriage. The pastoral bliss of Eustacia and Clym subsides quickly after the wedding. The marriage of Eula Varner and Flem Snopes is a sterile relationship that culminates in Eula’s suicide. Glasgow, even more than Hardy and Faulkner, explores the incompatibility of marriage with a romantic or erotic version of pastoral. The texts of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner tend to blame marriage and codified standards of Protestant morality for the inability to achieve happiness. Yet, the texts offer no viable alternatives.

Eustacia Vye, Eula Varner and Virginia Pendleton are unable to redefine themselves, even though they know that masculine constructs of the pastoral world are false and destructive. Neither Virginia Pendleton nor Eustacia Vye can survive the new Darwinian world. Other novels by Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner continue to examine the struggle women have to redefine themselves as they discover that the old pastoral myths no longer have the power to fulfill or satisfy.

**Endnotes**

1 Both Hardy and Glasgow were influenced significantly by Darwin’s ideas. In “I Believe” Glasgow said that her
spiritual and philosophical search found a certain respite when she discovered *The Origin of the Species*. For a detailed study of Hardy's view on Darwinism see Gillian Beer's "Finding a Scale for the Human: Plot and Writing in Hardy's Novels" in *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot and Nineteenth-Century Fiction*. Tuttleton observes that both Hardy and Glasgow were well-read in Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, and Haeckel (579).

For a more detailed look at the theme of Christianity vs. Paganism in *The Return of the Native*, see John Paterson's "*The Return of the Native* as Antichristian Document."

The other references in this dissertation are based on Hardy's 1912 revisions as included in The World's Classics edition. The citation of Eustacia's speech I have used is from the 1895 edition used in the 1959 Signet publication.

Barrineau's "Notes on the Text" in The World's Classics edition of *The Return of the Native* note many other changes and alterations in the text. Otis B. Wheeler's "Four Versions of *The Return of the Native*" shows seven stages in Hardy's version of the novel, a fact that would lead to further ambiguity in assigning a coherent philosophy to the work.

See Annette Kolodny's *The Lay of the Land* and *The Land before Her*.

The main character in this novel reads too many pastoral romances, leaves the life of the city for the peaceful life of the country. The novel parodies his attempts to live the pastoral existence.

Michael Millgate in *William Faulkner* and Peter Swiggart's *The Art of Faulkner's Novels* express some dissatisfaction with Eula's character as drawn in *The Town*.
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The stories of Eustacia Vye, Eula Varner, and Virginia Pendleton reveal that the pastoral goddess has difficulty surviving in a patriarchal society. The novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner often depict the lives of women who endure a hopeless struggle against the mythical expectations placed upon them by men who need them to fulfill their longings for a new pastoral paradise. Other women characters in their novels, however, have characteristics which make them potential, if not actual, survivors in spite of destructive attempts to make them conform to a masculine construct of the Golden Age. Three such characters are Tess Durbeyfield, Lena Grove, and Ada Fincastle. All three of these women have affairs with men who desert them. All three conceive children out of wedlock. Yet, in spite of their hardships experienced in this masculine construct of pastoral, they find a way to survive. Ellen Glasgow referred to this ability to survive in spite of great misfortunes "the vein of iron."

**Tess: Surviving the Pastoral Journey**

In *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* Hardy uses many pastoral conventions that would normally lead the reader to expect a
happy description of life in the bucolic idyll. The text describes landscapes that would be appropriate for lovers to while away the hours in perfect contentment. Tess takes various roads that move her in and out of potential pastoral environments. Even though each of these roads leads to disaster, Tess continues to take other roads and survive.

In The Dialogic Imagination, Mikhail Bakhtin describes the importance of "chronotopes" in the novel. "Chronotope" refers to the relationship between space and time. Bakhtin demonstrates that one of the most important chronotopes in the novel is the often repeated chronotope of the road. Describing the importance of this method of discourse in the Greek Romance, he writes:

Of special importance is the close link between the motif of meeting and the chronotope of the road ("the open road"), and of various types of meeting on the road. In the chronotope of the road, the unity of time and space markers is exhibited with exceptional precision and clarity. The importance of the chronotope of the road in literature is immense: it is a rare work that does not contain a variation of this motif, and many words are directly constructed on the road chronotope, and on road meetings and adventures. (Dialogic 98)

Tess of the D’Urbervilles is constructed by the importance of chance meetings on the road, and Tess's movement on
various roads from one potential pastoral environment to the next.

Tess employs the chronotope of the road at the beginning of the novel when Tess's father, John Durbeyfield, by chance, encounters the parson, who tells him that, even though the last name has been corrupted, he is in reality a descendant of an ancient noble family, the d'Urbervilles. This chance meeting on the road, eventually puts Tess on other roads trying to find the pastoral happiness envisioned by her parents. From this point, the structure of Tess resembles what Bakhtin would call, "the adventure novel of everyday life" (Dialogic 111). Bakhtin describes some of the key features of this kind of novel in this manner:

The most characteristic thing about this novel is the way it fuses the course of an individual's life (at its major turning points) with his actual spatial course or road—that is, with his wanderings. Thus is realized the metaphor "the path of life." The path itself extends through familiar, native territory, in which there is nothing exotic, alien or strange. Thus a novelistic chronotope is created, one that has played an enormous role in the history of the genre. At its heart is folklore. Various means for realizing the metaphor "the path of life" play a large role in all aspects of folklore. One can even go so far as to say that in folklore a road is almost never merely a road, but always suggests the whole, or a portion of, "a path of life." The choice of a real itinerary equals the choice of "the path of life." An intersection always signifies some turning point in the life of the folklore character; setting out on the
road from one's birthplace, returning home, are usually plateaus of age in the life of the individual (he sets out as a youth, returns a man). Road markers are indicators of his fate and so on. Thus this novelistic chronotope of the road is specific, organic and deeply infused with folklore motifs. (Dialogic 120)

This observation by Bakhtin is reflected in almost every aspect of Tess's story. After John Durbeyfield's "discovery" that he is of noble lineage, Tess sets out on the road, not a road that takes her very far from home, but a road that will be confined to Wessex. The major turning point in Tess's life is this meeting on the road between John Durbeyfield and the parson. All the events that come afterward spring from Mr. Durbeyfield believing that he is of noble ancestry. Tess leaves home and returns at several key points in her life. Each time she has been disappointed or ravaged in her quest, but she continues to survive in spite of all the misfortunes that come her way.

The text's descriptions of these potential pastoral environments do not conform with the pattern usually found in the bucolic idyll. *Tess* would conform more to the pattern established by Longus's *Daphnis and Chloe*. Writing of this classic pastoral, Bakhtin points out:

> At its center we have a pastoral-idyllic chronotope, but a chronotope riddled with decay, its compact isolation and self-imposed limits destroyed, surrounded on all sides by an alien world and itself already half-alien. (Dialogic 103)
The world of Daphnis and Chloe, bucolic as it may be, is threatened by class considerations, the invasion of pirates, and separation of the lovers. Hardy's Wessex has been invaded by the philosophy and technology of modernism. Tess feels "the ache of modernism" (129) which is bringing an end to the pastoral world. Though Tess is brought up in a rural environment, she is not one of the happy rustics who does not realize how miserable she really is. She has a sense that although there might be some perfect, distant worlds on faraway planets, she is living in a "blighted" world (36). When she walks near the forest, she does not experience the joys of a rural paradise; rather, even the wind becomes "the sigh of some immense sad soul, coterminous with the universe in space, and with history in time" (36). Her various experiences with culture and males only increase her feelings of unhappiness. Though Tess might have inherited some of the typical rural pessimism of her parents, this philosophy is confirmed in Tess's mind by her life of poverty, the outrageous decisions of a drunken father, the death of the family mule, her rape at the hands of Alec d'Urberville, the death of her baby, and the refusal of the rector to grant the baby a Christian burial. All of these events happen within the rural community which
is supposed to be so conducive to pastoral bliss. Some
time later, as Tess confides her pessimistic view of life
to Angel Clare, he marvels that a girl so young could have
such bitter views about life (128).

The text's first description of Tess in the novel
utilizes not only the normal pastoral conventions, but also
the decay and unhappiness that have invaded the bucolic
setting. Some of the village girls gather for a club dance
in a field. The custom itself and the clothes they wear
are reminders of a past, happy time "before the habit of
taking long views had reduced emotions to a monotonous
average" (19). Again, Hardy draws the analogy between the
old and the modern that he made in *The Return of the
Native*. The old times were more cheerful because they did
not look into a bleak future. The modern outlook turns our
emotions into a "monotonous average," where there is
neither great joy nor great sorrow.

Although this scene has the makings of a carefree
pastoral dance, Hardy subverts the idyllic setting by
introducing foreboding omens with Christian overtones.
Some of the white dresses have a "cadaverous" tint. There
are elderly ladies in the group who are "grotesque" and
"pathetic." The elderly women are a reminder that there
will come a time when the young women will say of their
amusements of that day, "I have no pleasure in them," a
quotation from Ecclesiastes 12:1: "Remember now your
Creator in the days of thy youth, before the evil days
come, and the years draw nigh when thou shalt say, 'I have
no pleasure in them.'" The Preacher of Ecclesiastes
repeats over and over, "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity."
Ecclesiastes portrays the older man who has experienced all
that the world has to offer, but comes to the end of life
warning that all the pleasures, wisdom, and power gained in
this life leave us nothing but emptiness. The text singles
out this "long view of things" as one of the ways the
Christian philosophy spoils present joys. These young
girls, who are now enjoying the dance will one day be
disappointed by the unhappiness of knowing that everything
is void, empty of meaning. Some time later, after Angel
leaves Tess, she will repeat the words, "All is vanity"
(270).

Tess has the potential to be like the women who used
to experience the pleasure of the moment, without reference
to the emptiness of the future. As in The Return of the
Native, the text suggests that a return to the perfect,
idyllic pastoral is not possible in the light of what we
know about nature, but nevertheless, a person can survive by accepting life on nature's terms. Tess may not be the raw material of divinity, as Eustacia was, but she is the raw material of a Darwinian survivor.

As Tess travels the road from one potential pastoral environment to the next, she encounters a Satan whose temptations and attacks result in her expulsion from Paradise. Nevertheless, after each destructive meeting with a new pastoral world, she recovers and displays the strength to continue the struggle.

None of the potential pastoral environments fulfill the hopes they promise. When she goes to the estate of the Stoke-d’Urbervilles, she temporarily lives in a pastoral environment. The manor owned by Mrs. d’Urberville was "a country-house built for enjoyment pure and simple, with not an acre of troublesome land attached to it" (41). The narrator begins immediately to subvert this pastoral world. Into this idyllic setting enters Alec d’Urberville who represents the amoral tendencies of the modern man corrupted by money. Alec, a "creature of industrialism, son of a rich but landless tradesman who usurped a landed name" (Hall 423), seduces the pastoral Eve. Alec d’Urberville begins his seduction of Tess by feeding her
strawberries in a pastoral setting, recalling the eating of the forbidden fruit by Eve (44-5). On the night Alec seduces Tess, she sees the locals dancing like "a sort of vegeto-human pollen" (66). The narrator compares their dancing to the myths of Pan and Syrinx, and Lotis and Priapus. Syrinx escaped the seduction of Pan by turning herself into a reed, while Lotis escaped the seduction of Priapus by changing into a lotus flower. Tess, however, will have no such supernatural powers or protection against Alec.

After Alec seduces Tess, she takes to the road again to return to her birthplace. As she looks down the slope toward her old pastoral environment, she realizes that her misfortune has changed her views of even the beautiful things in the environment from which she came:

It was always beautiful from here; it was terribly beautiful to Tess to-day, for since her eyes last fell upon it she had learnt that the serpent hisses where the sweet birds sing, and her views of life had been changed for her by the lesson. Verily another girl than the simple one she had been at home was she who, bowed by thought, stood still there, and turned to look behind her. She could not bear to look forward into the Vale. (81-2)

A serpent expels Tess, but there can be no return to paradise, not even the paradise of her childhood. She is now "bowed by thought." Tess, like other Hardy characters,
becomes too obsessed with reflective thought, which, in part, makes her unfit for the pastoral world. This expulsion from paradise is just one of many which Tess experiences throughout her life.

After Tess returns home, she has to deal with the guilt which Christianity imposes upon her. Since Tess has been brought up with Victorian standards of morality, she has difficulty dealing with the guilt of having a child out of wedlock. Eventually, however, Tess frees herself from some of these feelings and survives. After months of sadness, she decides to dress neatly, come out into the fields, and work with dignity (96). The narrator suggests that she might have realized that her view of the world about her was based on an illusion (96). She has the ability to overthrow the traditional Christian teachings and even take joy in her child. Tess begins to realize that these strict moral codes are merely man-made conventions, not in harmony with nature. The narrator makes it clear that Tess should not feel guilty for what had happened to her. When Tess begins to feel guilty, the narrator remarks:

But this encompassment of her own character-ization, based on shreds of convention, peopled by phantoms and voices antipathetic to her, was a sorry
and mistaken creation of Tess's fancy—a cloud of moral hobgoblins by which she was terrified without reason. It was they that were out of harmony with the actual world, not she. Walking among the sleeping birds in the hedges, watching the skipping rabbits on a moonlit warren, or standing under a pheasant-laden bough, she looked upon herself as a figure of Guilt intruding into the haunts of Innocence. But all the while she was making a distinction where there was no difference. Feeling herself in antagonism she was quite in accord. She had been made to break an accepted social law, but no law known to the environment in which she fancied herself such an anomaly. (91)

Tess should still feel in harmony with the pastoral world, for she has done nothing but violate some artificial codes. These kinds of sentiments help explain the subtitle of the novel, "A Pure Woman Faithfully Presented." Though the eyes of Victorian society may condemn her, she is still at one with nature. The narrator suggests that perhaps Tess had thoughts such as the following:

Moreover, alone in a desert island, would she have been wretched at what had happened to her? Not greatly. If she could have been but just created, to discover herself as a spouseless mother, with no experience of life except as the parent of a nameless child, would the position have caused her to despair? No, she would have taken it calmly, and found pleasures therein. Most of the misery had been generated by her conventional aspect, and not by the innate sensations. (96)

In a primitive environment like a desert island, free from Christianity and the moral interpretations of Victorian
society, she would not feel guilty because of what had happened to her.

The text mocks also the way society views Tess's "illegitimate" child. When Tess's child, Sorrow, dies, the narrator, in ironic tones, preaches a funeral eulogy: "So passed away Sorrow the Undesired--that intrusive creature, that bastard gift of shameless Nature who respects not the social law" (100). The text contrasts the acceptance of nature versus the cruelty of Victorian Christianity. This scathing criticism of Victorian religion appears to be a monological sermon delivered by the narrator to summarize the guilt of Victorian society, but as we will see, these authorial intrusions only serve to magnify the polyphony of the novel.

After Tess comes to the realization that she should put away her feelings of guilt and go out to face the world, she takes to the road again. In the pastoral month of May she comes to Talbothay's dairy in the Var Vale. Pastoral analogies fill the description of her first sight of this land, reminiscent of Paradise in the book of Revelation (108-9). The title of this section of the novel, "The Rally," describes Tess's spirits as "her hopes mingled with the sunshine in an ideal photosphere which
surrounded her as she bounded along against the soft south wind. She heard a pleasant voice in every breeze, and in every bird's note seemed to lurk a joy" (109). Again, we seem to have a character in pastoral harmony with the natural world.

After Tess comes to some degree of peace about herself, her feelings of guilt concerning her past are intensified by Angel Clare who thinks that he has been freed from the old Christian values. Angel criticizes the church for its inability to "liberate her mind from an untenable redemptive theology" (120). He tells his minister father that he wished that their religion had been born in Greece rather than Palestine (161).

At first, Angel seems to fit well with the pastoral environment. He is a kind of Davidic shepherd who roams the field playing his harp. The first time Tess hears him playing, she wanders out to meet him. But the text subverts what appears to be a perfect pastoral moment with the shepherd musician calling his love to him in the fields:

The outskirt of the garden in which Tess found herself had been left uncultivated for some years, and was now damp and rank with juicy grass which sent up mists of pollen at a touch; and with tall blooming weeds emitting offensive smells--weeds whose red and yellow and purple hues formed a polychrome as dazzling
as that of cultivated flowers. She went stealthily as a cat through this profusion of growth, gathering cuckoo-spittle on her skirts, cracking snails that were underfoot, straining her hands with thistle-mild and slug-slime, and rubbing off upon her naked arms sticky blights which, though snow-white on the apple-tree trunks, made madder stains on her skin, thus she drew quite near to Clare, still unobserved of him.

(127)

Bruce Johnson refers to this description as a "Darwinian Garden of Eden" (Species, 266). This garden does not fit the usual description of lovers in a pre-Fall bower, but this garden suits Tess and our Darwinian understanding of nature. This description of a garden seems to accord with Hardy's modern concept of the pastoral world, much as Egdon Heath does in The Return of the Native. As a matter of fact, Egdon Heath is visible from the Var Vale (186). Nevertheless, even in this Garden resides a serpent, Angel, who will not permit Tess to find her oneness with a garden that is truly sympathetic with her nature.

Tess and Angel are drawn together by the forces of nature. Using language similar to that of Ellen Glasgow in her description of the power of nature over Virginia Pendleton and Oliver Treadwell, the narrator in Tess writes, "All the while they were converging, under an irresistible law, as surely as two streams in one vale" (133). A few months later, as their passion intensifies,
their moods reflect that of the pastoral landscape: "Amid the oozing fatness and warm ferments of the Var Vale, at a season when the rush of juices could almost be heard below the hiss of fertilization, it was impossible that the most fanciful love should not grow passionate" (151).

Although Angel seems the perfect lover for the pastoral environment, he is in reality another Satan who will expel Tess from Paradise. At first, Angel and Tess are so happy in this garden pass that they seem to be the only two people in the world, like Adam and Eve (134). He thinks that he is a heathen who can fit into the sensual world of the other "summer-steeped heathens in the Var Vale" (160). Though he does not realize it, Angel's brand of Greek Hellenism is no more in tune with nature than the Victorian Christianity he thinks he has left behind. His own peculiar doctrines work in Tess in such a way that she again begins to decay and lose her potential to survive.

The relationship of Tess and Angel combines all of the conflicts found between the various philosophies of Christianity, paganism, pastoralism, and modernism (Bullen "Gods" 189). All of these forces play a part in Tess's destruction.
Angel Clare is another one of Hardy's idealists who does more harm than good by his idealism. He wants Tess to be his ideal pastoral partner in the ideal pastoral world. He talks to Tess about pastoral life in ancient Greece. He calls Tess "Demeter" and "Artemis" (135), though Tess resists those names. Angel Clare tries to find fulfillment, wholeness, paradise, the pastoral, in the ideal woman. J. Hillis Miller explains that since many of Hardy's heroes have no traditional religious beliefs concerning God, they "turn toward the only thing which seems a possible substitute for it, someone who exists within the everyday social world, but who radiates a seemingly divine light upon it" (114). Ellen Glasgow, in her novels, will try to substitute land, rather than another person, in the place of God.

As Angel looks at Tess in the early morning hours, "She was no longer the milkmaid, but a visionary essence of woman--a whole sex condensed into one typical form" (135). Angel sees Tess as the "natural woman" who is perfectly in harmony with the pastoral landscape. Even the narrator portrays Tess as one with nature, responding to nature, interpreting her life in the face of nature: "A field man is a personality afield; a field-woman is a portion of the
field; she has somehow lost her own margin, imbibed the essence of her surrounding, and assimilated herself with it" (93). As in the case of Eula Varner, the identification of Tess with nature by males is a destructive force in her life. Angel wants "to choose a mate from unconstrained Nature, and not from the abodes of Art" (175). When Angel sees her, he says, "what a fresh and virginal daughter of Nature that milk-maid is!" The narrator who calls Tess "a pure woman" would agree, but Angel's definition of a virginal daughter is different from that of the narrator. Angel's idealized notions of nature will force him to think of Tess in a different light at a later point in the novel. Angel Clare creates a myth about Tess, a myth that she will not fit, because she is a true representation of nature, not Angel's idealized view. Bruce Johnson points out, "Angel creates a number of illusions about Tess, the foremost being his notion that she is a child of his nature rather than of hers" ("Species" 265). Angel and the other men actually combine to destroy Tess's harmony with nature, and any potential harmony with nature that she could have had. Tess is one with nature, but not in the sense that males want to define her. What causes Tess's downfall is not nature, not having
a baby, but the societal interpretation and value of that act.

Angel has lost faith in everything, except a pastoral woman. Since he no longer has faith in the Christian vision of paradise, he tries to locate that paradise in Tess. Nevertheless, Tess must meet his new doctrinal standards of behavior to truly restore the lost paradise.

Angel Clare's doctrine is a combination of Christian morality and Greek Hellenism. Angel "elevated Hellenic Paganism at the expense of Christianity" (330). He rejects the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith, believing only some of the ethical teachings in the Bible. He tries to teach Tess that a person can live by the ethical teachings of Christ without necessarily believing the dogma of the church concerning the person and work of Christ.

Angel Clare is yet another character who tries to reinvest Christianity with new meaning, attempting to salvage something that is good in it. Angel tells his father:

My whole instinct in matters of religion is toward reconstruction; to quote your favorite Epistle to the Hebrews, "the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." (121-2)
Like Glasgow's Reconstruction environment in *Virginia*, Victorian England must reconstruct a new Christian definition in the light of modern science. Science had shaken the faith of many, but they could not give up Christianity altogether. In this sense, Angel is like Matthew Arnold. As David J. De Laura writes, "For Hardy, Arnold had fatally compromised himself in the seventies by his mediating theological position, metaphysically agnostic but emotionally and morally traditional and 'Christian'" (382). Yet Hardy himself maintained a similar stance.

Angel's views on morality are akin to Matthew Arnold's, while Hardy's are expressed more by Alec d'Urberville. In a conversation with Tess about Angel's views, Alec says that he cannot see the point in having an ethical system without any dogma. . . . If there's nobody to say, "Do this, and it will be a good thing for you after you are dead; do that, and it will be a bad thing for you", I can't warm up. Hang it, I am not going to feel responsible for my deeds and passions if there's nobody to be responsible to. (319)

In his poem, "The Respectable Burgher: On 'The Higher Criticism,'" Hardy mocks those who go to church to listen to preachers who no longer believe in the miracles or the historicity of the Biblical accounts. He concludes the poem by saying, "All churchgoing will I forswear, / And sit
on Sundays in my chair / And read that moderate man
Voltaire" (Poems 160). Angel Clare represents those
Victorians who no longer believed much in the Bible, but
could not break the habit of going to church or hanging on
to some elements of Christianity.

Angel's standards of morality are just as destructive
to Tess as if they had been clothed in the garb of
traditional Christian dogma. Tess still must live up to
standards of behavior which are foreign to her pagan
nature. In Tess, we see what Weinstein calls "the
Schopenhauerian ordeal . . . of human beings, caught up in
the unsought stresses of human character" (122). At first,
it seems that Greek Hellenism might be compatible with
Tess's paganism, but we soon understand that Angel is not
as far removed from Christianity as he thinks. Though Tess
thinks of him as Apollo, the sun God, the narrator reveals
the superficiality of Angel's paganism. Unlike Apollo,
Angel is not a sensual creature: "He was in truth more
spiritual than animal" (193). Despite all his
protestations, Angel must still conform to the Victorian
codes of morality (Bullen "Gods" 192). He is still far
more Hebraic than Hellenic (Springer 135). Hebrew and
Christian values shape his idealism more than Greek
paganism, a fact that is made abundantly clear when he employs the traditional double standard of morality to Tess. Even though he has committed adultery, he is the same, virtuous, repentant person. But because she has committed some kind of sexual sin in his eyes, she no longer fits his ideal, and therefore must be cast away. After Tess's confession he tells her, "I repeat, the woman I have been loving is not you" (226). This time, Tess is expelled from the pastoral garden, not by an amoral Alec d’Urberville, but by an idealistic moralist.

**Tess** exposes the kind of ideological hypocrisy found not only in Christianity, but also among those in the Victorian world who thought they were free of such constraints. Bakhtin argues that when ideologies become institutionalized, they become saturated with hypocrisy. The novel exposes this hypocrisy by “the laying bare of any sort of conventionality, the exposure of all that is vulgar and falsely stereotyped in human relationships” (Dialogic 162). **Tess** exposes the hypocrisy of the institutional church and the philosophical idealism that exists outside the church. Throughout the novel, people force Tess to conform to hypocritical ideologies. Gradually, she sees
through the hypocrisy, even manifesting a spirit of
rebellion against these inconsistent philosophies of life.

After Tess's expulsion from this garden, she travels
the road again to find another pastoral environment. Just
as the Blackmoor Vale of her childhood lost something of
its beauty because of Alec, now the Var Vale loses
something of its beauty because of Angel's rejection.
Thinking of the Var Vale, she muses, "Yet it was in that
vale that her sorrow had taken shape, and she did not love
it as formerly. Beauty to her, as to all who have felt,
lay not in the thing but in what it symbolized" (287-8).

Even after this expulsion from paradise, nature and
the spirit of her ancestors revive her. Though she goes to
another rural area, this rural setting in Flintcomb Ash is
anything but pastoral. Tess must engage in agonizing
agricultural labor that could not be classified as the
happy work in Georgics. The weather and the soil combine
to make the life of the laborers miserable. Tess and her
friends think back upon the days at Talbothays as paradise.
Flintcomb Ash is hell. The man who operates the threshing
machine is called "a creature from Tophet" (315) "in the
service of his Plutonic master" (316). The invasion of
modern industrialism contributes to the demise of the pastoral myth.

In spite of these hardships, Tess continues to fight. She will not accept even what Angel has done to her. At first, she tries to be submissive and justify his treatment of her, but she gets the courage to write to him a searing rebuke. She refuses to accept his idealistic reasons for rejecting her. She writes, "I am the same woman, Angel, as you fell in love with; yes, the very same!" (325). Later, she writes, even more vehemently,

Oh why have you treated me so monstrously, Angel! I do not deserve it. I have thought it all over carefully, and I can never, never forgive you! You know that I did not intend to wrong you—why have you so wronged me? You are cruel, cruel indeed! I will try to forget you. It is all injustice I have received at your hands! (343)

At the beginning of their relationship, Angel was truly an "angel" in Tess's sight. But his mistreatment of her opens her eyes to see how "monstrous" he is. Tess's anger at Angel Clare and the ideology which formed him gives her the strength to fight against her initial despair.

Though Tess finds the fortitude to survive, Alec d'Urberville re-enters her life. Alec gives up his new found Christian fervor in order to have Tess. Like Angel, he desires to find his paradise in Tess: "Well, this
paradise that you supply is perhaps as good as any other" (319). Alec even sees himself as Satan and Tess as Eve, comparing their relationship to that described by Milton in Paradise Lost (336). Ironically, Alec d’Urberville redeems Tess from this life of agricultural labor by making her his mistress.

All of Tess’s hopes for paradise seem to end when she becomes Alec’s mistress. After Angel returns, she murders Alec in one last attempt to free herself to enjoy, if only for a moment, a few moments of happiness with Angel.

After Tess kills Alec, she travels the road once more, this time with Angel. They run from the police and come to Stonehenge. The pastoral and the pagan come together at last. Tess says that one of her mother’s people was a shepherd near this place. She reminds Angel that he had once called her a heathen, so she was at home now in this pagan temple (379). Though the enforcers of Victorian law arrest her at this place and take her to her eventual death at the hands of that law, Tess seems to have found peace in the pagan temple at Stonehenge.

Although Tess may not seem like a survivor, especially since the novel concludes with her life ending on the gallows, the text hints that Tess could have survived had
she not been corrupted by Christianity and Hellenism. Tess survives for so long, even through all that she has to suffer, because of the strength of her pagan past. Even one of the d'Urberville ancestors is named Sir Pagan d'Urberville (13). The narrator intimates that women are closer to the ancient pagan ways than men are. They are perhaps "more natural" and thus in greater proximity to a natural, pagan religion. As Tess nears Talbothay's dairy, the narrator remarks on her closeness to nature in the following manner:

And probably the half-unconscious rhapsody was a Fetichistic utterance in a Monotheistic setting; women whose chief companions are the forms and forces of outdoor Nature retain in their souls far more of the pagan fantasy of their remote forefathers than of the systematized religion taught their race at later date. (109)

Tess is of Druidical heritage. The text implies that she would have been much happier had the evolution from Druid to the present continued without being interrupted by Christianity. Bruce Johnson says that Tess would have been a perfect example of Darwinian survival "if she had not been victimized by a Christian talent for ideals that generate guilt and remorse and, perhaps even worse, forgiveness as their psychological essence" (274-5).
Though Tess has a heathen heritage, Christianity and Victorian society overcome these pagan influences. Tess is a product of The National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church in England and Wales, a system of education first implemented in Hardy's Dorset in 1812 (Barrineau, Tess 388). Wotton writes, "Her mother's superstitions and ballads also exercise a profound influence upon Tess. Tess was a mixture of the Jacobean and the Victorian" (Tess 28), but the conventions of Victorian Christianity increasingly dominate her.

For Hardy, the pagan religions, especially the worship of the sun, were more beneficial and helpful religions than Christianity:

The sun, on account of the mist, had a curious sentient, personal look, demanding the masculine pronoun for its adequate expression. His present aspect, coupled with the lack of all human forms in the scene, explained the old-time heliolatries in a moment. One could feel that a saner religion had never prevailed under the sky. The luminary was a golden-haired, beaming, mild-eyed, God-like creature, gazing down in the vigor and intentness of youth upon an earth that was brimming with interest for him. (92)

While Hardy may not be advocating a return to the Greek religions of the past, there is little doubt that he blamed Christianity for many of the evils which a person like Tess must undergo. Springer contends that every time Tess
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renews her determination to survive, Hebraic forms of morality ensure her ultimate doom (143). What little possibility there is for happiness even in the modern pastoral world is ruined by Christian thought. After her seduction at the hands of Alec, Tess meets a man who paints signs containing Scriptural warnings such as "THY, DAMNATION, SLUMBERETH, NOT. / II Pet. 2:3." This particular sign is painted "against the peaceful landscape, the pale decaying tints of the copses, the blue air of the horizon, and the lichened stile board" (85). The implication is that such scriptural sentiments are out of place in the pastoral world.

Since Victorian standards of morality seem to be the culprit, is Hardy at this time prepared to advocate a return to primitivism and paganism? Does the text suggest a return to a world merely built on the survival of the fittest? Bakhtin writes, "The unified, dialectically evolving spirit, understood in Hegelian terms, can give rise to nothing but a philosophical monologue. And the soil of monistic idealism is the least likely place for plurality of unmerged consciousnesses to blossom" (Poetics 26). The text reveals the contradictions of all idealistic solutions to the problems presented in the text. The text
contains no idealistic solution. If it did, it would be guilty of the same kind of monistic idealism found in Angel Clare.

Tess is a Darwinian survivor who understands her kinship with nature. Tess exemplifies the kind of feelings which indicates sympathy for natural things. When she kills the wounded birds, she exemplifies a feeling that does not come from Victorian standards of behavior, but from feelings of kinship with nature. Those kinds of feelings helped Tess to survive. As a matter of fact, through considering the plight of the birds Tess gains courage to survive after Angel has deserted her:

"Poor darlings--to suppose myself the most miserable being on earth in the sight o' such misery as yours! . . . . And not a twinge of bodily pain about me! . . . ." She was ashamed of herself for her gloom of the night, based on nothing more tangible than a sense of condemnation under an arbitrary law of society which had no foundation in Nature. (271)

Tess's difficulty is combining these rules for survival with the rules of Victorian society. As Bruce Johnson puts it, "Significantly, it is really only Angel's lack of any truly Darwinian knowledge of Nature that brings Tess down" ("Species" 274).

However, throughout the text we can see the narrator's ambivalence toward Christianity, paganism, nature,
Victorian society, and even the characters themselves. Even the subtitle, "A Pure Woman Faithfully Presented" has an ironic undertone. David Lodge observes that the ambivalence in Hardy's texts is unavoidable since "his vices are almost inextricably entangled with his virtues" ("Language" 188). Laura Claridge in her article, "Tess: A Less than Pure Woman Ambivalently Presented," argues that Hardy undercuts his own text throughout the novel.

While Victorian idealism has had its way with Tess, we are reminded throughout the text of nature's cruelty as well. When the narrator describes the poverty of the Durbeyfield household, he reminds us that the children never asked to be brought into such a pitiful condition (28). The narrator surmises, "Some people like to know whence the poet whose philosophy is in these days deemed as profound and trustworthy as his song is breezy and pure, gets his authority for speaking of 'Nature's holy plan'" (28). While some might idealize the world of nature left to itself, Hardy does not.

As a matter of fact, the present conjunction of Nature with the rules of society seems to be a hopeless situation in the eyes of the narrator. When speaking of the forces
that drew Alec and Tess together, and the resulting

tragedies, the narrator conjectures:

In the ill-judged execution of the well-judged plan of things, the call seldom produces the comen, the man to love rarely coincides with the hour for loving. Nature does not often say "See!" to her poor creatures at a time when seeing can lead to happy doing; or reply "Here" to a body's cry of "Where?" till the hide-and-seek has become an irksome, outworn game. We may wonder whether, at the acme and summit of the human progress, these anachronisms will be corrected by a finer intuition, a closer interaction of social machinery than that which now jolts us round and along; but such completeness is not to be prophesied, or even conceived as possible. (46)

In some versions of pastoral, the characters are in perfect harmony with the natural world. All the forces of nature combine to reflect the feelings of the characters, and nature is filled with a benevolence that works events in a providential manner to provide an atmosphere of joy and contentment. Tess's narrator does not see nature working together with the character or the society for the individual's good. On the contrary, feelings, instincts, and emotions combine with culture in such a way that people are confused and make wrong choices by misreading the workings and interactions of nature and society. If society makes matters difficult, nature does not seem to offer any kind of helping hand. Not even dreaming of the
heights of human evolution seems to offer any hope for a resolution of these difficulties.

The text describes this conflict between nature's law and society's code when the maids of Talbothay's dairy dream of marrying a handsome young man out of their social class. The narrator depicts their emotions as writhing "feverishly under the oppressiveness of an emotion thrust on them by cruel Nature's law—an emotion which they had neither expected nor desired" (149). The narrator says that their emotions lacked "everything to justify its existence in the eye of civilization (while lacking nothing in the eye of Nature)" (149).

Neither does the text glorify the life of the rural poor. While many critics see Tess as a criticism of the way in which modernism ruined life for the country people, the miseries of the country people are mentioned in Tess.

If the text has difficulty advocating a return to primitivism, it also stops short of proposing a return to paganism.¹ Though the narrator calls the worship of Apollo "a much saner religion" (92) than Christianity, the text hints at the cruelty connected with those ancient beliefs and practices. Hardy was familiar with Andrew Lang who wrote in his Myth, Ritual, and Religion that Apollo was a
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destructive and creative god. Lang wrote of Apollo, "The
fair humanities of old religion boast no figure more
beautiful; yet he, too, bears the birth-marks of ancient
creeds, and there is a shadow that stains his legend and
darkens the radiance of his glory" (207-8). Bullen
believes that it would be too simplistic to say that *Tess*
merely offers a choice between Hebraism and Hellenism,
because Angel Clare's Hellenism is too idealistic and
forgets the cruelty that existed in paganism (Bullen "Gods"
196). Christianity, paganism, and nature all have the
potential to be cruel. Furthermore, our modern scientific
knowledge makes it impossible for us to combine any of the
idealistic myths of the past with our contemporary
scientific insight.

One of Hardy's contemporaries in 1877, James
MacDonald, wrote the article on Druidism in the
*Encyclopedia Britannica*. This article stated that the
Druids worshiped Apollo under the name of Belenus.
MacDonald also wrote that this version of the worship of
Apollo lacked love and charity (qtd. in Bullen *Gods* 198).
At the end of the novel, Tess lies down on a stone slab,
appearing ready for the blood sacrifice. Although the
Victorian police arrest her and carry her to her death, the
text makes the connection between the Apollo, Druidism, and Victorian Christianity. All of them combine to work death.

The text offers no resolution to the problems which combine to destroy Tess. Primitivism, paganism and religion are of no help. Even Angel Clare appears to have learned nothing at the end of the novel. He cannot offer Tess even the hope of an afterlife. Tess appears to have learned nothing, going so far as to encourage Angel to marry her sister Liza-Lu and "train and teach her" (380). Dale posits that the conclusion of Tess is a comic version of the ending of Paradise Lost, Angel and Liza-Lu setting out as Adam and Eve to start a new life (213). Clare walks away with Liza-Lu, Tess's sister, "a spiritualized image of Tess" (383). Angel and Liza-Lu get back on the road that Tess had walked so many times, the road that they think will lead to Paradise, but which, in fact, carries them further from it. Since Angel is no wiser than before, he is doomed to make the same mistakes. Since Liza-Lu is a spiritualized image of Tess, the chances of finding that pastoral paradise are even less, since Angel and Liza-Lu will be divorced even more from the natural world.

Contradictions fill nature, paganism, and culture. According to Bakhtin, the novel permits these kinds of
contradictions to exist within its framework. Because of Hardy's authorial intrusions into this novel, it is easy to assume that we can know Hardy's intent or assume that we can somehow form a philosophical whole based on the text. What Bakhtin said of Dostoevsky's novels applies to Hardy's as well: "Each novel presents an opposition, which is never canceled out dialectically, of many consciousnesses, and they do not merge in the unity of an evolving spirit" (Poetics 26). In Tess we hear voices which seem to cry out for a return to nature, or a return to paganism, yet even those desires are contradicted by other realities noted in the text.² Bakhtin says, "The novel can be defined as a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized" (Dialogic 262). In Tess, many individual voices repeat the longings for a pastoral world, but the methods of achieving that dream are often contradictory and hopeless, even within the minds of individual characters. If the pastoral itself is loaded with contradictions, the proposed methods of trying to return to the Golden Age are filled with as many.

While Hardy offers little, if anything, in the way of solutions to the forces that expel people from paradise,
the text indicates that Tess survives for as long as she does because she has the vein of iron to overcome the constraints placed on her by Victorian Christianity and idealism. If the text offers no solutions, it does offer the opportunity to admire the human spirit that can fight so long against the forces combined to destroy her. As Casagrande writes:

Unlike Greek tragic heroes who fall from greatness because of a tragic flaw, Tess—a woman crushed by poverty, by one man’s drunken folly, another man’s lust, and a third man’s rigid idealism, as well as by her own murderous passion—rises to tragic proportions because she fights against the suffering and oppression meted out to her by an unjust universe. (Beauty 16)

Although the roads Tess walks never lead to the pastoral destination she seeks (unless death is the only true paradise), we admire her courage in persisting in her search. Albert Guerard points out that Tess shows that "human beings and their longings for happiness are more important than the social conventions and psychic inhibitions which try to thwart them" (viii). Though Tess struggles to survive, ideological forces combine to prevent her from finding the pastoral world. Faulkner and Glasgow portray women who meet similar destructive forces, but find a way not only to fight, but to survive.
Faulkner's *Light in August*, like many of Hardy's novels, utilizes the chronotope of the road. The story of Lena Grove which frames this novel, begins and ends with a description of her traveling on foot. Lena seems to walk in a pastoral atmosphere with no worries or concerns. The text even describes her as "sheeplike" (6). She is like a wandering sheep, very trusting, especially of her lover who has deserted her. Occasionally, someone will stop and give her a ride in their wagon, though she seems quite indifferent to her mode of transport.

The narrator impresses upon the reader the pastoral quietude of Lena's journey. The descriptions of the journey imply that the noise level of each scene diminishes to no more than a hush. As Mr. Armstid takes Lena to his home, "The lane turns from the road, quieter even than the road" (14). Serenity seems to surround Lena, even when traveling in a rickety wagon on a dusty road. She is "swollen, slow, deliberate, and tireless" (10). Her sighs are but "a peaceful expiration, as though of peaceful astonishment" (12).

Though Lena is pregnant, trying to hunt down the father of her unborn child and make him marry her, she does
so without the desperation that marks the lives of other characters in the novel. Despite her predicament, the text describes her as "beyond hurry and haste" (448). In Lena's case, time does not seem to move forward, but remains fixed. The text describes Lena's journey in terms of Keats's ode, the scenes backrolling now behind her a long monotonous succession of peaceful and undeviating changes from day to dark and dark to day again, through which she advanced in identical and anonymous and deliberate wagons as though through a succession of creakwheeled and limpeared avatars, like something moving forever and without progress across an urn. (7)

The phrases concerning timelessness multiply throughout the text. Words such as "somnolence" and "dreamlike" describe Lena and her travels.

Though Lena seems to have an unshakeable pastoral tranquility, she is paired throughout the text with characters, such as Joe Christmas, who exemplify the opposite of serenity. Gutting has written of the spatio-temporal symbolism connected with the roads, corridors, and tunnels of Light in August, noting the contrasts between Lena and Joe Christmas as they walk various roads in the course of the novel. Whereas Lena walks the roads with a timeless, placid quality, Joe's movement along the various roads embroils him in the conflicts of time/history (26).
Whereas Lena's travels are described as "a peaceful corridor paved with unflagging and tranquil faith and peopled with kind and nameless faces and voices" (7), Joe's road, on the other hand, is filled with doubt, despair, and violence:

He thought that it was loneliness which he was trying to escape and not himself. But the street ran on: catlike, one place was the same as another to him. But in none of them could he be quiet. But the street ran on in its moods and phases, always empty: he might have seen himself as in numberless avatars, in silence, doomed with motion, driven by the courage of flagged and spurred despair; by the despair of courage whose opportunities had to be flagged and spurred. He was thirtythree years old.

One afternoon the street had become a Mississippi country road. (249)

Joe remembers "a thousand savage and lonely streets" (242). He does not know whether he is white or black, and he lashes out in anger at the society that rejects him for thinking he is black. The country road in Mississippi leads him to the home of Joamna Burden, the middle-aged spinster whom he eventually murders in a violent rage for her embodiment of a perverted New England/Southern puritanism.

Bakhtin observes that one of the features of dialogic and carnivalesque literature is parodic doubling. Texts pair characters with their opposites to highlight ideological contradictions (Poetics 127-8).
August pairs Lena Grove with people cursed by the disease of, in Hardy's terms, "taking thought." Joe Christmas cannot turn off the voices in his head, not even the voice of McEachern, his adoptive father who tried to teach him Presbyterian theology. Joe thinks, "I see I see I more than see hear I hear I see my head bent I hear the monotonous dogmatic voice which I believe will never cease going on and on forever and peeping" (253). This reflective tendency in Joe has the ability to make him physically ill. He stays ill for two years after he is rejected by a prostitute (247-8).

Another Lena opposite is Joanna Burden, a woman who inherits the "burden" of the history and guilt of her ancestors. The burden of guilt imposed by Calvinistic and Presbyterian theology is reiterated by noting that the name of her brother was "Calvin" Burden. When she is a little girl, her grandfather tells her that she can never escape the shadow of the black race:

But in order to rise, you must raise the shadow with you. But you can never lift it to your level. I see that now, which I did not see until I came down here. But escape it you cannot. The curse of the black race is God's curse. But the curse of the white race is the black man who will be forever God's chosen own because He once cursed him. (279)
While questions of time, race, and history never seem to disturb Lena, Joanna lives her entire life under this historical "burden," trying to raise the black race to higher levels, always feeling her own guilt for being white.

Gail Hightower, the Presbyterian minister turned out of his church because of an unfaithful wife and his strange mixture of history with theology, is also tormented by his thoughts. Hightower completely withdraws from society so that he will never have to be disturbed again. When Byron Bunch tries to get him to be involved in the lives of Lena Grove and Joe Christmas, he keeps screaming out, "I wont. I wont. I have bought immunity" (341). When his feelings of guilt begin to bother him, he retreats into the past by reading Tennyson, a technique he has used since his seminary days. He has found such works as Tennyson to be better than prayer for giving an escapist form of peace (350). Gail Hightower strives to retreat from the world, but he cannot have the peaceful acceptance of time which characterizes Lena.

When compared with other major characters in the novel, Lena appears to be an ideal pastoral character who can live a life of bliss in a new Greek Arcadia. The other
characters seem to be drawn in deliberate contrast to intensify the contrast between her placidity and their misery.

Since the tormented lives of Joe, Joanna, and Hightower are the opposite of Lena's pastoral tranquility, many critics have tried to explain the source of Lena's peace. These explanations usually take one of the following forms: 1) Lena is mindless and unthinking; 2) she is the embodiment of an earth goddess in harmony with nature; or 3) she is one of the rustic stoics who merely takes life as it comes. Though there are problems with all three of these explanations, the text does lend support to such interpretations.

The text says that Lena has that quality of "calm unreason" (20). Some critics have said that since Lena is free from abstract thought, she is at peace with herself and the world. A common view among critics is that Lena is a simple-minded person incapable of abstract thought, Carol Ann Taylor going so far to say that Lena is like an autistic child, merely repeating ritualistic language without giving it any thought of her own (49). Irving Howe refers to her as "the good unruffled vegetable Lena" who survives because of her stupidity (150). If Lena is free
from the curse of abstract thought, she would be the opposite, not only of Joe, Joanna, and Hightower, but also of characters such as Hardy's Tess.

Lena shares many characteristics with Tess. They are both from poor, rural areas and they both face the dilemma of bringing a child into the world without a father. But Tess is cursed with the obsession to think and reflect, while Lena never seems to be tortured by unpleasant thoughts concerning the past or future. While looking for Lucas, the text says, "Her face is calm as stone, but not hard. Its doggedness has a soft quality, an inwardlighted quality of tranquil and calm unreason and detachment" (20). Her "unreason" shields her from the destructive thoughts of characters such as Tess. In this sense, Joe Christmas has more similarity to Tess, because they are both on and off the road, meeting various tragedies which propel them further and further from pastoral paradise. Lena seems to live the pastoral existence in the rural environment even when there is tragedy all around her. She lives her life with a sense of detachment from tragic surroundings. In Tess, nature can exist in pastoral stillness, but Tess cannot. When Alec seduces her, stillness characterizes the rural world around her. Even as Tess's seduction take
place, "above them rose the primeval yews and oaks of The Chase, in which were poised gentle roosting birds in their last nap; and about them stole the hopping rabbits and hares" (Tess 77). In Light in August, however, violence fills the rural world, yet Lena continues to exist in tranquility. Abel argues that Lena remains peaceful because "she knows no reality beyond her subjective moment. She represents ordinary naive mankind, inviolably innocent because it cannot enter the realm of ideas" (37). At first glance, Lena may appear to be Faulkner's version of Tess and Eustacia without the tragic flaw of reflection. She does not suffer from the "ache of modernism" characteristic of Tess and many other characters in Faulkner and Glasgow. The "over-reflectiveness" of Christian civilization curses the other major characters in Light in August: Joe Christmas, Joanna Burden, and Gail Hightower.

The text also suggests that the secret of Lena's success is her union with nature. Her very name, "Grove," and the many allusions to fertility lend support to the idea that she is an earth or fertility goddess, therefore, in harmony with nature and the earth. Cleanth Brooks, for example, argues that Lena is able to meet life on the road without desperation because she does not experience the
alienation from nature in the manner that other characters
in the novels do. In Brooks's words, Lena "is nature"
(Yoknapatawpha 67).

The title, Light in August, may also suggest Lena's
status as an earth goddess. When someone asked Faulkner
about the origin of the title for this novel, his
explanation links Lena and the pastoral environment:

In August in Mississippi there's a few days somewhere
about the middle of the month when suddenly there's a
foretaste of fall, it's cool, there's a lambence, a
luminous quality to the light, as though it came not
from just today but from back in the old classic
times. It might have fauns and satyrs and the gods
and--from Greece, from Olympus in it somewhere. It
lasts just for a day or two, then it's gone, but every
year in August that occurs in my country, and that's
all that title meant, it was just to me a pleasant
evocative title because it reminded me of that time,
of a luminosity older than our Christian civilization.
Maybe the connection was with Lena Grove, who had
something of that pagan quality of being able to
assume everything, that's--the desire for that child,
she was never ashamed of that child, whether it had
any father or not, she was simply going to follow the
conventional laws of the time in which she was and
find its father. But as far as she was concerned, she
didn't especially need any father for it, any more
than the women that--on whom Jupiter begot children
were anxious for a home and father. It was enough to
have had the child. And that was all that meant, just
that luminous lambent quality of older light than
ours. (Gwyn 199)

This explanation emphasizes similar concerns in Hardy
concerning paganism and Christianity. Faulkner expresses
the opinion that it is necessary to move away from the
constraints of Christian civilization to enjoy the pastoral world. There was a brightness that existed in the world before the coming of Christian civilization. Christianity has brought a darkness that results in shame and guilt where they should not exist. The name "Helen" is related etymologically to the Greek words for "light" (Bleikasten "Praise" 131). Lena, like Tess, is a pagan, connected with the pagan light and brightness of ancient times. Unlike Tess, Lena's paganism never succumbs to the pressures of Christian society. Lena does not seem to struggle as Tess does to resolve complicated arguments within herself about the conflict of nature and Christian conventions. Lena seems to know instinctively what Tess must strive so hard to find by way of reason. Though Lena follows the conventions of the society in which she lives in trying to find a father for her baby, her world is not going to fall apart if she does not meet the standards of the society. 

*Light in August* criticizes Protestant Christianity, especially the Calvinistic and Presbyterian version. Gail Hightower and Joanna Burden are products of its influence. Joe Christmas becomes embittered because of the stringent demands of McEachern to learn the Presbyterian Shorter Catechism. The text implies that Presbyterianism has
brought death, but Lena, because of her similarities to a pagan goddess, brings life.

Lena’s quality of “detachment” also seems to lend support to the idea that the secret of Lena’s pastoral tranquility is a stoic acceptance of life. Chase believes that Lena represents the “quiet enduring stoicism and wisdom of the heart which he finds among the poor whites, Negroes, and other socially marginal types” (212). She does not question her plight, but simply accepts the hardships and disappointments without too much joy or sorrow. Even when Lucas Burch leaves her the second time by slipping out the window, she does not complain about his leaving, but merely that she had to get out of bed to close the window.

Hardy’s Olly Dowdens, Glasgow’s Miss Willy Whitlows, and Faulkner’s Lena Groves appear to have a stoic fortitude which helps them survive. The novels of these authors often portray the simple-minded rural rustics as the only people who obtain any kind of happiness. These texts, then, would seem to imply that the key to happiness is not to ask much of life, but to be content to merely survive. What Weinstein says of Hardy’s characters also appears to be true of Faulkner’s and Glasgow’s:
If you are small enough, in Hardy's world, you can retain civil relations between soul and body, and this unaspiring civility marks the charm of Hardy's rustics. His Prometheans, however, those who make demands on life, regularly collapse upon themselves, their human project exploded by the forces of nature within and without. (124)

While *Light in August* may suggest that the key to Lena's past may be ignorance, harmony with nature, or stoic peace, the text subverts these opinions, revealing an ambivalence toward these very traits.

First, Lena is not always as mindless as the text sometimes makes her appear. Though Lena does have a calm placidity toward life, the text subverts the idea that she is merely a form of non-thinking vegetation. Even as a child, she knows about such abstract issues as class consideration. When her mother and father take her into town, she makes them let her get out of the wagon and walk so that the people will think that she is from the town (3). After Mrs. Armstid gives her some money, she thinks of how she has been eating like a lady, like a lady traveling (28-9). Thus, she is familiar with such concepts as class consciousness, and those ideas and attitudes do make a difference to her.

Far from being "unreasoning," Lena is a detective. She is smart enough to know from Byron's description of Joe
Brown that he is Lucas Burch. She knows how to lead Byron Bunch along with some questions until she traps him into revealing that Joe Brown is Lucas Burch. When Byron realizes how she tricked him into revealing the identity of Joe Brown, he "could have bitten his tongue in two" (60). Lena can be quite skilled and manipulative in the use of language.

Though the text says that she felt no shame for being pregnant out of wedlock, the narrator hints that she may feel some shame after all, at least when under the scrutinizing gaze of Mrs. Armstid, because she lies to her about her last name being Burch. The text also reveals that she knows how to avoid answering questions that might be embarrassing to her. Frequently in her conversation with Mr. Armstid she either refuses to answer a question or shifts the conversation to other matters. In her conversation with Gail Hightower concerning Byron Bunch, she shows that she knows how to dissimulate (455).

Furthermore, Lena has concocted a very detailed story of why Lucas has not sent for her yet. Her rendition of it to Mrs. Armstid shows that she has thought about it a great deal and probably even rehearsed how to explain her situation to everyone. She knows how to prepare a speech.
Lena is not mindless, but has a will to survive as strong and determined as that of Tess and Ada Fincastle. Her will to survive is expressed in comic terms, but the text reveals that this calm, "unreasoning" woman can reason after all. She is not totally free from feelings of guilt and shame.

The idea that Lena has peace because she is an earth goddess also receives ambivalent treatment by the text. One of the first devices the text uses to question the pastoral bliss associated with Lena Grove is the allusion to Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn." Keats's "Grecian Urn" shows people engaged in bacchanalian revelry, but the characters are fixed. If there is any pastoral bliss to be found in Lena Grove, the reader must remember that such bliss is an artistic representation, which may ultimately be the only place where pastoral bliss can exist--on urns, in paintings, poetry, and novels. In Keats's words, this bucolic idyll is a "cold pastoral." Bleikasten suggests that the painting on the urn is an Apollonian representation of the Dionysian. If that is the case, then *Light in August*, and any pastoral bliss found within it, is also an Apollonian representation of the Dionysian. In any pastoral representation there is the possibility that the
bucolic ideal is only an illusion of art, and may only exist in art, not reality.

The sexuality depicted on Keats's Grecian urn portrays the eroticism of Lena Grove, particularly in her relationship to Byron Bunch: "Bold lover, never, never canst thou kiss, / Though winning near the goal--yet, do not grieve" (17-8). At the end of the novel, Byron Bunch tries to fulfill his sexual desires, but Lena holds him at bay. The unbridled sexuality of Joe Christmas and Joanna Burden is described in the following manner:

Now and then she appointed trysts beneath certain shrubs about the grounds, where he would find her naked, or with her clothing half torn to ribbons upon her, in the wild throes of nymphomania, her body gleaming in the slow shifting from one to another of such formally erotic attitudes and gestures a Beardsley of the time of Petronious might have drawn. She would be wild then, in the close, breathing halfdark without walls, with her wild hair, each strand of which would seem to come alive like octopus tentacles, and her wild hands and her breathing: "Negro! Negro! Negro!" (285).

This description of heated sexuality does not even fit versions of erotic pastoral, but reflects a kind of penance Joanna does to try to condemn herself for the sins of her forefathers against blacks. Even Joe Christmas realizes that by doing so, Joanna thinks that she is "damning herself forever to the hell of her forefathers, by living not alone in sin but in filth" (283).
Since the text draws such a dark reverse of the erotic pastoral in the affair of Joanna Burden and Joe Christmas, one would expect to find the opposite kind of sexuality in Lena Grove—a pure kind of sexual freedom divorced from guilt of any kind. The sexuality of Lena Grove, after her affair with Lucas Burch, resembles the cold pastoral eroticism of the Grecian urn.

Another manner in which the text subverts Lena's status as pastoral goddess is her juxtaposition with the tragic events that happen around her during her stay in Jefferson. Though Light in August may be viewed as pastoral, it is a "bloody and violent pastoral" (Brooks Yoknapatawpha 54). While Lena passes placidly through this environment, Joanna Burden is murdered and Joe Christmas is lynched. At first glance, one might admire Lena's ability to cope with her pregnancy and the hardships of her life, but surely one should expect more involvement from a pastoral goddess in the pastoral environment over which she reigns. As Wittenberg remarks, Lena leaves "the community in the same impersonal, enigmatic way in which she arrived, as if she were some sort of detached visiting goddess" (116).
Finally, the text also subverts the opinion that Lena Grove exemplifies the stoicism of the rustic people. Though Lena moves through the novel unperturbed, she does move. If she had been willing to merely accept life as it was, she would never have climbed through that small window of her leanto and started on a perilous journey to find Lucas Burch. Although the furniture repairer speculates that she probably never intended to find him, there is no question that she set out on a quest either for Lucas Burch or a better life than she had with her brother's family.

Since the text both supports and subverts the theme of Lena as an unreasoning, stoic, earth goddess, Bakhtin's theories concerning the dialogic nature of the novel and carnival help us to understand the ambivalence of the text toward Lena. Lena is a carnivalized version of an earth goddess who wanders through blighted pastoral environments, simultaneously degrading idealistic pretensions and generating life by evoking ambivalent laughter. Lena's story becomes a piece of folkloric humor that has regenerative power even when told in the context of Joe Christmas's tragic story.

From the beginning of the novel, the narrator sets the tone of carnival humor. His description of Lena riding in
the wagons is so grotesque, even in its quietness, that one
laughs at this exaggerated portrayal of pastoral quietude.
The descriptions of Lena walking in the men's shoes, the
exaggerated simplicity of her talk and reasoning set a
comic tone for the rest of the narrative. Even as she
rides in the wagon, she watches the road "between the ears
of the mule" (14). Her pastoral journey is framed by
folkloric humor associated with mules. The grotesque
procession of the wagons is reminiscent of a carnival
parade. At the end of the novel, Lena watches the
"telephones and fenceposts like it was a circus parade"
(559). The text treats Lena's story, and she views life,
in terms of carnival. The characteristics and mode of
travel of this earth goddess are carnivalized by these
grotesque images.

Lena comes from an area that was a pastoral wilderness
before the lumber companies came and cut down all of the
trees. This area now resembles a wasteland with the ugly,
remnants of a deserted sawmill with "gutted boilers lifting
their rusting and unsmoking stacks with an air stubborn,
baffled and bemused upon a stump-pocked scene of profound
and peaceful desolation" (4-5). This is not merely the
pastoral destroyed, but the pastoral inverted. The scene
is rural and peaceful, but only because destruction has taken place. This theme of the sawmill destroying the pastoral wilderness will be emphasized again in "The Bear" and "Delta Autumn." Lena, the earth goddess, travels from one planing mill and sawmill town to the next, where the same devastation has taken place.

Lena's regenerative powers are seen from the very beginning as she continues her journey toward Jefferson. People, who might not normally be kind, find themselves being kind to Lena, almost against their will. Mr. Armstid thinks that women will not be kind to Lena because she is about to have a child out of wedlock, but Mrs. Armstid, though hard and "savage" gives Lena money to continue her search for Lucas Burch, realizing that she will probably never find him.

Lena's presence has a profound effect upon Gail Hightower and Byron Bunch. Byron is in danger of becoming a reclusive disciple of the Reverend Hightower, but Lena brings them both out of their existence as hermits. Carnival humor degrades idealistic pretensions such as those embraced by Hightower and Bunch. By coming into contact with Lena Grove, Hightower and Bunch become grotesque images of isolated idealists.
Hightower and Bunch have to leave their sterile, ivory towers to deal with the regenerative power of Lena's womb.

Diane Roberts in *Faulkner and Southern Womanhood* writes:

Lena Grove becomes the fertile presiding goddess of an apparently restored order. However, despite the insisted-upon "correctness" of maternity and the abhorrent barrenness and perversity identified in Joanna Burden, the reassertion of the urn's perfection in the timeless life cycle of copulation, birth, and death, *Light in August* hints at a subterranean potential for chaos: sexuality, race, gender, history, even class gone liquid, all hierarchies erased. (173)

This "subterranean potential for chaos" is localized in Lena's belly. All of the distinctions and ideologies which divide people are degraded by the regenerative power of ambivalent laughter.

In terms of grotesque realism, Lena's body is Bakhtin's material body principle. The narrator lays a great deal of stress on her being like the earth, and the constant emphasis on her belly and her pregnancy fits with Bakhtin's concept of the carnivalesque, grotesque body. In Keats's "Ode on a Grecian Urn" are the words, "What leaf-fringed legend haunts about thy shape / Of deities or mortals, or of both" (5-6). The shape of the urn is reflected in the shape of Lena's belly. The legends and stories center around her belly. Most of the major characters, either directly or indirectly come into contact
with Lena's belly and are regenerated by it. Lena's body is a focus of major emphasis in this novel, explained by Lena's own words at the beginning and end of the text, "a body does get around" (32, 559). Her body, passing through various towns and experiences, is associated with life and with death. But the result is always an ambivalent laughter which regenerates. Through this means she degrades their high seriousness, but in a positive manner. Describing this form of degradation, Bakhtin writes:

To degrade . . . means to concern oneself with the lower stratum of the body, the life of the belly and the reproductive organs; it therefore relates to acts of defecation and copulation, conception, pregnancy, and birth. Degradation digs a bodily grave for a new birth; it has not only a destructive, negative, aspect, but also a regenerating one. To degrade an object does not imply hurling it into the void of nonexistence, into absolute destruction, but to hurl it down to the reproductive lower stratum, the zone in which conception and a new birth take place. Grotesque realism knows no other lower level; it is the fruitful earth and the womb. It is always conceiving. (Rabelais 21)

All of the characters are ultimately hurled down into Lena's belly. Hightower in his "high tower" must be degraded, brought down to earth in order to be regenerated as a human being. It is true that he must experience a form of death, but that should not have been foreign to his Christian thinking since Jesus Christ said, "Unless a grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone,
but if it dies, it produces much grain. He who loves his life will lose it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life" (John 12:24-5). In order to be useful, people must "be sown," that is, come down into the earth and regenerated. *Light in August* buries Hightower and Bunch through their contact with Lena by degrading their pretensions and involving them with her life.

Because of their contact with Lena, the proud and idealistic Bunch and Hightower become an inverted Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. *Light in August* also emphasizes Hightower's large belly, comparing him to an eastern idol. But the image of Hightower as idol is carnivalized as he becomes Byron's Sancho Panza. On the day that Lena Grove gives birth to her child, Byron must ride to her rescue by finding someone to help her deliver the baby. Byron rides on a mule to Hightower's house. The text uses the same kind of language to describe Byron's heroic ride on the mule as it does to describe Hightower's dreams of the heroic Confederate soldiers: "It was just dawn when Byron stopped his galloping mule before the house. . . . He sprang to the ground already running" (433). The obese
Hightower is sound asleep, but awakens to help Byron in his quest to aid Lena in her moment of crisis.

After helping to deliver the baby, Hightower thinks, "That will be her life, her destiny. The good stock peopling in tranquil obedience to it the good earth; from these hearty loins without hurry or haste descending mother and daughter" (448). One of the characteristics of grotesque realism is coming in contact "with the reproductive and generating power of the earth and of the body" (Rabelais 22). Hightower himself is regenerated through this experience.

Hightower believes that the land itself will be blessed because of the fecundity of the earth goddess who is present with them. As he looks at the home of the murdered Joanna Burden, he thinks:

"Poor, barren woman. To have not lived only a week longer, until luck returned to this place. Until luck and life returned to these barren and ruined acres." It seems to him that he can see, feel, about him the ghosts of rich fields, and of the rich fecund black life of the quarters, the mellow shouts, the presence of fecund women, the prolific naked children in the dust before the doors; and the big house again, noisy, loud with the treble shouts of the generations. (449)

Lena has not only brought salvation to Hightower, but to the land itself. Presbyterian, Calvinistic ideology had resulted in barren ground, houses, and wombs. Lena,
through bringing people into contact with the earth, has regenerated lives and land.

The conclusion of *Light in August* is told by a furniture repairer. That Faulkner would give the last chapter to another narrator is a strong indication that Lena's story has become a piece of folkloric humor that will be passed from person to person. Her story is juxtaposed with the stories of Hightower and Joe Christmas and it is all reduced in the end to a piece of folk humor, a tall tale by the furniture repairer. One cannot help but see the humor in poor Byron Bunch, standing on the side of the road, waiting for Lena,

Standing there, face and no face, hangdog and determined and calm too, like he had done desperated himself up for the last time, to take the last chance, and that now he knew he wouldn't ever have to desperate himself again. (558)

This chronotope of the road ends with comedy. Angel Clare walking away with Liza-Lu and Byron Bunch traveling alongside Lena are both comic representations of the search for the pastoral, or the walk hand-in-hand out of Paradise.

But these comic aspects should not be viewed as a destructive form of criticism. Comedy is a way of laughing at life in its absurdities. Lena's comic status is not
meant to be demeaning as in some forms of savage satire.

Bakhtin said that carnival humor

is also directed at those who laugh. The people do not exclude themselves from the wholeness of the world. They, too, are incomplete, they also die and are revived and renewed. This is one of the essential differences of the people's festive laughter from the pure satire of modern times. The satirist whose laughter is negative places himself above the object of his mockery, he is opposed to it. The wholeness of the world's comic aspect is destroyed, and that which appears comic becomes a private reaction. The people's ambivalent laughter, on the other hand, expresses the point of view of the whole world; he who is laughing also belongs to it. (Rabelais 12)

Faulkner and Lena can laugh at the world, not in a cruel satirical manner, but in a life affirming sense. They realize that they are part of the human comedy, with just as many foibles and contradictions as other people who are degraded and made to appear comic in the carnivalesque sense.

The narrator who concludes Light in August is similar to one of Hardy's rustics, given the last word to provide a carnivalesque conclusion to the story. Cleanth Brooks notes that the pastoral is always more closely aligned with comedy than with tragedy (Yoknapatawpha 72). Bakhtin points out that comedy is not even divorced from tragedy.

Even in the furniture repairer's account, Lena's story is associated with the tragedy of Joe Christmas, though
Lena will not talk about that aspect of her journey. It might seem odd that the death of Joe Christmas would be associated with the birth of Lena’s child, but this juxtaposition of birth and death is part of carnival humor:

This laughter could grasp and comprehend a phenomenon in the process of change and transition, it could fix in a phenomenon both poles of its evolution in their uninterrupted and creative renewing changeability: in death birth is foreseen and in birth death, in victory defeat and in defeat victory, in crowning a decrowning. Carnival laughter does not permit a single one of these aspects of change to be absolutized or to congeal in one-sided seriousness. (Bakhtin, Poetics 164)

In the telling of Lena’s story, both birth and death become the site of ambivalent laughter. The furniture repairer tells the story in the dark to his wife in the bedroom, and appears to be part of his lovemaking. He makes it a kind of lewd story, and when he hints that Byron wanted to make love to Lena, his wife asks, “What was it he aimed to do?” The furniture repairer replies, “You wait till I come to that part. Maybe I’ll show you too.” The furniture repairer is not merely going to tell her what Byron wanted to do; he is going to show her. Even the act of telling the story is associated with sexuality and a celebration of life.

Carnival laughter does not allow us to emphasize the tragedy of Joe’s death, as though his tragedy was the focus
of life's meaning. Carnival laughter shows that birth and death occur simultaneously. As Joe dies, Lena's baby is born, with all of the degrading humor that accompanied those events. Even though a great deal of death happens around Lena, she is bringing forth life. In a sense, she is even giving new life to Joe Christmas. Even Mrs. Hines mistakes the baby for Joe. Carnival laughter does not permit "a one-sided seriousness," toward either birth or death. Joe's death is a reminder at birth that everyone is mortal. The baby's birth is a reminder that life goes on, is regenerated even in the midst of tragedy. In "Ode on a Grecian Urn," Keats wrote, "When old age shall this generation waste, Thou shalt remain, in midst of other woe / Than ours, a friend to man..." (46-8). Just as the urn would continue to exist in the midst of other people's tragedy, Lena's cold pastoral will continue to inspire a regenerative ambivalent laughter.

Ada Fincastle: The Presbyterian Pastoral

While Faulkner's deconstruction of Protestantism, Presbyterianism in particular as exemplified in McEachern and Hightower, seems to leave little of value in that tradition, Glasgow shows how Presbyterianism crushes the erotic version of pastoral while simultaneously giving
people strength to endure enormous difficulties. *Vein of Iron* manifests ambivalence toward the Presbyterian heritage. In *Vein of Iron*, the strength of Presbyterianism replaces the erotic pastoral with a family version that features strong women as the stabilizing force.

As in *Tess* and in *Light in August*, the chronotope of the road is an important narrative device in *Vein of Iron*. Ada Fincastle, and her father, John, travel the road into and out of Ironside during the course of the novel. Both of them encounter disappointment and disillusionment on the road, but ultimately it leads Ada to an unexpected form of fulfillment.

The second chapter describes Ada watching the road, waiting for her father to bring her a doll with real hair. Finally, in the distance, she can see the wagon coming and she runs to meet her father. The narrator takes the time to describe the pastoral environment that surrounds Ada as she waits. But the road only leads to disappointment because her father can only afford to bring her a china doll, not one with real hair. This first disappointment on the road is a path that Ada will continue to walk until her dreams of an erotic pastoral are replaced by a family idyll.
In describing the idyllic chronotope of the novel, Bakhtin explains that the destruction of the idyll becomes one of the major themes of novel writing. From the eighteenth century the novel portrays the idyllic world "rapidly approaching its end, as well as differing evaluations of the forces that are destroying it--that is, the new capitalist world" (Dialogic 233). Vein of Iron describes the loss of the pastoral world in terms of philosophical Presbyterianism and capitalism. The goals of Ada’s Presbyterian ancestors who settled the region were a combination of Presbyterian theology and capitalism. Ralph McBride, Ada’s husband, sees the connection between Presbyterianism and the capitalistic success of Ada’s ancestors:

It takes conviction to set out to despoil the wilderness, defraud Indians of their hunting-grounds, and start to build a new Jerusalem for predestinarians. I’m not so sure . . . that predestination didn’t conquer the land. It’s a doctrine that has made history wherever it found itself. (460)

Ada Fincastle’s ancestors came to the Shut-in Valley with the pastoral dream of establishing a new, Presbyterian Eden. Though the Fincastles have been in the valley for over a century, they are in a sense the outsiders. The Native Americans were there before them. The pastoral
dream was so strong in some of these settlers that there was a longing to go to the world of the Indians, which seemed more peaceful and close to nature.

By Ada’s time, the Presbyterian heritage had been handed down through five generations, but the settlers modified the theology and philosophy of life through the years. The Puritan vision was essentially pastoral in its desire to set up a new paradise, but when these puritan elements mixed with certain features of the modern world, a hopeless confusion resulted.

Ada’s view of the pastoral paradise is not like that of her strict Presbyterian ancestors. Her father, who has lost his position as a Presbyterian minister due to his unorthodox theology, influences Ada’s new concepts of life and religion. Ada and her father are trying to find a pastoral paradise with a background of Presbyterian theology. But to do that, certain ideas must be dismantled and things that were formerly divided must be reunited. Bakhtin describes how difficult it is to dismantle and rebuild a philosophy:

Amid the good things of this here-and-now-world are also be found false connections that distort the authentic nature of things, false associations established and reinforced by tradition and sanctioned by religious and official ideology. Objects and ideas are united by false hierarchical relationships,
inimical to their nature; they are sundered and separated from one another by various other-worldly and idealistic strata that do not permit these objects to touch each other in their living corporeality. These false links are reinforced by scholastic thought, by a false theological and legalistic casuistry and ultimately by language itself—shot through with centuries and millennia of error—false links between (on the one hand) good material words, and (on the other) authentically human ideas. It is necessary to destroy and rebuild the entire false picture of the world, to sunder the false hierarchical links between objects and ideas, to abolish the divisive ideational strata. It is necessary to liberate all these objects and permit them to enter into the free unions that are organic to them, no matter how monstrous these unions might seem from the point of view of ordinary, traditional associations. (Dialogic 169)

Bakhtin's description of the necessity to "destroy and rebuild the false picture of the world" summarizes the lives of John and Ada Fincastle. John Fincastle must divorce himself from the "ideational strata" of the theology he has inherited. He studies in England, spending hours reading philosophy in the British Museum. He saw that religious doctrines he had cherished were based on these "false associations and official ideology": "All the learning in the British Museum does not prove that man can apprehend God; it proves only that men have invented gods" (Vein of Iron 49). Not willing to follow the official doctrine of the Presbyterian church, he remained true to his convictions but lost his church and his livelihood.
Since her father was liberal in his religious view, it was not difficult for Ada to be theologically progressive. Ada tries to rebuild a vision of the pastoral world that is, in fact, more in keeping with the wilderness environment that existed before the Europeans settled it. Ada has a longing for the kind of union with nature and freedom possessed by the Native Americans before Ada's ancestors arrived. Ada thinks often of the legend of her great-great-grandmother whom the Indians captured. Although many considered her captivity to be a tragedy, she seemed to enjoy some aspects of it, and often looked longingly toward the mountains where she had spent her confinement. Throughout the novel, the text describes Ada longing for that kind of primitive freedom. The valley is an example of what Bakhtin calls "the polyglot world" (Dialogic 12). The mixture of European culture with that of the Native Americans leads to a reinterpretation of the old pastoral symbols. When the old European methods for obtaining idyllic bliss fail, some of the language of Native Americans is incorporated into the life and thought of the settlers.

Despite Ada's progressive ideas, she still has to deal with the moral standards of the Presbyterian community.
Since those moral standards were based upon connections with doctrines that she did not believe, it was difficult for her to redefine her life and her own ethical system.

The concern with moral appearances and propriety permeates this work as much as it does Hardy's novels that portray the moral strictness of Victorian society. Ada's true love, Ralph McBride, is forced to marry another girl, because he was in her bedroom when she screamed. In order to protect the virtuous reputation of the girl, he is forced to marry her even though they had no sexual relations at all. These moral codes and obsessions with propriety cause a great deal of unhappiness in Vein of Iron. Ralph McBride and Ada Fincastle would have married early in life had it not been for these concerns. Though many of the people of Ironside feel that Ralph never made any improper advances to Janet Rowan, nevertheless, the old codes had to be followed. Ralph and Ada bear the consequences of these codes for the rest of their lives. As liberal as John Fincastle is, he gives the advice, "We cannot alter a rule of conduct. No matter how wrong or absurd it may be, it is stronger than we are" (147). Though Ada's father has been a rebel in many ways, he will not alter this rule of sexual conduct. But Ada is willing
to carry rebellion further than her father and rebel against the codes of conduct. At this point in her life, Ada realizes that she is fighting something much stronger than she had anticipated when forming her views of life:

A power, terrible for good or evil, was offended, and only sacrifice could appease its resentment. The wrath of God said her grandmother. The law of the tribe said her father. Well, no matter, since the wrath of God and the law of the tribe both demanded atonment in blood. Suddenly, it seemed to her that she was opposing a phantom. But it was a phantom that would prevail in the end because it was the stronger. (155)

Ada realizes that Ironside society forbids her marital union with Ralph because of codes of conduct that are too deeply ingrained within the culture to be overthrown by the temporary unhappiness of two lovers. Ada wishes that they were living under the same codes as the ancient Native Americans who had once inhabited the region:

A deep instinct, stronger than speech, superior to knowledge told her this could not have happened. To someone else perhaps, long ago in that half-obliterated past when savages roamed the mountains—long ago a boy named Ralph and a girl named Ada might have lived through such shame and suffering and bitterness. (164)

This Presbyterian phantom, however, is a force that will thwart Ada’s attempts to fulfill her dreams of an erotic pastoral.
In order to experience even a small amount of sexual fulfillment, Ada must distance herself both from the Presbyterian teaching of her grandmother and the community's concern with morality and propriety. She must also be willing to accept responsibility for her actions. Finally, she does so. She goes into the pastoral world, the mountains where the Native Americans used to live, and enjoys just a few days of erotic pastoral pleasure with Ralph McBride. Though he is married and about to be sent off to fight in World War I, she makes the decision to consummate her love with Ralph in the pastoral wilderness. This section of the novel is entitled "Life's Interlude."

The love scenes in this section of the novel are told in terms of the Native American environment and legend. They make love on the Indian Trail. Ralph gathers some pine boughs and leaves and says, "I'm making you a couch--an Indian couch. All the Indians have gone, and we're the last of the lovers" (208). For a few days, they make love in the freedom of an environment that existed once before the Presbyterians came, but in the back of their minds they are haunted by a sense of guilt and foreboding. Even while they are making love, "there was a mute supplication embedded somewhere in her unconscious being. Don't punish
us, God. We aren’t hurting anyone. Don’t punish us, God” (212). Ralph and Ada know that “round their island of happiness, there was the ebb and flow of a treacherous universe” (217).

Ada becomes pregnant and, like Tess, must bear the shame of being a fallen woman, but she does so with bravery. She has been willing to bear it for the one moment of pleasure. The community ostracizes her, and she is treated much as the witch and her son. Because of her actions, Ada must endure "the punishment of the tribal gods in whom Ada no longer believes" (Raper 168). Nevertheless, even while she is pregnant, she knows a few moments of pastoral happiness. Her father recommends that she could find some moments of peace by spending time among the sheep. The pregnant Ada enjoys the most explicit reference to pastoral peace found in the novel: "Here, with the friendly sheep browsing around her, she would lie flat on the earth and fold her impatient hands under her head" (253). These moments among the flock provide the last link she has with her old dream of pastoral bliss: "As she picked her way, followed by the two ewes and the lamb, through tufts of mullein as gray as stone, she would find again, for the moment at least, that her old faith in the
goodness of life was restored" (254). After these moments of pastoral peace, the novel begins in earnest to carnivalize Ada's romantic pastoralism.

Glasgow continues to show that the pastoral version of eroticism is impossible. For Glasgow, much like Faulkner and Hardy, sexuality is always a complicating factor in any vision of the pastoral. Raper writes, "Through Ada's struggle Glasgow deals once again with what may well have been the underlying theme of her career--the role sex and unwanted offspring play as a check upon the freedom of individuals and of mankind" (166).

Though John and Ada Fincastle are able to free themselves from many of the restraints of their Presbyterian heritage, they are still idealists who find it difficult to face the realities of life. John Fincastle tells Ada, "There are only two ways of meeting life--one is to yield to it, and one is to retreat from it. I chose the latter" (148-9). Ada discovers that it is impossible to maintain a pastoral retreat. The ideological pretensions of both conservative and liberal Presbyterians are degraded in Vein of Iron by the presence of idiots.

Before John Fincastle dies, he has a dream of the world dissolving into a great void. But it seems that he
cannot tolerate that vision to which his philosophy and his life have led him. He has to get back to God's mountain, to a myth which will give him some kind of hope before he dies, so he leaves the city to return to the mountains of his youth. But his last vision is of a world of idiots from which there is no salvation. His vision of the future world filled with idiots is similar to that of Shreve in *Absalom, Absalom!* as he imagines that "the Jim Bonds are going to conquer the western hemisphere" (471). In John Fincastle's world, the idiots have the final word. 

Carnivalesque humor prevails at the end. Bakhtin contends that festivals such as the feast of fools were a gay and free expression of "our second nature" in which gay folly was opposed to "piousness and fear of God." Thus the champions of the festival considered it a "once-a-year" liberation, not only from routine but also from the religious outlook. It permitted the people to see the world with foolish eyes. (Rabelais 260) 

*Vein of Iron* begins and ends with descriptions of idiots. John Fincastle draws near to the end of his life realizing that laughter may be the best way to approach life after all. He has lived his life in the realm of the mind, relying on reason, but at the end he seems to see the futility of it all. When John Fincastle wonders about how his family will survive, he
discovered, to his surprise, that he was laughing. After all, a sense of the ridiculous was as stout a prop as one needed. It helped even more than philosophy when one matched one's wits against the universe. Or was all philosophy simply an ultimate sense of the ridiculous. (428)

John Fincastle begins to develop the carnivalesque sense of life as he nears death. He begins to feel more at home with the humble people, rather than philosophers. "He was still laughing, he discovered, with that deep inward irony. It wasn't easy to surpass the Ancient of Days in a burlesque of mortality" (431). As Bakhtin points out, Zoroaster was considered to be wise because he laughed at birth (Rabelais 69).

Vein of Iron begins with Ada and some of her childhood friends chasing the idiot Toby Waters. "Children were chasing an idiot boy up the village street to the churchyard" (3). One of the little boys picks up cow droppings and places them in Toby's cap. Throughout her life, Ada comforts herself that she and her family are not as bad off as Toby Waters and his mother. Toby Waters and his mother live in a pigsty and Toby is frequently seen carrying slop for the pigs. After Ada has the child out of wedlock, children chase her in the streets and throw things at her just the way she and other children used to chase Toby. Now, "she felt herself fleeing in the skin of the
idiot" (264). As she looks at the children chasing her, she thinks, "behind her the voices of children--or were they idiots?--were babbling" (264). Ada begins to see that the highly serious, spiritual people who condemn the people of the flesh, represented by Toby and his mother, bring down the spiritualized culture of the Presbyterians. She begins to have doubts about the condemnation heaped upon Toby and his mother, especially after she finds herself in the same category after she has given into the ways of the flesh.

Just before John Fincastle dies, he has a dream that he is a little boy waiting in a wagon for his mother. As he waits,

He knew, without knowing how he knew it, that something horrible was about to happen, was stealing toward him. I must run away, he thought, but he couldn't run; he couldn't detach his feet from the bare ground between the stumps. He couldn't loosen his tongue from the roof of his mouth when he tried to open his lips and call out to his mother. While the sweat broke out on his skin, and every pore seemed dripping with fear, the family flocked from the cabin and began to dance round him, singing and jeering. And as soon as he saw them he knew what he had dreaded--for they were all idiots. His mother had brought him to one of the mountain families that had inbred until it was imbecile. Two generations of blank, grinning faces and staring eyes and driveling mouths danced and shouted round him as they pressed closer and closer. A world of idiots, he thought in his dream. To escape from them, to run away, he must break through not only a throng, but a whole world of idiots. (456)
The laughter and dancing of the idiots shows their superiority over the frightened, awe-stricken man of reason in John Fincastle. Bakhtin writes that "festive folk laughter presents an element of victory not only over supernatural awe, over the sacred, over death, it also means the defeat of power, of earthly kings, of the earthly upper classes, of all that oppresses and restricts" (Rabelais 92). All of the ideologies that have restricted and bound John and Ada Fincastle are mocked by the presence of the idiots.

The idiots in this novel degrade the philosophical idealism of John Fincastle and Ada’s romantic pastoral dreams. When Ada is living in the city, she thinks about going to see a relation, Mrs. Bland, who might be able to help the Fincastle family financially. Ada finds that the Blands have also been ruined by the Depression. The sight of Mrs. Bland makes Ada see the ridiculous nature of all forms of idealism:

She turned away from the couch and went out of the room and down the stairs, treading as softly in the violent music as if she were following the burial of a lost hope through a carnival. That is spoilt too, she thought. I wish I hadn’t come. I wish I’d stayed away and kept my faith in the romantic life. As long as I believed in it, it was mine. And maybe nothing is real, not even money or the want of it. (404)
Romantic and philosophical idealism, money, and class consciousness seem like carnival images in the face of life's realities. The combining of funereal and carnival imagery is an important concept in Bakhtin's concept of the grotesque. Bakhtin explains that in Rabelais "death is an ambivalent image . . . ; therefore, death can be gay. . . . Where death is, there also is birth, change, renewal" (409). Though Ada is saddened by the death of her romantic delusions, carnival brings life out of death. After the death of her romantic dreams, which were in danger of making her as ineffectual as her father, she discovers the "vein of iron" which helps her to survive.

The death of the erotic is resurrected in the form of the family idyll. After World War I comes to an end, Ralph McBride obtains a divorce. Ada and Ralph finally marry, but marriage once again proves to be the death of the erotic dream. Like so many of Ellen Glasgow's heroines, Ada finds that reality very seldom matches the dream. Ralph McBride, her lover and eventual husband, remains bitter for the rest of his life because his dreams of life do not match the reality. Ada becomes rather stoic about life; she resembles Dorinda Oakley, both women realizing that what they obtain is far from what they had originally
dreamed of for themselves. Before the end of the novel, *Vein of Iron* takes on the elegiac tone of a person who has seen the death of the erotic pastoral. Ralph is still bitter about the years he had to waste because of the marriage to Janet Rowan. Pessimism and despair fill his life. His relationship with Ada contains none of the passion that existed before the war.

Nevertheless, Ada survives and learns from her life, especially her experiences in the city. As Gail David points out, the pattern in the female version of the pastoral is that the woman starts out in the rural environment, goes to the city, and then returns to the country with new wisdom and the fortitude to survive. In the male version of the pastoral, the man usually leaves the town or court to find new wisdom, then returns to the city to apply the principles he has learned.

Some critics feel that all Ada learns through her experiences with love and the city is to maintain a stoic acceptance of life. The text does seem to suggest at times that the only happiness possible is through a form of secularized Presbyterianism which enables the person to survive the loss of certain aspects of the bucolic dream.
The text illustrates something of the stoicism of the Presbyterian position in Ada's ancestor who originally settled that part of the land, who brought with him two Bibles and "one other book, a copy in his own handwriting of the Meditations of a heathen emperor who had not even been converted and saved" (21). That book by the heathen emperor, of course, was The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. Raper says that "as early as 1894 Glasgow had in times of personal crisis looked to Stoical philosophers, especially Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus, for fortitude, stability, and consolation" (Shelter 152).

Ada has done more, however, than move from the erotic pastoral to stoicism. The novel ends on a more positive affirmation than "life as a thing to be put up with."

Though Ada realizes that the dream of an erotic pastoral is impossible to maintain, she has a happiness which is more than a stoic acceptance of life. She finds a more enduring and satisfying form of happiness in the context of the family. Many of Glasgow's earlier writings seem concerned with an individual's pursuit of happiness and struggle toward a solution based entirely within the individual. In Vein of Iron, however, the solution is found within the context of family and communal life.
Though in *Virginia*, Glasgow seemed to disparage devotion to family, toward the end of her writing career she seemed to take the position that the family idyll was worthwhile. Thinking of women like her Aunt Meggie, Ada muses, "All over the world there were nameless wives and mothers still baking and scrubbing and washing in the hope that imperfect human ties might remain linked together" (384). Toward the end of this novel, even though her relationship with Ralph is less than perfect, she believes it worthwhile to keep the family together because of the strength and contentment that families ultimately afford. The texts also suggest that the woman is the main one who keeps the family stable. The pastoral interludes are found not in the Native American wilderness, but in the context of shared life with family and friends. Describing these happy moments of the family novel, Bakhtin writes:

> Idyllic elements are scattered sporadically throughout the family novel. A constant struggle is waged here between depersonalized alienation in relations between people and human relationships built either on a patriarchal or an abstractly humanist foundation. Scattered throughout the great, cold, alien world there are warm little corners of human feeling and kindness. (Dialogic 233)

In the city, Ada and her family encounter this "depersonalized alienation" but their family provides stability and survival. Tonette Bond writes "Glasgow
needed the strategies found in pastoral tradition in order to give artistic expression to her humanistic remedy to a society demoralized by the values of a commercial technology" (567-8). The pastoral strategy, however, is modified in Vein of Iron to emphasize the importance of the family.

When Ada Fincastle leaves the country to go to the city, the importance of the family unit comes to the forefront of the novel. Family heritage compared to the rootlessness of city shows the superiority of the country over the city. One of the main features of the life of the city described in Vein of Iron is the loneliness and isolation of people. The Great Depression era in the city emphasizes how even the elderly are left to fend for themselves.

The chronotope of the road leads Ada back to the country to the old home place. One of the ways in which the pastoral idyll is reworked is in what Bakhtin calls the family novel. Since Vein of Iron seems to parallel Bakhtin's description of the family novel, I would like to quote his description of the manner in which the family idyll changes:

In the family novel and the novel of generations, the idyllic element undergoes a radical reworking and
as a result perceptibly pales. Of folkloric time and the ancient matrices only those elements remain that can be reinterpreted and that can survive on the soil of the bourgeois family and family-as-genealogy. . . .

The family of the family novel is, of course, no longer the family of the idyll. It has been torn out of its narrow feudal locale, out of its unchanging natural surroundings—the native mountains, fields, rivers, forest—that had nourished it in the idyll. At best the idyllic unity of place is limited to the ancestral family town house, to the immovable part (the real estate) of capitalist property. But this unity of place in the family novel is by no means a necessity. What is more, there is a break-off in the course of a character's life from a well-defined and limited spatial locale, a period of wandering in the life of the heroes, before they acquire family and material possessions. . . . The novel's movement takes the main hero (or heroes) out of the great but alien world of random occurrence into the small but secure and stable little world of the family, where nothing is foreign, or accidental or incomprehensible, where authentically human relationships are re-established, where the ancient matrices are re-established on a family base: love, marriage, childbearing, a peaceful old age for the in-laws, shared meals around the family table. This narrow and reduced idyllic little world is the red thread running throughout the novel, as well as its resolving chord. (Dialogic 232)

One can see many similarities between this description of the family novel and Vein of Iron. Ada experiences a time of wandering in the city. In the course of Vein of Iron, the family is torn from its roots in the shadow of God's mountain. They have to go to the city in order to survive. But they come back to the shadow of God's mountain in the town of Ironside to try to establish something of the family idyll that has been lost. The complications of city
life are left behind for the simplicity and authenticity of family life on the farm. Aunt Meggie will return with them and they will share communal meals. Certainly, it is a reduced idyll from what Ada had dreamed of, but it resembles the vision shared by the first settlers of Ironside. She and Ralph decide they will build the rest of their lives there. They do not decide to do this because they are moving back to find an easy life in the country. The house is dilapidated and the land is fallow. Ada realizes that it will not be an easy life, but being back on the land of her ancestors links her with her heritage:

She had a sense, more a feeling than a vision, of the dead generations behind her. They had come to life there in the past; they were lending her their fortitude; they were reaching out to her in adversity. This was the heritage they had left. She could lean back on their strength; she could recover that lost certainty of a continuing tradition. (461)

Characters such as Ada Fincastle offer much more hope than the women encountered in the novels of Hardy and Faulkner.

At the beginning of Vein of Iron, John Fincastle's Hindu prayer expresses one of the longings of the pastoral world: "May all that have life be delivered from suffering" (116). As the novel unfolds, the lives of the Fincastle family are an exact opposite of the answer to that prayer. Vein of Iron suggests the impossibility of
escape from suffering, but some people have the vein of iron, the endurance, to live with the suffering.

It might seem odd that a woman writer would even turn to the pastoral to portray the fortitude of women, since the pastoral is, as David observes, "a genre which traditionally presents nature from the perspective of the white male author and according to literary convention, images the rural landscape as a submissive female" (xiii). But this is exactly why women writers such as Glasgow and Welty do employ the pastoral mode; since the pattern is so well-established, it is easy to use it and subvert it. Glasgow subverts the traditional pastoral by making its main characters women who can survive independently. Although Ada Fincastle and Dorinda Oakley both conceive illegitimate children, they are not ruined women in the usual sense. They are not the usual submissive females typified by the rural landscape.

Glasgow's women characters seem to possess more strength than those of Hardy and Faulkner. Ada Fincastle and Dorinda Oakley break the moral conventions of their society, but they do not murder out of anger, or commit suicide out of desperation, nor do they become mindless survivors. They endure with an intelligent dignity. There
is a great difference between Ada Fincastle's response to the death of the erotic myth and that of Eula Varner. The forces of the modern world complicate Eula's sexual existence and finally destroy her. Eula Varner, created by a male author, responds to the antipastoral forces with suicide. Tess responds with murder. Lena continues to survive, but only in a comic sense. Ada Fincastle, created by a female author, finds a way to survive even without the erotic fulfillment provided by a male partner. Several of Glasgow's heroines have erotic longings which are destroyed by the male construct of patriarchy and societal constraints, but they find a way to survive.

This survival is more than a form of stoicism. Although Ada is not happy in the way she envisioned happiness in terms of the erotic pastoral, she is happy:

It was different, but it was happiness. We couldn't have felt this when we were young lovers, she told herself. What we felt was more glowing, more vehement, more light-hearted and joyous; but it lacked this peace, this completeness, this security against time and change. (410)

The happiness Ada finds in the context of the family idyll may not be the passionate form she had dreamed of, but it does have the staying power that characterized the life of her Presbyterian ancestors. Their marriage is perhaps
similar to the kind of marriage advocated by the narrator of *Far from the Madding Crowd*.

Ada survives by secularizing the Presbyterian myth from which she had tried to distance herself. While no longer believing in the God of the Presbyterians, she realizes that there is something basic to the Presbyterian faith which gives a strength and fortitude to people which helps them to survive, just as it had helped her ancestors. While Tess's d'Urberville ancestry leads to her destruction, Ada's heritage supplies her strength. Unlike many male-authored texts, Glasgow gives her women an ancestry of strong females, whether related by blood or merely gender, from which to draw strength. The tales of women of the past have achieved mythic status in Ada's rural community. Ada can think of women such as Mrs. Morecock:

Mrs. Morecock had seen the brains of her baby spatter her skirts; she had been famished for food as a captive; she had eaten roots; when she reached water, she had knelt down and lapped it up like an animal. In the end she had the courage to escape, she had crossed trackless mountain on her way home to Ironside. For months she had lived on berries and the bark of black gum or sassafras. Though she was a walking skeleton when she reached Ironside, she had the spirit, or the folly, to begin life again. How was she able to forget? Ada wondered. How could they drop the past so easily, those pioneers, and plunge into the moment before them? They were hard, it was
true, but it was the hardness of character. Unlovable they were, but heroic. (248)

In the end, Ada finds the same kind of fortitude to endure the disappointments and tragedies of life as the female heroines of the past had done.

While Glasgow rejects the dogma of the Presbyterians, there are certain "secular" aspects of Presbyterianism which she retains, such as "moral integrity, self-reliance, devotion to a cause of their own or of God's formulation, endurance, and fortitude" (McDowell 205). The Presbyterian doctrine of predestination also inspires a kind of stoic acceptance of suffering, a trait which resides in many of the Fincastles, even though not all of them still hold to the doctrine.

The Old Presbyterianism of the ancestors is both glorified and disparaged in this novel. Ellen Glasgow had already engaged in a great deal of criticism of Presbyterianism, Calvinism, and Puritanism. Her first novel, The Descendant is very similar to Faulkner's Light in August. Both texts demonstrate the disastrous effects of bringing up a boy under a strict Calvinistic heritage. Faulkner and Glasgow follow a long line of American authors who blame Calvinistic Puritanism for all the ills of modern society (Raper 151). These harmful aspects of
Presbyterianism are emphasized in Faulkner's McEachern and Gail Hightower. McEachern, ignoring the need of Joe Christmas for love and compassion, merely hammers the Shorter Catechism into his head. Joe Christmas learns to hate the Presbyterian and all forms of authoritarian dogma. Gail Hightower ignores the needs of his wife and congregation by his incredible combination of Presbyterian theology with Southern history. His Presbyterianism leads to his isolation from the world and the death of his wife.

For Glasgow, this Presbyterianism, when it becomes a dogmatic code which interferes with the happiness of people, must be transgressed. Vein of Iron portrays Mrs. McBride's form of Presbyterianism as the source of Ralph McBride's weakness. Seeing the cruelty of Ralph's mother in forcing him to learn the Shorter Catechism as a child, Ada vows that she will never force her children to learn it.

As much as Glasgow detested these facets of Presbyterianism, the old Presbyterianism is vindicated because it produces the "vein of iron." Throughout the novel, Ada is in a conflict concerning what to maintain in her Presbyterian heritage. Vein of Iron illustrates the dialogic nature of the novel, showing the difficulty a
society encounters when trying to support and at the same time break away from the codes which are simultaneously destructive and beneficial. For Ada, Presbyterianism must be demythologized, but also remythologized, retaining some of the characteristics of the myth that are conducive to survival. As Santas writes, "If Barren Ground is Miss Glasgow's version of the modern South's pastoral dream, Vein of Iron is her modern pastoral reality—or at least a much more tough-minded blueprint of the dream" (199). In Vein of Iron, Presbyterianism has taken a new form, but it is the Presbyterian heritage none the less, a Calvinistic heritage of a strong God who makes strong people.

Tess, Lena, and Ada show the responses of three women to various forms of moral standards after they have been betrayed sexually. Each character displays a remarkable ability to fight against systems which could confine or condemn them. Ultimately, Tess is defeated by these forces. She resorts to murder as the only option to open an avenue of escape. Her road leads to death at the hands of the society whose laws she has violated. Her sister continues to walk on the road, possibly to face the same dangers. Lena Grove continues her search for the man who has betrayed her, but the comic resolution of the text is
more life-affirming than the story of Tess. The story of Ada Fincastle takes us a step beyond both Tess and Lena. Ada Fincastle comes to an ambivalent relationship within marriage. Tess’s and Lena’s stories both end outside of marriage with conflicts left in question. Though Ada’s marriage to a weak man was not her original dream, she has come to peace with a long term relationship with him.

The ambivalent denouements of Tess, Light in August, and Vein of Iron often leave readers with a sense that nothing has been resolved. All three texts subvert a satisfying version of the pastoral idyll. Were it not for the folkloric aspects of carnival found within the three texts, they might all be viewed as tragedies to some degree. But the comic aspects of the novel, holding up various versions of pastoral for ambivalent laughter, especially in Faulkner and Glasgow, prevent us from looking at the failures, disappointments and adversities of the characters without a hope for the resurrection of the idyll in a better form.

Endnotes

1 See Charlotte Bonica’s article “Nature and Paganism in Hardy’s Tess of the d’Urbervilles. She argues that Tess does not advocate paganism as a substitute for Christianity.
For another view on Hardy's moral ambivalence see Bernard J. Paris's "'A Confusion of Many Standards': Conflicting Value Systems in *Tess of the Durbervilles*.”

Bleikasten points out, "Lena is anything but a maenad. . . . There is not the faintest touch of the Dionysian in the evocation of her world. This Arcadia is utterly chaste" ("Praise" 135).

See Annette Kolodny's *The Land before Her*, p. 19-34 for a discussion of captivity narratives and the ambivalence toward the Native American manner of life.

Both Hardy and Glasgow were influenced by the philosophies of Schopenhauer. Writing of her search for theological or philosophical peace in "I Believe," Glasgow said, "The figure of the Compassionate One, whose mercy embraced all living things, regardless of race or tribe or species, seemed to fulfill that ancient Hindu invocation, which Schopenhauer considered the noblest of prayers, ‘May all that have life be delivered from suffering’" (234). *Vein of Iron* represents one of Glasgow's attempts to incorporate the philosophy of Schopenhauer. For a closer look at Schopenhauer's influence on Hardy see Jagdish Chandra Dave's *The Human Predicament in Hardy's Novels* and Mary Ann Kelly's "Hardy's Reading in Schopenhauer: *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*.”
CHAPTER 5
BATHSHEBA EVERDENE AND DORINDA OAKLEY:
INDEPENDENT WOMEN AND THE PASTORAL

Though Ellen Glasgow admired Thomas Hardy's treatment of female characters in his novels, she was troubled by one aspect of his portrayal of women:

With Meredith and Hardy, woman, for the first time in men's novels, drops her cloak of sentimentality and appears no less human and vital than does the source of her being. And yet even here the ancient tradition is not completely discarded, and these great writers, unlike in so much else, are alike at least in this—that they both appear, in many of their books, if not in all, to regard caprice as the ruling principle of woman's nature. . . . That a real Sue would have deserted the suffering Jude is almost unbelievable but caprice is probably the last quality that the masculine imagination will relinquish in its conception of woman; and certainly to make the womanly woman capricious is a pleasant change from the earlier fashion of making her insipid. ("Feminism" 30)

Glasgow's Virginia Pendleton was the insipid, womanly woman. In Vein of Iron and Barren Ground, Glasgow provided descriptions of strong, independent women. Characters such as Hardy's Bathsheba moved beyond the usual description of insipid female characters. Though characters such as Tess and Eustacia often display an unusual amount of courage, Hardy's portrayal of Bathsheba Everdene comes close to the portrayal of an independent woman. Nevertheless, Bathsheba's capriciousness still dominates, exemplified especially in the trouble that she causes by sending
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Boldwood the valentine. Far from the Madding Crowd and Barren Ground describe the efforts of two independent women farmers. These texts treat their attempts with an ambivalence that often accompanies the endeavors of women who face various versions of the pastoral idyll.

Far from the Madding Crowd: The Independent Woman Carnivalized

Of all Hardy's novels, perhaps the one that critics classify most frequently as pastoral is Far from the Madding Crowd. Hardy himself in a letter to Leslie Stephen said that the novel would be "a pastoral tale" and that "the characters would probably be a young woman-farmer, a shepherd, and a sergeant of cavalry" (Florence Hardy, Life 125). The title itself hints that this novel will have some connection with pastoral. The title is taken from a stanza in Thomas Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard," which deals with rural peasants who are praised because they live "Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife" and in "the cool sequester'd vale of life." Far from the Madding Crowd, with its descriptions of the natural world, utilizes many of these pastoral conventions, such as a bucolic existence insulated from the frenzied life of urban culture.
Pastoral allusions occur throughout the text. Susan Tall's husband is named Laban, recalling the father-in-law for whom the biblical Jacob worked as a shepherd. Boldwood talks about waiting for Bathsheba in the manner that Jacob had to work fourteen years for Rachel. Bathsheba is named after the biblical Bathsheba, who eventually married David, the shepherd-king of Israel.

The scenes of bucolic bliss and natural harmony find their strongest expression in chapter 12, entitled, "The Great Barn and the Sheep Shearers":

It was the first day of June, and the sheep-shearing season culminated, the landscape, even to the leanest pasture, being all health and colour. Every green was young, every pore was open, and every stalk was swollen with racing currents of juice. God was palpably present in the country, and the devil had gone with the world to town. (149)

Associating God with the idyllic aspects of rural life, while connecting the devil with city life recalls the title and Gray's poem.

Though pastoral allusions connected with the title multiply in some portions of the novel, the text subverts these descriptions of unalloyed harmony and happiness. The title contains a touch of irony, because the novel soon demonstrates that these rural characters are not "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife." The complications,
jealousies, failures, and disappointments that attend life in the city are present in this seemingly bucolic existence. The text removes the mask from nature itself to reveal its violence and cruelty. Toward the beginning of the novel, the narrator concludes his description of winter night in the country by observing, "Many a small bird went to bed supperless that night among the bare boughs" (25). Diseases among the sheep, fires, and storms combine to subvert the notion of a peaceful existence in harmony with nature. Though this novel uses many pastoral conventions, it sustains no unqualified description of nature's beneficence.

The text also subverts the expectation of a pastoral romance between Gabriel and Bathsheba, though they are thrown together in an idyllic setting at the beginning of the novel. Bathsheba seems suited to be a pastoral character. As she rides to her new farm she is surrounded with myrtles, geraniums, and cactuses (10). Not long after assuming responsibility for the farm, she holds a sheep-shearing supper for men she employs. William Empson calls such scenes "the trick of old pastoral," since they foster the illusion that lord, lady, and the poor exist in a symbiotic harmony. Bathsheba sits at the head of the
banquet table as a feudal lord who invites her workers to share in the bounty of her table. The communal tableau closely resembles Bakhtin's description of a carnival banquet where all class distinctions are done away with at the table. All classes sit at the table and share the same food. They eat and drink too much. Bathsheba, Boldwood, and the rustics sing at the end of the meal while Gabriel plays the flute. The narrator says that the scene recalls "the suppers in the early ages of the world" (166). The difference between this scene and Bakhtin's theory of the carnival banquet is that class distinctions are maintained at this table. Bathsheba actually sits inside the house, separated from the men. Gabriel is allowed to sit at the other end of the table until Boldwood arrives, then he must give up his place to one of a superior class.²

Although Bathsheba has characteristics that resemble a pastoral lady of the manor, the text undermines this image. The narrator remarks early on that she has the "woman's prescriptive infirmity" (10) which Gabriel Oak later explains to be "vanity" (12). The first description of Bathsheba includes a scene of her observing her own beauty in a mirror. She tells Gabriel she wouldn't mind being a bride if she "could be one without having a husband" (35).
She would just like to "show off" on her wedding day. One of the reasons she refuses Gabriel is that she has a better education and a larger farm (36). When she speaks to her hired workers, the narrator describes her superior language in the following manner: "When in the writing of the later poets, Jove and his family are found to have moved from their cramped quarters on the peak of Olympus into the wide sky above it, their words show a proportionate increase of arrogance and reserve" (85). The text demonstrates Bathsheba's pride particularly when she must ask Gabriel for help after she has fired him: "Who am I, then, to be treated like that? Shall I beg to a man who has begged to me?" (146). When Gabriel tries to warn her about Troy, she gets angry and reminds him, "I am mistress here!" (203).

Further complicating her pastoral role, the text describes her as a temptress. Of course, her very name "Bathsheba" corresponds to the wife of David. When David saw her bathing, he had her husband killed in order that he might have her. In Bathsheba Everdene's relationship with Boldwood, she is described as Eve: "Adam had awakened from his deep sleep, and behold! There was Eve. The farmer took courage, and for the first time really looked at her" (122). Boldwood, a confirmed bachelor, had been in a deep
sleep as far as women were concerned, but his passion for Bathsheba ultimately drives him from paradise.

The text also compares Bathsheba to the pharaoh who enslaved the people of Israel. After Bathsheba fires Gabriel, the narrator says that he "went away from her in placid dignity, as Moses left the presence of Pharaoh" (141). Moses, like Gabriel, was a shepherd. Bathsheba enslaves men, even pastoral shepherds, with her charms, thus further problematizing her status as a pastoral character. Perhaps one of the key questions in the novel is the one Gabriel asks Bathsheba after his misfortunes with his own farm, "Do you want a shepherd, ma'am?" (52). Bathsheba spends the rest of the novel trying to make up her mind about that question.

Bathsheba's character must be viewed with ambivalence, because she is a complicated, contradictory mixture of qualities. She wants to be an independent, woman farmer. She shows her independence from the beginning by telling her workers that she will have no bailiff, but will "manage everything with my own head and hands" (81). She does not like the idea of marriage because she says, "I hate to be thought men's property in that way--though possibly I shall be had some day" (34). Yet, one of the first descriptions
of her in the text is of her riding in a wagon beside a caged canary on "the perches of its prison" (10). While Bathsheba professes to be an independent woman, the book reveals that she is imprisoned by certain ideas, and even has a desire to be caged by men. She tells Gabriel, "I want someone to tame me: I am too independent" (36).

_Far from the Madding Crowd_ also treats Gabriel Oak as a pastoral character in the same ambivalent manner. He is described in terms of a pastoral shepherd. He has a flute and plays it frequently while others dance and sing. His name, "Oak," recalls Greek myths that associate Pan, the pastoral deity, with the oak (Kegel-Brinkgreve 81). In the corner of his hut he has a sheep crook (17). At times he has the meditative attitude of the shepherd, looking at the sky and appreciating its beauty (14, 17). In his proposal to Bathsheba he promises that if she would marry him he would play the flute for her in the evenings (34). The pastoral imagery around Gabriel multiplies as the narrator says that he plays his flute "with Arcadian sweetness" (45).

Though Gabriel is a shepherd, the text also undermines his status as a pastoral character. Though he plays the flute like Pan, the sounds that emanate from his instrument
sound "like nothing in nature" and "seem muffled in some way" (15). Furthermore, his flute playing makes his facial features seem unattractive. When some of the rustics inform him of his unusual facial contortions while he plays, he vows that he will never play the flute in front of Bathsheba for fear that she might find him unattractive (70). Although he is the pastoral shepherd who sings to his love, it makes him sexually unappealing. Even Gabriel has ambivalent feelings toward his own occupation as a shepherd: "A shadow in his life had always been that his flock ended in mutton--that a day came and found every shepherd an arrant traitor to his defenceless sheep" (41). While pastoral shepherds are usually thought of as at peace with themselves, Gabriel is haunted by guilt. Sometimes, a curious anger in his relationship to the sheep manifests itself. As Gabriel grows jealous of Boldwood he nicks the sheep in the groin. There can be little doubt that this is a symbol of sexual anger directed toward Bathsheba (155).

Though the text sometimes describes Gabriel as a pastoral lover, he is also portrayed as a capitalistic entrepreneur who thinks of love in terms of money and investments: "Love being an extremely exacting usurer . . .
every morning Oak’s feelings were as sensitive as the Money Market in calculations upon his chances” (29).

Far from the Madding Crowd further problematizes Gabriel’s status as pastoral shepherd by describing him as a Satanic observer. Throughout the text Gabriel is depicted as gazing at Bathsheba without her awareness. The first time he sees her his activity is described as “espial” (11). Later, he spies upon her when she is riding a horse in an unladylike fashion. Bathsheba does not know she was being watched, otherwise, she would not have assumed such a posture. When Bathsheba is in a shed, he views her by “putting his eye close to a hole” where he could see her clearly. His sight of her is called “a bird’s eye view, as Milton’s Satan first saw paradise” (18). Morgan remarks that when Gabriel spies upon Bathsheba as she is riding, it is Bathsheba who appears to be the sensual lover while Gabriel appears to be the Satanic figure who is waiting for the opportunity to destroy the pastoral bliss (45).

Although the text compares him to Satan, it treats him as devilish only in a carnivalized sense. As Bakhtin points out, in early grotesque imagery, the devil is not a bad fellow (Rabelais 41). The inconsistencies in Gabriel’s
character, fluctuating between saint and Satan cause ambivalent laughter. While Bathsheba seems annoyed by Gabriel's constant spying, the narrator also remarks, "Rays of male vision seem to have a tickling effect upon virgin faces in rural districts" (23).

Far from the Madding Crowd does not permit us to give our whole-hearted approval to any one character since they all have admirable and unpleasant characteristics. Gabriel's physical characteristics are described as "the middle line between the beauty of Saint John and the ugliness of Judas Iscariot as represented in a window of the church he attended" (11). Gabriel is an angel and a devil. The characters and events must be looked upon with the ambivalent humor of carnival. The characters are grotesque representations of biblical and mythological characters. Gabriel is described in terms of biblical characters who also evoke ambivalent response. Gabriel is compared to Samson (26), one of the most problematic characters in the Bible because he also has characteristics of the saint and sinner: the servant of God who destroys the Philistines, yet the rebellious son, and the lover of Delilah.
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The very names of the characters carry such ambivalent meanings that we are encouraged to look at the characters with a vague uncertainty. That Bible names and allusions do not always fit the people who bear them is shown in the story of Cain Ball who got his name because his mother thought that it was Abel who killed Cain (84). Likewise, "Gabriel" and "Bathsheba" may have some similarities to their Biblical namesakes, but one must be careful not to draw too many strict analogies.

The manner in which the text subverts its own biblical allusions is seen in a conversation between Troy and Bathsheba. When she tells him that she will not speak to him again, Troy replies, "I am soon going again to the miserable monotony of drill—and perhaps our regiment will be ordered out soon. And yet you take away the one little ewe-lamb of pleasure that I have in this dull life of mine" (185). Troy's remark is an interesting subversion of the story of David and Bathsheba. After David has Uriah the Hittite killed and takes Bathsheba for his wife, Nathan the prophet tells David a parable of a rich man who stole from a poor man the only lamb that he had. When David says that he will kill the man who did that, Nathan tells him, "Thou art the man." David could have had any woman in the
kingdom, but he had stooped to take possession of the wife of one of his subjects. Though Troy puts Bathsheba in the character of David, he is more like David than any other character in the novel. He is a well-known womanizer who could have had almost any woman that he wanted, including Fanny Robin whom he deserts though she is with child. He takes Bathsheba from Boldwood and Gabriel, who love only Bathsheba. All of these narrations, especially those dealing with sheep and biblical pastoral allusions contain so much ambiguity that an attitude of ambivalence must be maintained toward the text.

Furthermore, the narrator himself does not always appear to be trustworthy, undermining his narrative. Even after Bathsheba sends the Valentine to Boldwood, the action which causes so much of the novel’s later tragedy, the narrator says, “Bathsheba was no schemer for marriage, nor was she deliberately a trifler with the affections of men, and a censor’s experience on seeing an actual flirt after observing her would have been a feeling of surprise that Bathsheba could be so different from such a one, and yet so like what a flirt is supposed to be” (129). The reader must view Bathsheba is terms of a contradiction. She is a flirt and not a flirt.
The key feature of grotesque realism according to Bakhtin is incompleteness or transformation (Rabelais 32). All of the characters in this novel are in a sense, grotesque, because they are composites of so many different ideologies. They are still evolving and transforming.

One of the most provocative grotesque images in *Far from the Madding Crowd* is the description of the technique used by a shepherd to get a ewe to "take" a lamb that is not her own. After one of Bathsheba's lambs dies, Gabriel skins it and puts its hide on another lamb so that the ewe will take it for its own. The skin of the dead lamb would remain on it until the mother had fully accepted it. This grotesque image of the sheep wearing the dead skin of another illustrates the grotesque principle of death being transformed into life, what Bakhtin calls "a pregnant death" (Rabelais 25). The lamb is transformed into the offspring of the ewe who has none. Gabriel is in this process of transformation, waiting until Bathsheba will accept him. Boldwood and Troy both have to be "skinned" before she accepts him, but she eventually "takes" to him.

These features of grotesque realism in *Far from the Madding Crowd* encourage an ambivalent laughter toward the characters and events. A very important statement in the
early pages of the novel reads "With an air between that of Tragedy and Comedy Gabriel returned to his work" (24). The entire novel treads that delicate balance between tragedy and comedy. The narrative tone, even in the more tragic parts of the novel, very often maintains an atmosphere of comedy.

One of the most tragic events in the novel is the description of the dog, called "George's son," who ruins Gabriel financially by running his sheep off a cliff. Gabriel shoots the dog afterward because the dog had done his job too well. Since the dog was rewarded for chasing sheep, he thought chasing them more was good. Hardy uses the dog's actions as a point to make about philosophy and, perhaps, literary criticism:

George's son had done his work so thoroughly that he was considered too good a workman to live—and was, in fact, taken and tragically shot at twelve o'clock that same day—another instance of the untoward fate which so often attends dogs and other philosophers who follow out a train of thought to its logical conclusion, and attempt perfectly consistent conduct in a world made up so largely of compromise. (42)

Far from the Madding Crowd has often been subjected to this same kind of tendency to reach consistent conclusions about its meaning. Hardy's tone toward the actions of dogs and philosophers should be considered in interpreting his novels as well. Events and characters are too complicated,
too compromised to make firm judgments. These complicated, inconsistent, compromising characters become the subject of ambivalent laughter. Though the narrator uses the word "tragically" to describe the killing of George's son, the whole tone of the paragraph is comic.

The word "pastoral" is used several times in this novel in a way that encourages ambivalent laughter. It is used in conjunction with other words and themes which seem inconsistent. The chapter in which Gabriel loses his farm because of the death of his sheep is entitled: "Departure of Bathsheba: A Pastoral Tragedy." The words "pastoral" and "tragedy" seem incompatible, especially in the light of the narration that follows. Although the chapter describes the death of the sheep through the dog, George's son, the whole chapter is told in a humorous mode. The description of George's previous owner as a cursing drunkard is handled in a light-hearted manner. The portrayal of George's son is told in a humorous comparison of father and son. After the description of the dogs, the narrative says, "Thus much for the dogs." The novel then proceeds to relate the tragedy which is also handled in the same humorous manner.

Another example of this word "pastoral" being used in an odd manner is the account of Gabriel's reaction to the
loss of his farm. The narrator says, "He had sunk from his modest elevation as pastoral king into the very slime-pits of Siddim" (43). The term "pastoral king" seems to be an oxymoron since in most versions of pastoral, the shepherd is a humble person without material wealth or power. A king has too many worries and concerns to fit in the pastoral environment. One of the key features of carnival humor is the crowning and decrowning of the carnival king (Bakhtin, Rabelais 372, 380). The very term "pastoral king" encourages laughter. The text has already described Gabriel's "tragedy" with the comic descriptions of the dog, George's son. Gabriel is decrowned by this pastoral tragedy. The rest of the novel describes how he remains in this condition until his fortunes reverse themselves. At the end of a long process of carnivalesque narrative, Gabriel is recrowned as the pastoral king of Weatherbury.

The first time the word "pastoral" is used the novel employs the term to describe the thoughts of a dog concerning pastoral. As Gabriel and his dog, George, are on their way to make a call on Bathsheba, the narrator writes that George was "walking behind with a countenance of great concern at the serious turn pastoral affairs seemed to be taking" (30). This initial use of the term
hints that these "serious affairs" in the text should not be taken too seriously. George the dog seems to know that a pastoral life should not be taken up with grim and intense matters. For George, the version of pastoral to which he is accustomed does not include great matters. This ironic tone toward the pastoral is sustained throughout the novel.

George the dog also carnivalizes Gabriel's behavior toward Bathsheba. Gabriel recognizes that he waits for Bathsheba the way a dog waits for its food. Gabriel's realization that he resembles a dog "felt it lowering, and would not look at the dog" (29). The point of carnival humor is to degrade and lower in just this fashion.

Although it is easy to look at Far from the Madding Crowd in terms of pastoral romance, this carnivalesque humor subverts the pastoral idyll. For example, when Gabriel looks for an excuse to visit Bathsheba, "he found his opportunity in the death of a ewe" (30). It is odd that this shepherd who is supposed to care for the sheep, is actually happy that one of the sheep has died so that he might further his romantic claims. In a carnivalesque fashion, we laugh at the "sincere" shepherd who uses death as an opportunity for love-making.
As in other Hardy novels, the chief voices that carnivalize the pretensions of other characters are the rustics, such as Joseph Poorgrass, Billy Smallbury, Jan Coggan, and Laban Tall. When these men discover that Bathsheba's ricks are burning, they display the folkloric traits of carnival:

"O, man--fire, fire! A good master and a bad servant is fire, fire!--I mean a bad servant and a good master: O Mark Clark--come! And you Billy Smallbury--and you Maryann Money--and you Jan Coggan, and Matthew there!" Other figures now appeared behind this shouting man and among the smoke, and Gabriel found that far from being alone he was in a great company--whose shadows danced merrily up and down, timed by the jigging of the flames, and not at all by their owners' movements. The assemblage--belonging to that class of society which casts its thoughts into the form of feeling, and its feelings into the form of commotion--set to work with a remarkable confusion of purpose. (49)

This portrayal contains many of the aspects of carnival humor. Though there is a fire where precious property is being burned, in the midst of the emergency the character calling for help takes the time to quote an old saying (even trying to correct himself) about fire being a bad master. Furthermore, the shapes of the rustics are said to "dance merrily." As we have seen in our study of The Return of the Native, one of the most common carnivalesque, regenerative images is fire. Even though this is a very serious moment, this scene, like so much of the novel is
carnivalized by the speech and actions of the rustic characters.

Their comments concerning Gabriel Oak and Bathsheba Everdene continually lower and degrade their idealistic class pretensions. One of the features of carnival humor is juxtaposing the sacred and vulgar, the high and the low, the official and unofficial. When the rustics hear of Bathsheba's new piano, one of them says, "And 'a can play the peanner, so 'tis said. Can play so clever that 'a can make a psalm tune sound as well as the merriest loose song a man can wish for" (47). Describing Bathsheba as someone who plays a psalm like a vulgar, secular song is a means of degrading both Bathsheba and the religious tune.

Henry Fray, one of the rustics, mocks the pretensions of the rich in wanting to add rooms to their houses:

Then the next thing 'twill be as 'tis always with these toppermost farmers as they grow grand; the parlour will have to be a drawing room, the kitchen must then forsooth be a parlour. The wash-house is wanted then for the kitchen, and the pigs-styes turned into a wash-house. Then says they to the landlord, if ye'll believe me my poor pigs haven't a roof between their heads and the sky, and 'tis shameful of ye! Up springs a row of outhouses. (110)

The pairing of the pigs-styes with the wash-houses is a way of bringing low even the homes of the farmers, their employers.
The text demonstrates the carnival humor toward such serious matters as when Joseph Poorgrass goes to get the bodies of Fanny Robin and her baby. On the way back, he stops his wagon at an inn and proceeds to get drunk. Gabriel Oak, incensed by his behavior says, "As for you Joseph, who do your wicked deeds in such confoundedly holy ways, you are as drunk as you can stand" (298). Doing wicked deeds in such confoundedly holy ways is the essence of carnival humor. Gabriel tells Poorgrass that he should be a man of spirit. Poorgrass protests, but finally says, "Well, let it pass by; and death is a kind friend" (299). In carnival humor, death is a friend that generates life.

In typical carnivalesque humor, the rustics use religious terminology even in their drinking escapades. The vessel which they drink from is called a "God-forgive-me," since a person would usually be so drunk after drinking from such a vessel that he would have to ask for God's pardoning grace. Thus, drunkenness and religious faith are combined in a carnivalesque manner even in the name for the vessel.

Gabriel understands that the conversations of the rustics are demeaning to him and Bathsheba. After hearing one of their conversations about Bathsheba's parents,
Gabriel says, "Good Lord, you do talk" (67). Later, when the conversations concern him and Bathsheba personally, he becomes more violent in his condemnation of their language. He knows that they are lowering him just as George the dog does.

After Gabriel thinks that he has lost Bathsheba to Boldwood, one of the rustics, Mark Clark gives Gabriel the advice that seems to be the advice of the narrator to the reader: "Never mind, heart! . . . You should take it careless-like, Shepherd" (69). Gabriel is taking matters far too seriously. The rustics are able to take such developments in life without worrying about them. The reader should also look at the events in the novel in that same "careless" fashion, realizing that the events are part of the carnival humor.

The person who can interpret life only in a serious manner is exemplified by Farmer Boldwood:

Stern in the outlines of action, mild in the details he was serious throughout all. He saw no absurd sides to the follies of life, and thus, though not quite companionable in the eyes of merry men and scoffers, and those to whom all things show life as a jest, he was not intolerable to the earnest and those acquainted with grief. Being a man who read all the dramas of life seriously, if he failed to please when they were comedies, there was no frivolous treatment to reproach him for when they chanced to end tragically. (126)
Boldwood is exactly the opposite of the rustics who have the ability not only to enjoy comedy, but to laugh at the absurd nature of even life's most devastating tragedies. The carnival humor of the rustics, in its grotesque realism, reveals the comic even in the tragic. Boldwood "read all the dramas of life seriously." The text suggests that as we read the text of Far from the Madding Crowd, we should not make the same mistake as Boldwood.

Hardy also employs architecture as an agent of grotesque realism to degrade hypocritical pretensions. After Troy realizes that Fanny Robin and her child have died, he feels guilty about his desertion. To try to atone in some way for what he had done, he goes to Fanny's grave and plants flowers around it. After his act of penance, he comes in contact with the grotesque which degrades his hypocrisy and pious actions. Just above Fanny's grave is what the narrator calls "a gargoyle." The narrator remarks, "It has been sometimes argued that there is no truer criterion of the vitality of any given art-period than the power of the master-spirits of that time in grotesque" (325). Though Hardy's view of the grotesque may not be identical to Bakhtin's, the grotesque gargoyle
provides the same function as Bakhtin's theory of the
grotesque. This gargoyle was

too human to be called like a dragon, too impish to be
like a man, too animal to be like a fiend, and not
enough like a bird to be called a griffin. This
horrible stone entity was fashioned as if covered with
a wrinkled hide, it had short erect ears, eyes
starting from their sockets, and its fingers and hands
were seizing the corners of its mouth, which they thus
seemed to pull open to give free passage to the water
it vomited. The lower row of teeth was quite washed
away, though the upper still remained. Here and thus,
jutting from the wall against which its toes rested as
a support, the creature had for four hundred years
laughed at the surrounding landscape voicelessly in
dry weather, and, in wet, with a gurgling and snorting
sound. (326)

Bakhtin writes of how similar grotesque images have filled
literature and painting since classical antiquity. These
gargoyles, being a common feature of the grotesque, were
especially prominent on cathedrals built in medieval times.
The gargoyle in Far from the Madding Crowd resembles that
description of the grotesque given by Bakhtin as

the extremely fanciful, free, and playful treatment of
plant, animal, and human forms. These forms seemed to
be interwoven as if giving birth to each other. The
borderlines that divide the kingdoms of nature in the
usual picture of the world were boldly infringed.
Neither was there the usual static presentation of
reality. There was no longer the movement of finished
forms, vegetable or animal, in a finished and stable
world; instead the inner movement of being itself was
expressed in the passing of one form into another, in
the ever incompletely character of being. (Rabelais
32)
The instability of grotesque forms and the "incompleted" character of this gargoyle which had perched there since medieval times was human, dragon, imp, fiend, bird, and griffin. Yet, it was in such a process of transformation between each of these beings that it could be classified as none of them. This grotesque image vomits on Troy's actions.

After Troy plants these flowers, rain pours from the gargoyle's mouth washing away the flowers from Fanny's grave. Just as the gargoyle has been laughing at all the pretensions, follies, and tragedies of men for four hundred years, it degrades Troy's sudden moral reformation.

Toward the end of the novel, the carnivalesque humor is directed toward Bathsheba herself as her pretensions of being an independent woman farmer are degraded. Some critics have seen Hardy as hinting that woman cannot be successful or fulfilled as an independent woman, thus she has to be married to Gabriel at the end of the novel. When Bathsheba goes to the corn-market at Casterbridge, the narrator remarks: "This Saturday's debut in the forum, whatever it may have been to Bathsheba as the buying and selling farmer, was unquestionably a triumph to her as a maiden" (95). In other words, the men were merely
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interested in her as a sexual object. Dorinda Oakley will try to escape this objectification by the male gaze when she succeeds in becoming an independent woman farmer. Bathsheba equates this male gaze at the market with marriage. She tells Liddy, "I shan't mind it again, for they will all have grown accustomed to seeing me there. But this morning it was as bad as being married: eyes everywhere!" (96). Bathsheba, in some ways, longs to escape these confining stares.

Though Bathsheba is a successful farmer, the text does not seem content to leave her as such. When Bathsheba contemplates marriage, Henry Fray, one of the rustics muses, "I don't see why a maid should take a husband when she's bold enough to fight her own battles, and don't want a home; fir 'tis keeping another woman out" (156). Dorinda Oakley will exemplify the independent woman who sees no need to take a husband. Bathsheba, on the other hand, is portrayed as a woman, who either for financial or emotional reasons, succumbs to the custom of marriage.

If Gabriel had been a pastoral king, then it appears that Bathsheba, through being a successful woman farmer has become a pastoral queen. The rest of the novel emphasizes her decrowning and recrowning.
The text employs Troy as the instrument of carnival humor that dethrones Bathsheba as pastoral queen. Bathsheba has come with her flock of sheep to the Greenhill sheep fair. Bakhtin discusses the importance of fairs in carnival humor:

Nearly every Church feast had its comic folk aspect, which was also traditionally recognized. Such, for instance, were the parish feasts, usually marked by fairs and varied open-air amusements, with the participation of giants, dwarfs, monsters and trained animals. (Rabelais 5)

In typical carnival fashion, the Greenhill Fair has a circus. Troy, after leaving Bathsheba, has become a member of that touring circus and becomes an actor. There could be no more lowering kind of humor to Bathsheba than learning that her supposedly dead husband was performing before her in a circus act. When Troy sees Bathsheba sitting in the crowd, the narrator describes her as "on high . . . sitting as queen of the tournament" (354). For him to expose his identity would be a decrowning of the queen. Pennyways, the bailiff that Bathsheba had fired, recognizes Troy and wants to humiliate her. He writes her a note saying, "Your husband is here. I've seen him. Who's the fool now?" (359). Though Troy swipes the note before Bathsheba can read it, the narrator has succeeded in carnivalizing Bathsheba's position as pastoral queen.
Though Bathsheba is quite successful, Gabriel makes it plain that she could not run the farm without him: "How would the farm go on with nobody to mind it but a woman?" (203). Though the text gives Bathsheba a measure of independence, it is pretty clear that Bathsheba needs, if not a husband, at least a man. When Gabriel threatens to go to America, Bathsheba is bewildered too by the prospect of having to rely on her own resources again: it seemed to herself that she never could again acquire energy sufficient to go to market, barter, and sell. Since Troy’s death Oak had attended at the same time with his own. What should she do now! Her life was becoming a desolation. (405-6)

At the end of the novel, Bathsheba realizes that she needs Gabriel. Since he threatens to go to America, she agrees to marry him. Many critics have referred to this as a bourgeois compromise, indicating a patriarchal view that women cannot be successful without a man. So, as Morgan writes, Bathsheba is "conjured back to life, 'revived' and married off" (Morgan 53). Others have seen this as a tragedy of diminished expectations since Bathsheba doesn’t really seem to love Gabriel as much as she needs his help on the farm. Others see it as a genuinely happy ending where Gabriel and Bathsheba finally find a lasting kind of love.
The description of Bathsheba and Gabriel's relationship sounds similar to that of Ralph McBride and Ada Fincastle. The narrator says that Gabriel and Bathsheba spoke very little of their mutual feeling: pretty phrases and warm expressions being probably unnecessary between such tried friends. Theirs was that substantial affection which arises (if it arise at all) when the two who are thrown together begin by knowing the rougher sides of each other's character, and not the best till further on, the romance growing up in the interstices of a mass of hard prosaic reality. This good-fellowship--camaraderie, usually occurring through similarity of pursuits, is unfortunately seldom superadded to love between the sexes, because men and women associate not in their labours but in their pleasures merely. Where however happy circumstance permits its development the compounded feeling proves itself to be the only love which is strong as death--that love which many waters cannot quench, nor the floods drown, beside which the passion usually called by the name is evanescent as steam. (409)

Hardy and Glasgow both seem to indicate that passionate love and romance is something that has to be set aside. Gabriel and Bathsheba's love is based on friendship and shared work. In the final analysis, Gabriel and Bathsheba can marry because Gabriel's business is better. Thus Hardy moved the pastoral from a sexual or romantic idyll to the bliss of shared labor between a man and woman.

One should be wary of accepting Bathsheba's marriage to Gabriel as the end of her difficulties, since throughout
the novel, her relationships with men only complicate her life. Far from being a solution to her problems, men are presented throughout this novel as dangers to Bathsheba. While it may appear that Bathsheba cannot be successful as an independent woman farmer without the help of a man, we must remember that Bathsheba does well until she marries. Marriage to Troy, for example, threatens independence and her success.

Though the narrator describes the kind of love that Gabriel and Bathsheba have for one another as that kind that "many waters cannot quench," the text encourages us to look at even this new relationship with ambivalent laughter. The rustics are present at the home of the newly married characters, and, typically Hardy gives them the last word. Though Bathsheba and Gabriel are finally married, the rustics carnivalize their happiness. In Far from the Madding Crowd, the rustics, as usual have the last word, or, in this case, the last laugh. In the eyes of the rustics, Gabriel is still a man of spirit and this marriage is rather foolish. When Gabriel refers to Bathsheba as "my wife" they laugh about how naturally those words seemed to come to him. Then they laugh at him by saying he should have said the words "chillier," but assured him that time
would take care of that. In other words, the rustics already are bringing low the marital happiness of the couple.

The last words of the novel are given to Joseph Poorgrass who says, "I wish him joy o'her; though I were once or twice upon saying to-day with holy Hosea in my Scripture manner which is my second-nature, 'Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone.' But since 'tis as 'tis, why it might have been worse, and I feel my thanks accordingly" (414). Poorgrass is quoting Hosea 4:17. In that verse, God is expressing the attitude that He has been patient with the people of Ephraim long enough. He has been calling them to repentance, but they will not listen, so he will no longer appeal to them. Poorgrass believes that Bathsheba is Gabriel's idol, and there is nothing that can be done for him now that they have married, so people should leave him alone. While Poorgrass is not convinced that they are happy, he is thankful because it could have been worse. His words add the final touch of ambivalence toward the marriage of Gabriel and Bathsheba. They have been crowned the king and queen of pastoral once again. We are not sure how happy they are, or will be, but we can
join in ambivalent laughter at the process of their decrowning and recrowning.

Barren Ground: A Pastoral of Feminine Independence

While Hardy and Glasgow appear to agree concerning the dangers of sexual passion and the value of shared work, Glasgow takes her vision of the pastoral a step further. While it does not appear that Hardy could envision a pastoral life for the woman apart from a man, the new pastoral environment envisioned by women like Ellen Glasgow will feature women who are independent.

For Glasgow, the model of the future pastoral is especially different. The new pastoral would be filled with women finding an idyllic existence in a world of work. This labor and action would not be foreign to the pastoral world. Even in Milton's description of pastoral paradise before the Fall, there was labor in the Garden, but it was not attended by any of the curses. The labor envisioned by many women would be free from exploitation and oppression.

In the opening pages of Barren Ground, the stage is set for a new kind of pastoral with women in the foreground: "The old men stayed by the farms, and their daughters withered dutifully beside them; but the sons of
the good people drifted away to the city, where they assumed control of democracy as well as of the political machine which has made democracy safe for politics" (5). These daughters who wither dutifully will be replaced by daughters such as Dorinda Oakley who rescue the land. The males have gone to the city, but the females remain on the land and bring forth a new pastoral. This pastoral has some affinity with the pastoral versions that have come before it. Tonnette Bond writes:

The old vision of a lost Arcadian South harbored by Dorinda's ancestors is part of Dorinda's imaginative inheritance. . . . In telling us Dorinda's story, Glasgow shows that the ancient pastoral dream of a humanized nature is still potent in its power to reconcile the mind to life in the fallen world. Dorinda has internalized her forbears' vision of a lost Southern Arcadia and to the task of giving reality and permanence to that dream she dedicates her full creative powers. (566)

The similarities between *Barren Ground* and *Far from the Madding Crowd* are quite noticeable. Tuttleton notes that Dorinda is a "composite" of many Hardy characters: "Dorinda becomes the woman farmer like Tess; the agricultural manager, like Bathsheba Everdene. To the backwater district she, like Donald Farfrae in *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, brings modern farming methods" (589). The resemblance of the names "Gabriel Oak" and "Dorinda Oakley" suggest that Glasgow was commenting upon a novel by one of.
her favorite writers. The two heroines, Bathsheba Everdene and Dorinda Oakley, are both independent women farmers. Both have unhappy love affairs. Both think of marriage in terms of its economic benefits. While it seems that *Barren Ground* will end exactly as *Far from the Madding Crowd*, with the independent woman farmer marrying a man whom she does not really love in order to help secure a financial future, Dorinda Oakley experiences the death of her husband and decides that in the future she will work her farm independently. Dorinda Oakley escapes Bathsheba's fear of being man's property, by becoming the master of property herself. In her new independence, Dorinda declares, "We don't need a man. . . . If I couldn't do better than men about here, I'd be a mighty poor farmer" (302). As a matter of fact, she makes men dependent upon her. After she returns from New York to Pedlar's Mill, she talks to Nathan Pedlar and thinks, "He was as dull probably as he had ever been; but his dullness had ceased now to bore her. 'I'll find him useful, anyhow,' she thought" (275). Dorinda achieves the kind of admiration from men that Bathsheba Everdene seeks. She takes great pride in knowing that men admire her not because of the sexual aspect, but because she is now a woman with power: "He was looking at
her now with keen, impersonal admiration. Just as if she had been a man, she thought with a glow of triumph. . . . Already he had forgotten the momentary physical appeal she had made to him in the beginning; and she felt that his respect for her was based upon what he believed to be her character" (292). When Dorinda reaches age fifty, she thinks:

Since the emotional disaster of her youth, she had been incapable of either loving or hating without a caustic reservation; and she felt that the hidden flaw in her relations with men was her inability to treat a delusion of superiority as if it were a moral principle. This was a small indulgence, she imagined to a woman who loved passionately; but to one who had safely finished with love and attained the calm judgment of the disillusioned, it was indulgence which might prove to be particularly irksome. (490)

In her youth, Dorinda Oakley is another one of Glasgow's hopeful, idealistic, young women with "April charm in her face" (10). Like so many of Glasgow's female characters, Dorinda dreams of a great love who will fulfill her life: "Love! That was the end of all striving for her healthy nerves, her vigorous youth, the crown and the fulfilment of life! At twenty, a future without love appeared to her as intolerable as the slow martyrdom of her mother" (59). After seeing Jason Greylock, she places all of her hopes for future happiness in a romantic life spent with him: "To-day the miracle had occurred, and the whole of life
had blossomed out like a flower in the sun. She had found romance" (12). But Dorinda recognizes from the very beginning, that these feelings of love will not last. The "April flush" of love seems to enlighten the bleak land itself, and yet, "beautiful as it was, it seemed to be vanishing, like a beam of light, in the very moment when she felt it flooding her heart. Yet this sense of unreality, of elusiveness, made it more precious" (13).

Though she realizes that some of her ideas about love are illusive, she fantasizes about Jason. Even as her friend, Rose Emily, approaches death, Dorinda's mind is not with her, but "miles away in an enclosed garden of wonder and delight" (22).

Like most of the other men in Glasgow's novels, Jason Greylock is indecisive and easily manipulated. Jason left the rural world of Pedlar's Mill and went to the city for education. When he returns, he has "the thin veneer of the city" (13). Rose Emily says that Jason "has picked up a lot of new-fangled ideas. . . . He even called broomsedge 'bromegrass' till he found that nobody knew what he was talking about" (25). Jason, like Clym Yeobright and Grace Melbury, comes back from the city unsuited for the land. Like Clym Yeobright, Jason returns to educate the rural
poor, but finds that "nobody seems to ask any more of life than to plod from one bad harvest to another" (31). Old Matthew Fairlamb knew that Jason was "a bit too soft to stand the hard wear of these here roads" (16). Even Jason admits that he has always been "balked or bullied out of having what I wanted in life" (65). He eventually marries Geneva Ellgood after proposing to Dorinda, because he cannot stand up to his father or Geneva's brother.

Although Dorinda falls in love with a man who hates the landscape of Pedlar's Mill, she lives in harmony with the landscape. The land in Barren Ground is almost as bleak as Hardy's Egdon Heath. The narrator describes it as "bare, starved, desolate" (3). This land is dominated by broomsedge, and the broomsedge becomes a living, breathing character in this novel. As Tuttleton remarks, "The resemblance between the sinister encroaching fields of broomsedge in Barren Ground and the furze of Hardy's Egdon Heath in The Return of the Native is more than coincidental" (583). In spite of its bleakness and barrenness, Dorinda feels at one with this land. Whereas Eustacia Vye hated the bleak landscape of Egdon Heath, Dorinda feels her life to be intertwined with the land around Pedlar's Mill: "There were moments when it seemed to
her that her inner life was merely a hidden field in the
landscape, neglected, monotonous, abandoned to solitude,
and yet with a smothered fire, like the wild grass, running
through it" (12). Even when Jason expresses his hatred of
the land, she affirms to him that though she used to listen
for the trains she hoped would one day take her away, she
is now used to the land.

As in most pastoral novels, the landscape often
reflects the feelings of the characters and corresponds to
their seasons of life. After Jason proposes to Dorinda,
the bleak world of nature at Pedlar's Mill is transformed
in her eyes:

In May and June, for a brief season between winter
desolation and summer drought, the starved land
flushed into loveliness. Honey-coloured sunlight.
The notes of a hundred birds. A roving sweetness of
wild grapes in the air. To Dorinda, whose happiness
had come so suddenly that her imagination was still
spinning from the surprise of it, the flowerlike blue
of the sky, the songs of birds, and the elusive scent
of the wild grape, all seemed to be a part of that
rich inner world, with its passionate expectancy and
its sense of life burning upward. They were to be
married in the autumn. (108)

Although the spring promises the hope of married bliss, the
marriage is not to take place until the autumn, when things
begin to die.

Once again, the illusion of love deceives Glasgow's
heroine. After she and Jason are engaged, Dorinda thinks,
"For three months she had lived in a state of bliss so supreme that, like love, it had created the illusion of its own immortality. Yes, for three months she had been perfectly happy" (137).

All of Glasgow's women have to learn by experience the delusive nature of the romantic pastoral. Harrison writes, "For society, and for women especially, the consequences of sexuality--disguised as 'romance' in the typical plot complications of the pastoral--can be devastating" (38). Geneva Ellgood, who eventually marries Jason Greylock, spends the rest of her life trying to convince everyone that she and Jason are "blissfully happy" even though she is so miserable with Jason she finally drowns herself.

Like other characters in Glasgow and Hardy, Dorinda grows up reading romance novels, especially the historical fiction of Sir Walter Scott (42). These women find it difficult to see through the promise of romance. Virginia Pendleton sees through it, but she can never redefine herself. Dorinda Oakley does. Like other female characters such as Ada Fincastle, Dorinda must learn by experience how false romantic delusions are. Lectures and past examples cannot cause them to abandon idealistic notions.
The aged women know the truth about romance and marriage. Mrs. Oakley, Dorinda's mother, had given herself completely to her children "after the first disillusionment of her marriage" (44). She tries to help Dorinda see the illusive quality of romance and marriage. As Mrs. Oakley tells Dorinda:

I've got nothing to say against marriage, of course . . . . Marriage is the Lord's own institution, and I s'pose it's a good thing as far as it goes. Only, . . . it ain't ever going as far as most women try to make it. You'll be all right married, daughter, if you just make up your mind that whatever happens, you ain't going to let any man spoil your life. (106)

Dorinda tries to believe her mother's wisdom for a while. She tries to draw strength from her female ancestors: "Yes, whatever happened, she resolved passionately, no man was to spoil her life! She could live without Jason; she could live without any man" (107). But soon, Jason comes back into her life. They become engaged, but he marries Geneva Ellgood instead. When Dorinda realizes that Jason has jilted her for Geneva, the narrator remarks, "And while life fought its way into her, something else went out of her for ever--youth, hope, love--and the going was agony" (159). Only the reality of mistreatment at the hands of her lover can destroy the pastoral dream.
Dorinda's mother tells her that she comes from a long line of women who were passionately in love with men, but grew out of it. Dorinda's great aunt had tried to commit suicide because of an unhappy love affair, but she lived to be a wise old woman of ninety. Another of her aunts had to be sent to a mental institution because she fell in love with someone, but she recovered her senses and became a missionary (105). When Dorinda asks her mother why the women in their family have so much difficulty in these relationships with men, Dorinda's mother replies:

It's nature, I reckon. . . . Grandfather used to say that when a woman got ready to fall in love the man didn't matter, because she could drape her feeling over a scarecrow and pretend he was handsome. But, being a man, I s'pose he had his own way of looking at it; and if it's woman's nature to take it too hard, it's just as much the nature of man to take it too easy. The way I've worked it out is that with most women, when it seems pure foolishness, it ain't really that. It's just the struggle to get away from things as they are. (105)

If women allow romance to delude them, it is because they accept the masculine way of looking at love and happiness. Dorinda's mother doesn't really accept the male idea that "it's nature." She sees their embracing of the romantic pastoral as a way of escaping things as they are. The women soon find out, however, that they have not escaped at all, but rather suffer severe consequences for embracing
the masculine plot. When Dorinda thinks that she is going to marry Jason, the narrator says, "She had found happiness, not by seeking it, but by running away from it" (108). Those words are almost identical to the words used to describe Mrs. Pendleton in *Virginia*. Yet, this happiness for Dorinda, and other women, is only fleeting, because the happiness that eventually comes is still based on the masculine plot. After Jason jilts Dorinda, she determines that she will never again try to escape reality by such illusive fantasies as romance:

All her trouble, she felt, had come to her from trying to make life over into something it was not. Dreams, that was the danger. Like her mother she had tried to find a door in the wall, an escape from the tyranny of things as they are; and like her mother, she had floundered among visions. Even though she was miserable now, her misery was solid ground; her feet were firmly planted among the ancient rocks of experience. She had finished with romance, as she had finished with Jason, for ever (187).

Dorinda realizes now that there is no escape from reality. Imagination is an enemy for it fosters dreams of romantic happiness. From her youth, Dorinda has this nagging sense of discontent that she was for ever approaching some magical occasion, and yet never quite reaching it. She was "for ever about to be satisfied, and yet never satisfied in the end" (98).
In this most dialogic of Glasgow's novels, we have access to Dorinda's consciousness perhaps more so than any other of Glasgow's characters. In that consciousness, we see Bakhtin's analysis of how characters are always on the verge of great truth, but never being able to finalize themselves or their characters. Writing of Dostoevsky's work, Bakhtin wrote:

Every thought of Dostoevsky's heroes . . . senses itself to be from the very beginning a rejoinder in an unfinalized dialogue. Such a thought is not impelled toward a well-rounded, finalized, systemically monologic whole. It lives a tense life on the borders of someone else's thought, someone else's consciousness. It is oriented toward an event in its own special way and is inseparable from a person. (Dialogic 32)

In Barren Ground, Dorinda Oakley carries on a constant dialogue with herself, examining her life to find the source of her unhappiness and discontent. Dorinda carries on a dialogue with the ideologies of her Presbyterian heritage, romantic concepts of love, and her attitude toward the land. She asks herself the same questions time and again, always anticipating the answer, but she never arrives at a satisfying conclusion though she tries to convince herself that she has. Therefore, her consciousness is always filled with this tension of never being able to reconcile her own private ideologies within
herself or with other people. These attempts to redefine herself in the light of her mounting experience remain an unresolved tension.

Since the world destroyed by Jason's unfaithfulness was an illusion, she must face the task of redefining herself apart from these masculine illusions. Dorinda eventually comes to a totally different view of love, realizing with bitter disappointment that "nothing endured... If either her love or her hatred had lasted, she would have found less bitterness in the savour of life" (313).

Even before Glasgow wrote *Vein of Iron*, she was writing about this kind of endurance and fortitude in the character of Dorinda Oakley. In a sense *Barren Ground* written in 1925 was Glasgow's first *Vein of Iron*. Dorinda is an oak with a vein of iron. After she tries to kill Jason for marrying Geneva Ellgood, she realizes how weak and pitiful a person Jason actually is. At this point, she tries to develop a hardness in her character which will prevent her from ever being heartbroken again:

There were women she knew, who could love even when they hated; but she was not one of these. The vein of iron in her nature would never bend, would never break, would never melt completely in any furnace. "He is weak and a coward," she thought. "how could I love a coward?" (174)
From this point on she begins to think, "Yes, she was not broken. She could never be broken while the vein of iron held in her soul" (184). Toward the end of the novel, after she becomes successful on the farm, she thinks,

After all, it was not religion; it was not philosophy; it was nothing outside her own being that had delivered her from evil. The vein of iron which had supported her through adversity was merely the instinct older than herself, stronger than circumstances, deeper than the shifting surface of emotion; the instinct that had said, "I will not be broken" (474).

Glasgow uses the pastoral convention to show how Dorinda came to redefine herself and develop the vein of iron. Rather than finding peace in the pastoral world, Dorinda leaves the country; realizing that she is pregnant with Jason's baby, she decides to leave Pedlar's Mill and go to New York. She will not allow even an out-of-wedlock pregnancy to destroy her: "There was no self-pity in her thoughts. The unflinching Presbyterian in her blood steeled her against sentimentality. She would meet life standing and she would meet it with her eyes open" (202). Dorinda is the prototype of Ada Fincastle in *Vein of Iron*. Like Ada, Dorinda has the strong Calvinistic blood which gives her the ability to survive:

Her passionate revolt from the inertia of the land had permeated the simplest details of living. The qualities with which she had triumphed over the
abandoned fields were the virtues of the pioneers who had triumphed over life. . . . Then the thought came to her that, if her parents had been denied material gifts, they had possessed a spiritual luxury which she herself had never attained. She had inherited, she realized, the religious habit of mind without the religious heart; for the instinct of piety had worn too thin to cover the generations. . . . Firmness of purpose, independence of character, courage of living, these attributes, if they were not hers by inheritance, she had gleaned from those heavy furrows of her great-grandparent's sowing. "Once a Presbyterian, always a Presbyterian," her mother had said when she was dying. (422-3)

While not accepting the Presbyterian dogma, she has the Presbyterian ability to endure.

After an accident in New York, Dorinda loses the baby, but she begins to try to find some new meaning to life other than love. Dr. Farraday tells her, "Keep a stiff upper lip. . . . That's the only way to meet life. Keep a stiff upper lip" (217). Not the religion of her mother, but the self-independence of Dr. Farraday actually becomes her model to follow. She struggles to find meaning in her life without romance or religion. Earlier in her life she had tried to substitute romance for religion. When Jason speaks, she feels as she used to when she sang hymns such as "Jesus, Lover of My Soul" or "Nearer My God to Thee" (29). There had been a time in her life when Dorinda had experienced "grace" but she found that it did not satisfy (61). Throughout her life, she can never turn to religion
as a source of comfort and strength as her mother had done.

Her mother tells her, "There ain't but one way to stand
things. . . . There ain't but one thing that keeps you
going and keeps a farm going, and that is religion. If you
ain't got religion to lean back on, you'd just as well give
up trying to live in the country" (104). But Dorinda
replies, "I don't feel that way about religion. . . . I
want to be happy" (104). For Mrs. Oakley, religion
supplies the strength for endurance. But in her youth,
Dorinda doesn't want endurance. She wants happiness, and
she connects religion with unhappiness.

Not having religion to give her a purpose for
existence, Dorinda turns her thoughts to Pedlar's Mill.
After two years in New York, she decides that she will go
back to Old Farm and try to become an independent woman
farmer. Dorinda's new philosophy of life will simply be
"work." When Nathan warns her of the hard work of the
farm, Dorinda replies, "Oh, I don't mind work. What else
is there in life?" (294).

Though the landscape of Pedlar's Mill with its
depressing broomsgedge landscape once frightened Dorinda, it
calls her back. The land exerts a powerful force upon the
characters in this novel. While she is in New York,
Dorinda says, "... I can't stay away any longer. I'm part of it. I belong to the abandoned fields" (250). In another subversion of the traditional pastoral, Dorinda goes to the city, learns about farming, and comes back to the country to achieve oneness with the land. It is while she is in the city that she truly realizes her harmony with the land. Since childhood, Dorinda has felt that "the land contained a terrible force, whether for good or evil she could not tell, and there were hours when the loneliness seemed to rise in a crested wave and surge over her" (38). The broomsedge symbolizes loneliness, a loneliness which Dorinda tries to escape. In her youth, when she thinks of the desolation of the land, she reflects, "Worse than this even was the haunting thought that the solitude was alive, that it skulked then in the distance, like a beast that is waiting for the right moment to spring and devour" (58).

Dorinda eventually comes to the conclusion that she is one with the broomsedge:

All the light on the earth had vanished, except the faint glow that was still cast upward by the broomsedge. Wave by wave, that symbol of desolation encroached in a glimmering tide on the darkened boundaries of Old Farm. It was the one growth in the landscape that thrived on barrenness; the solitary life that possessed an inexhaustible vitality. To fight it was like fighting the wild, free principle of nature. Yet they had always fought it. They had spent their force for generations in the
futile endeavor to uproot it from the soil, as they had striven to uproot all that was wild and free in the spirit of man... While she stood there she was visited by a swift perception, which was less a thought than a feeling, and less a feeling than an intuitive recognition, that she and her parents were products of the soil as surely as were the scant crops and the exuberant broomsedge. Had not the land entered into their souls and shaped their moods into permanent or impermanent forms? (128)

Dorinda will always feel as desolate as the broomsedge, but she will continue to live just as it does. She has to learn to grow and flourish on barrenness. The theme for the title is expressed in one of Dorinda's thoughts about the broomsedge-covered landscape: "That's what life is for most people, I reckon," she thought drearily. "Just barren ground where they have to struggle to make anything grow" (196). "Barren ground" becomes the symbol for life in general. One should not expect happiness, but only the struggle to make something grow out of circumstances that life stacks up against people.

For the rest of her life, Dorinda refuses to have any kind of romantic or passionate relationship with a man. She agrees to marry Nathan Pedlar, but only as a means to help her manage the farm and acquire new property.

In order to avoid these complications she encountered with Jason Greylock, Dorinda marries Nathan with the understanding that there will be no passion, no sex between
them. Though she tells Nathan, "I couldn't stand any love-making" (373), he agrees to this arrangement: "Sex emotion, she repeated grimly was as dead as a burned out cinder in her heart. But respect she could still feel, and a marriage founded upon respect and expediency might offer an available refuge from loneliness" (373).

Some critics have suggested that the relationship between Gabriel Oak and Bathsheba Everdene was likely the same kind of relationship as existed between Dorinda and Nathan. Although we might presume that Gabriel and Bathsheba's relationship would not be entirely asexual, Glasgow carries this to the extreme of pointing out that the relationship between Nathan and Dorinda will not involve sex.

Dorinda was well-acquainted with Nathan Pedlar before their marriage. Dorinda had nursed Nathan's dying wife, Rose Emily. Even in those days, she found nothing attractive about Nathan. She thought of him as a "clown" (18), "an absurd man" (18). In the days of her youth, Dorinda wondered how Rose Emily had ever consented to marry him:

She had often wondered how Rose Emily could have married him. Poverty would have been happiness, she felt, compared with so prosaic a marriage; yet she
knew that, according to the standards of Pedlar's Mill, Nathan was an exceptional husband. (19)

Dorinda believes that it would be better to be a spinster like the Snead sisters than to marry a man as unattractive as Nathan (88). Yet, Dorinda will eventually consent to marry this same man. Nathan is a self-sacrificing man. Rose Emily says, "Nathan is the best man that ever lived. He never thinks of himself a minute" (23).

While these texts seem to advocate moving away from passion and sex to a kind of celibate existence within the married state, finding fulfillment in shared work, the texts in both Hardy and Glasgow seem to point to the unfulfilling nature of this kind of relationship between men and women. If friendship and shared work make the perfect relationship between men and women, then Giles Winterbourne and Marty South in The Woodlanders should have made the perfect couple.

Dorinda doesn't seem to want shared work, not with a man, at least. Soon after her marriage to Nathan Pedlar, he wants to help her, but she rejects his help: "For the first time she understood what work had meant in her mother's life; the flight of the mind from thought into action. To have Nathan hanging round her in the dairy was the last thing, she said to herself, that she had
anticipated in marriage" (381). Actually, she marries Nathan for economic reasons so that she can expand her farm by buying Jason Greylock's Five Oaks plantation: "Nathan was scarcely more than a superior hired man on the farm" (387).

After Nathan dies, Dorinda makes the next step: eliminating a relationship with a man altogether. Gail David writes, ". . . the marriage of the protagonist, insofar as marriage serves as an artifact of culture, suggests a possible (though not inevitable) capitulation to the norms of patriarchy" (xix). Glasgow tries to move away from the patriarchal solution to Dorinda's dilemma. Toward the end of the novel, shared work with a man seems to be abandoned for a vision of shared work with other women. Dorinda and Fluvanna, her black servant, will work the land. There was a foresight of this possibility in the opening pages of the novel when Dorinda looks at the farm owned by three single women:

Beyond the old Haney place and the stretch of pines there were the pastures of Honeycomb Farm, where three old maids, Miss Texanna Snead, the postmistress, and her sisters Seena and Tabitha, who made dresses, lived on the ragged remnant of once fertile acres. Recently the younger brother William had returned from the West with a little property, and though the fortunes of the sisters were by no means affluent, the fields by the roadside were beginning to look less forlorn. (28)
But even in this example, a male rescuer was necessary in order to make the land start to look better.

For Glasgow, the future pastoral woman will be much like the pioneers described in *Vein of Iron*—hard, unlovable, and heroic. In the place of ecstatic romance, women, such as Dorinda Oakley find "compensation for this lost sexuality" (Harrison 31) in working the land.

Harrison also goes so far as to say that

the land here clearly does not substitute for or become a male presence; it is not gendered. Dorinda's fulfillment comes from work, and her erotic relationship with the land suggests another possibility for the female protagonist—as for the male hero, romance becomes secondary to the heroic quest. (31-2)

Harrison admits that Dorinda has an erotic relationship with the land, but it is an eroticism without gender. In Glasgow's pastoral, one of the chief features of pastoral romance, love and eroticism, is eliminated. In Glasgow's later novels, such as *Barren Ground* and *Vein of Iron*, the female protagonist seems to have to deny her sexuality in order to find happiness.

At the close of *Barren Ground*, Dorinda has a terrible night of remembering how she has lost love and happiness, but the next morning she finds fulfillment in the land:

The storm and the hag-ridden dreams of the night were over, and the land which she had forgotten was waiting
to take her back to its heart. Endurance. Fortitude. The spirit of the land was flowing into her, and her own spirit, strengthened and refreshed, was flowing out again toward life. This was the permanent self, she knew. This was what remained to her after the years had taken their bloom. She would find happiness again. Not the happiness for which she had once longed, but the serenity of mind which is above the conflict of frustrated desires. Old regrets might awaken again, but as the years went on, they would come rarely and they would grow weaker. "Put your heart in the land," old Matthew had said to her. "The land is the only thing that will stay by you." Yes, the land would stay by her. Again she felt the quickening of that sympathy which was deeper than all other emotions of her heart, which love had overcome only for an hour and life had been powerless to conquer in the end,—the living communion with the earth under her feet. While the soil endured, while the seasons bloomed and dropped, while the ancient, beneficent ritual of sowing and reaping moved in the fields, she knew that she could never despair of contentment. (524-5)

Margaret Bauer has written on the many similarities between Dorinda Oakley and Margaret Mitchell's Scarlett O'Hara in *Gone with the Wind.* Before Scarlett O'Hara had found strength in Tara, Dorinda Oakley had been advised by Matthew Fairlamb to put her heart in the land. *Barren Ground* closes with the hope that women will escape being viewed as mere items of exchange in a patriarchal society, but find their own source of strength in the land. Endurance and fortitude will come from the land, not from an empowering male. Dorinda feels the spirit of the land flowing into her, what Gail David describes as "an
alliance with the natural world from which the female protagonist derives psychological strength and spiritual empowerment" (xxv).

For Dorinda, the land itself has taken the place of romance, and she thinks that she will never need any kind of romantic fulfillment again. "At middle age, she faced the future without romantic glamour, but she faced it with integrity of vision" (525). At the end of the novel, John Abner suggests that she could marry Bob Ellgood: "Dorinda smiled, and her smile was pensive, ironic, and infinitely wise. 'Oh, I've finished with all that,' she rejoined. 'I am thankful to have finished with all that!'" (526). Since these are the last words of the novel, it appears that this is the wisdom that Dorinda has learned as a result of her tragedies and her union with the land.

These statements that Dorinda makes throughout the novel, such as "I'm finished with all that" must not be taken too seriously. Dorinda makes such blanket generalizations and commitments throughout her life, only to do and feel the opposite. Bakhtin warns against making any such firm, monologic conclusions:

In a monologic design, the hero is closed and his semantic boundaries strictly defined: he acts, experiences, thinks, and is conscious within the limits of what he is, that is, within the limits of...
his image defined as reality; he cannot cease to be himself, that is, he cannot exceed the limits of his own character, typicality or temperament without violating the author's monologic design concerning him. (Poetics 52)

But Dorinda's character is never finalized in this monologic manner. Dorinda fluctuates between having everything figured out and having nothing figured out: "What did anything matter? It seemed to her suddenly that, not only her love for Jason, but everything, the whole of life, was a mistake" (279). When she is just beginning to form an attachment to Jason Greylock, she becomes jealous of Geneva Ellgood: "At the moment she realized that the innocence of her girlhood, the ingenuous belief that love brought happiness, had departed for ever" (69-70). However, Dorinda never really loses this belief. Over and over Dorinda keeps making pronouncements about things that do not bring happiness. After Jason fails to give her proper attention on Easter Sunday, she concludes, "the possession of a new dress does not confer happiness" (96).

One of the most important thoughts in the novel becomes, "I have finished with all that," or some similar phrase. The novel ends with this sentence, but it occurs time and again after Jason leaves her: "Well, that was over" (189). When Dr. Burch tells her that she will find
that she needs love in her life once again, she replies, "But I don't need it. I am through with all that" (237). When Dr. Burch tells her that he will wait until she gets over her sexual qualms, Dorinda replies, "Waiting wouldn't change me. I've finished with all that" (252). When Mrs. Farraday tells her that she should marry because life on the farm would be drudgery, again she says, "Oh, I've finished with all that" (248). After she returns to Pedlar's Mill and refuses to speak to Jason Greylock, he accuses her of being hard. She replies, "Yes, I am hard. I'm through with soft things" (309). After she tells Jason she wants nothing to do with him, she thinks, "Oh, if the women who wanted love could only know the infinite relief of having love over" (309). All of these statements come from a woman who is not yet twenty-three. In her thirties, she thinks, "Youth, with its troubled rapture and its unsatisfied craving, was well over" (377). Dorinda seems to find fulfillment and peace at several points in the novel when she is "finished with all that". But thoughts that there must be more to life continue to plague her. The novel resists our reducing Dorinda to a finalized object lesson about the joys women find in work. As Bakhtin argues:
a living human being cannot be turned into the voiceless object of some secondhand, finalizing cognitive process. In a human being there is always something that only he himself can reveal, in a free act of self-consciousness and discourse, something that does not submit to an externalizing secondhand definition. (Poetics 58)

The reader has no confidence at the end of the novel that Dorinda will not be in agony again in a few months, only to awaken to say one more time, "I've finished with all that."

At first glance we might think that Glasgow advocates a sexless, agrarian pastoral. Dorinda is thankful that she has finished with all that, but why is she thankful? She is thankful because her past love affair has shattered her heart. In the night of turmoil before she awakens to remember "the true meaning of life," she reminisces:

It was while she was treading on the spongy earth at the edge of the ploughed field that she saw life crumble like a mountain of cinders and roll over her. She was suffocated, she was buried alive beneath an emptiness, a negation of effort, beside which the vital tragedy of her youth appeared almost happiness. Not pain, not disappointment, but the futility of all things was crushing her spirit. She knew now the passive despair of maturity which made her past suffering seem enviable to her when she looked back on it after thirty years. Youth can never know the worst, she understood, because the worst that one can know is the end of expectancy. (521)

Just before her moment of "enlightenment," Dorinda thinks, "It was too late now, she knew, for her youth was gone. Yet because it was too late and her youth had gone, she
felt that the only thing that made life worth living was the love that she had never known and the happiness that she had missed" (522). Dorinda is filled with regret: "And the youth that she had never had, the youth that might have been hers and was not, came back, in delusive mockery, to torment her. It was as if the sardonic powers of life assumed, before they vanished for ever, all the enchanting shapes of her dreams" (523).

When Dorinda remembers the young Jason Greylock, she thinks:

Time was nothing. Reality was nothing. Success, achievement, victory over fate, all these things were nothing beside that imperishable illusion. Love was the only thing that made life desirable, and love was irrevocably lost to her. (523-4)

But after the terrible night in which Dorinda has all of these gloomy thoughts, the morning comes and she replaces love and romance with dedication to the land.

But there are several problems with this interpretation that woman can find happiness with land as a substitute for love. Many recent critics have praised Dorinda's industry and fortitude. Glasgow's female protagonists sometimes function as heroes who are on a quest, and the quest seems to be toward freedom and autonomy. Some critics conclude that Dorinda Oakley goes on a quest, a quest that even
takes her to the city to learn wisdom. Tonette Bond asserts that "Glasgow sends Dorinda, her artist-heroine, on a heroic quest for essential meaning, a search which is fulfilled when Dorinda succeeds through pastoral vision in remaking her world to harmonize with that 'more vivid world of imagination'" (567). When she has worked through all the male structures and conventions, she emerges as a woman who is liberated by the land. In the words of Harrison, women according to this future pastoral novel will "use land as means of liberation from an oppressive society" (13). Some critics see Barren Ground as a milestone in Glasgow's career where she finally breaks away from the male conventions and creates a completely independent woman. In Glasgow's earlier novels, the women seem to be unable to develop this independence. The female characters help men find their identity, but they stop short of finding themselves. In the male version of quest stories, seeking freedom is a heroic act, but in many texts, even those written by women, autonomy is "illusory and dangerous" (David 166). This appears to be the case in Glasgow's earlier novels. Barren Ground tries to embrace the concept of an autonomous woman, but Dorinda Oakley's story continues to portray the danger involved.
However, the text subverts the notion of taking Dorinda as a model for woman's future fulfillment. The text once again subverts itself and we see Bakhtin's multivoicedness of the novel. The text does not glorify Dorinda for becoming a hard unfeeling woman because of one incident that happened when she was twenty-one. Rather than the story of a woman who finds fulfillment as an independent business woman, the text often suggests that Dorinda is an embittered woman because of an unhappy love affair in her youth. In her pride and her desire to never be hurt again, she cuts herself off from all the possible joys in life. Dorinda has learned to look at life in a comic manner: "From the cool and detached point of view she had attained, life appeared to her to be essentially comic; but comic acts, whether presented in the theater or in the waggish hilarity of Pedlar's Mill, seemed to her merely depressing" (272). Rosa Coldfield, who withdraws from life because of one man's mistreatment, is a grotesque version of Dorinda Oakley. In Bakhtin's terms, Rosa is a carnivalized Dorinda, held up for ambivalent laughter.

Dorinda takes a cynical attitude toward life. When Mrs. Oakley says, "I hope New York didn't turn you into a scoffer, Dorinda," she replies, "New York didn't get a
chance, Ma. Pedlar's Mill had done it first" (305). The masculine version of the pastoral had soured her:

The power to pity was still hers, for compassion is a detached impulse, but she had lost beyond recall the gift of poignant emotion. Nothing had penetrated that dead region around her heart. Not her father's death, not her mother's illness—nothing. Drought had withered her, she told herself cynically, and the locust had eaten away the green of her spirit. (338)

She never again experiences loving emotions. Even after Nathan dies, she realizes that "she was not feeling what she knew that she ought to feel" (444). When Jason is dying and she agrees to take care of him she performs the actions like an "automaton" (504).

Dorinda could have had a happy, erotic love in the pastoral environment, but unfortunately she seeks it from a man who is not a part of the pastoral environment and who defiles it. Jason Greylock is an aristocrat with the taint of slavery upon him. Furthermore, he has been corrupted by the city: "Though he had sprung from the soil, he had returned to it a stranger, and there could be no sympathetic communion between him and the solitude. Neither as a lover nor as a conqueror could he hope to possess it in spirit" (31-2). He chooses to marry into the artificiality of the aristocracy, rather than enjoy the simple pastoral beauty of Dorinda Oakley. Dorinda believes
that the problem is in love itself, rather than with the partner that she has chosen.

The idea that Dorinda finds fulfillment in working the land is subverted by the entire text, especially by comparing descriptions of Dorinda with her mother. Dorinda once described her mother's determination to live in these terms: "Oh, it's hard work that she lives on.... She says if she were to stop working, she'd drop down dead like a horse that is winded. She never stops, not even on Sundays, except when she is in church" (14). Work seems to be little more than just a way to keep living when all the romance of life has been done away with. Old Matthew Fair-lamb, who acts as the philosopher of this rural world says, "Well, thar ain't much rest to be got out of that.... I ain't contedin' against the doctrine of eternal damnation ..., but as long as yo' Ma is obleeged to work so hard, 'tis a pity she ain't got a mo' restful belief" (15). Mrs. Oakley could not stand silence or sitting still. She had to be constantly moving:

She had worked so hard for so many years that the habit had degenerated into a disease, and thrift had become a tyrant instead of a slave in her life. From dawn until after dark she toiled, and then lay sleepless for hours because of the jerking of her nerves. She was, as she said of herself, "driven," and it was the tragedy of her lot that all her toil made so little impression. Though she spent every bit
of her strength there was nothing to show for her struggle. Like the land, which took everything and gave back nothing, the farm had drained her vitality without altering its general aspect of decay. (39)

When Dorinda thought of her mother, she thought of "Work. Never anything but work" (174).

Dorinda's mother was also married to a man that she did not love passionately. She had loved a young missionary that she was to marry, but he was killed. She had dreamed of being the wife of a missionary, "blue skies and golden sands, of palm trees on a river's bank and of black babies thrown to crocodiles" (44). She married Joshua Oakley, although "she could have lived without Joshua" (43). Women such as Dorinda and her mother must work to keep their minds occupied rather than face the emptiness and futility of their lives.

The question one must ask in the face of this happy ending is: Has Dorinda become any different than the people who came before her, her mother and father included, for whom she felt such sympathy? The only difference is that she has become a successful farmer. But her work habits are no different from those of her mother or even her father. Thinking of her father, Dorinda reflects:

There were times when Dorinda asked herself if indeed he had any personal life apart from the seasons and
the crops. . . . All his life he had been a slave to the land, harnessed to the elemental forces, struggling inarticulately against the blight of poverty and the barrenness of the soil. Yet Dorinda had never heard him rebel. His resignation was the earth's passive acceptance of sun or rain. When his crop failed or his tobacco was destroyed by frost, he would drive his plough into the field and begin all over again. (40)

Dorinda eventually comes to have no personal life apart from the season and the crops. She also becomes a slave to the land, not even having free time to go to church, working until she is totally exhausted every night. As a matter of fact, we wonder if Dorinda has found the peace that her father had. She is not so much resigned to her fate, as work to blots it out of her mind. Dorinda's father doesn't appear to be blocking anything out. He just works: "There was nothing human about him, except his prophet's head and the humble dignity of one who had kept in close communion with earth and sky. He had known nothing but toil; he had no language but the language of toil" (118).

Dorinda becomes almost exactly like her mother in how she tries to use work to blot out her sense of unhappiness and discontent. After Jason jilts her, she thinks constantly that she must find something to do or else she will lose her mind: "I must do something," she thought.
"If I don't do something, this pain will go on forever" (162). "I must do something, or this misery will never end. . . . If I could only do something" (163). "If I don't do something I shall die" (164). "You've got to do something," repeated a derisive voice in her brain.

"You've got to do something, or you'll go out of your mind" (184). This method of blotting out unhappiness becomes the dominant feature of the rest of her life. Looking back over her life, Dorinda realizes:

This was the secret of her contentment, she knew, breathless activity. If she was satisfied with her life, it was only because she never stopped long enough in her work to imagine the kind of life she should have preferred. While her health was good and her energy unimpaired, she had not time for discontent. If she had looked for it, she sometimes told herself, she could have found sufficient cause for unhappiness; but she was careful not to look for it. (412)

Dorinda has become her mother. Far from being an example for women to emulate, she is an exhausted woman trying to stop thinking about the kind of life she would have preferred.

Mrs. Oakley was constantly cleaning the house in order to keep her mind occupied. After Jason leaves Dorinda for Geneva Ellgood, Dorinda begins the same kind of cleaning obsession:
Coming back to life, with all that she had to face would be terrible. Taking the broom from the corner behind the door, she began sweeping the floor in hard, long strokes, as if she were sweeping away a mountain of trash; and into these strokes she put as much as she could of her misery. When she had finished sweeping the store, she brushed the mud from the platform and the steps to the pile of refuse which had accumulated at the back of the house. Then she brought a basin of water and a cake of soap, and scrubbed the counter and the shelves where the dry goods were kept. She worked relentlessly, with rigid determination, as if to clean the store were the one absorbing purpose of her life. (178)

This relentless work becomes the dominant feature of Dorinda's life. After her mother dies, she does nothing but work:

The bitter irony of her point of view had faded into a cheerful cynicism which formed a protective covering over her mind and heart. She had worked relentlessly through years; but it was work that she had enjoyed . . . . At thirty-three, the perspective of the last ten years was incredibly shortened. All the cold starry mornings when she had awakened before day and crept out to the barn by lantern light to attend to the milking appeared to her now as a solitary frozen dawn. All the bleak winters, all the scorching summers, were a single day; all the evenings, when she had dreamed half asleep in the firelit dusk, were a single night. She could not separate these years into seasons. In her long retrospect they were crystallized into one flawless pattern. (346-7)

Like a Buddhist monk who feels that he has gone beyond all desire, Dorinda thinks she has achieved that kind of contentment as well. But she has such thoughts at several points in the novel. When she is in New York, she thinks:

"I'm dried up at the core, . . . and yet, I've got to go on
pretending that I'm alive, that I'm like other people. She felt nothing; she expected nothing; she desired nothing; and this insensibility, which was worse than pain, had attacked her body as well as her heart and mind" (226). Despite this denial, she does expect something. Later in life, she again thinks she expects nothing:

Even the vision of something different in the future, that illusion of approaching happiness which she had believed as indestructible as hope itself, had dissolved as the glimmer of swamp fires dissolves in the twilight. She knew now that life would never be different. Experience, like love, would always be inadequate to the living soul. What the imperfect actuality was to-day, it would be to-morrow and the day after; but there was rest now, not disquietude, in the knowledge. The strain and the hard work of the war had tired her nerves, and she looked forward to the ample leisure of the time when she should expect nothing. . . . The difference was that at twenty her happiness had depended upon love, and at fifty it depended upon nothing but herself and the land. To the land, she had given her mind and heart with the abandonment that she had found disastrous in any human relations. (470)

But Dorinda has come to all of these conclusions before. Each time she thinks she has resolved those troubling issues, she has another battle where she has to fight off the memory of Jason and the love she missed. She has these crisis experiences, and then comes away thinking that the land is enough and that she is perfectly content, expecting nothing. Though she thinks her hopes for happiness have dissolved, toward the end of the novel she
goes through the same experience again: "More than thirty years of effort and self-sacrifice--for what? Was there an unfulfilled purpose, or was it only another delusion of life? .... What she mourned was not the love that she had had and lost, but the love that she had never had"

(518-9). Not only does she regret love, but she wonders if all the years of work on the farm were worth it after all. Even though she believes she has reached the contentment of expecting nothing, at the end of the novel she thinks:

She saw now, as she had seen in the night, that life is never what one dreamed, that it is seldom what one desired; yet for the vital spirit and the eager mind, the future will always hold the search for buried treasure and the possibilities of high adventure. Though in a measure destiny had defeated her, for it had given her none of the gifts she had asked of it, still her failure was one of those defeats, she realized, which are victories. .... The best of life, she told herself with clear-eyed wisdom, was ahead of her. (525)

So, Dorinda does expect something from the future after all. There is still a buried treasure for her to find. No doubt, she will soon be disappointed and unhappy again, and determined to cut herself off from feelings of hope. She has expressed similar thoughts throughout the novel, only to give up to stoic detachment once again.

When she is in New York, she thinks:

With her, however, she felt that she had nothing to expect and nothing to lose. One idea had possessed
her so completely that now, when it had been torn out from the roots like a dying nerve, there was no substitute for happiness that she could put in its place. "I've finished with love," she repeated over and over. "I've finished with love, and until I find something else to fill my life, I shall be only an empty shell. . . . " (228)

The rest of her life, Dorinda tries to find this something else with which she will be able to fill her life.

Bakhtin writes that Dostoevsky "always represents a person on the threshold of a final decision, at a moment of crisis, at an unfinalizable--and unpredeterminable--turning point for his soul" (Poetics 61). This is where Dorinda always is, even at the end of the novel. While she is in New York she tries to decide what to do with the rest of her life. She thinks, "There must be something in life besides love" (250). When Dr. Burch asks her how she will fill her life without love, she replies, "With something better than broomsedge. That's the first thing that puts out on barren soil, just broomsedge. Then that goes and pines come to stay--pines and life-everlasting" (238).

Just like the land at Pedlar's Mill is barren, Dorinda's life is barren as well. She will return to the land and try to get something to grow on Old Farm besides broomsedge. At the same time, she will try to get something to grow in the barrenness of her life. When she
thinks of Old Farm she concludes, "There is something else for me also. Love isn't everything" (250). The land becomes a substitute for love. When Dr. Burch tries to express his feeling of love for her, she ignores him and thinks immediately of the Virginia landscape (251). After she returns to Pedlar's Mill, she meets Jason for the first time since their affair. When he tries to speak to her, she ignores him and envisions the landscape (297).

What she will fill her life with is work on Old Farm:

"Whatever I give, the farm will be always mine," she thought. . . . "The farm isn't human and it won't make you suffer. Only human things break your heart." Everything appeared so simple when she regarded it through the film of sentiment that obscured her judgment. Kinship with the land was filtering through her blood into her brain; and she knew that this transfigured instinct was blended of pity, memory, and passion. Dimly, she felt that only through this fresh emotion could she attain permanent liberation of spirit. (306)

In New York, after she decides that she will go back to Virginia and employ modern methods of farming, she has a dream:

As far as she could see, on every side, the field was filled with prickly purple thistles, and every thistle was wearing the face of Jason. A million thistles, and every thistle looked up at her with the eyes of Jason! She turned the plough where they grew thickest, trampling them down, uprooting them, ploughing them under with all her strength; but always when they went into the soil, they cropped up again. Millions of purple flaunting heads! Millions of faces! They sprang up everywhere; in the deep furrow
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that the plough had cut; in the dun colored clods of the upturned earth; under the feet of the horses; under her own feet, springing back, as if they were set on wire stems, as soon as she had crushed them into the ground. "I am going to plough them under, if it kills me," she said aloud; and then she awoke.

But Dorinda never ploughs them all under. She clears the "land" of thistles, but not her heart. This dream symbolizes her repeated attempts throughout the novel of trying to root out the memory of Jason from her mind, but she never does. Over a decade later, she still dreams of him, "not as she knew that he was to-day, but as she had once believed him to be. For a moment, through the irresistible force of illusion, she was caught again, she was imprisoned in the agony of that old passion" (354).

Jason becomes the broomsedge that keeps returning. Dorinda had always thought of the broomsedge in these terms, "The more you burned it off and cut it down, the thicker it came up again next year" (59). Each time Dorinda tries to free her mind from the memory of Jason, the thicker it returns. In her forties, Dorinda tells Jason that she stopped thinking of him twenty-five years ago. Actually, she has never stopped thinking about him, and the only time she has been able to forget him is through engaging in ceaseless activity.
Has Dorinda Oakley found a new kind of pastoral happiness, or has she merely been conquered by the bleak landscape? Dorinda conquers the literal broomsedge of the land, but not the barren ground of her heart. Old Matthew Fairlamb once said that Jason Greylock should leave Pedlar's Mill before it was too late: "I ain't got nothin' to say against him, but if he'd listen to the warnin' of eighty-odd years, he'd git away before the broomsage ketches him. Thar's one thing sartin sure, you've got to conquer the land in the beginning, or it'll conquer you before you're through with it" (16). While the literal broomsedge conquers Jason Greylock, the broomsedge of bitterness and regret continues to grow in Dorinda.

She keeps trying to find the something else that would fulfill her life. When she is thirty-three, she is depressed because she realizes that her youth is passing and

she had never known the completeness, the fulfilment, that she had expected of life. Even now, she could not tell herself, she did not know what it was that she had missed. It was not love, nor was it motherhood. No, the need went deeper than nature. . . . In a little while, with happiness still undiscovered, she would be as wrinkled and grey as her mother. Only her mother's restless habit of work would remain to fill the vacancy of her days. (355)
Dorinda substitutes work for feeling. Even though life has tried to break her, she becomes a kind of working machine that refuses to allow herself to feel. After her mother dies, the narrator says of Dorinda, "when she looked back on the years that followed her mother's death, Dorinda could remember nothing but work" (346).

One of the most important words in the last half of the novel is the word "monotony." Though some critics say we should admire Dorinda's independence and industriousness, her life is a monotonous existence of denying her feelings. Early in her life, she felt that she was trapped in a monotonous existence:

The day had begun. It was like every other day in the past. It would be like every other day in the future. Suddenly the feeling came over her that she was caught like a mouse in the trap of life. No matter how desperately she struggled, she could never escape; she could never be free. She was held fast by circumstances as by invisible wires of steel. (57)

She thinks that love will deliver her from this monotony, but finds that it cannot. So, she gives her life completely to work. But work only increases the feelings of monotony. As her father is dying, she thinks, "What was her pain, her wretchedness, compared to his monotony of toil? What was any pain, any wretchedness, compared to the
emptiness of his life?" (267). Yet, Dorinda chooses to live this same kind of monotonous and empty existence:

From the broomsedge and the flat horizon, loneliness rose and washed over her. Loneliness, nothing more! The same loneliness that she had feared and hated as a child; the same loneliness from which she had tried to escape in flights of emotion. Food, work, sleep, that was life as her father and mother had known it, and that life was to be hers in the future. (271)

After she begins to take care of the farm she thinks:

While she passed on, the expression of the landscape faded from tranquil brightness to the look of unresisting fortitude which it had worn as far back as she could remember. In her heart also she felt that the brightness quivered and died. With her drooping energy, weariness had crept over her; but out of weariness, she passed presently, like the country, into a mood of endurance. She realized, without despair, that the general aspect of her life would be one of unbroken monotony. Enthusiasm would not last. Energy would not last. Cheerfulness, buoyancy, interest, not one of these qualities would last as long as she needed it. Nothing would last through to the end except courage. (296)

After her father's funeral, "... the earth was shovelied back into the hollow beneath the great pine in the graveyard, and the movement of the farm began again with scarcely a break in its monotony" (300). As she travels the country roads she hears "the monotonous droning of insects" (333). The text describes her at the age of thirty-eight in the following manner:

Her life, she knew, was becoming simplified into an unbreakable chain of habits, a series of orderly
actions at regular hours. Vaguely, she thought of herself as a happy woman; yet she was aware that this monotony of contentment had no relation to what she had called happiness in her youth. It was better perhaps; it was certainly as good; but it measured all the difference between youth and maturity. (389)

Dorinda's life, far from being fulfilling, is a monotonous existence of unremitting labor. Even Dorinda seems to wonder if her independence is praiseworthy: "Her pride was foolish, she supposed, but it was all that she had. With nothing else to fall back on, she had taken refuge in an exaggerated sense of independence" (248). Dorinda realizes that so many of the good things in life are passing her by, but her new philosophy of life becomes "you can't have everything" (388). Dorinda's life becomes nothing more than the dull stoicism embraced by her parents. They accept everything with the same kind of stoic detachment that Dorinda will try to embrace later in life. Mrs. Oakley tries to prepare Dorinda for disappointment by telling her, "But there's one thing I can tell you, daughter, mighty few folks in this world ever get what they want" (123). Dorinda buys a new dress to impress Jason, rather than buy a red cow that the family needs for the farm. Her parents justify her actions in the following manner:
"Well, I reckon you won't be young but once, daughter," her mother had observed with the dry tolerance of disillusionment, "and the sooner you get over with it the better," while her father had stretched out his toil-worn hand and fingered one of the balloon sleeves. "That's mighty pretty, honey, an' don't you worry about not gettin' the red cow. It saves yo' Ma the trouble of churning an' you kind of lose the taste fur butter when you ain't had it fur some while." (98-9)

When she is in New York, a young Dr. Burch shows a romantic interest in Dorinda. She tells him, "I suppose the truth is that life doesn't seem to me to be worth all the fuss they make over it. The more they suffer, the harder they appear to cling to living. I believe in facing what you have to face and making as little fuss as possible.... Life makes us and breaks us. We don't make life. The best we can do is bear it" (235).

Dorinda has recurring doubts that her chosen way of life is really best. When she asks the doctor if her mother is dying, he replies, "Why, the woman in there has been dying for twenty years!" (340). Dorinda realizes that this is what she is doing as well:

Would nothing thaw the frozen lake that enveloped her being? Would she never again become living and human? The old sense of the hollowness of reality had revived.... She longed with all her soul to suffer acutely; yet she could feel nothing within this colourless void in which she was imprisoned. (341)
Even though she does nothing but work, thinking that is the only satisfaction to be found in life, she has doubts:

At such moments she would feel that life had cheated her, and she would long passionately for something bright and beautiful that she had missed. Not love again! No, never again the love that she had known! What she longed for was the something different, the something indestructibly desirable and satisfying. Then there would return the blind sense of a purpose in existence which had evaded her search. The encompassing dullness would melt like a cloud, and she would grasp a meaning beneath the deceptions and the cruelties of the past. But this feeling was as fugitive as all others, and when it vanished it left not the glorified horizon, but simply the long day's work to be done. (352)

Later in life she admits that she "missed everything I really wanted" (427).

Not only does the text question Dorinda's attitude toward work, it also questions her attitude toward sexuality. While some critics have praised Dorinda for her sexual independence, the text treats her sexual mania as a sickness, rather than a model for women to follow.

Dorinda's attitude toward sexuality is devastated by her affair with Jason. After she loses her baby, Dr. Burch tries to develop a relationship with her. When he touches her, she says, "Don't... I've finished with all that sort of thing" (237). She explains to the doctor that she will never change her mind about the sexual aspect of life: "Yes, for good. I can't explain what I mean, but the very
thought of that makes me—well, sick all over" (237).

This, from a young woman of twenty-one, and she sticks by this philosophy for the rest of her life:

Her revulsion from the physical aspect of love was a matter of the nerves, she knew, for more than two years under the roof of a great surgeon had taught her something deeper than the patter of science. Yet, though her shrinking was of the nerves only, it was none the less real. One side of her was still dead . . . . But the thought of love, the faintest reminder of its potency filled her with aversion, with an inexpressible weariness. She simply could not bear, she told herself bluntly, to be touched. (250)

She thought that there was the possibility that she might be able to love Burch, but

Her nerves, not her heart, repulsed him. She might even love him, she thought, if only he could keep at a distance; if he would never touch her; if he would remain contented and aloof, neither giving nor demanding the signs of emotion. But at the first gesture of approach every cell in her body sprang on the defensive. (251)

Her celibate marriage to Nathan is filled with tension. The narrator commends the relationship to a degree: "On her side at least marriage had begun where it so often ends happily, in charity of mind. Though she could not love, she had chosen the best substitute for love, which is tolerance" (387). Nevertheless, their marriage is filled with tension from the day of the wedding. They know, and all the community knows that she has no real love for Nathan. She does not really appreciate Nathan until he
dies a hero trying to save people from burning in a train wreck. Again, because of her lack of feeling, Dorinda has let another opportunity to enjoy life pass her by. All that Dorinda comes to care about is endurance. Speaking of a pine tree that has lived for a long time, Dorinda says, "All the meaning of his life has gone into it, and the meaning of the country. Endurance, that's what it is" (272).

*Barren Ground* does not resolve anything as far as women finding fulfillment is concerned. Bakhtin writes,

> Self-consciousness can be interrogated and provoked into revealing and representing itself, but not by giving it a predetermined or finalizing image. Such an objectified image is precisely what is inadequate to the very thing that the author has selected as his subject. (*Poetics* 65)

Both work and marriage are a bitter disappointment.

Dorinda thinks:

> Looking around at other women, she could not see that they were better off in the matter of love than she was herself. Even the few who had married the men they had chosen had paid for it—or so it appeared to her—with a lifetime of physical drudgery or emotional disappointment. She supposed they had compensations that she could not discover—otherwise how could they have borne with their lives?—but there was not one among them with whom she would have changed places. Those who had been most deeply in love appeared to her to have become most bitterly disenchanted. (412-3)
Of course, her life is nothing more than disenchanted physical drudgery as well. There is no need for her to change places with them because they are all equally miserable.

Far from being an example for women to follow, Dorinda represents the woman who can never be happy, even in work. While some critics think that Dorinda has found fulfillment in the land, she represents the woman who can never completely break away from the traditional view of happiness. We have the feeling at the end of the novel that she is trying to convince herself one more time that "she is finished with all that", but she never will be. In *Barren Ground*, one can hear the voice of a woman who tries to convince herself that she is free from masculine constructs, and yet at the same time, expressing the emptiness because of nothing that can satisfactorily take their place. Though Dorinda tries to find the substitute in land and work, she does not succeed. The text leads us to believe that Dorinda will continue with the struggle to define herself, but that is the nature of life and language. Writing of Dostoevsky's work, Bakhtin said the "great dialogue . . . is organized as an unclosed whole of
life itself, the life poised on the threshold" (Poetics 63).

While Glasgow takes the pastoral a step further than Hardy, the result is much the same. Hardy's characters do not find the fulfillment they have sought. Glasgow tries to move beyond a romantic pastoral, and even beyond a pastoral of shared work. But because of the masculine construct and restraints, Glasgow's texts never quite liberate themselves enough to envision a happy relationship entirely free of the masculine pastoral.

While the story of Dorinda Oakley does not resolve all of the issues concerning the success or failure of the independent woman, Dorinda does move beyond Bathsheba in that she has a self-reliance that Bathsheba loses after Troy's death. While Bathsheba remains capricious, Glasgow's women move on to display a courageous, if not entirely satisfying, fortitude.

Bathsheba, for all her determination to become an independent woman farmer, never manifests the kinship with the land that motivates Dorinda. Recent feminist criticism points out that the success of women's lives in the pastoral environment can be traced to a non-gendered union with the land that derives strength from the land but does
not exploit it. Though Dorinda's relationship with other people may not be satisfying, she does conquer the land. Unfortunately, as Helen Levy points out, she "re-forms and revitalizes male failures" (110). Bathsheba is decrowned as a pastoral queen and can only succeed because she succumbs to the custom of marriage. In *Far from the Madding Crowd*, Bathsheba is conquered by the forces of nature, but then succeeds because of a man. In *Barren Ground*, Jason Greylock is defeated and Dorinda succeeds in spite of him.

But since Dorinda's relationship with others did not seem rewarding, Glasgow gave what seemed to her at the age of sixty-two a more gratifying resolution in *Vein of Iron*. Helen Levy writes that after *Barren Ground* Glasgow "lost her belief in the individual material achiever as a model applicable for woman, body or soul" (118). In *Vein of Iron*, Ralph McBride is as weak in many respects as Jason Greylock, but Ada Fincastle has the vein of iron that not only enables her to survive a sexual betrayal, but also to love Ralph in spite of his weakness. In *Vein of Iron* and *Barren Ground*, both heroines return to the old home place. But Ada Fincastle returns with her family in place. She shares a life of hard work with Ralph, not because she
needs him as Bathsheba needs Gabriel (Ada is stronger than Ralph and has to support him), but because she loves him. Lucinda MacKethan contends that Ada returns to restore a matriarchal order ("Matriarchal" 104). While Dorinda manifests the characteristic of fortitude, Ada combines the fortitude with love for family.

Endnotes

1 Gregor says that "if Hardy is celebrating pastoral life in his novel, it must surely be in the spirit of Samuel Beckett" (49). In a sense, my analysis of the novel as an example of grotesque realism and carnival humor does point to the absurd nature of this pastoral.

2 Langbaum suggests that this scene "emerges from the nineteenth-century-long argument for feudal community as opposed to the equality that produces isolation" (80). My reading contends that this banquet is not really successful as a pastoral banquet.

3 Morrell argues that "ahead of Gabriel and Bathsheba is no romance, but a reality that Hardy represents as more valuable, a reality of hard and good work on the two farms" (Morrell 59).

4 Wotton writes that "only with Gabriel, whose love undergoes the evolutionary process and who is not detached from the community of labour as are Boldwood and Troy, can the unity of labor and love, being and consciousness, be achieved" (138).

5 Several statements in Tonette Bond's article suggest that Dorinda has successfully achieved the dream of a Southern pastoral. Bond believes that Dorinda moves from a false idyl with Jason to a true idyl on old farm. Bond writes, "Through rigorous self-sacrifice and discipline in the service of her creative vision, she transforms the farms into the idyllic setting of her youthful dream and in the process established upon a harsh reality a vision taking the shape of her ancestors' dream of an Arcadian South"
(573). A little later Bond asserts, "At the end of the novel, the values of literary pastoral—continuity, harmony, tranquility, ease—have been externalized by Dorinda. And after the passion of the emotional storm following Jason's burial, Dorinda's mind reflects the harmony and ordered calm of the pastoral landscape surrounding her" (574). It is my view that this "ordered calm" is subverted by the text, especially the ending. The text does not suggest that Dorinda has recreated the Southern Arcadia.

Bauer's analysis shows the possibility that Mitchell borrowed extensively from Glasgow's Barren Ground. The emphasis upon putting one's heart in the land is reflected in Scarlett's passion for Tara.

Pamela Matthews in Ellen Glasgow and a Woman's Traditions argues forcefully that Dorinda is model of feminine independence who finds strength from land and a community of women. While I agree with some aspects of this analysis, the evidence I present calls into question whether Dorinda has genuinely found contentment in her chosen manner of life.
CHAPTER 6
FAILED SHEPHERDS:
IDEALISTS SEEKING THE PASTORAL

Pastoral literature usually contains a shepherd of some kind. Greek and Latin pastorals are written and sung by shepherd poets. Hebraic and Christian literature also tries to employ the pastoral motif. Some of the most famous Biblical literature contains pastoral elements. For example:

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.
He makes me to lie down in green pastures; He leads me beside the still waters,
He restores my soul; He leads me in the paths of righteousness For His name's sake.
Yea, though I walk through valley of the shadow of death,
I will fear no evil; For You are with me;
Your rod and Your staff, they comfort me. (Psalms 23:1-4)

This most famous of Biblical texts describes God as a shepherd who leads his people to a peace and contentment typified by a rural landscape. The text portrays God as the kind shepherd who protects them and gives them a sense of harmony in the pastoral environment. The 100th Psalm also contains the same pastoral imagery: "Know that the Lord, He is God; / It is He who has made us, and not we
ourselves; / We are His people and the sheep of His pasture” (Ps. 100:3). As the Old Testament portrays God as the shepherd of his people, the New Testament continues the theme by using the same metaphors for Jesus Christ. In St. John's gospel, Jesus says,

I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd gives His life for the sheep. But a hireling, he who is not the shepherd, one who does not own the sheep, sees the wolf coming and leaves the sheep and flees; and the wolf catches the sheep and scatters them. The hireling flees because he is a hireling and does not care about the sheep. I am the good shepherd; and I know My sheep, and am known by My own. As the Father knows Me, even so I know the Father; and I lay down My life for the sheep. And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they will hear My voice; and there will be one flock and one shepherd. (John 10:11-16)

Jesus describes himself as someone who cares about his people because he truly loves them. Other people may look after the sheep because they are paid to do so, but Jesus proves the love of a true shepherd by giving himself sacrificially for the sake of his people.

Luke's gospel illustrates the love and compassion of the true shepherd in the parable of the lost sheep:

What man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he loses one of them, does not leave the ninety-nine in the wilderness, and go after the one which is lost until he finds it? And when he has found it, he lays it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he comes home, he calls together his friends and neighbors, saying to them, "Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep
which was lost!" I say to you that likewise there will
be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than
over ninety-nine just persons who need no repentance.
(Luke 15:4-6)

In this parable, Jesus criticizes the self-righteous
Pharisees who feel that they have no need of repentance.
Jesus teaches that people should rejoice concerning the
person who, though he may have lived a wicked life, yet
returns. This parable also illustrates the kindness of the
shepherd who is willing to seek the lost sheep.

The Bible uses the image of the shepherd to describe
not only God and Jesus, but also the leaders of the people.
The Apostle Peter tells the elders of the church:

Shepherd the flock of God which is among you, serving
as overseers, not by compulsion but willingly, not for
dishonest gain but eagerly; not as being lords over
those entrusted to you, but being examples to the
flock; and when the Chief Shepherd appears, you will
receive the crown of glory that does not fade away.
(I Peter 5:2-4)

Pastors and elders of the church are shepherds who are
serving under the Great Shepherd, Jesus Christ. The Greek
word for "shepherd," "poimein," is the same word translated
as "pastor" in the New Testament.

The Old Testament uses the figure of the shepherd to
refer to any of the leaders of the people. Some of the
most caustic language of the Bible is used to denounce
religious and governmental leaders who are failing in their duties as shepherds:

Thus says the Lord God to the shepherds: "Woe to the shepherds of Israel who feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? You eat the fat and clothe yourselves with the wool; you slaughter the fatlings, but you do not feed the flock. The weak you have not strengthened, nor have you healed those who were sick, nor bound up the broken nor brought back what was driven away, nor sought what was lost; but with force and cruelty you have ruled them. So they were scattered because there was no shepherd; and they became food for all the beasts of the field when they were scattered" ... Thus says the Lord God: "Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will require My flock at their hand; I will cause them to cease feeding the sheep, and the shepherds shall feed themselves no more; for I will deliver My flock from their mouths, that they may no longer be food for them." (Ezekiel 34: 2-5, 10)

Christian pastoral literature is often used for the same purpose of castigating the leaders of people, especially the clergy. Even in Lycidas Milton puts words in the mouth of the apostle Peter that echo the words of both John and Ezekiel:

How well could I have spar'd for thee, young swain, Enough of such as for their bellies' sake, Creep and intrude into the fold? Of other care they little reck'ning make, Than how to scramble at the shearsers' feast, And shove away the worthy bidden guest; Blind mouths! that scarce themselves know how to hold A Sheep-hook, or have learn'd aught else the least That to the faithful Herdman's art belongs! What recks it them? What need they? They are sped; And when they list, their lean and flashy songs Grate on their scannel Pipes of wretched straw. The hungry Sheep look up, and are not fed,
But swoln with wind, and the rank mist they draw,
Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread:
Besides what the grim Wolf with privy paw
Daily devours apace, and nothing said;
But that two handed engine at the door
Stands ready to smite once, and smite no more.

(113-131)

Lycidas was the selfless shepherd who fed the sheep, but these other modern members of the clergy feed themselves while the sheep starve. Christian pastoral literature consistently criticizes men who enter the ministry for selfish reasons. Poggioli points out that Christian pastorals are usual polemics against the spiritual rulers of the people who more often resemble Satan than Christ by the way that they live for wealth and power rather than by the sacrificial standard of the cross of Christ (102). Hebraic and Christian narrators often use the pastoral convention either to portray the happiness that God provides for his people, or as a means of criticizing the false shepherd.

In their novels, Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner describe the shepherds of the people, whether religious or civic, with the same kind of venom. As shepherds of the flock, the clergy are supposed to lead the people to the pastoral paradise. Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner in their novels present shepherds who do the opposite. The shepherds in
Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner either neglect the flock, or perform positive acts of cruelty toward the flock. In *Tess of the d'Urbervilles,* Tess baptizes her own baby just before it dies. She asks the parson if the baptism was just as good as that administered by the church. Feeling sympathy for Tess, the parson replies that it would be the same. But when Tess asks permission then to give the baby a Christian burial, the parson refuses. He says, "Well—I would willingly do so if only we two were concerned. But I must not—for certain reasons" (101). His reputation among his parishioners, and possibly his livelihood, are more important to him than suffering and sorrow. These sorts of descriptions of the ministry appear frequently in the novels of these three writers.

More than merely criticizing the cruelty and hypocrisy of certain ministers, these texts often suggest the impossibility of a Christian pastoral in any sense. Though the Hebraic/Christian pastoral contains some of the same elements as the pagan pastoral, (i.e., shepherds, harmony with nature, peace), the methods of obtaining that paradise differ between the two systems. As Poggioli has pointed out, the Christian pastoral is brought about by redemption, whereas the pagan pastoral is achieved by a retreat (1).
In the Christian pastoral, sinful people live in a corrupt world. The only way to achieve the pastoral bliss is through some kind of redemption. The pagan pastoral is simpler, requiring simply a return to nature. The Christian requirement of redemption complicates the return to the pastoral. In the Christian view, nature itself longs for the day of redemption. The Apostle Paul wrote:

For the earnest expectation of the creation eagerly waits for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to futility, not willingly, but because of Him who subjected it in hope; because the creation itself also will be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groans and labors with birth pangs together until now. (Romans 8:19-22)

All of creation suffered because of the Fall in Eden. The Christian hope looks forward to a redemption that will not only affect people, but also the entire created order. The Christian shepherd's solution to the loss of pastoral bliss requires more than simply encouraging his people to return to nature, since nature itself suffers the effects of the Fall. Kegel-Brinkgreve points out that Christian and classical eclogues are "not really congenial and easy to fuse" (189). For writers with a Christian cultural heritage, this difficulty results in a characteristic
ambivalence toward both pagan and Christian versions of pastoral.

In pastoral poetry, the shepherds form a kind of leisure class who sing of the beauties of the bucolic life and criticize departures from it. Free from ambition and greed, the pastoral shepherd practices moderation. Poggioli contends that the pastoral shepherd "is obsessed by neither temptation nor guilt, and is free from the sense of sin. Being quiet and passive, he is rarely driven to sins of commission; as for sins of omission, he is inclined to treat them as virtues" (8). Obviously, the pagan and Christian versions of the pastoral are incompatible. The Christian shepherd often views the natural world as evil, filled with temptations one must resist. Denying what is natural even in himself, the Christian shepherd often succumbs nevertheless to the temptations of the flesh, becoming a hypocritical parody of his own prescription for the return to paradise. Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner present these shepherds to be as confused and conflicted as their flocks. They not only refuse to enter the pastoral world themselves, they also prevent others from entering it. These texts present even well-intentioned shepherds as unable to lead the people to
paradise. The shepherds in Hardy, Glasgow and Faulkner fail, they make matters worse for their people, and they are often cruel. These texts imply that Christian morality, being opposed to the ways of nature, cannot possibly lead to the pastoral paradise. There can be no combination of the Christian and pagan pastoral. The pastoral must be pagan. Poggioli argues that "the critical mind can only treat as failures all attempts to Christianize the pastoral, or to translate Christianity into pastoral terms" (19).

As Milton used the pastoral elegy in Lycidas to criticize the shepherds, so Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner use the pastoral mode to criticize certain versions of Christian leadership. In several of these texts, the shepherds are obviously Christ-figures, symbols of the good shepherd. But as their stories unfold, the reader realizes quickly that these representations are parodies of Christ. The characters are a species of the grotesque, allowing the reader to laugh at them, bringing down to earth their idealism. Bakhtin writes, "This is why medieval parody played a completely unbridled game with all that is most sacred and important from the point of view of official ideology" (Rabelais 84). These texts play a game with the
shepherds. To show the failure of the Christian shepherds, I have chosen to concentrate especially on Clym Yeobright, Gail Hightower, Ike McCaslin, and Gabriel Pendleton. While Clym Yeobright and Ike McCaslin are not members of the professional clergy, the texts describe them as men who feel the call to transform the world, or to help people find the pastoral paradise once again. Paul Alpers demonstrates how pastoral concepts of the shepherd change and encompass people other than literal shepherds or clergy:

To say that this is the representative anecdote of pastoral means that pastoral works are representations of shepherds (and, in post-classical literature, sheperdhesses) who are felt to be representative of some other or of all other men and/or women. But since all the terms in this definition are subject to mediation or reinterpretation, pastoral is historically diversified and transformed. Various writers at various times modify the way shepherds are depicted, on the grounds that it either does not truly represent them or that it deprives them of their representative force. . . . The biblical metaphor of the good shepherd enters pastoral for this reason. (26-7)

Whether they are members of the professional clergy or not, all of these men are shepherds who fail in their task to lead the flock to the green pastures and still waters.
Gail Hightower:  
The Failure of an Isolated Shepherd

Though Gail Hightower, the failed Presbyterian minister in *Light in August*, resigned his pulpit and became a recluse, he had been a religious hermit long before he quit the ministry. Before he left the seminary he determined to isolate himself from the suffering of people, using religion, and even the ministry, as an excuse for doing so. Hightower had decided early in life, even while he was still at seminary, that he would flee from the darkness of life. As an ostracized minister in Jefferson, he remembers why he had chosen to enter the ministry:

He hears now only the myriad and interminable insects, leaning in the window, breathing the hot still rich maculate smell of the earth, thinking of how when he was young, a youth, he had loved darkness, of walking or sitting alone among trees at night. Then the ground, the bark of trees, became actual, savage, filled with, evocative of, strange and baleful half delights and half terrors. He was afraid of it. He feared; he loved in being afraid. Then one day while at seminary he realised that he was no longer afraid. It was as though a door had shut somewhere. He was no longer afraid of darkness. He just hated it; he would flee from it, to walls, to artificial light. (349)

Hightower resents that he and other people have to go through so much suffering:

It is because so much happens. Too much happens. That's it. Man performs, engenders so much more than he can or should have to bear. That's how he finds that he can bear anything. That's it. That's what is
so terrible. That he can bear anything, anything. (329)

Hightower hates the fact of human suffering so much, he tries to escape it in, of all places, the church. His very name "Hightower" is a sign which indicates that he has cut himself off from the earth, flesh.

Gail Hightower came to Jefferson as a minister preaching a strange mixture of Presbyterian theology and Southern history. Hightower lives in the past, obsessed with the death of his grandfather who was killed in the Civil War. This fixation concerning his dead grandfather combines inextricably with his Christian theology:

It was as if he couldn't get religion and that galloping cavalry and his dead grandfather shot from the galloping horse untangled from each other, even in the pulpit. And that he could not untangle them in his private life, at home either, perhaps. (66)

Though Hightower is supposed to be a Christian shepherd, setting an example of love and forgiveness, helping to lead his people to paradise, his strange theology isolates him from everyone, even his wife.

Not long after they arrive in Jefferson, Hightower's wife absents herself from the congregation. She begins to take trips to Memphis where she engages in various immoral activities. Again, we see the contrast between an idealistic man and a woman of the flesh who tries to bring
him down from his "high tower." After a long absence, she returns to Jefferson and the church, but she disrupts the service one morning, screaming at the pulpit and shaking her fist, either at Hightower or God. She has to be taken to a sanitorium, but after her release she resumes the trips to Memphis. Eventually, she commits suicide in Memphis, and Hightower is forced to resign his pulpit.

Hightower's marriage shows that he is not qualified to be a shepherd. According to the New Testament, an elder must be "one who rules his own house well, having his children in submission with all reverence (for if a man does not know how to rule his own house, how will he take care of the church of God?)" (I Timothy 3:4-5). Hightower's marriage indicates an inability to shepherd his church flock. His marriage was never a picture of pastoral bliss. Like so many other failed shepherds in these novels, Hightower's sexual life is a mockery of the pastoral ideal. From the beginning, he never viewed marriage as "men and women in sanctified and living physical intimacy, but a dead state carried over into and existing still among the living like two shadows chained together with the shadow of a chain" (529). Just as the pastoral bacchanalian feast could only exist frozen on a
Grecian urn, Hightower comes to believe that love can only exist in art: "'Perhaps they were right in putting love into books,' he thought quietly. 'Perhaps it could not live anywhere else'" (531). Love, compassion, and forgiveness never exist in the real world for Hightower.¹

The Christian shepherd is to point his people to paradise through redemption, but even Gail Hightower's marriage is an emblem of the Fall, not redemption. His obsession with the past results in a terrible sin which casts both him and his wife out of paradise. The text describes his relationship with his young wife and their estrangement in terms of Adam and Eve and what happened to them as a result of the Fall. When thinking of how he had never told his wife of how only being in Jefferson, imagining those Confederate soldiers, would fill the hunger of his heart, he concludes:

But he had never told anyone that. Not even her. Not even her in the days when they were still the night's lovers, and shame and division had not come and she knew and had not forgot with division and regret and then despair, why he would sit here at this window and wait for nightfall, for the instant of night. Not even to her, to woman. The woman. Woman (not the seminary, as he had once believed): the Passive and Anonymous whom God had created to be not alone the recipient and receptacle of the seed of his body but of his spirit too, which is truth or as near truth as he dare approach. (514-5)
Before the Fall, Adam and Eve were naked and were not ashamed. After the Fall, they realize their nakedness and their shame. The same kind of Fall happens between Hightower and his wife when she realizes his perverted view of the past. As Pitavy puts it, Hightower "attempts to recover this former life by re-creating it in a sanctuary of dreams, from which he excludes all living things, thus causing the death of his wife. He is a hostage of the dead" (110).

Even after his wife has a nervous breakdown and has to be taken to a sanitorium, he is still in the pulpit "with his wild hands and his wild rapt eager voice in which like phantoms God and salvation and the galloping horses and his dead grandfather thundered, while below him the elders sat, and the congregation, puzzled and outraged" (70). He does not try to help her by showing any kind of compassion or forgiveness. Nothing deters his pursuit to live in the past, not even concern for his wife. His lack of compassion for her, combined with his strange theology, angers his congregation:

But the town said that if Hightower had just been a more dependable kind of man, the kind of man a minister should be instead of being born about thirty years after the only day he seemed to have ever lived in—that day when his grandfather was shot from the galloping horse—she would have been all right too.
But he was not, and the neighbors would hear her weeping in the parsonage in the afternoon or late at night, and the neighbors knowing that the husband would not know what to do about it because he did not know what was wrong. And how sometimes she would not even come to the church, where her own husband was preaching, even on Sunday, and they would look at him and wonder if he even knew that she was not there, if he had not even forgot that he ever had a wife, up there in the pulpit with his hands flying around him and the dogma he was supposed to preach all full of galloping cavalry and defeat and glory just as when he tried to tell them on the street about the galloping horses, it in turn would get all mixed up with absolution and choirs of martial seraphim, until it was natural that the old men and women should believe that what he preached in God's house on God's own day verged on actual sacrilege. (67)

Gail Hightower's great sin is conflating Christ with his grandfather. He does not worship the Christ who dies to forgive sin, but his grandfather who dies as a Southern hero. All he wants in life is to live in Jefferson, to be able to look out the window of his house every night, and imagine the galloping confederate heroes. He drives his wife away because she realizes that he does not care about her, but cares only about his dead grandfather. He just needs her to help him get a church in Jefferson so he can look out of his window every evening at sundown and imagine those heroes. When she realizes that she can never help assuage his hunger, he becomes the "author and instrument of her shame and death" (538).
The story of his grandfather and civil war glory paralyzes Gail Hightower. He does not shepherd the flock of God in any sense. Time has stopped for Hightower, "as though the seed which his grandfather had transmitted to him had been on the horse too that night and had been killed too and time had stopped there and then for the seed and nothing had happened in time since, not even him" (69). He is one of Milton's "blind mouths" who has entered the ministry for selfish reasons.

Rather than helping his people to paradise, Hightower creates a paradise in his own mind. Even after the church dismisses him, he builds his pastoral paradise by avoiding others. He and Byron Bunch try to stay away from people, especially those engaged in power struggles where people are likely to get hurt. Hightower's manner of avoiding the power struggles in Jefferson continues throughout his life, even after he resigns the ministry. When Byron Bunch begins to hint that he wants him to help him help Lena Grove, Hightower thinks, "I am not in life anymore" (330).

After his wife commits suicide, Hightower refuses to leave town, much to the disappointment of his congregation. He isolates himself from all humanity within his small house, trying to find peace and contentment reading
Tennyson and Keats. As a matter of form, he advertises a business which he never vigorously pursues:

Rev. Gail Hightower, D.D.
Art Lessons
Handpainted Xmas & Anniversary Cards
Photographs Developed.

The people in the town said that the "D. D." stood for "Done Damned." Hightower appears to be damned both as a minister and as a man.

He and the town do not have much to do with one another, although he is forced into action once to help a black woman in labor. All that he really asks of life is "to be permitted to live quietly among his fellows" (81). When his conscience begins to prompt him to leave his isolated world to help Lena Grove and Joe Christmas, he thinks, "I wont. I wont. I have bought immunity . . . I paid for it. I didn't quibble about the price. No man can say that. I just wanted peace; I paid them their price without quibbling" (341). Since he resigned his pulpit, even submitted to several beatings designed to persuade him to leave, Hightower believes that he has the right to remain isolated from any responsibilities toward the people in Jefferson.

Everything about Hightower speaks of his isolation. He used to be thin, but now "his skin is the color of flour
sacking and his upper body in shape is like a loosely filled sack falling from his gaunt shoulders of its own weight, upon his lap" (85). When Byron comes to see him, Byron smells the "plump unwashed flesh and unfresh clothing— that odor of unfastidious sedentation, of static overflesh not often enough bathed" (328). He has a "stubborn, ascetic face: the face of a hermit who has lived for a long time in an empty place where sand blows" (332).

Actually, after Hightower is dismissed from his church, he becomes the shepherd of one, Byron Bunch. But even then he is not like a Christian shepherd, but rather he takes the posture of an "eastern idol" (98). But through Hightower's counsel, Byron Bunch almost becomes another recluse. Even when Byron tells him things that might draw him from his isolation, he listens to Byron's story as though "he were listening to the doings of people of a different race" (88). When he realizes that Byron is in love with Lena Grove, he has an expression of "shrinking and foreboding" (90). The more he learns of Byron's attempt to help Lena, Hightower just keeps repeating, "Ah, Byron, Byron."
Though Gail Hightower's fall can be blamed on personal character flaws, the text suggests that his doom was inevitable because of his Protestant heritage. Christianity can never lead to paradise and bliss. It can only lead to crucifixion. As Gail Hightower listens to the beautiful, peaceful music as it emanates from the church on Sunday evening, his thoughts of bliss and peace are interrupted by these thoughts:

Yet even then the music has still a quality stern and implacable, deliberate and without passion so much as immolation, pleading, asking, for not love, not life, forbidding it to others, demanding in sonorous tones death as though death were the boon, like all Protestant music. It was as though they who accepted it and raised voices to praise it within praise, having been made what they were by that which the music praised and symbolised, they took revenge upon that which made them so by means of the praise itself.

Listening, he seems to hear within it the apotheosis of his own history, his own land, his own environed blood: that people from which he sprang and among whom he lives who can never take either pleasure or catastrophe or escape from either, without brawling over it. Pleasure, ecstasy, they cannot seem to bear: their escape for it is in violence, in drinking and fighting and praying; catastrophe too, the violence identical and apparently inescapable And so why should not their religion drive them to crucifixion of themselves and one another? (404-5)

The Christian shepherd really has no choice but to lead his people toward crucifixion rather than paradise. The Protestant faith, Hightower, and the South itself are doomed to violence and crucifixion rather than pastoral
peace. The blending of the pastoral and Christianity is not possible, as Hightower shows. The Christian version of the pastoral only denies love and life. Bakhtin writes,

It was the victory of laughter over fear that most impressed medieval man. It was not only a victory over mystic terror of God, but also a victory over the awe inspired by the forces of nature, and most of all over the oppression and guilt related to all that was consecrated and forbidden ("manna" and "taboo"). It was the defeat of divine and human power, of authoritarian commandments and prohibitions, of death and punishment after death, hell and all that is more terrifying than the earth itself. Through this victory laughter clarified man's consciousness and gave him a new outlook on life. (Rabelais 90-1)

The Southern version of Presbyterianism, like medieval Catholicism had nurtured the fear of God and hell. Descriptions of these ideas in novels such as Light in August provide an opportunity for people to laugh at these terrors. The Southern ideology of chivalry, slavery, and Christianity as combined in the grotesque figure of Hightower relativize all that is considered sacred or profane by that culture. The combination of Southern glory and Presbyterianism is a grotesque image which evokes laughter rather than fear. By criticizing Hightower's vision, the Christianized paradisal dream of the whole South is also shown as a mockery of original Christianity. Hightower, like so many in the South, juxtaposed Christianity and glory of the Confederate armies.
The text mocks this juxtaposition by the fact that Hightower's grandfather did not die as a war hero, but rather from a shotgun blast, probably of a Southern woman, while he was trying to raid a chicken house. Such parodies provide the function of what Bakhtin calls "removing the mask" of all that was official, frightening and serious. After the mask had been removed, "another truth was heard in the form of laughter, foolishness, improprieties, curses, parodies and travesties" (Rabelais 94). Light in August parodies the South's idealization of the war, its heroes, and its past, along with its underlying cultural and religious ideology.

Since Hightower's life, and its consequences, are tragic in many respects, laughter may seem inappropriate. Nevertheless, Hightower's actions and rhetoric are matters for laughter, a laughter of a serious nature. Bakhtin argued that carnivalistic laughter was not incompatible with serious themes:

True ambivalent and universal laughter does not deny seriousness but purifies and completes it. Laughter purifies from dogmatism from the intolerant and the petrified; it liberates from fanaticism and pedantry, from fear and intimidation, from didacticism, naivete and illusion, from the single meaning, the single level, from sentimentality. Laughter does not permit seriousness to atrophy and to be torn away from the one being, forever incomplete. It restores this ambivalent wholeness. Such is the function of
laughter in the historical development of culture and literature. (Rabelais 123)

These writers, such as Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, demonstrate ambivalent feelings toward Christianity. The texts do not advocate the destruction of Christianity, but the purifying of it. These carnival images are meant to cause us to take a serious, laughing look at all that is false and hypocritical. These grotesque images promote a skepticism which will actually prove regenerative, burying that which is cruel and resurrecting a better form of doctrine and practice in its place.

The text demonstrates that the institutional church, supposedly a paradise on earth showing the rest of the world the way to paradise, is in reality a cruel institution. Hightower realizes that the leaders of the church, who play the same power games as the rest of humanity, are the most to blame for the cruel nature of the institutional church:

He sees himself a shadowy figure among shadows, paradoxical, with a kind of false optimism and egoism believing that he would find in that part of the Church which most blunders, dreamrecovering, among the blind passions and the lifted hands and voices of men, that which he had failed to find in the Church's cloistered apotheosis upon earth. It seems to him that he has seen it all the while: that that which is destroying the Church is not the outward groping of those within it nor the inward groping of those without, but the professionals who control it and who
have removed the bells from its steeples. He seems to see them, endless, without order, empty, symbolical, bleak, skypointed not with ecstasy or passion but in adjuration, threat, and doom. He seems to see the churches of the world like a rampart, like one of those barricades of the middle ages planted with dead and sharpened stakes, against truth and against that peace in which to sin and be forgiven which is the life of man. (537-8)

Instead of shepherds who love the sheep, the church has hirelings who enter the ministry for selfish gain. The ministry makes the most mistakes and carries people further away from paradise. The church, and especially, the professional clergy, who should be teaching people the forgiveness of Christ, instead use their positions only to stir up hatred and injustice. Hightower realizes that he had been "a charlatan preaching worse than heresy, in utter disregard of that whose very stage he preempted, offering instead of the crucified shape of pity and love, a swaggering and unchastened bravo killed with a shotgun in a peaceful henhouse, in a temporary hiatus of his own avocation of killing" (539).

Hightower perceives that he is guilty of using the church only to foster his own selfish desires. As he thinks of the temptation to use the church for selfish purposes, he thinks,

And I accepted that . . . I acquiesced. Nay, I did worse: I served it. I served it by using it to
forward my own desire. I came here where faces full of bafflement and hunger and eagerness waited for me, waiting to believe; I did not see them. Where hands were raised for what they believed that I would bring them; I did not see them. (538)

In Bakhtin's terms, the encounters with Joe and Lena have resulted in a dialogic encounter with himself that has broken down the official, unified vision he was trying to impose upon himself:

A dialogic relationship to one's own self defines the genre of the soliloquy. It is a discussion with oneself. . . . At the heart of the genre lies the discovery of the inner man—"one's own self," accessible not to passive self-observation but only through an active dialogic approach to one's own self, destroying that naive wholeness of one's notions about the self that lies at the heart of the lyric, epic, and tragic image of man. A dialogic approach to oneself breaks down the outer shell of the self's image, that shell which exists for other people, determining the external assessment of a person (in the eyes of others) and dimming the purity of self-consciousness. (Poetics 120).

Hightower realizes that he has neglected one of the fundamental duties of the shepherd. Jesus told Peter, "Feed my sheep" (John 21:17). Hightower understands that he failed to feed those who looked to him with hunger. Rather than feeding them, he only used the flock for his own pleasure, thus falling under the condemnation of Ezekiel 34:2, "Woe to the shepherds who feed themselves! Should not the shepherds feed the flocks?" Hightower's description of people looking to him with hunger, echoes
Milton's words in *Lycidas*, "the hungry sheep look up, and are not fed" (125).

Even the pastoral desire to be left alone, to be kept away from human suffering, is seen to be as ridiculous and grotesque as Gail Hightower himself:

He believed with a calm joy that if ever there was shelter, it would be the Church; that if ever truth could walk naked and without shame or fear, it would be in the seminary. When he believed that he had heard the call it seemed to him that he could see his future, his life, intact and on all sides, complete and inviolable, like a classic and serene vase, where the spirit could be born anew sheltered from the harsh gale of living and die so, peacefully, with only the far sound of the circumvented wind, with scarce even a handful of rotting dust to be disposed of. (527-8)

Again, the text uses the image of the vase or urn to describe the artfulness, or unreality of the pastoral dream. Hightower does not want to use his call to help others, but only to shield himself from the horrors of life. Hightower never believes that he could do heroic things in the present in his calling in the church, so he idealizes the past of the Southern heroes, trying to exist in a world of art. Even as he thinks about his grandfather raiding the chicken house, he thinks:

I tell you, they were not men after spoils and glory; they were boys riding the sheer tremendous tidal wave of desperate living. Boys. Because this. This is beautiful. Listen. Try to see it. Here is that fine shape of eternal youth and virginal desire which makes heroes. (533)
Hightower not only retreats into the past, he picks a pathetic past in which to hide.

Toward the end of *Light in August*, Byron Bunch leads Hightower to involve himself in the lives of Lena Grove and Joe Christmas. He helps to deliver Lena's baby, and he makes a futile attempt to save Joe Christmas from lynching.

After Hightower helps deliver Lena Grove's baby, he seems to come to life again. He muses: "Life comes to the old man yet, while they get there too late" (446). He even seems to feel a part of nature once again. He takes a walk through the forest and thinks, "I must do this more often" (448). Coming into contact with Lena makes him aware of nature once again. It is not Christianity or Christian dogma which results in his new birth, but contact with people, especially a pastoral woman of the earth.

Toward the end of the novel, Gail Hightower must leave his sanctuary once again as he tries to protect Joe Christmas from Percy Grimm and the mob determined to lynch Joe. Joe Christmas tries to find refuge in Hightower's home. Ironically, the home that Hightower tried to isolate from Jefferson becomes the scene of one of its bloodiest events, as Percy Grimm kills and castrates Joe Christmas. Subverting the expected Christian duties of the priest,
Hightower lies in an attempt to save Joe Christmas, while Percy Grimm who eventually kills Joe, has a voice "clear and outraged like that of a young priest" (512). The violence of Southern Christianity finds its voice in a mob led by a fanatical "priest/shepherd," determined to protect white women from Joe Christmas, "even in hell." Though Hightower fails in his attempt to save Joe, he at least makes the effort. Critics are divided concerning whether Hightower has genuinely been cured of his heresy. While Hightower does realize the truth about himself and the unhappiness he has caused, his so-called "heroism" at the end of the novel may be a parody of true Christian heroism. Whether we are to believe that Hightower has truly been delivered from his isolationist heresy is complicated by the last scene in his story. Once again, he is before the window, that window that caused him to want to be in Jefferson from the beginning, waiting to hear the Confederate dead ride by one more time:

He hears above his heart the thunder increase, myriad and drumming. Like a long sighing of wind in trees it begins, then they sweep into sight, borne now upon a cloud of phantom dust. They rush past, forwardleaning in the saddles, with brandished arms, beneath whipping ribbons from slanted and eager lances; with tumult and soundless yelling they sweep past like a tide whose crest is jagged with the wild heads of horses and the brandished arms of men like the crater of the world in explosion. They rush past, are gone; the dust swirls
skyward sucking, fades away into the night which has fully come. Yet, leaning forward in the window, his bandaged head huge and without depth above the twin blobs of his hand upon the ledge, it seems to him that he still hears them: the wild bugles and the clashing sabres and the dying thunder of hooves. (544)

Though it appears that Hightower has done two heroic things in trying to save Joe Christmas and helping to deliver Lena's baby, it seems that he may be poised to enter the world of isolation once again and wait for tomorrow night to see the heroes of the Southern past ride by once again. We don't know. It is best to see this as an example of Bakhtin's polyphonic novel,

Thus the new artistic position of the author with regard to the hero in Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel is a fully realized and thoroughly consistent dialogic position, one that affirms the independence, internal freedom, unfinalizability, and indeterminacy of the hero. (Poetics 63)

Protestant Christianity and its representatives, especially in the South, still worship violence and death instead of the Christ who forgives. *Light in August* juxtaposes the stories of Joe Christmas and Gail Hightower to show that they are more intimately related than merely the closing encounter between them would indicate. Gail Hightower's ideology and isolation represent part of the reason why the tragedy of Joe Christmas occurs. The text presents Hightower in grotesque fashion so that this destructive
ideology might be buried and the death of Joe Christmas find some redemptive value after all.

Gabriel Pendleton: The Failure of an Evasive Shepherd

In Glasgow's Virginia, Gabriel Pendleton, Virginia's father, is an Episcopal minister who uses his ministry to help preserve the status quo. He looks back with affection on the antebellum South, blaming any present evils on the influence of modernism or the northern United States. He regarded "the period before the war in Virginia as attained perfection, and the present as falling short of that perfection only inasmuch as it had occurred since the surrender" (27). Raper writes:

Virginia's father, a mild, easy-going Episcopal clergyman . . . teaches Virginia to live on humility, patience and illusions, especially the illusions that all men (except Yankees and scalawags) are honest, that all women (even New England abolitionists) are virtuous, that antebellum Virginia was perfection attained, and that the present state of things falls little short of that high condition . . . . All except the seed of this natural savage instinct to struggle has been tamed out of Gabriel by his wife and by the artificially mannered system of Dinwiddie life, so that sacrifice is his dominant instinct. (Shelter 243)

The narrator describes Gabriel Pendleton as "one of the many martial Christians of the Confederacy" who had "laid aside his surplice at the first call for troops to defend the borders, and had resumed it immediately after the
surrender at Appomattox" (26). People in Dinwiddie, Virginia did not know whether he should be praised most for being a soldier or a saint. Though feelings of guilt about his part in the war occasionally disturbed his sleep, he would awaken and "go about his parochial duties with the serene and childlike trust in Providence that had carried him into battle" (26).

Gabriel Pendleton is another idealist who prefers to live in a world of illusion:

A militant idealism had ennobled his fighting as it now exalted his preaching. He had never in his life seen things as they are because he had seen them always by the white flame of a soul on fire with righteousness. To reach his mind, impressions of persons or objects had first to pass through a refining atmosphere in which all baser substances were eliminated, and no fact had ever penetrated this medium except in the flattering disguise of a sentiment. Having married at twenty an idealist only less ignorant of the world than himself, he had, inspired by her example, immediately directed his energies toward the whitewashing of the actuality. Both cherished the naive conviction that to acknowledge an evil is in a manner to countenance its existence, and both clung fervently to the belief that a pretty sham has a more intimate relation to morality than has an ugly truth. Yet so unconscious were they of weaving this elaborate tissue of illusion around the world they inhabited that they called the mental process by which they distorted the reality "taking a true view of life." (26)

The Golden Age for Gabriel Pendleton was the antebellum South. Rather than leading his people toward redemption and the future, he tries to show them the beauty of the
past and imitate its virtues. Gabriel Pendleton's vision of the pastoral is what Bakhtin calls a "monologic understanding . . . against the firm background of a unified world of objects" (Poetics 18). His is a "single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as objects into itself" (Poetics 18). However, toward the end of the novel, his monologic interpretation of the world begins to break down as the suffering of other consciousnesses intrudes upon the stability of his idealism.

Mr. and Mrs. Pendleton, using their powers of evasive idealism, shut out all of the horrors of slavery, refusing to acknowledge the suffering which it caused. While thinking of the condition of blacks in Virginia, he says, "People may say what they please, but there never were happier or more contented creatures than the darkeys . . . I doubt if there's another peasantry in the world that is half so well off or half so picturesque" (281). This thought was prompted by looking at a Negro home and thinking "how tranquil and happy the little rustic home appeared under the windy brightness of the March sky" (281). This illusion that the poor and the oppressed are really happy in their "pastoral" environment, is one of the methods of ignoring the plight of these people. The
pastoral can actually become a device of the upper classes to ignore the poor and oppressed. Rather than functioning as a true shepherd, calling attention to the plight of the oppressed, Gabriel Pendleton uses the power of his ministerial office to keep the illusion alive.

Ironically, Gabriel Pendleton meets his death trying to save a black man from being lynched. In a world of monologic idealism, a person is able to maintain a unified spirit. But when a person comes into contact with other cultures, monologism begins to give way to dialogism.

Cyrus Treadwell, the great capitalist of Dinwiddie, had a son by his black servant, Mandy. When Treadwell refuses to help the young man, who is accused of killing a policeman, Gabriel Pendleton feels that he must help. Coming into contact with blacks causes his own world to be "thrown off its ideological balance" (Bakhtin Poetics 20). Because he is a Christian, he thinks that he must help the Negroes in some way. He tells Cyrus Treadwell, "The terrible thing for us about the Negroes is that they are so grave a responsibility--so grave a responsibility. Of course, we aren't to blame--we didn't bring them here; and yet I sometimes feel as if we had really done so" (278). When Cyrus argues that if the white people had not brought them
to America, they would have never been civilized or
Christianized, Gabriel replies,

Ah, that is just where the responsibility rests on
us. We stand for civilization to them; we stand
even—or at least we used to stand—for Christianity.
They haven't learned yet to look above or beyond us,
and the example we set them is one that they are
condemned, for sheer lack of any finer vision, to
follow. The majority of them are still hardly more
than uneducated children, and that very fact makes an
appeal to one's compassion which becomes at times
almost unbearable. (278)

Even though Gabriel can never bring himself to admit that
the white man might be responsible for the suffering of
blacks, he does admit that the white Christians have set a
terrible example for them. The plight of blacks in the
South begins to strip away some of the illusive veneer of
his pastoral myth.

Gabriel Pendleton's method for maintaining the
paradisal age for all these years has been to maintain a
state of illusion. At the end of his life, when he is
called upon to face harsh realities, he almost backs away
from his responsibility. It is March, a wonderful pastoral
month in Virginia. As he thinks about trying to save the
young black man from lynching, the cool March breeze makes
him think "that whatever was unpleasant could not possibly
be natural" (280).
As Gabriel goes to help Mandy's son at Cross's Corner, he has one last pastoral vision of the Southern countryside:

The March wind, fresh and bud-scented, was blowing away his despondency. . . .

In the soul of Gabriel, that essence of the spring, which is immortally young and restless, awakened and gave him back his youth, as it gave the new grass to the fields and the longing for joy to the hearts of the ploughmen. He forgot that he was "getting on." He forgot the unnatural depression which had made him imagine for a moment that the world was a more difficult place than he had permitted himself to believe--so difficult a place, indeed, that for some people there could be no solution of its injustice, its brutality, its dissonance, its inequalities. (280)

Again, his evasive vision of the pastoral causes him to ignore all of the suffering in the world and to go on believing the pastoral illusion he has created in his mind.

On his way to Cross's Corner, he stops at the home of old Aunt Mehitable, a former slave, to see if she can tell him anything about the case of Mandy's son. As he sits on the porch with her, he looks again at the pastoral setting:

The wind had lowered until it came like the breath of spring, bud-scented, caressing, provocative. Even Gabriel, whose optimism lay in his blood and bone rather than in his intellect, yielded for a moment to this call of the spring as one might yield to the delicious melancholy of a vagrant mood. The long straight road, without bend or fork, had warmed in the paling sunlight to the color of old ivory; in a neighboring field a young maple-tree rose in a flame of buds from the ridged earth where the ploughing was over; and against the azure sky in the south a flock
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of birds drifted up, like brown smoke from the marshes. (283)

As Gabriel looks at "the purple shadows that slanted over the ploughed fields," he thinks, "How peaceful it looks" (284). A few moments later he sees in the distance, close to a blighted pine, what appears to be several men in a scuffle. He runs from Aunt Mehitable's porch to see what is happening. He finds that several white men are beating a young black man because he "jostled" a white woman. Gabriel believes that the black man is innocent and steps in to fight on his behalf. The white men kill Gabriel in the pastoral field where everything appeared so peaceful, where "up the long road the March wind still blew, as soft, as provocative, as bud-scented" (286). The white shepherd, Gabriel Pendleton, who had deluded himself to think that blacks were happy in the peaceful, pastoral world, discovers the violence in that world and dies in it, showing even by his death that his view of the pastoral world is an illusion. Thus, even in the consciousness of a character who is seemingly ideologically closed, Glasgow presents "the hero's self-consciousness and the inescapable open-endedness, the vicious circle of that self-consciousness" (Poetics 51) as his ideology begins to break down. As Bakhtin writes of Dostoevsky's heroes,
"... their own unfinalizability and indeterminancy is realized in very complex ways, by ideological thought, crime, or heroic deed" (Poetics 59).

Both Gail Hightower and Gabriel Pendleton reach their moment of apotheosis when trying to save someone from a lynching. The blood shed by racism blights the stillness and tranquility of the Southern landscape. Though many of the religious shepherds tried to maintain the illusion of the pastoral world in spite of the reality of racism, the horror finds a way to intrude upon the dream.

Ike McCaslin: The Failure of the Shamanic Shepherd

Ike McCaslin is another of Faulkner's idealists. Ike tries to find a single, ideological position upon which to base the rest of his life. He shuts out other voices in an effort to try to remain true to his ideals. Ike thinks he has found a way to return to a pastoral existence and wants to set an example for others to follow. Such monologic idealism rarely succeeds. Bakhtin writes, "The monistic principle, that is, the affirmation of the unity of existence, is, in idealism, transformed into the unity of the consciousness" (Poetics 80). Ike tries to maintain this unity of consciousness throughout his life.
Though Ike McCaslin is not part of the professional clergy, he is, nevertheless, a failed shepherd. Under the tutelage of Sam Fathers, the descendant of a Chickasaw chief, Ike is brought up to be a kind of modern shaman. While on frequent hunting trips into the Mississippi wilderness, Sam Fathers teaches Ike not only how to hunt, but also his kinship with nature. By the time Ike reaches the age that he can inherit the land of his ancestors, he decides that he will renounce it, since he has come to believe that no one should own land. This conviction, combined with his guilt concerning the way Southern land was used for slavery, leads Ike to repudiate his inheritance by giving up the land which is rightfully his. After this act of self-denial he becomes a Christ-figure, trying to emulate the Nazarene. In two stories contained in *Go Down, Moses*, "The Bear" and "Delta Autumn," we find that Ike fails to live up to his potential either as a shaman or a Christian shepherd.

After the training under Sam Fathers, Ike would seem to be a person who has the potential to be a shepherd that will one day be able to lead his people back to the pastoral paradise of oneness with nature. He is so in tune with nature, he has the shamanic vision of the great deer
of the woods whom Sam calls "Grandfather." After Ike kills his first deer, Sam baptizes, or consecrates Ike by marking his face with the blood of the deer. When Ike is sixteen years old, he is a better woodsman than many grown men who have been hunting all their lives. General Compson realizes how unique Ike is in his knowledge of the woods and about life. When Cass and Boon want Ike to leave the hunt because he is missing too much school, General Compson defends Ike's right to stay:

"All right," General Compson said. "You can stay. If missing an extra week of school is going to throw you so far behind you'll have to sweat to find out what some hired pedagogue put between the covers of a book, you better quit altogether.—And you shut up, Cass," he said, though McCaslin had not spoken. "You've got one foot straddled into a farm and the other foot straddled into a bank; you aint even got a good hand-hold where this boy was already an old man long before you damned Sartorises and Edmondses invented farms and banks to keep yourselves from having to find out what this boy was born knowing and fearing too maybe but without being afraid, that could go ten miles on a compass because he wanted to look at a bear none of us had ever got near enough to put a bullet in and looked at the bear and came the ten miles back on the compass in the dark; maybe by God that's the why and the wherefore of farms and banks."

General Compson realizes that Ike knows far more important things than what is contained in books. Further, we see that General Compson perceives that Ike is destined for other things besides farms and banks. Farms and banks,
part of the civilized world, keep us from learning the things about nature that Ike knows.

Sam teaches Ike that the accouterments of civilization alienate us from the ways of nature. In "The Bear," when Ike goes out to look for Old Ben, the giant bear of the woods, he learns that he cannot find him unless he puts away his gun, watch, and compass:

He had already relinquished, of his will, because of his need, in humility and peace and without regret, yet apparently that had not been enough, the leaving of the gun was not enough. He stood for a moment—a child, alien and lost in the green and soaring gloom of the markless wilderness. Then he relinquished completely to it. It was the watch and the compass. He was still tainted. (208)

Ike becomes one with nature by completely "relinquishing" to it. By leaving behind the trappings of civilization, he has at last become one with the natural world. He realizes that civilization makes us unfit for communion with the natural world. He is rewarded for this relinquishment, for Old Ben allows the boy to see him.

When Ike becomes twenty-one he begins to apply what his education under Sam Fathers and his knowledge of the woods has taught him. Now that he knows how to live in the wilderness, he must decide what to do with the tamed land which he is destined to inherit. Just as he felt he had to relinquish the gun, compass, and watch, he now feels that
he must relinquish the land. Just as he felt tainted by those trappings of civilization, he feels tainted by the land, the land

which old Carothers McCaslin his grandfather had bought with white man's money from the wild men whose grandfathers without guns hunted it, and tamed and ordered it for the reason that the human beings he held in bondage and in the power of life and death had removed the forest from it and in their sweat scratched the surface of it to a depth of perhaps fourteen inches in order to grow something out of it which had not been there before and which could be translated back into the money he who believed he had bought it had had to pay to get it and hold it and a reasonable profit too: and for which reason old Carothers McCaslin, knowing better, could raise his children, his descendants and heirs, to believe the land was his to hold and bequeath since the strong and ruthless man has a cynical foreknowledge of his own vanity and pride and strength and a contempt for all his get . . . (254-5)

Ike realizes that the land had been taken from the Indians for the sake of profit, a profit that was based on slavery. Since Ike does not believe that anyone has the right to own the land, he says,

I can't repudiate it. It was never mine to repudiate. It was never Father's and Uncle Buddy's to bequeath me to repudiate because it was never Grandfather's to bequeath them to bequeath me to repudiate because it was never old Ikkemotubbe's to sell to Grandfather for bequeathment and repudiation. Because it was never Ikkemotubbe's fathers' fathers' to bequeath Ikkemotubbe to sell to Grandfather or any man because on the instant when Ikkemotubbe discovered, realised, that he could sell it for money, on that instant it ceased ever to have been his forever, father to father, and the man who bought it bought nothing. (256-7)
Even though Ike is not a clergyman, he uses the Bible to justify his relinquishment of the land. Appealing to the book of Genesis to justify his actions, Ike tells Cass:

> Because He told in the Book how He created the earth, made it and looked at it and said it was all right, and He made man. He made the earth first and peopled it with dumb creatures, and then he created man to be His overseer on the earth and to hold suzerainty over the earth and the animals on it in His name, not to hold for himself and his descendants inviolable title forever, generation after generation, to the oblongs and squares of the earth, but to hold the earth mutual and intact in the communal anonymity of brotherhood, and all the fee He asked was pity and humility and sufferance and endurance and sweat of his face for bread. (257)

Ike advocates a kind of communal holding of the land, looking after it, but no one in possession of it.

Possessing land causes greed, slavery, wars and death.

Unlike Gail Hightower, Ike is ashamed of the past of the South, even that of the great military heroes (287).

Ike should be the ideal shepherd, because he has repudiated all possessions. Poggioli, writing about the characteristics of the true pastoral shepherd, points out,

> Poverty emancipates man from the slavery of desire . . . and relieves man from the burden of wealth, the chief of which is having charge of a host of servants. The old shepherd is the patriarch but not the master of his clan, and this is why he lives in peace without the responsibilities and worries of a taskmaster. (11)
Evidently, there can be no true pastoral environment where there are masters and servants. Therefore, the pastoral dream of the South was doomed from the beginning because they sought to establish an Arcadia based on materialism which depended on economic exploitation. So then, Ike should be an ideal shepherd because he repudiates land wealth.

Ike's idealism actually makes communication impossible. As Bakhtin writes,

In an environment of philosophical monologism the genuine interaction of consciousnesses is impossible, and thus genuine dialogue is impossible as well. In essence idealism knows only a single mode of cognitive interaction among consciousness: someone who knows and possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error; that is, it is the interaction of a teacher and a pupil, which, it follows, can be only a pedagogical dialogue. (Poetics 81)

Ike cannot be dissuaded from his idealism. Ike, however, makes the same mistake as Gail Hightower. Instead of seeking to make things better for people or trying to show by example the better path, he just wants to be left alone:

I'm trying to explain to the head of my family something which I have got to do which I don't quite understand myself, not in justification of it but to explain it if I can. I could say I don't know why I must do it but that I do know I have got to because I have myself to have to live with for the rest of my life and all I want is peace to do it in. (288)
When asked about Ike's decision to relinquish the land, Faulkner himself said, "Well, I think a man ought to do more than just repudiate. He should have been more affirmative instead of shunning people" (Grenier 175). When he repudiates the land, Ike believes that he is free (299). He says, "Sam Fathers set me free" (300). But like Gail Hightower, Ike uses his freedom to enter the cloister:

And Isaac McCaslin, not yet Uncle Ike, a long time yet before he would be uncle to half a county and still father to none, living in one small cramped fireless rented room in a Jefferson boarding-house where petit juries were domiciled during court terms and itinerant horse- and mule-traders stayed, with his kit of brand-new carpenter's tools and the shotgun McCaslin had given him with his name engraved in silver and old General Compson's compass (and, when the General died, his silver-mounted horn too) and the iron cot and mattress and the blankets which he would take each fall into the woods for more than sixty years and the bright tin coffee-pot . . . (300)

In Christian theology, the purpose of self-denial is to gain the freedom to serve others, to engender life. Ike's repudiation results in barrenness. When Ike refuses to reclaim his land, his wife denies sex to him for the rest of their lives. Ike becomes the uncle to half a county and father of none. His barrenness typifies the ineffectiveness of his ideas, as well as his inability to love.
As such, Ike McCaslin once again becomes a subject of laughter. As carnival used to take delight in parodying the hypocritical monks of its day, so the descriptions of Ike McCaslin become parodies of genuine pastoral shepherds.

Love characterizes the true shepherd, but Ike fails to demonstrate love to his wife or to others. Ike's example of repudiation has left little impression on others. After Ike is an old man, Roth Edmonds asks him, "I suppose the question to ask you is, where have you been all the time you were dead?" (345). Ironically, a black woman reveals to Ike that his problem throughout his life has been an inability to love. When Ike suggests to Roth Edmonds's black mistress that she just go North and marry a black man, she responds, "Old man, . . . have you lived so long and forgotten so much that you dont remember anything you ever knew or felt or even heard about love?" (363). Ike's repudiation has accomplished nothing, least of all the gaining of respect from his family and community.

After Ike relinquished his land, he bought some carpenter tools to live in imitation of Christ, for he thought, "if the Nazarene had found carpentering good for the life and ends He had assumed and elected to serve, it would be all right too for Isaac McCaslin . . . " (309).
Even though Ike thinks he is imitating Christ, he is in fact the opposite of Christ. As Kinney observes, "Ike has not found in emulating Christ a successful mask by which to serve or influence humanity" (Kinney 237). Unfortunately, Ike chose a strange part of the life of Christ to emulate. Christ did not leave life to carpenter, but left his carpentering to teach and give himself sacrificially for others. Ike McCaslin perverts the example of Christ to withdraw from society. The passages quoted earlier from the New Testament show Christ as dying for the good of the sheep, even going to rescue them from danger. Ike distances himself from the sheep and merely watches the destruction of the pastoral landscape as civilization continues to destroy it.

Though Ike had a wisdom about the world that he could have shared with others, he withdrew. Major de Spain, unable to understand why Ike repudiated his inheritance, invites him to stay at his house during the winter: "You sleep with me and before this winter is out, I'll know the reason. You'll tell me. Because I dont believe you just quit. It looks like you just quit but I have watched you in the woods too much and I dont believe you quit even if
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it does look damn like it . . . " (309). His past qualified him to do so much more than just repudiate.

Ike never applies what he has learned. As Vickery points out, Ike confuses the ritual with the reality (Vickery Moral 212). Ike typifies the Christian minister who knows how to carry out the rituals and sacraments of the church, but knows nothing of how to apply the realities symbolized in the sacraments, such as life, forgiveness, and love. After a while, even the rituals themselves become empty and meaningless. In Ike's case, he applies none of the wisdom he learned in the hunt to his life, although he continues to perform the ritual of the hunt. But even the hunt loses its significance when the wisdom of Sam Fathers and the skill of General Compson, Major de Spain, and Walter Ewell are replaced by the young city-dwellers who come into the country just to shoot does.

While Millgate suggests that the lessons Ike learned in the wilderness just became obsolete (Unity 232), the fault is not in the wisdom learned, but in the inability to transfer the lessons to the present situation. Ike illustrates the inability of leaders to change. Ike stops maturing after he has learned the important lessons of the wilderness. As an old man, he is still playing the child's
game of hunting. He is still involved in an old ritual which loses its meaning, while refusing to use his wisdom to meet the needs of the contemporary society.

For all the wisdom that Ike has about nature and the place of human beings in it, he is a failure both as a man and a husband. Like so many of the other characters in Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, Ike may learn a great deal, but there is too much in his heritage, too much that his culture has ingrained into him that he must overcome. Ike feels guilty because of the slavery of the past. When he was a boy, he felt badly about how the Native American Sam Fathers was treated as a Negro by the Southern society. A man who was as in tune with nature as Ike, and who had seen the horror of slavery and its curse on the land, should have been able to see the immorality of racism. Yet, when Roth Edmonds has an affair with a woman who has a small amount of black blood in her, he cannot accept her.

In "Delta Autumn" we see Ike as an old man, still taking hunting trips down into the delta country. When Roth Edmonds's mistress visits old Uncle Ike, he realizes that he cannot tolerate the idea of mixing with black blood, even in a small amount. When he perceives that Roth Edmonds's mistress is black, he thinks, "Maybe in a
thousand or two thousand years in America . . . But not now! Not now!" (361). Then he screams at the woman, "You're a nigger!" (361). Bakhtin writes:

The dialogic means of seeking truth is counterposed to official monologism, which pretends to possess a ready-made truth, and it is also counterposed to the naive self-confidence of those people who think that they know something, that, who think that they possess certain truths. Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth in the process of their dialogic interaction. (Poetics 110)

The black woman is a threat to Ike's monologic philosophy of life. He expresses the view that neither he, nor the South, is ready for the heteroglossic interaction with another culture. That interaction, of course, has already taken place, and the monologic world of the South is already being broken down by that encounter. Ike's screaming at her is an attempt to block her out of his mind so that he might retain the pathetic remnants of his unified understanding of life.

Instead of the sage of the woods, the last we see of Ike is a pathetic old man shivering on his cot in much the same way as Quentin Compson in Absalom, Absalom!, shivering because of the legacy and the future of the South. Like Hightower, Ike has tried to escape his responsibility, but has paid a heavy price for wanting to be left alone. Like
many others in the South, Ike McCaslin refuses to accept the passing of time. They all want to freeze time on the Grecian urn. Since they can't make time stand still, they try to escape the passing of time by withdrawing into meaningless ritual.

Clym Yeobright:
The Failure of a Secular Shepherd

If Hardy's criticism of the traditional Christian shepherds is scathing, so are his attacks upon those secular idealists who were trying to reform society. Hardy's vision of the new pastoral incorporates the brutality of nature. Those who wish to return to the pastoral world must realize that it will have different characteristics than those formerly envisioned. Those who try to reform society without taking into account the bleakness of nature are doomed to failure. Such a figure is Clym Yeobright in The Return of the Native. Clym is an idealist who returns to Egdon Heath with some new European theories which he thinks he can teach to the inhabitants of the heath to make their world better. He is the native who returns with the purpose of returning to the pastoral world of the heath, but he also wants to improve it. He is a secular shepherd with a genuine love for his people who wants to alleviate some of their misery. His similarity to
traditional Christian shepherds is mentioned throughout the
text. In Clym, we detect the text's ambivalence toward
modern thought. Modern thought is both Savior and
destroyer of the pastoral idyll.

For the narrator, Clym's education is the source of
much of his unhappiness and resulting tragedy. Hardy's
first chapter, which contains his moving description of the
heath, is entitled, "A Face on Which Time Makes but Little
Impression." The heath shows little trace of time because
it has been able to resist the inroads of civilization.
But if the heath is a face that shows little of time,
Clym's face has already begun to show the ravages of modern
life and thought:

The face was well shaped, even excellently. But the
mind within was beginning to use it as a mere waste
tablet whereon to trace its idiosyncrasies as they
developed themselves. The beauty here visible would
in no long time be ruthlessly overrun by its parasite,
thought, which might just as well have fed upon a
plainer exterior where there was nothing it could
harm. (138)

"Thought," "the mind," is the culprit who is taking away
the beauty from Clym's face. The narrator says, "He
already showed that thought is a disease of flesh, and
indirectly bore evidence that ideal physical beauty is
incompatible with emotional development and a full
recognition of the coil of things" (138). While
contemplating the great future planned for the boy, neither Clym nor his mother realized that this civilized education would be a source of Clym's tragedy.

This education seems to have permanently severed his union with the heath that had been so characteristic of his earlier days: "Clym had been so inwoven with the heath in his boyhood that hardly anybody could look upon it without thinking of him" (170). The narrator says later:

If anyone knew the heath well it was Clym. He was permeated with its scenes, with its substance, and with its odours. He might be said to be its product. His eyes had first opened thereon; with its appearance all the first images of his memory were mingled; his estimate of life had been coloured by it; his toys had been the flint knives and arrowheads which he found there, wondering why stones should 'grow' to such odd shapes; his flowers, the purple bells and yellow furze; his animal kingdom, the snakes and croppers; his society, its human haunners. (175)

One would think that with such a background Clym would find his Golden Age in the heath once again, but he has been ruined for the pastoral world.

Everyone, especially his mother, had assumed that Clym would accomplish great things in the world. "He had been a lad of whom something was expected . . . The only absolute certainty about him was that he would not stand still in the circumstances amid which he was born" (169-70). Clym later realizes that his ambition has separated him from the
true happiness he had once experienced on the heath. The trade he had chosen had further alienated him from the heath, making him "a shop-man" (171). After his awakening, Clym realizes that he would rather pursue the career of a peasant saint. He tells Eustacia, "I could live and die in a hermitage here, with proper work to do" (200). As the novel progresses, Clym seems to become a desert saint, trying to enlighten other natives of the heath.

Strangely, Clym wants to return to the heath and do to its inhabitants what his education had done for him. Clym thinks he can educate people in such a way that ambition and affluence will not be the goal of their lives (176). The narrator seems to think that such a plan has little chance of success:

In passing from the bucolic to the intellectual life the intermediate stages are usually two at least, frequently many more; and one of those stages is almost sure to be worldly advanced. We can hardly imagine bucolic placidity quickening to intellectual aims without imagining social aims as the transitional phase. (174)

Clym wants to educate the masses in such a way that they may still retain their "bucolic placidity." But a higher intellectual life almost always seems to destroy the pastoral peace that once existed. It is the intellectual life that has marred Clym's beautiful, pastoral face. Clym
doesn't realize that by educating the people of the heath in this fashion, he would "destroy the organic community he wants to rejoin" (Langbaum 96). At times, The Return of the Native suggests that modern education produces people such as Clym who have forgotten that the happiness of the bucolic life doesn't lie in improving it, but in submitting to it as it presently exists. Furthermore, before people can pursue the intellectual goals that Clym envisions for them, it is usually necessary to improve their financial condition in order that they might devote themselves to such studies. Hardy often demonstrates in his texts that capitalistic means of production do not improve the life of the poor, but often oppress them by cutting the people off from their livelihood. Often, the capitalistic means of obtaining the money necessary for the intellectual life cuts one off from the idyllic environment.

Clym doesn't seem to realize that he is still the captive of ambition, even when he tells his mother that he feels that he has to "do some worthy thing before I die" (177). He is still obsessed with the idea of becoming a great man, an idea so prevalent in his thoughts that his fanatical pursuit eventually results in his own blindness. Clym returns from the city with new philosophical ideals
which he is sure will help the people of the heath. In Paris he has become acquainted with the "ethical systems popular at the time" (174). Clym has become a town thinker, and he returns to transform the people of the heath into the same. But the ethical systems of town thinkers are not congruous with the Ishmaelitish heath. The text contrasts Clym's idealism with the stoic acceptance of the heath dwellers. Such philosophies as Clym's result in the loss of the Golden Age, and make it difficult, if not impossible, to recapture it.

Clym and others like him certainly mean well. They want to improve the lot of others by education. They want to save the masses. The text suggests that as these well-intentioned individuals try to implement their new methods, they take people from the bucolic world, causing much unhappiness for themselves and others as they alienate them from union with their environment. Clym is John the Baptist (174) and the apostle Paul (177) rolled into one. He wants to save the world from its sins and its foolishness, but he does not realize that the world does not want to be saved, least of all the people in the heath who are far happier in their paganism than he could ever make them.
Clym is Prometheus come to give the fire of education to darkened Egdon. As Prometheus was a son of the Titan, Iapetus, Clym is a son of the heath that the narrator calls a Titan. Toward the end of the novel, he seems to become a disenchanted Prometheus. After he has been reduced to the occupation of a furze-cutter, he tells Eustacia,

Now, don't you suppose, my inexperienced girl, that I cannot rebel, in high Promethean fashion, against the gods and fate as well as you. I have felt more steam and smoke of that sort than you have ever heard of. But the more I see of life the more do I perceive that there is nothing particularly great in its greatest walks, and therefore nothing particularly small in mine of furze-cutting. (257)

Like Prometheus, Clym has been punished by the Titanic heath for his attempt to help the primitive residents. Clym has gone from being the cultured Parisian, to the educated-liberator, to a furze cutter. Clym is so disillusioned he does not seem to mind his punishment.

Clym not only fails to lead others to the idyllic life, he loses it himself. The text seems to suggest that Clym knows a way to enjoy this modern, Darwinian version of pastoral. The novel hints that the resolution of his conflicts lies in responding to the world in the same manner as the heath. He recognizes that attempts to civilize or cultivate the heath always meet with strong
resistance. The heath was like Wildeve's patch that had finally been made fertile, but only after one man had died and another ruined himself in the attempt (34). Another piece of ground had once been cultivated, but "... the heath and fern had insidiously crept in, and were reasserting their old supremacy" (55-6). When Clym thinks of the land's defiance of modernization, he smiles with "barbarous satisfaction" (176). The text suggests that if Clym had resisted modernism as the heath had done, if he had been barbarous, if he had followed this inclination that made him smile, he would have found the secret of union with the heath. Again, it appears that the narrator advocates a primitive return to the heath, accepting it as the ancient Celts, thereby escaping the ache of modernism. The text carnivalizes this solution a little later when it appears that Clym has achieved union with the heath by a return to the primitive.

In the course of the novel, Clym occasionally finds harmony with the heath. When he is deeply troubled, he not only walks this landscape, but flings himself down upon it, symbolizing the close union he seeks. Though problems and tragedy fill the text, Clym has recourse to these pastoral interludes that keep alive his pastoral vision. He is
lying on the heath the night of the eclipse when Eustacia comes and interrupts his reverie. After an argument with his mother, he finds solace in the familiar terrain, and for a moment he is not only on the heath, but back in the prehistoric, primitive times, "the carboniferous period" (206), when union with nature was possible.

Some critics believe that Hardy has written the modern pastoral. The text seems to indicate, however, that Clym has not achieved even Hardy's more pessimistic view of pastoral happiness. Clym's vision of the pastoral is flawed. His desire to return to the heath is a wish for the preconscious state of childhood. One is tempted to think that toward the end of the novel, Clym is close to achieving the pastoral harmony he seeks. As a furze-cutter, he blends with the heath. He is a "brown spot . . . and nothing more in the heath" (253). He appears to have become Francis of Assisi, surrounded by bees, butterflies and flowers. Not even rabbits and snakes are afraid of him (254). He seems to have truly become one with the land. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator says that "the most thoroughgoing ascetic could feel that he had a natural right to wander on Egdon" (5). Clym has achieved a kind of stoic asceticism.
However, a closer examination of Clym's life on the heath suggests failure rather than success. The narrator says that Clym's "daily life was of a curious microscopic sort, his whole world being limited to a circuit of a few feet from his person" (253). This description of Clym's life is the world of a small child or infant, who is unaware of anything beyond himself. His furzecutting "represents a regressively mindless connection to the womb-like heath" (Langbaum 64). He has abandoned any sexual feelings for Eustacia. Far from finding contentment, even in a Darwinian version of pastoral, Clym is a blind, castrated, Oedipal figure who loses all the joy of life. Clym's efforts to attain union with the heath make him a clown of carnival, exposing the foolishness of his endeavors.

Furthermore, as the novel closes, Clym is still trying to improve the people by preaching to them. He never gives up his "culture scheme" (252). He is determined to be the savior of his people to the very end.

At the end of the novel, Clym is still the idealist, trying to help the masses. The last picture of Clym is a Christ-like figure delivering a Sermon on the Mount on one of the hills of the heath. But the new Messiah has no
power. Clym is the new kind of preacher, "secular, and sometimes religious, but never dogmatic" (412). Clym is a preacher, but one who has little influence on his hearers:

He left alone set creeds and systems of philosophy, finding enough and more than enough to occupy his tongue in the opinions and actions common to all good men. Some believed, and some believed not; some said that his words were commonplace, others complained of his want of spiritual doctrine while others again remarked that it was well enough for a man to take to preaching who could not see to do anything else. But everywhere he was kindly received, for the story of his life had become generally known. (412)

The phrase, "some believed, and some believed not" is taken from the last scene in the book of Acts. The Apostle Paul has been trying to persuade Jews that Jesus was the Messiah, and their reaction was "some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not" (Acts 28:24). Even though Clym, the new apostle Paul, has laid aside the apostolic dogma, he has about the same success. But whereas the book of Acts ends on a note of triumph, The Return of the Native ends with a pathetic character whom most people view as an eccentric failure who must preach because he can do nothing else. Even though the novel ends where it begins, on the Rainbarrow, Clym has not yet learned the secret of pastoral tranquility. He remains a reformer among those who see no need of reformation.
In a carnivalistic sense, the rustics are still laughing at Clym. They sit on the hillside in a very casual manner viewing him as something of an oddity. From the beginning of the novel, the rustics have been used to laugh at intellectual pretensions of these idealists.

Because of Egdon's bleak landscape and the tragic attempt of Clym to return to the pastoral world, some critics see *The Return of the Native* as an anti-pastoral novel that describes the foolishness of the attempt to return to paradise, or the foolishness of the pastoral mode in general. Others, such as Robert Langbaum, see *The Return of the Native* as Hardy's last pastoral in a series that began with *Under the Greenwood Tree* (67). Some critics, such as Michael Squires, are willing to treat *Under the Greenwood Tree*, *Far from the Madding Crowd*, and *The Woodlanders* as pastoral, but refuse to include *The Return of the Native* in that category (20). After all, Hardy's description of the modern person in general, and Clym in particular, seems to leave little hope for a pastoral existence:

In Clym Yeobright's face could be dimly seen the typical countenance of the future . . . The view of life as a thing to be put up with, replacing the zest for existence which was so intense in early civilizations, must ultimately enter so thoroughly into the constitution of the advanced races that its
facial expression will become accepted as a new artistic departure. People already feel that a man who lives without disturbing a curve of feature, or setting a mark of mental concern anywhere upon himself, is too far removed from modern perceptiveness to be a modern type. Physically beautiful men—the glory of the race when it was young—are almost an anachronism now; and we may wonder whether at some time or other, physically beautiful women may not be an anachronism likewise. (169)

Now that the race is old, is a return to the pastoral possible or even profitable? Clym's stoic resignation seems a far cry from the pastoral bliss envisioned by the Greeks. As Bruce Johnson writes, "It is as though Hardy is intimating that evolution has finally produced a creature who is too determinedly self-reflective and (in feelings riddled with self-consciousness) too artificial to survive" (117). Is Mrs. Yeobright's assessment the best that the person can hope to achieve: "The vision of what ought to have been is thrown aside in sheer weariness, and browbeaten human endeavour listlessly makes the best of the fact that is" (220)? Her sentiments echo those of the narrator that life is "a thing to be put up with."

Based on these aspects of the text, it would be tempting to conclude that modern thought ruins a person for the pastoral world. Clym should have just returned to the heath, accepted it as it was, labored on the heath like the
other rustics, and all would have been well. Clym is a parody of the kind of idyll described by Bakhtin:

In the idyll, as a rule, there were no heroes alien to the idyllic world. In the provincial novel, in contrast, one occasionally finds a hero who has broken away from the wholeness of his locale, who has set off for the city and either perishes there or returns, like a prodigal son, to the bosom of his family. In novels of the Rousseauan type, the major protagonists are the author's contemporaries, people who had already succeeded in isolating individual life-sequences, people with an interior perspective. They heal themselves through contact with nature and the life of simple people, learning from them the wisdom to deal with life and death. (Dialogic 231).

Clym comes back to nature and to the people who have a certain amount of wisdom about living in harmony with the heath. When this native returns, he is never restored to the wholeness that he came home to find. Clym is still isolated, living with that "interior perspective" which prevents him from finding the peace he seeks.

Although these novels by Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner treat the serious theme of people who live tragic lives by not conforming to the standard of a true pastoral shepherd, each of these stories degenerates into a comic use of language to describe these self-styled shepherds. Bakhtin writes that in the comic novel, one can isolate those parodic stylizations of generic, professional and other languages we have mentioned as compact masses of direct authorial discourse—pathos-filled-moral-didactic, sentiment-elegiac or idyllic. In the
In each of these texts dealing with failed shepherds, not only is the traditional pastoral parodied, but also the polemic pastoral against the shepherds. Though the language may appear to be moral/didactic, comic language intrudes to reveal the foolishness of the shepherds. The descriptions of Hightower imagining the horses galloping and galloping; the image of Ike as old man wearing a carpenter’s costume or shivering in his tent while city-dwellers go hunting; the depiction of old Gabriel Pendleton wading into a scuffle with three young men; and the parody of a blind Clym preaching a sermon on the mount are examples of the novel’s ability to move into a comic mode to reveal the hypocrisy of shepherds, sacred or secular, who either neglect or harm the sheep.

Endnotes

1 Chase points out that Hightower’s ideology “is not metaphysical or theological...; it is purely mythic and aesthetic, the product of a mind immersed in Keats and Tennyson” (21). As such, it may be wrong to condemn Hightower’s Presbyterianism since his isolation does not spring from his theology but from an artistic view of life.
Benson believes that Hightower has seen the truth about himself and redeems himself "by descending into the pit of himself and ripping from his heart his dearest sin" (543). Welsh takes the opposite view arguing that "his belated effort to save Christmas is as useless as it is feeble, and considering everything we are made to understand about Grove, it is hard to believe that she would not have given birth to a healthy child without assistance" (134). These totally opposite interpretations reinforce my view concerning the ambivalent and dialogic nature of the text. Hightower's actions, though admirable in some ways, are problematized by the very texts which describe these "heroic" acts.

Wotton, recasting Empson's version of old pastoral says that the "thinking people" constructed pastoral discourses to "efface the contradictions between wage labor and capital" (60). As I have shown in my discussion of the other novels, the texts often use the rustics and contradictory discourse within the characters themselves to relativize these ideological discourses.

Marjorie Garson notes particularly how the rustics in Return disparage reading and writing, emphasizing "the materiality of language and call into question any possibility of transcendence of the body" (69).
In The Dialogic Imagination, Bakhtin describes the disintegration of the idyll in terms of the collapse of culture:

In Hegel's definition, the novel must educate man for life in bourgeois society. This educative process is connected with a severing of all previous ties with the idyllic, that is, it has to do with man's expatriation. Here the process of a man's re-education is interwoven with the process of society's breakdown and reconstruction, that is, with historical process. (Dialogic 234)

In Hardy's The Woodlanders and Faulkner's Go Down, Moses, the texts describe the events that led to the deterioration of a way of life. The woodlanders who inhabit the Little Hintock woods and the residents near the Mississippi wilderness are gradually being "expatriated" as historical forces, especially as those influences of the urban world begin to encroach upon their environment. Due to this gradual death, an elegiac tone with an ambivalent hope for the future pervades these works.

The Woodlanders: Hardy's Ambivalent Pastoral Elegy

Critics classify Hardy's The Woodlanders as a pastoral novel more frequently than they do his The Return of the Native, but these woods problematize concepts of pastoral
as much as Egdon Heath. The Little Hintock forest and its most famous inhabitants, Giles Winterbourne and Marty South, sometimes conform to the usual portrayal of pastoral characters. Giles can grow trees as no one else because there is "a sort of sympathy between himself and the fir, oak, or beech that he was operating on" (49). Such descriptions of harmony between human beings and nature, so common in the pastoral, are actually rare in The Woodlanders, where the relationship between the Little Hintock woods and its residents could best be described in terms of conflict, pain, and struggle.

In some respects, The Woodlanders resembles an agricultural idyll where "agricultural labor transforms all the events of everyday life, stripping them of the private petty character of obtaining when man is nothing but consumer" (Dialogic 227). The laborers in the Little Hintock woods, such as Giles Winterbourne and Marty South do not work merely to make a living. They define their lives in terms of their work. When forces separate these people from their customary labor, they are separated from their identity as persons.

Hardy's depiction of the brutalities of nature, combined with certain stylistic methods and mixing of
genres, causes some critics to reject the idea that *The Woodlanders* is pastoral. The intense irony Hardy employs throughout much of the novel leads Robert Langbaum to see *The Woodlanders* as antipastoral dark comedy (113). Michael Millgate views it as more reminiscent of tragi-comedy (*Career As a Novelist* 260). Mary Jacobus goes so far as to say that *The Woodlanders* describes the failure of pastoral (119). Noting Hardy's frequent departures from the traditional pastoral, Charles May terms *The Woodlanders* a distorted or "grotesque pastoral" (150).¹

Actually, *The Woodlanders*, despite its frequent references to pastoral conventions, follows Hardy's iconoclastic method of overthrowing cherished ideas of the pastoral, especially the idyllic aspects. Like Egdon Heath in *The Return of the Native*, Little Hintock appears on the surface to be a secluded, isolated paradise. It is "self-contained" and "one of those sequestered spots outside the gates of the world where may usually be found more meditation than action, and more listlessness than meditation" (7). But the text soon demonstrates that the people are not as isolated as they appear. The people in this wooded area are still "part of the pattern in the great web of human doings" (18).
Not only are these characters a part of the real world, they experience the heartaches common to people on the outside of the country setting. Within this backwoods environment, "dramas of a grandeur and unity truly Sophoclean are enacted in the real, by virtue of the concentrated passion and closely knit interdependence of the lives therein" (7). The reference to Sophocles, author of such plays as Antigone, Oedipus Tyrannus, and Electra, alerts us that tragedies unfold within this environment. Hardy's little poem on the title page warns that a rural setting is not necessarily a guarantee of happiness: "Not boskiest bow'r, / When hearts are ill affin'd, / Hath tree of pow'r / To shelter from the wind." This text does not use the pastoral mode to give an impression that everything is wonderful in the country. Roger Dataller, in The Plain Man and the Country, implies that even though these rustic characters experience tragedy, their rural roots sustain them with a sense of "innate well-being" (137). But none of the characters, with the possible exception of Marty South, endures trials gracefully because of their agrarian heritage. The struggles of characters such as Giles Winterbourne, Grace Melbury and her father, and John South, defeat, rather than ennoble them.
Although certain vestiges of the pastoral world remain in Little Hintock, a fall from days of previous peace and contentment has already taken place. The "great web" brings the influence of outside forces to bear upon the secluded woodland. Descriptions of the natural environment of the forest do not point to an Edenic paradise, but to the loss of it. The frequent images in this novel of man and woman around an apple tree are a constant reminder of Adam and Eve and their loss of bliss. Though more and more of the pastoral world of Little Hintock is passing away, the Serpent has been in the garden long before the arrival of the major urbanite characters such as Fitzpiers, Mrs. Charmond, or even Grace Melbury. The novel describes the continuing deterioration of the pastoral world.

Even the sun rarely shines on Little Hintock. The matting of tree limbs and boughs and the thickness of fog obscures the Sun-God, Apollo. The text refers to the forest where most of the residents live as the Tempe-vale, recalling the imagery used in *The Return of the Native*. But Apollo no longer frequents this valley of Little Hintock. As Hardy wrote in *The Return of the Native* that somber landscapes such as Egdon Heath may be the new Tempe-vale, the forest of Little Hintock is also a modern Tempe-
vale, more in tune with the gloomy outlook of modern human beings.

The world of Little Hintock bears a curse. It is "tomb-like", "an incubus of the forlorn" (5). Sometimes days emerge "like a dead-born child" (19). Even the trees, which are as much a character in this novel as Egdon Heath in *The Return of the Native*, experience the effects of the fall. Whereas the heath seems permanent, the trees which are the vital part of this pastoral landscape are passing away:

On older trees still than these huge lobes of fungi grew like lungs. Here, as everywhere, the Unfulfilled Intention, which makes life what it is, was as obvious as it could be among the depraved crowds of a city slum. The leaf was deformed, the curve was crippled, the taper was interrupted; the lichen ate the vigour of the stalk, and the ivy slowly strangled to death the promising sapling. (41)

The "Unfulfilled Intention" refers again to Hardy's fascination with Darwinism. Since the old forms of life do not have the strength to survive, the old is passing away, but so is the new. In the pastoral myth, nature is usually mythologized as a mother, but "Unfulfilled Intention" often robs Nature of its maternal characteristics. Though some elements of the pastoral world might remain, the disintegration of nature continues to take place and makes life more difficult for those who depend upon it for
sustenance. The woodlands might have seemed like Eden at one time, but Hardy's description carries echoes of the curse pronounced to Adam: "Cursed is the ground for your sake; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life. Both thorns and thistles it shall bring forth for you" (Gen. 3:17-8).

Hardy's pastoral subverts even the traditional use of the cycle of the seasons with its emphasis on fertility rites. In the pastoral one expects winter to be associated with death and spring with new birth. But in Hardy's version, the opposite often happens. As Mary Jacobus writes, "The seasonal cycle revolves and returns, but for humans it does not bring renewal; their consciousness of change effects a divorce between man and nature" (122).

The Woodlanders also describes another aspect of God's curse upon Adam, "In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread . . . " (Gen. 3:19). The natives of Little Hintock are not pastoral shepherds living a life of leisure. They must work diligently just to survive. Because of the novel's emphasis on hard work, some critics have a tendency to find in The Woodlanders the tradition of Virgil's Georgics instead of pastoral. However, the Georgic expresses an attitude which praises the satisfaction of
work, whereas *The Woodlanders*, while admiring the industriousness of the characters, presents the work as a curse made worse by the invasion of outsiders from the urban world. Michael Squires implies that in Hardy's view of the pastoral, purposeful work replaces leisure (160-1).

Certainly, work and the pastoral are not incompatible in some pastoral texts. Before the Fall, Adam and Eve worked in the garden of Eden, but their labor was free from exhaustion, pain, and anxiety about future financial considerations. The pictures of Giles and Marty working tempt one to believe that they achieve the bliss of non-rigorous labor present in Eden, but Hardy subverts any notion of Edenic paradise. Giles finds satisfaction in work, but Marty does not and points out how hard it is for people to survive. Certainly, the people in Little Hintock do not have a life of leisure as often envisioned by the pastoral poets, and their toil is increased by urban invaders who take away their land and possessions.

In part, the infiltration and acceptance of urban philosophy and goals cause the fall from the ideal pastoral world. Though a fall has already taken place, the urbanites who come to dwell in Little Hintock hasten the process of disintegration. One of the first characters the
reader meets in this novel is an urban barber, an outsider who comes to cut Marty South's hair. When Marty refuses to allow him to do so, he assumes the role of Satan, convincing her with clever arguments why she should part with her tresses. Even Marty sees his Satanic resemblance and accuses him of being like the Devil in Faustus. When the barber offers money as the major temptation, the novel hints at one of the sources of the original fall. In the ideal pastoral world, money and class considerations would matter little, if at all. Little Hintock becomes a reflection of the urban world where status is determined by money and possessions. Many of the tragedies within the novel occur because of an obsession with class considerations. Marty cuts her hair for money, albeit with no selfish intent, but to save her father's possessions. Mr. Melbury sends Grace to the city so that she might climb in the social scale. George Melbury is much like Faulkner's Thomas Sutpen. As Sutpen was motivated to become a rich, powerful man because of being insulted at the home of a rich land-owner, George Melbury determined to establish a higher class family because of an insult he received as a boy from a minister's son. Grace refuses
Giles because he is socially beneath her. Giles loses his home because of the greed of Mrs. Charmond.

Mrs. Charmond's unfeeling desire for land and destruction of cottages represents the cold selfishness of upper classes, or in Mrs. Charmond's case, moneyed classes, for the rural poor who barely eke out an existence. Michael Squires observes that in *The Woodlanders*, "moral hierarchy is inversely related to class structure" (161). While the natives of Little Hintock may not be perfect, they do not have the almost unfeeling cruelty of those with money. As a matter of fact, the leisured classes in this novel cause most of the trouble. While the rural natives are not entirely innocent, the idle Fitzpiers, Mrs. Charmond, and to a degree, Grace, who has returned not to work but to live a life of educated leisure, accelerate the movement toward complete destruction of the pastoral world. This modern preoccupation with money makes Hardy's creation, "a modern Wessex with a vengeance" (Keith 47).

The concerns for money and class addressed in *The Woodlanders* are similar to those discussed in *The Return of the Native*. Grace Melbury resembles Clym Yeobright. Clym Yeobright's mother sent him away to become rich and cultured. Mr. Melbury sends Grace away so that she can
become a great lady. When Grace comes home, there is another "return of the native" with an education and new philosophies which make it difficult for her to find harmony with the land and people that she left behind. Grace comes to believe that one of the worst things that ever happened to her was leaving Little Hintock in order to be educated. She tells her father,

I wish you had never, never thought of educating me. I wish I worked in the woods like Marty South! I hate genteel life, and I want to be no better than she. . . . Cultivation has only brought me inconveniences and troubles. I say again, I wish you had never sent me to those fashionable schools you set your mind on. . . . I have never got any happiness outside Hintock that I know of, and I have suffered many a heartache at being sent away. (168)

Though Grace expresses feelings of wanting to live a simple life such as Giles and Marty, she does not remain constant in these desires. She is much like Fitzpiers, who thinks that he would like to live a life in the country, in the pastoral world, when actually he hates everything about it. Grace's pull may be more natural, but her urban education ruins her for the pastoral world.

Like many other characters in these novels, Grace becomes a marketable commodity cut off from the labor of the Hintock folk. The urban outsiders bring not only money and class considerations, but philosophical ideals
foreign to the pastoral. Carl Weber suggests that with *The Woodlanders* Hardy comes to believe "that man's happiness may be due, not to blind chance or a malign Fate, not to tainted heredity or ingrained 'character,' but to the organization of society, to man-made laws and conventions" (xii). Some of the characters retain the vestiges of the pastoral manner of life. Giles Winterbourne is Autumn's brother, a "woodlands god symbolising the values of an idealised way of life" (Kramer "Approaches" 14). But Giles is also a mass of contradictions. While David Lodge argues that Giles and Marty are in "complete accord with their natural environment" ("Darwinian" 82), the text suggests that this assessment is not entirely true. At times, they appear to be one with the environment, but the urban ideals have already destroyed some of their harmony with the natural world. While Giles appears rustic, sexual, and content, class consciousness and a sense of Victorian propriety infect him in a manner not in keeping with a true pastoral character. Giles resembles some of the other characters in the book who "live in the novel between two worlds, unable to go forward or back" (Bayley 198).

Not only have these characters been influenced by class and money considerations, but also by Victorian
attitudes toward sexuality. Giles Winterbourne and Marty South appear to be sexless, rather than satyrs dancing through the woods in sensual ecstasy. Marty is symbolically deflowered at the beginning of the novel. Hardy employs the Norse myth of Loki and Sif to describe the loss of Marty's hair. Loki was a fire demon, whom later Christian mythologists found easy to equate with Satan. According to Norse mythology, Loki mischievously cuts off the hair of Sif, the wife of Thor. Other legends of Loki say that he also seduced her. In Victorian culture, a woman's long hair was an important symbol of sexuality. When the barber deprives Marty of her hair, she becomes almost asexual, especially in the eyes of Giles Winterbourne. Satan and Loki are both profaners of the sexual purity of women. As evil outsiders corrupted Eve and Sif, so evil, urban outsiders defile Marty South and Grace Melbury. These corruptions become allegorical myth to explain the decline of the woodland society as a whole, which has been brought about largely because of the temptations of money and class. Marty is not asexual by nature, but becomes a sexual martyr to save her father and Giles from ruin. She is not deflowered of her virginity, but rather deflowered of her entire sexuality, becoming a
kind of nun because of the pressures of foreign elements in the rural world.

Giles is not asexual by nature, but Victorian conventions make him so. When he steals a kiss from Grace before he tells her that she cannot be freed from Fitzpiers by divorce, he reveals the erotic feelings he has for her. Grace and Giles obviously have a strong sexual attraction for one another, so much so that they cannot trust themselves to be alone together in a hut. But thoughts of community reactions consume their thoughts. If modern romanticism inhibits Eustacia Vye, the "proper" Victorian education of young girls inhibits Grace Melbury. Once again, the Victorian codes of marriage and morality invade even this secluded pastoral world and take the joy of the sexual experience from the characters. All of this concern with morality and propriety is not native to the Little Hintock woods, but is "an alien sense of propriety derived from Victorian but not rural England" (Keith 46). The pastoral myth of free sexuality cannot exist in an environment where people are too conscious of their own reputations connected to artificial societal codes.

Hardy subverts the idea of sexual bliss in the pastoral by locating spontaneous sexual activity not in the
natives, but in outsiders such as Fitzpiers and Mrs. Charmond. In a pastoral, one would expect that the natives, free from societal restraints would teach urbanites the way of free sexuality. Although Robert Drake describes Giles Winterbourne and Marty South as "true Arcadians" (254), I think it would be more accurate to say that they have some of the characteristics, or perhaps, the potential to be true Arcadians. In the pastoral world of Little Hintock, the natives know little of sexual freedom, and even those characters such as Fitzpiers, Mrs. Charmond, and Grace Melbury, who have been influenced by the urban world, receive some form of punishment after they enjoy any erotic fulfillment.

The institution of marriage itself militates against the sexual freedom of the characters. One of the central issues of the novel is the contemporary divorce law. None of the inhabitants understands this law because it is so foreign to them. They must go to the city for interpretation of the law. Grace's erotic feelings for Giles begin to flourish until she discovers that the marriage laws prohibit her divorce. The moment she knows the truth about the law, she denies her sexual feelings for Giles. Even though Michael Millgate sees The Woodlanders
not as a protest against social institutions, but against simple sexual mismatching (*Career as a Novelist* 257), the novel abounds with social criticism, not the least of which is the divorce law. That Hardy had in mind the institution of marriage itself when writing *The Woodlanders* is clear from his 1895 preface to the novel where he speaks of the tragic consequences endured by people when they are bound by a covenant, even when they later find out that they were more suited for someone else. There may be the intimation in *The Woodlanders* that marriage itself is foreign to the pastoral. Once marriage is introduced, divorce laws complicate matters even more. While such laws may not have an impact on characters such as Fitzpiers and Mrs. Charmond, such laws squelch the erotic desires of those obsessed with propriety.

Penny Boumelha argues that *The Woodlanders* should not be viewed as "a kind of sexual pastoral in which the 'innocence' of desire is opposed to the 'alien' intrusion of marriage" (110). Boumelha believes that the problems in the novel stem more from class and gender issues rather than the convention of marriage. She points out that ultimately Grace's salvation is marriage to Fitzpiers. Nevertheless, the only reason marriage saves her is due to
the value that the society placed on the marriage. Furthermore, Grace's "liberation" has been bought at a terrible price both to Giles Winterbourne and herself. Giles dies to maintain the purity of her marriage vow, and Grace is doomed to a life with a husband who will never be faithful to her. Little Hintock can never be a pastoral paradise as long as the residents conform to patriarchal codes of marriage.

Actually, the whole patriarchal family structure works against the pastoral. Rather than pursuing the one she loves, Grace feels she must seek the consent of her authoritarian father. As a matter of fact, Grace wants to marry in order to escape her father and achieve some kind of independence. Little Hintock adopts the prevailing Victorian attitudes towards class, sex, marriage and the family.

Although the text points to the evil influence of the urban world upon the rural, the entire blame for the destruction of the pastoral does not rest entirely upon the city. The rural world and its characters must also share part of the blame. One of the important pastoral myths is the superiority of the country over the city. In the pastoral, this myth is usually established by criticisms of
the city from the distant perspective of the pastoral world coupled with descriptions of the sublimity of the pastoral life and environment. In *The Woodlanders*, the rural life faces the same problems as the urban. As Mary Jacobus writes, "Subjected to a post-Romantic gaze, Nature reveals the same defects, the same crippling evolutionary struggle, as urban industrial society" (116). Hardy's description of the woods as a slum indicates that the "Unfulfilled Intention" operates in both places. One could argue that the pastoral world is actually better, but it has lost its appeal simply because of the invasion of urban philosophy. No doubt, the urban ideals have made matters worse, but that contention would not explain Hardy's description of the cruelty of the natural world itself. The myth of nature as benevolent and mothering is suspect. Furthermore, what might be good in the pastoral society is powerless before the onslaught of time and history. Nature itself with its evolutionary progress, the weakness of the rural characters, and the presence of urbanites all combine to wreck the traditional view of pastoral happiness in the woods.

Since Hardy's description of Little Hintock is so bleak, one can understand how some recent critics see *The
Woodlanders as an elegy. The Woodlanders might best be viewed as an ambivalent elegy, for its glorification of the past and its hope for the future are suspect. Traditional means of hope for the future are disparaged, but perhaps not completely absent. Hardy subverts the traditional pastoral elegy by omitting and undercutting the essential ingredients of comfort and hope. In Hardy's elegy for the pastoral, there is little praise for the pastoral, and little hope for its rebirth.

In Christian versions of the pastoral, a process of redemption restores paradise. Paradise is lost until, in the words of Milton, "one greater Man/Restore us, and regain the blissful seat" (Paradise Lost, I:4-5). In pagan versions of the pastoral, a retreat to the countryside restores bucolic bliss. Hardy's pastoral encourages neither method of restoration since he rejects both the Christian hope and the possibility of retreat. The Hintock woods, far from being a place of hopeful retreat, groan with pain because of the fall that has taken place. Hardy's philosophy combines a rejection of Christianity and a bleak view of nature itself. Such a view denies the possibility of retreat or redemption.
The Christian hope focuses on the work of a redeemer who restores paradise. The New Testament ends with a description of a paradiisical age to come: "And God will wipe every tear from their eyes; there shall be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying. There shall be no more pain, for the former things have passed away. Then he who sat on the throne said, 'Behold, I make all things new'" (Rev. 21:4-5). But for Hardy, there is no redeemer who can make all things new. Whatever mythical symbolism might be invested in the various redeemers and messiahs, Hardy demonstrates that none of them can restore the pastoral paradise. Hardy uses the biblical imagery of the Fall, but not the imagery of Revelation's paradise restored. Even in the legend of Loki and Sif, Thor functions as a redeemer, forcing Loki to restore Sif's hair in an even more beautiful form. But for Marty South, there is no one, not even Giles Winterbourne, who functions as a redeemer. Hardy's novels are replete with falls without the hope of redemption.

The text not only rejects Christianity as a possible means of redemption, but also philosophical idealism. The original title of The Woodlanders was Fitzpiers at Hintock, suggesting the centrality of this character as far as Hardy
was concerned. Fitzpiers comes to Little Hintock, armed with transcendental philosophy, hoping to find some kind of peace in the pastoral world. Fitzpiers and Grace are similar to Clym Yeobright. They have been educated in the urban environment, and their presence in the rural world is destructive. Modern philosophy cannot restore paradise. In May 1886, as Hardy was in the process of writing The Woodlanders, he wrote:

These venerable philosophers seem to start wrong; they cannot get away from a pre-possession that the world must somehow have been made to be a comfortable place for man. If I remember, it was Comte who said that metaphysics was a mere sorry attempt to reconcile theology and physics. (Early Life 234)

As Hardy pointed out in The Return of the Native, one must reject the notion that nature somehow desires to make people happy.

Love is also ineffective as a means of reinstating pastoral happiness. In the end, Grace Melbury becomes much like Thomasin Yeobright. As Thomasin was disenchanted about love because of Wildeve, Fitzpier’s unfaithfulness disillusions Grace. At the end of the novel, Grace and Fitzpiers leave the rural environment. Robert Drake believes that by the end of the novel Grace achieves true reconciliation with the Arcadian world, and that even Fitzpiers has moved more in that direction (256-7). But
the departure of Grace and Fitzpiers resembles the
banishment of Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden. Grace
leaves the Arcadian world with a man who is probably going
to continue to be unfaithful to her. In one of his
letters, Hardy said of Grace, "You have probably observed
the ending of the story . . . is that the heroine is doomed
to an unhappy life with an inconstant husband" (Early Life
289). The only person left in the rural world is Marty
South, who remains to sing the pastoral elegy for Giles
Winterbourne.

In the Christian view, the restoration of paradise
occurs not through the work or efforts of humanity, but by
"grace," God's unmerited favor. It is no accident that one
of the central characters in this novel is named "Grace."
As Schwarz writes, "The very name of Grace enables Hardy to
play on the irony of the atheist Fitzpiers' quest for
Grace's love" (Schwarz 28). One can almost view the story
of Grace and Fitzpiers as an allegory of the search of an
atheist or agnostic for "grace." But again, Hardy subverts
the idea of Grace, because Grace is not really "grace." In
Christian theology, a dichotomy exists between grace and
law. Since doing the works of the law cannot restore
paradise, the work of Christ on behalf of human beings is
necessary. In *The Woodlanders*, Grace does not function as grace, but as law. Grace is bound by the laws of propriety and Victorian marriage and divorce laws. She does not give her love to the "undeserving," such as Giles, but to those whom she feels meet Victorian class standards. Fitzpier's search for grace is doomed from the beginning because there is no grace in Grace. The love affair between Grace and Fitzpier represents the modern person's search for grace in a world where grace does not exist. Since there is no grace, all that is left is permanent banishment from Eden. The cherubim and flaming sword still bar the way to the tree of life.

In the Christian vision of the future paradise, the way to the tree of life will be opened again: "In the middle of its street, and on either side of the river, was the tree of life, which bore twelve fruits, each tree yielding its fruit every month. The leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations" (Rev. 22:2). In *The Woodlanders*, the hope for a tree of life is subverted by John South's tree of death. In the beginning, the tree appears to be a tree of life because John South's very survival is tied to it. As long as the tree lives, South lives, but he dies when it dies. At times, the text seems
to suggest that there is no tree of life, and there is nothing that can substitute for it. When the myth of the tree dies, so does humanity's hope for a future life of happiness.

Nor can Hardy look for paradise to be restored in a retreat. His view of nature, influenced by his interpretation of Darwin, robs nature of its appealing qualities. Hardy wrote in his notebook:

After looking at the landscape ascribed to Bonington in our drawing room I feel that Nature is played out as a Beauty, but not as Mystery. I don't want to see landscapes, i.e. scenic paintings of them, because I don't want to see the original realities—as optical effect that is. I want to see the deeper reality underlying the scenic, the expressions of what are sometimes called abstract imaginings. (Early Life 242-3)

If modern science robs nature of its beauty, abstract imaginings about nature remain. Those abstract imaginings do not contain a hope for a retreat to rural bliss, but speak to the futility of a return to a Golden Age.

Since Hardy dismisses redemption and retreat as possible avenues of return to the pastoral world, all that is left is the death of the myth and an elegy for it. Boumelha concludes that The Woodlanders expresses the final inadequacy of the pastoral mode. Its elegiac characteristics are appropriate to lament the death of the
pastoral myth. The text encourages the reader to view Grace's and Marty's pilgrimages to the grave of Giles Winterbourne as pastoral elegy. Northrop Frye says that "In the classical pastoral elegy the subject of the elegy is not treated as an individual but as a representative of a dying spirit of nature" (Fables 119). Some critics have been quick to conclude that Giles is a dying spirit of nature, but with no hope for resurrection. Perhaps all that is left is the elegy itself. Since science has done away with the goodness of nature and the bucolic idyll, all that remains is the elegy. Lodge writes, "Giles, and the whole action of which he is a part, clearly symbolise the passing of a certain kind of society and way of life" (93). Marty's and Grace's visitations include speeches of praise, flowers, and a procession of mourners, including nature itself. David Lodge has pointed out the similarities between the activities of Marty and Grace and the worship of Adonis (90). Adonis was originally a tree spirit worshiped by young girls who mourned his death and celebrated the hope of his resurrection in the spring (Lodge 90). Giles Winterbourne was also a tree spirit, called both a wood god and a fruit god (Woodlanders 209). Some critics see Giles and Marty as young women who mourn
his death, but their acts of worship do not contain any hope for the rebirth of this nature-god. Giles
Winterbourne's death represents more than just the sad death of a pastoral character, but the passing away of the pastoral world itself. Mary Jacobus writes that Giles' death "signifies the depletion of Nature by an atomising, scientific vision" (116). The text uses the elegiac mode to lament the passing of the myth that nature is beautiful and purposeful, and that harmony with the landscape can be achieved according to the old imaginings of the bucolic idyll.

Marty South's eulogy for Giles in the last paragraph of the novel is obviously a pastoral elegy:

"Now, my own love," she whispered, "you are mine, and only mine; for she has forgot 'ee at last, although for her you died. But I--whenever I get up I'll think of 'ee, and whenever I lie down I'll think of 'ee again. Whenever I plant the young larches I'll think that none can plant as you planted; and whenever I split a gad, and whenever I turn the cider-wring I'll say none could do it like you. If ever I forget your name, let me forget home and heaven. . . . But no, no, my love, I never can forget 'ee: for you was a good man, and did good things!" (276-7)

While Lodge is correct in drawing parallels between the worship of Adonis and Giles, there is also a similarity between the death of Giles and the death of the Christian god, even Christ himself. Marty is the only one that has
not forgotten Giles, just as modern science had caused many of Christ's former followers to consider him to be irrelevant in the light of recent scientific discoveries. The haunting words, "although for her you died," recall the Christian teaching of the death of Christ on behalf of his people. In spite of that sacrifice, those who used to love him have now forgotten him. But Marty promises that she will never forget. The words, "whenever I get up I'll think of 'ee, and whenever I lie down I'll think of 'ee again," recall the words of Deuteronomy 6:7: "You shall teach them diligently to your children, and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, when you walk by the way, when you lie down, and when you rise up," or perhaps the words of the psalmist who meditated on God in the night watches (Ps. 63:6); and when he awoke, God was still with him (Ps. 139:18). Her words, "If I forget your name," recall Psalm 137:5-6, "If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its skill! If I do not remember you, let my tongue cling to the roof of my mouth." The last words of the elegy, "for you was a good man, and did good things," remind one of the Apostle Peter's words Cornelius' household, "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good"
(Acts 10:38). Giles is a Christ figure, a good man who did good things, but who is largely forgotten.

Though Marty's elegy for Giles contains elements of worship, her devotion is nothing more than a memory of a myth, which for Hardy, is what Christianity had been reduced to. Marty will carry on the memory of the myth, but the myth will really have no power other than to evoke a memory. Jacobus writes that Marty goes through the traditional rites of elegy, but "in a context where they retain beauty without their mythic power of consolation and renewal" (121). Hardy's own personal faith in Christianity had been similarly undermined. Although he continued to go to church throughout his life, he only enjoyed the traditions and symbols in an intellectual sense. For him, science had demythologized Christianity. One of his poems, "The Impercipient," begins:

That with this bright believing band
I have no claim to be,
That faiths by which my comrades stand
Seem fantasies to me,
And mirage-mists their Shining Land,
Is a strange destiny. (67)

The old Christian myth and the pastoral myth have no relevance for Hardy other than a powerless memory. Scarborough describes these attempts to hang on to religious beliefs as "an attenuated clinging to the
devitalized traditional myth and ritual. Myth is not so much dead as it is broken, enervated, numbed" (6).

There seems to be little, if any, hope in Hardy's pastoral elegy. Blomfield points out that in the nineteenth century, praise, lamentation, and consolation were replaced by sadness, depression and grief as the chief characteristics of the elegy (155). Blomfield attributes this change in the elegy to the modern feeling of alienation. The discoveries of modern science, coupled with a loss of religious faith increased the feeling of alienation. Hardy could not find a new myth which would help human beings to overcome their sense of alienation. Therefore, his elegies have a note of despair about them.

Many Victorians, especially those in the rural areas, had not only been alienated from their religious cultural heritage, but also from their customary manner of work. The Little Hintock environment is on the brink of destruction. Describing such disintegrating idylls, Bakhtin wrote:

Opposed to this little world, a world fated to perish, there is a great but abstract world, where people are out of contact with each other, egoistically sealed-off from each other, greedily practical; where labor is differentiated and mechanized, where objects constitute this great world on a new basis, to render it familiar, to humanize it. It is necessary to find a new relationship to nature, not to the little nature
of one's own corner of the world but to the big nature of the great world, to all the phenomena of the solar system, to the wealth excavated from the earth's core, to a variety of geographical locations and continents. (Dialogic 234)

This "abstract world" is represented in *The Woodlanders* by people such as Fitzpiers and his transcendental philosophy, Mrs. Charmond's vanity and greed, and Grace Melbury, who has been taken from the concrete, physical world of the woods to be educated as a lady. *The Woodlanders* describes how foreign, urban, abstract ideals invade Little Hintock, with their result of separating people from their work and from one another. Since many people derived their identity from their work, the invasion of certain capitalistic forces separated them not only from their livelihood, but also from their sense of belonging and selfhood.

Critics have debated whether there is any hope in Hardy's elegy. In the traditional elegy, the speaker usually expresses a hope for resurrection, but contemporary forms of elegy often have a more pessimistic note. Jahan Ramazani writes, "... the modern elegist tends not to achieve but to resist consolation, not to override but to sustain anger, not to heal but to reopen the wounds of loss" (xi). Hardy's elegy does not seem to help relieve the sadness one experiences at the fading of the pastoral
life. Even Marty's elegy does not have much comfort in it. Hardy seems to go out of his way to see to it that we do not close the wound, but leave it open. The endings of his novels are often tragic at worst, and ambivalent or ambiguous at best. There is no sense of having everything figured out so that "all's well that ends well." The sense of alienation and despair persists in the elegiac mode. In Bakhtin's terms, the elegy has been novelized, resisting the comfort of closure. David Lodge writes that Hardy used a "mode of writing in which every scene, gesture and image would function simultaneously on several different levels: as a vivid and precise imitation of actuality, as a link in a chain of causation, as symbolic action and as part of a formal pattern of parallels, contrasts and correspondences" (80). This lack of closure results in many different interpretations and classifications, because the texts really do operate on some many different levels. As Bayley has said in his article on re-reading Hardy, one has a different experience each time one reads The Woodlanders because Hardy uses so many different genres and modes within a single work (191-2).

Hardy ends this novel, not in total despair, but far from happiness. Marty remains behind with something of the
same kind of stoic resignation possessed by Clym Yeobright. Hardy's attitude appears to be that we cannot expect to find a pastoral environment in such a world as this. The mark of wisdom would seem to be to adapt to this world as best we can and not expect too much.

Hardy's pastorals do not convince us that the life of the country is better than the life of the city, but that in the country one sees the true character of nature. The stoic response to it is closer to the truth than that of the idealists. People such as Clym Yeobright and Fitzpiers come to the country with an infantile longing for conflict-free existence, but find that such a condition is not possible.

The ending of the novels suggests those feelings expressed in Hardy's poem, "He Never Expected Much," which Hardy says was a reflection on his 86th birthday. In this poem he personifies the World as speaking to him when a child and giving the following advice:

Many have loved me desperately,  
Many with smooth serenity,  
While some have shown contempt of me  
Till they dropped underground.

I do not promise overmuch,  
Child; overmuch;  
Just neutral-tinted haps and such,"

To this advice, the narrator replies,
Wise warning for your credit's sake!
Which I for one failed not to take,
And hence could stem such strain and ache
As each year might assign. (886)

The only way to bear the "strain and ache" is to realize
that the world doesn't promise much, and what it gives
should be seen as having neither a benevolent or malign
purpose, merely, "neutral-tinted haps and such."

However, there may be hope in Hardy's elegy after all.
Bakhtin writes, "In the process of becoming the dominant
genre, the novel sparks the renovation of all other genres,
it infects them with its spirit of process and
inconclusiveness" (Dialogic 7). At the end of The
Woodlanders, we are left wondering if there is any hope in
the pastoral elegy or not. It is this inconclusiveness
that the novelized version of pastoral elegy inspires.
Bakhtin writes:

A "man of the people" in the novel is very often of
idyllic descent . . . A "man of the people" appears in
the novel as the one who holds the correct attitude
toward life and death, an attitude lost by the ruling
classes. . . . Often connected with this figure is a
particular way of treating food, drink, love,
childbirth. He is, after all, the representative of
eternal productive labor. There is an emphasis on the
healthy failure of such a man to understand accepted
falsehoods and conventions (which then exposes these
for what they are). (Dialogic 235-6)

Giles Winterbourne, in some respects, matches Bakhtin's
description of a "man of the people." In some ways, he is
a hero who holds the proper attitude toward life. He works at an idyllic occupation. On the other hand, he has been corrupted by outside ideals. He fails to survive this corruption. Nevertheless, his life is heroic in that it demonstrates the destructive tendencies of those influences that destroyed the pastoral world. Hardy's view toward his resurrection of this man of the people is ambivalent. David Lodge points out that like many Victorians, Hardy was "both an evolutionary and a pessimistic thinker: he believed in the inevitability of change without assuming that it would necessarily be changed for the better" (87). Ellen Glasgow expressed similar sentiments in her credo "I Believe" by saying, "I believe in evolution, though I do not believe that evolution, of necessity means progress" (242). The Woodlanders depicts a society rapidly undergoing change. An old manner of life is passing away, but whether there will be a resurrection of a better way is viewed with ambivalence.

"The Bear" and "Delta Autumn":
Elegies for the Wilderness

In "The Bear" and "Delta Autumn," Ike McCaslin and the narrator sing the funeral elegy for the Mississippi wilderness. Faulkner does not advocate a return to the simple life of the wilderness, because the wilderness is
vanishing. If redemption lies in a return to the
simplicity of nature, redemption is impossible because
civilization is destroying Nature. This lamentation for
the death of the wilderness appears throughout "The Bear"
and "Delta Autumn."

"The Bear" and "Delta Autumn" illustrate the
destruction of the idyllic aspects of the pastoral by the
encroachment of capitalistic progress. Bakhtin writes,
"The destruction of the idyll may be treated, of course, in
a multitude of ways. The differences are determined by
differing conceptions and evaluations of the idyllic world
rapidly approaching its end, as well as differing
evaluations of the forces that are destroying it--that is,
the new capitalist world" (Dialogic 233).

Faulkner's description of the rapacity of civilization
appears not only in Go Down, Moses, but in several other
novels as well. In A Fable, the narrator remarks,

Rapacity does not fail . . . but all governments and
nations which ever rose and endured long enough to
leave their mark as such, had sprung from it
[rapacity] and in and upon and by means of it became
forever fixed in the amazement of man's present and
the glory of his past; civilization itself is its
password and Christianity is its masterpiece . . . it
is in and from rapacity that he gets, holds, his
immortality. (259-61)

These statements are an ironic twist to the Apostle Paul's
"Love never fails" (I Corinthians 13:8). A civilization that was supposed to have been built on love had turned rapaciously upon itself and was destroying itself.1

"The Bear" begins with a nostalgic reminiscence of the wilderness. Ike McCaslin, now sixteen, had been allowed to hunt with the men for the past six years. For six years he had heard the best kind of speech, that is, talk about "the wilderness, the big woods, bigger and older than any recorded document" (191). These men of the hunt share stories about the great woods of the past, realizing that a day fast approaches when there will be no more woods. The men, aided by whisky, sit around the camp and tell the great stories of the past, especially about Old Ben, the great bear of the woods. Winter enhances the elegiac tone of these stories, told usually during hunting expeditions in November and December, the time of death and decay, further symbolizing the destruction of the wilderness way of life. Ike always remembers "the November woods under the dissolving afternoon and the year's death, sombre, impenetrable . . ." (195). Even the season of the year points to the bear and the woods as symbols of a rapidly decaying way of life. Ike McCaslin lives to see the almost total destruction of the wilderness. As a boy he travels
through the "last of open country, the last trace of man's puny gnawing at the immemorial flank . . ." (195).

As in most pastoral literature, urban civilization is the enemy, destroying humanity's oneness with nature. The narrator of "The Bear" describes the bear and the wilderness in these terms:

That doomed wilderness whose edges were being constantly and punily gnawed at by men with plows and axes who feared it because it was wilderness, men myriad and nameless even to one another in the land where the old bear had earned a name, and through which ran not even a mortal beast but an anachronism indomitable and invincible out of an old dead time, a phantom, epitome and apotheosis of the old wild life which the little puny humans swarmed and hacked at in a fury of abhorrence and fear like pygmies about the ankles of a drowsing elephant;--the old bear, solitary, indomitable, and alone; widowered childless and absolved of mortality--old Priam reft of his old wife and outlived all his sons. (193-4)

The wilderness speaks of an "old dead time." The bear itself is a nature god that is about to die. As this nature god sees the encroachment of civilization, its will to live diminishes. The bear will decide to die when the inevitability of civilization comes too close, or as Ike says, "when even he dont want it to last any longer" (212).

Sam Fathers also represents the last remnants of the simple life in harmony with nature. The son of a Chickasaw chief, his only unhappiness was the result of a society that classified him as a Negro. As he approaches the end
of his life, the narrator says, "... for seventy years now he had had to be a negro. It was almost over now and he was glad" (215). After the bear decides to die, Sam Fathers decides to die as well, knowing that the natural way of life is doomed. The text describes Sam as "the old man, the wild man not even one generation from the woods, childless, kinless, peopleless" (246). Sam is a child of the woods that are passing away, and he leaves no one behind. What would be the use of a legacy now that the woods are going to die? He does leave behind Ike, but Ike only witnesses the continuing destruction of the wilderness. When the hunters ask the doctor to examine Sam before his death, the doctor says that Sam "just quit" (248). That same terminology will be used for Ike when he repudiates the land. Ike "just quits" when he is twenty-one, dying a long time before his physical death.

Even as a teen-ager, Ike recognizes that the wilderness is coming to an end. He knows that the death of the great bear symbolizes the death of the wilderness and humanity's harmony with nature. When they finally find the dog, Lion, that is strong enough to hold the bear, Ike realizes that Lion signifies the last of that way of life:

So he should have hated and feared Lion. Yet he did not. It seemed to him that there was a fatality
in it. It seemed to him that something, he didn't know what, was beginning, had already begun. It was like the last act on a set stage. It was the beginning of the end of something, he didn't know what except that he would not grieve. He would be humble and proud that he had been found worthy to be a part of it too or even just to see it too. (226)

Ike senses, like the narrators in Hardy's fiction, that there can be no return to the past. Scientific progress and urban industrialization make such a return an impossibility.

Boon Hoganbeck joins Sam Fathers and Ike McCaslin in sharing feelings of the approaching fatality. Like Sam Fathers, Boon is also a descendant of Native Americans. The narrator does not describe Boon's simplicity of life with the same terms of dignity reserved for Sam Fathers, but Boon inherits the primitivism of early Native Americans, a childlike innocence concerning life and encroaching civilization. Boon had been ten years old all his life:

He was four inches over six feet; he had the mind of a child, the heart of a horse, and little hard shoe-button eyes without depth or meanness or generosity or viciousness or gentleness or anything else, in the ugliest face the boy had ever seen. It looked like somebody had found a walnut a little larger than a football and with a machinist's hammer had shaped features into it and then painted it, mostly red; not Indian red but a fine bright ruddy color which whisky might have had something to do with but which was mostly just happy and violent out-of-doors, the wrinkles in it not the residue of the forty years it
had survived but from squinting into the sun or into
the gloom of cane-brakes where game had run, baked
into it by the camp fires before which he had lain
trying to sleep on the cold November or December
ground while waiting for daylight so he could rise and
hunt again, as though time were merely something he
walked through as he did through air, aging him no
more than air did. He was brave, faithful, improvident
and unreliable; he had neither profession job nor
trade and owned one vice and one virtue; whisky, and
that absolute and unquestioning fidelity to Major de
Spain and the boy's cousin McCaslin. (228)

Like many characters who live in harmony with the natural
world, Boon does not notice the passing of time until the
pastoral manner of life begins to fade. The contrast
between Boon and the urban manner of life is brought out
when he and Ike must go to Memphis to buy whisky for the
hunting camp:

It was as if the high buildings and the hard
pavements, the fine carriages and the horse cars and
the men in starched collars and neckties made their
boots and khaki look a little rougher and a little
muddier and made Boon's beard look worse and more
unshaven and his face look more like he should never
have brought it out of the woods. . . (231)

Boon also sees the inroads of civilization, realizing that
his simple life of living in the woods and hunting will
soon be taken away. The text especially points to this in
the description of Boon as he defends his squirrels for his
own possession. Ike finds Boon at the edge of clearing,
sitting underneath a tree filled with squirrels. Boon
screams at Ike, "Get out of here! Dont touch them! Dont
touch a one of them! They're mine!" (331). This tree filled with squirrels is at the edge of a clearing. Boon knows that the railroad and the lumber companies will soon take even this away from him. Leo Marx, in *The Machine in the Garden* writes: "Whether represented by the plight of dispossessed herdsman or by the sound of a locomotive in the woods, this feature of the design brings a world which is more "real" into juxtaposition with an idyllic vision. It may be called the *counterforce*" (25). Boon is like one of the old herdsmen in Virgil's pastorals. He fears that he will soon be dispossessed by this counterforce to the wilderness idyll.

"The Bear" also recalls the time when the woods were sold to the lumber company to cut the timber. General Compson and Walter Ewell decide that they will form a hunting club and lease out the privilege to hunt in the woods. Just before part of the wilderness is sold to the lumber companies, Ike goes on a hunt "almost forty miles beyond any country the body had ever seen before" (316). The next spring they heard that Major de Spain had sold the timber rights to the land.

Ike goes back and finds even more changes: a planing mill covering two or three acres and stacked steel rails,
ready to make more railroad tracks into the wilderness.

This railroad is compared to a serpent:

Then the little locomotive shrieked and began to move: a rapid churning of exhaust, a lethargic deliberate clashing of slack coupling traveling backward along the train, the exhaust changing to the deep slow clapping bites of power as the caboose too began to move and from the cupola he watched the train's head complete the first and only curve in the entire line's length and vanish into the wilderness, dragging its length of train behind it so that it resembled a small dingy harmless snake vanishing into weeds, drawing him with it too until soon it ran once more at its maximum clattering speed between the twin walls of unaxed wilderness. (318)

The train, like the serpent that destroyed the paradise of Eden, destroys the paradise of the wilderness. The narrator tells of how the hunters used to be able to hear the railroad in the distance, but now it gets closer and closer to them, beginning to spoil their hunt (319-20). Leo Marx writes, "The locomotive, associated with fire, smoke, speed, iron, and noise, is the leading symbol of the new industrial power. It appears in the woods, suddenly shattering the harmony of the green hollow, like a presentiment of history bearing down on the American asylum." (27). The railroad is also a very important symbol in Hardy's novel A Laodicean. In Faulkner, the train "had brought with it into the doomed wilderness even before the actual axe the shadow and portent of the new
mill not even finished yet and the rails and ties which were not even laid" (321). Utley writes,

Old Ben, like Thorpe's Big Bear, has cosmic dimensions; he is the God of the Wilderness. At his death the Wilderness dies, or at least shrinks to a tiny plot of hunting land surrounding the graves of the ritual dead: Lion, Old Ben, Sam Fathers. Ike, fleeing a Snopesian civilization and the raucous planing mill which is its symbol, revisits the "dead." Like gods they never die. . . . Ike's recollections of the seasonal myths and resurrection of the god are interrupted by the sight of a rattlesnake, the snake of this diminished Eden—the immortal snake who stole life from man and who is the prototype of the logging train which devours the wilderness. (Utley 172-3)

Europeans came to the new world to create a new paradise, but technology became its god. As Simpson writes, "In his desire to conquer the land, New World man destroyed the possibility of making a truly fresh beginning in mankind's social and moral history by allowing his mechanical side to take precedence over his romantic inclinations" ("Ike" 203).

Ironically, Boon, Ike, and Sam Fathers, who sense the tragedy of the vanishing wilderness more than any others, track the bear and train the dog to hold the bear. Boon actually kills the great bear. Though Boon, Ike, and Sam Fathers love the wilderness, they are all instruments in this fatality.
Boon and Ike represent the destructive love which Americans always exercised toward the wilderness. Though Ike sings the elegy for the wilderness, there is a sense in which he helps to bring about its destruction. Ike never seems to realize the inconsistency of his love for the wilderness and his willingness to kill the deer and lead hunting parties composed of men from the city who have no respect for nature, but only want to kill, even does, if necessary. Ike realizes that his own rapacity is a contradiction, so he tries to justify it once again on theological grounds:

God created man and He created the world for him to live in and I reckon he created the kind of world He would have wanted to live in if He had been a man—the ground to walk on, the big woods, the trees and the water, and the game to live in it. And maybe He didn't put the desire to hunt and kill game in man but I reckon He knew it was going to be there, that man was going to teach it to himself. . . . He put them both here: man, and the game he would follow and kill, foreknowing it. I believe He said, "So be it." I reckon He even foreknew the end. But He said, "I will give him his chance. I will give him warning and foreknowledge too, along with the desire to follow and the power to slay. The woods and fields he ravages and the game he devastates will be the consequence and signature of his crime and guilt, and his punishment. (348, 349)

While Ike mourns the loss of the wilderness, like many Americans, he realizes that he too has played a part in
that destruction, incurring guilt for the game he devastated. Brumm writes,

This deep attachment to the wilderness, to untouched timeless nature, reflects on the attitude toward civilization, its inevitable enemy and destroyer. Here again is a genuinely American experience for which Europe has no counterpart: the destruction of the wilderness by civilization in one short, dramatic act taking less than a man's lifetime. There is, to be sure, a sentimentality in this feeling for the wilderness: only as doomed and vanquished could it be lamented and loved so much by writers who necessarily just by picking up pen and paper, have to confess themselves as part of the civilization they accuse. But love and art feed well on contradictions; and it is inevitable that the wilderness, achieving the revenge of the weak and the vanquished should engage the imagination of the American writer in order to achieve its immortality with a vengeance. (130)

Ike has killed so many deer that it would not be possible for him to count them (336). This elegy that Ike sings for the wilderness is one in which he shares responsibility for its destruction.

In "Delta Autumn" Ike McCaslin is an old man. The elegiac tone for the destruction of the wilderness continues. Ike remembers when the hunters used to come to the woods with wagons, how many deer and bears there were, and how they used to sleep in wet blankets. Now, people came to the woods in cars, because it took so much longer just to get to the wilderness, "the territory in which game still existed drawing yearly inward as his life was drawing
inward" (335). As they drive further, the elegiac tone continues:

At first there had been only the old towns along the River and the old towns along the hills, from each of which the planters with their gangs of slaves and then of hired laborers had wrested from the impenetrable jungle of water-lying cane and cypress, gum and holly and oak and ash, cotton patches which as the years passed become fields and then plantations. The paths made by deer and bear became roads and then highways, with towns in turn springing up along them and along the rivers. . . . Most of that was gone now. Now a man drove two hundred miles from Jefferson before he found wilderness to hunt in. (340)

Faulkner continues this description of the vanishing wilderness, mentioning the cotton fields, neon lights, automobiles, cotton gins, and the railroad. People no longer hear the scream of the panther but the screeching of the railroad (341). When the car finally reaches the wilderness, Ike realizes that "the retrograde of his remembering had gained an inverse velocity from their own slow progress, that the land had retreated not in minutes from the last spread of gravel but in years, decades, back toward what it had been when he first knew it" (341).

Continuing the elegiac tone, the narrator describes Ike's thoughts: "There was some of it left, although now it was two hundred miles from Jefferson when once it had been thirty. He had watched it, not being conquered,
destroyed, so much as retreating since its purpose was served now and its time an outmoded time" (343).

The last act in "Delta Autumn" is the new city hunters killing a doe. In the past, killing a doe signified the abundance of the land. Now, it merely symbolizes the greed and lawlessness of modern humanity.

The elegy in Go Down, Moses shares characteristics with the classical elegy. This elegy recalls the exploits of mythic men and animals. Nature weeps over its own destruction. In Go Down, Moses, the narrator makes constant reference to the "green gloom" that pervades the wilderness setting. In the previous chapter concerning Ike as a failed shepherd, I implied that Ike, while relinquishing the land, did nothing productive. One of the characteristics of classical elegy is the questioning of the guardians of the dead shepherd. The text points an accusatory finger at Ike and others who were guardians of the wilderness. Where were they, and what were they doing to prevent this destruction? The elegy also contains thoughts concerning divine justice and the evils of the modern world. The text in these two stories refers constantly to the encroachment of industrialization. Also, Ike continues to point to the justice of God in punishing
men for their rapacity concerning the land. As mentioned earlier, the end of an elegy usually contains hope for a resurrection. I see no such hope in Hardy, but Faulkner's view may not be as bleak.

Some critics see in these stories the hope for redemption. Perhaps the price of atonement has been paid, and there is hope for a pastoral world of the future. Some critics, such as Lewis, point to the fact that Old Ben is compared to Priam, king of Troy. Lewis writes:

Priam, we remember, was the ruler of the old citadel and was destroyed with it; but one warrior survived him, Aeneas, his nephew and we may say his foster-child, who after many trials established a new kingdom in a new country. . . . I suggest that we are closer to the archetypal image reproduced in The Bear if we think of it as a pattern of redemption in terms of the ultimate forces in the world (like the Aeneid), rather than a dream projection mirroring interior psychic conflicts. (200)

While Lewis sees a hope for redemption, who is the Aeneas in Go Down, Moses? Who does Old Ben leave behind to preserve the manner of the wilderness? While Ike might have been a possible deliverer, he certainly offers no hope for redemption himself. As "Delta Autumn" closes, Ike thinks:

This Delta. This land which man has deswamped and denuded and delivererd in two generations so that white men can own plantations and commute every night to Memphis and black men own plantations and ride in jim crow cars to Chicago to live in millionaire's
mansions on Lakeshore Drive, where white men rent farms and live like niggers and niggers crop on shares and live like animals, where cotton is planted and grows man-tall in the very cracks of the sidewalks, and usury and mortgage and bankruptcy and measureless wealth, Chinese and African and Aryan and Jew, all breed and spawn together until no man has time to say which one is which nor cares. . . . No wonder the ruined woods I used to know don't cry for retribution! he thought: The people who have destroyed it will accomplish its revenge. (364)

Ike, a defeated old man, shivering in the cold, is certainly no redeemer. Ike's life closes with no hope for a resurrection of the old pastoral world, but only a prediction of punishment for those who destroyed it. The text offers little hope for redemption, unless one adopts Ike's hope for a heavenly paradise. Even if nature itself punishes humanity, people without some kind of moral base will be too blind to learn the need for repentance. Simpson writes,

Ike's bitterness assumes that the Second Fall has not completely obliterated the element of Rousseau-esque discontent that drove modern man to seek to return to nature. It may be, however, that Faulkner is one of the last writers to experience fully the Rousseau-esque tradition of discontent—that is to say, a writer who really feels what it means for modern man to have lost the chance to enter into a living, instead of a bull-dozing, relationship with nature. We may now be entering the age of "post-modern man." A major characteristic of this age will be the full acceptance of a mass-technological society as the one and only way of existence. No doubt the people who live in the post-modern world will accomplish the revenge of "the ruined woods," but will they realize it? Punishment is meaningless when the punished have no moral norm to
which they can relate their punishment, and nature as a moral or ethical norm has become almost meaningless. ("Ike" 209)

The text describes humanity's punishment for its pursuit of technological advancement and destruction of the woods, but there may be no way to reclaim it. Bakhtin contends that when capitalistic forces destroy a bucolic setting, there is usually "no philosophical sublimation of the idyll" and that "the positive hero of the idyllic world becomes ridiculous, pitiful and unnecessary; he either perishes or is re-educated and becomes an egoistic predator (Dialogic 234-5). Ike perishes without obtaining, or offering others much hope for a better future.

Like Ike McCaslin, we leave the text thinking that perhaps the wilderness has served its purpose. Therefore, we sing its hopeless elegy.

If there is any hope for the future in this pastoral elegy, it may be found in the person of Roth Edmonds's mistress. While Ike has always believed that he was taking the moral high ground, the text carnivalizes his convictions by showing the ridiculous nature of his withdrawal from society and his continued racial prejudice. This Christ-figure even tries to give Roth's mistress money in an attempt to get rid of her. She shows by her actions
that she is superior to him. The woman believes Ike spoiled Roth by giving up his land. Once again, Ike's act of relinquishment has had harmful, rather than beneficial effects. Ike's attitude toward the woman, turning her away, trying to buy her off, repeats the same mistakes of Sutpen and others who never could rid themselves of racial hatred. Ike realizes that the land was cursed and destroyed because of this evil of racial injustice, yet he continues to cling to these inherited attitudes.

Ike does, however, make a gesture at the end of "Delta Autumn" which indicates that perhaps there may be hope in this elegy. Ike gives her General Compson's hunting horn, "covered with the unbroken skin from a buck's shank and bound with silver" (363). He wants her to give it to her son. Giving the horn covered with the buck's skin symbolizes the passing on of a tradition. Richard Moreland suggests that the passing of the horn to her son indicates "the possibility that she might indeed effect meaningful change in that tradition, if not by making a man of Roth (or of himself), then perhaps by making a better man of her son" (185). Since this woman knows how to love (something that she suggests Ike does not know how to do), perhaps the tradition can be handed on through her to someone who could
combine love for others with love of the pastoral tradition.

Perhaps we could imagine a scene just after the closing pages of "Delta Autumn" with this woman walking on the road carrying the deer horn. The image is almost as grotesque and carnivalesque as that of Lena and Byron Bunch. But such an image gives a hope that the dying tradition of the pastoral wilderness will be given new birth in a more life-affirming version.

Endnotes

1 Though May uses the words "grotesque pastoral" to indicate the incompatibility of the pastoral with Hardy's philosophy of life, I use the term in a more Bakhtinian sense which allows us to merge the grotesque nature of Hardy's work with pastoral ideology in such a way that the connection with traditional pastoral can be seen, encouraging an ambivalent view toward pastoral that regenerates with laughter.

2 Wotton observes that in The Woodlanders Grace Melbury is "the living embodiment of the radical separation where the direct social relations between the individuals of the community of labour are transformed into material relations between them and social relations between the marketable commodities they produce"(54-5).

3 Ursula Brumm writes that Faulkner believes that "trade, government, war, art, Christianity, and all of civilization" (126) combine to exploit the natural world.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION

Each generation of authors uses its own insights and talents as it considers different aspects of the pastoral mode. Authors pick and choose among the various pastoral anecdotes and conventions to express their love or criticism, and in many cases, their ambivalence toward pastoral. In Bakhtin's terms, writers accentuate and re-accentuate various classical conventions which results in the continued growth and development of these images. While the pastorals of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner may not be identical to those of Theocritus, Virgil, Milton, or Marvell, they do re-accentuate some of their themes in order that our present understanding of the hopes and dreams that lie underneath the pastoral hope might be better understood. This concept helps to explain why there are so many definitions and disagreements concerning the nature of pastoral literature. Bakhtin's theories help us to understand how these images, genres, modes, and conventions are transformed by each generation of writers, readers, and critics. The dialogic nature of language helps us to understand that as readers we come to texts with a set of images, beliefs, and definitions that may be very different from those of the original author. Through
a dialogic encounter with the text, each generation broadens and deepens the understanding of literary modes such as pastoral. Bakhtin writes that "every age re-accentuates in its own way the works of its most immediate past. . . . New images in literature are very often created through a re-accentuating of old images, by translating them from one accentual register to another" (421). Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner took certain elements of the pastoral mode and gave it a unique emphasis.

The novels of Thomas Hardy, Ellen Glasgow, and William Faulkner treat the pastoral with an ambivalence that has led to many very divergent interpretations by literary critics. These texts display both a nostalgia and a distaste for the rural world which lead to grotesque pastoral imagery. Since so many of their novels end in bitterness, irony, or tragedy, it is easy to assume that these authors were filled with nothing but pessimism for life, even in the bucolic world. But the texts I have examined show that their love/hate relationship with the rural world is not as pessimistic as it may seem. Though they portray the bucolic idyll as passing away, they treat its death in such a way that there is hope for a rebirth. The carnivalesque humor that they use to describe even the
tragedies in the rural world point to a life that comes from death.

Explaining this regenerative power of grotesque, carnival humor, Bakhtin writes:

Actually the grotesque . . . discloses the potentiality of an entirely different world, of another order, another way of life. It leads men out of the confines of the apparent (false) unity of the indisputable and stable. Born of folk humor, it always represents in one form or another, through these or other means, the return of Saturn's golden age to earth—the living possibility of its return . . . . The existing world suddenly becomes alien because there is the potentiality of a friendly world, of the golden age, of carnival truth. Man returns unto himself. The world is destroyed so that it may be regenerated and renewed. While dying it gives birth. The relative nature of all that exists is always gay, it is the joy of change. (Rabelais 48)

Since there were so many harmful and hypocritical aspects to the forms of pastoral inherited by Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, they portrayed these versions in grotesque forms. These official versions of pastoral are held up for the folk humor of carnival, especially by rustic characters, clowns, fools, and idiots. Grotesque images combining stories and symbols of life and death pervade the works. These versions of pastoral become grotesque, but they are held up for this kind of humor in order that they might be regenerated. The desire for the golden age is still there,
and the hope for it is expressed in the grotesque forms of

carnival truth.

Though the novels may end on a such a tragic or bitter
note that the context seems completely foreign to pastoral
literature, the grotesque nature of the portrayal itself
contains the hope for the rebirth of the golden age.

Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner often expressed their
optimistic views for the future. In his Nobel Prize
acceptance speech Faulkner said that he believed man would
prevail (Essays 120). Thomas Hardy said that he believed
one day wars would end, not because of any moral
transformation, but simply because humanity would one day
see the absurd in war (Millgate, Biography 410). This
depiction of the absurd nature of some ideologies, even
pastoral, is a way of burying it so that it might be given
life once again.

This ambivalent attitude toward all kinds of ideology
was expressed by Ellen Glasgow in "I Believe": "I believe,
therefore, that faith has its victories, but that
skepticism remains the only permanent basis of tolerance.
I believe in the challenging mind, in the unreconciled
heart, and in the will toward perfection" (245). The
ambivalent attitude of all three authors toward the
pastoral is explained in terms of "skepticism" and "the unreconciled heart." Their texts do not really solve any problems or give us unqualified methods for attaining a golden age. They do hold up the absurdities of life for regenerative laughter and encourage a carnival attitude toward official ideology.

Though some writers such as Lewis Simpson hint that the pastoral mode may be about to completely pass away, the pastoral has been with us a long time and will no doubt continue to be a part of our study, vocabulary, and desires. In Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics, Bakhtin contends that "nothing conclusive has yet taken place in the world, the ultimate word of the world and about the world has not yet been spoken, the world is open and free, everything is still in the future and will always be in the future. But this is, after all, also the purifying sense of ambivalent laughter" (166). Writers continue to use the pastoral mode and re-accentuate its meaning. In the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner, this re-accentuation often took the form of ambivalent laughter. The grotesque imagery in the novels of Hardy, Glasgow, and Faulkner exposes the absurdities of pastoral, while betraying a desire that its tradition might be regenerated.
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