

*The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*  
7(1), Spring 2011, Ser. 12/4  
(Previously *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*)

## **Thomas Hardy's *Under the Greenwood Tree* : An Althusserian Perspective**

**A. Keshavarzi \***

Ph. D candidate Shiraz University, Shiraz  
Islamic Azad University, Firuzabad  
email: akeshavarzi@rose.shirazu.ac.ir

**A. Abjadian**

Professor  
Shiraz University, Shiraz  
email: aabjadian@rose.shirazu.ac.ir

### **Abstract**

With the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, England entered into a transitional period. Sociologists believe that in each era of transformation, the ruling class tries to establish its own values, but some resistance to these new values is inevitable. Thomas Hardy's novels in general, and *Under the Greenwood Tree* specifically, are no exception. Based on these notions, this paper tries to interpret *Under the Greenwood Tree*. Much of the criticism of Hardy's work insists on the point that the created characters in his work along with their new ideas emphasize Hardy's attempts in standing against the ideological discourses of the middle-class. Under the light of Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) and Antonio Gramsci's notion of hegemony, Hardy can be considered as a true subject of his society, one who tries to strengthen the pillars of his society through depicting characters who have to be in the mainstream of the current ideological discourses of his age. Therefore, dealing with various aspects of this novel, this study tries to see how Louis Althusser's notions can help us to understand Hardy himself, his characters as well as the era in which he lived and wrote.

---

Received: 2/27/2010 Accepted: 10/26/2010

\* Corresponding author

**Keywords:** *Under the Greenwood Tree*, Louis Althusser, Antonio Gramsci, ISAs, hegemony



پښتونستان د علومو انساني و مطالعاتو فرېسنجی  
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی

## **1. Introduction**

Most critics believe that Thomas Hardy is critical of his age as well as its demands, or they consider him as an author parodying the Victorian age, but through Althusser's and Gramsci's notions, we get a different picture of Hardy. Undoubtedly, Hardy goes to extremes in depicting abnormalities, and sometimes it is felt he has a kind of sympathy toward them, but at the end of his novels he clarifies his points, and one understands that he is a subject and at the service of the system.

Penny Boumelha, Hardy's most significant feminist critic, draws her observations from Althusser's theory of social formation. She tries to reveal contradictions, distortions and ambiguities in Hardy's presentations of texts, believing that Hardy refuses to suggest a clear position on the issue of gender; she is suggesting that Hardy is a conscious experimenter who tries to be ambiguous all the time, especially through his unique androgynous voice in exploration of women's situations. The source of her departure from the present study is her insistence on Hardy's conscious ambiguity. In a sense, she fails to see that Hardy is a 'subject' who consciously or unconsciously should reveal the demands of the dominant ideologies of the society.

Rosemarie Morgan, another eminent feminist, emphasizes Hardy's female characters' palpability which leads to their visibility, and lays emphasis upon the physical dimensions of them. She provides two reasons for her stress on the physicality of the characters. First, she expresses that Victorian critics were not satisfied with Hardy's women in terms of moral censure, and secondly, Hardy had no puritanical censure and had complete faith in the healthy, life giving force of free, unexpressed sexual activity, and had complete commitment to active, assertive, self-determined women (Morgan, 1988: p. x). The point is that the vigorous, energetic and resilient characteristics ascribed to Hardy's characters by Morgan are doomed to failure, and Hardy merely brings them to prepare the grounds to show the struggles present in the society and the domination of the ruling ideologies. In this sense, the characteristics assigned to Hardy by Morgan cannot be trusted. Hardy's

feministic attitudes cannot be ignored, yet he is a male subject hailed by the patriarchal society. The question is what happens to the volatile emotions and sensations ascribed to Hardy's characters.

Dale Kramer touches upon Hardy's tragic vision. He identifies society as the tragic cause of Hardy's characters by thwarting the happiness of the characters who are unable to reconcile their desires with its demands. Kramer believes that Hardy is concerned with defending the integrity and absolute moral value of the individual consciousness of his characters against judgments based on social conventions. Kramer's stress on the integrity of Hardy's characters is nothing different from their subjectivity.

George Wotton (1985) deals with the contradictions present in Hardy's novels, arguing that it is ideological conflicts that push Hardy to delineate his characters in different contradictory positions. Undoubtedly, ideological conflicts permeate Hardy's novels and these conflicts result in contradictory positions to reveal the struggles present in the society to achieve domination.

These studies and a lot of others do not mention the roles of Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs) which are played by Hardy himself and his characters. Based on Althusser's notion of ISAs in transforming the individuals to good subjects, the purpose of this paper is to trace the material ritual practices of ideological recognition present in Hardy's *Under the Greenwood Tree* which identify individuals as subjects. Thus, the paper tries to clarify characters' obedience to ISAs or vice versa; to clarify where the Althusserian meaning of "subject" is used; that is, "a subjected being who submits to a higher authority, and is therefore stripped of all meaning of this ambiguity, which is a reflection of the effect which produces it" (Althusser 2004, p. 701); and finally to observe whether the subjects freely accept their subjection to the Subject's "commandments".

## 2. Discussion

Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century up to the middle of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Marxist tradition was dominant in view of all walks of life and society, including

literary works. In this tradition, the doctrine of Base/Superstructure viewed society's structure as based heavily on the material forces and economy. The shift in economy would result in shift in the society's structure. Thus, this Base shaped the Superstructure including religion, law, politics, and social interactions. However, with the breakdown of the capitalist mode after the First World War, Marxists expected the great socialist revolution to happen because the bourgeoisie had lost its prestige and confidence in its materialistic field. But nothing of this kind happened. The New-Marxists realized that while the bourgeoisie had lost their economic domination, they still maintained their domination over the working class because of their dominance in ideological and cultural field. Hence, they came to the notion that the supremacy of any class in a society does not originate exclusively in its economical prominence but also owes a lot to its dominant status in the realm of ideology. Therefore, they concluded that the bourgeoisie class had executed various methods to gain ideological dominance.

According to this theory, the ruling class secures its supremacy through encouraging the spread of its own ideas by controlling the means of cultural production such as the media, the educational system as well as other social institutions. The origin of this new doctrine is Althusser's famous essay which is originated from Antonio Gramsci's conception of hegemony that has prepared the grounds for cultural materialists to realize the materiality of culture. With the publication of his essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" (1968), Althusser became popular. Althusser emphasizes ideology as the source of perceiving the circumstances of individuals in the world, and as it is politically determined.

Since Althusser's view is an extension of Antonio Gramsci's idea of hegemony, the definition of hegemony plays a significant role. Gramsci's concept of hegemony has been analyzed and extended by such early post-modern thinkers as Foucault, Althusser, Raymond Williams, and even Stuart Hall in their efforts to interrogate the "truth discourse" of post-enlightenment modernity at large. Hegemony "is the conscious

imposition of a totalized value system on the various constituencies of a society. And, in resorting to overt compulsion, it becomes vulnerable to resistance" (Spanos, 2001, p. 117). Gramsci believes that the ruling class tries to subordinate the individuals of his society through consent and coercion, but the emphasis is on consent which creates obedient subjects through various means. Like ideology, hegemony constitutes the value system of the dominant social order. However, this value system of the dominant social order becomes so pervasive through various means--through the establishment of canons, social rituals, parties, media, educational institutions, churches, literature and so forth--that it becomes the only "truth discourse" and variation from it looks odd. The only "truth discourse" is the truth extended by the state institutions in so far as that it has become natural to its members, and "it is thus invisible, its center being a 'center elsewhere', as it were, 'beyond the reach of [free] play'. This is why resistance to it is ultimately unspeakable" (Spanos, 2001, p. 117). Therefore, individuals accept their own subordination willingly, consent to dominant social order, and become subjects.

Gramsci's idea of hegemony leads Althusser to his own view of the individuals as subjects. He believes that, through ISAs, members of societies become subjects, even good ones:

The vast majority of (good) subjects work all right "all by themselves"; i.e. by ideology (whose concrete forms are realized in the Ideological State Apparatuses [ISAs]). They are inserted in the practices governed by the rituals of the ISAs. They "recognize" the existing state of affairs (*das Bestehende*), that "it really is true that it is so and not otherwise," and that they must be obedient to God, to their conscience, to the priest, to the Gaulle, to the boss, to the engineer, that thou shalt "love thy neighbour as thyself," etc. Their concrete, material behaviour is simply the inscription in life of the admirable words of the prayer: Amen--So be it" (Althusser, 2004, p. 701).

These ISAs start working from the very beginning of an individual's life; that is, from when the baby is in his cradle, through the family to make him/her a subject by their own specific and popular methods.

Joanna Zylinska (2005) believes that "when we are born into the world we adopt a number of gender codes that are passed on from our parents, educators and earlier generations--such as 'pink for the girls, blue for the boys', 'girls shouldn't still like that', 'boys don't cry', and so on" (5); of course, these are not the only codes that are transferred to the individuals through their parents, educators or earlier generations. The most significant institution, for Althusser, is the educational system; then there is family, the church, the cultural system including literature, sport, etc. These institutions contain the ideologies according to which the ruling class demands its subjects to perform and act. Through these apparatuses, the members of a society become subjects, owing allegiance to their supremes; that is, the state apparatuses' function is to transform the individuals into subjects: "all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects." To clarify the point, Althusser (2004) goes on saying that

ideology 'acts' or 'functions' in such a way that it 'recruits' subjects among the individuals (it recruits all), or 'transforms' the individuals into subjects (it transforms all) by that very precise operation which I have called interpellation or hailing, and which can be imagined along the lines of the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: Hey! You there! (p. 699)

Through this mere hailing by the police, the individual is converted to a subject; that is, he finds an identity in the hegemonic ideology, and works in its direction. Through interpellation, a special way of addressing, individuals misrecognize themselves as the sources of meaning and power, rather than recipients--hence, hailing and interpellation are the most significant elements of apparatuses, whether in actual everyday life or in the works of literature. Althusser (2004) believes that since "ideology hails or interpellates individuals as subjects", and since "ideology is eternal", "*individuals are always-*

*already subjects*" [original emphasis] (p. 700). That is, even before the individuals are born, according to Althusser, they are subjects as, for example, they bear their fathers' names, and therefore have an identity which is irreplaceable. Interpellation permeates every moment of subjects' lives, and its omnipresence makes them oblivious to its ubiquitous existence. Thus, this kind of relationship makes "the subjects 'work', they 'work by themselves' in the vast majority of cases, with the exception of the 'bad subjects' who on occasions provoke the intervention of one of the detachments of the (repressed) State apparatuses" (Althusser, 2004, p. 701). To give some examples of ISAs and their methods, he states that

Schools and Churches use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to 'discipline' not only their Shepherds, but also their flocks. The same is true of the Family...The same is true of the cultural IS apparatuses (censorship, among other things), etc. (Althusser, 1971, p. 145).

That is why Roland Barthes' *Mythology* regards very common things such as toys as new myths in the post-modern era; "a wrestling match, an elaborate dish, a plastics exhibition" contain ideology and provide ideas and attitudes which attract the individuals toward themselves in order to act accordingly (Barthes, 1993, p. 11). According to Barthes, these objects provide a kind of identity for the individuals that promote the notion that they cannot and should not attempt to confront the world but to act as they are demanded of.

The primary concern of conservative Victorians was that the validation of literary works could be equated to a validation of the moral/spiritual standards held by the work or the characters within that work. This concern arises from a culture which recognizes the didactic and communal nature of literature in introducing and upholding cultural ideas and practices. It is a culture which realizes that literature is more than mere aesthetic--it is also social and cultural. Therefore, Brockett's

notion, saying that concern for the aesthetic of "the arts is secondary; the primary issue always is one of power, a battle over which groups' values and standards shall prevail" (1994, p. 1), seems to stem from Gramsci's concept. As the individuals of the society are pushed to consent to the dominant discourses of the society, it is believed that literature, as an institution in the hands of the ruling class, should be in its direction. In all Hardy's novels, it is as if Hardy performs the same thing; that is, by challenging ideologies, he makes them visible and available to analysis. However, his goal is not to challenge them. Actually, "the hegemonic concept is one that has become the 'common sense' of the people. But a counterconception [sick] is constantly generated, even if only embryonically, to challenge the prevailing common sense" (Benedetto Fontana 2005, p. 98). Therefore, the question of challenge and resistance is always there, whether in actual social practices or in literature.

Hardy as an individual is in the domain of hegemony of his age since his individuality has been shaped by ISAs; therefore, he is a real subject in Althusserian sense. He has been hailed as a subject by the cultural institutions. The media, the newspapers, and the reviewers have hailed, addressed, called out to him, in a particular way; that is, a novelist. In talking of ideology, Althusser declares:

There are moments of recognition, moments when we recognize ourselves because we have been addressed, called out in a particular way. 'Hey! You!' And round we turn to face the policeman, the headteacher, the priest. At those moments we become, as he puts it, subjects because we are subjected to an authority, a Subject with a capital S. We are located, in relation to that Subject, as biddable small s subjects precisely because we recognize ourselves, and (this is crucial) *because we have no choice*. (we are turned into biddable subjects because it becomes instantly obvious to us that we *are* that way and that we *know* that way. [original emphasis] (Law, 2000, p. 14)

Hardy is a subject, and he knows it; he knows that he should be in the way the middle class demands him to be; that is, creating docile subjects like those created in *Under the Greenwood Tree*.

The stress in *Under the Greenwood Tree* is on the validated normative ideas prevailing in the Victorian age, on the internalized ideologies of the subjects, on their behavior according to the legitimized rules, and on how they follow these legitimized norms without any resistance against the institutionalized ideologies of the society.

Hardy's focus is on how a new discourse is made dominant in the society by the ruling class and how the ruling class takes the consent of its subjects to come to hegemony. The substitution of the traditional musical instruments of the choir by the organ played in the church instead of performing music around the village and going house to house, and the ideologies that the organ will bring with itself is one of the significant issues in the novel, depicting the sort of process at work in such a situation to make it, in Althusser's term, the dominant ideology and to create consent resulting in hegemony, in Gramsci's sense. In his discussion of hegemony, Jones (2006) claims that according to the French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, hegemony relies on "symbolic violence". Jones argues that "texts perform symbolic violence in the exclusions they perform and the silences they impose upon outsider groups." He continues saying that "symbolic violence also takes the form of taste judgments, where outsiders are marginalized and shamed of physical behaviour and 'ways of living' where some feel confident and others feel awkward" (p. 52). The countrymen of the choir, though presented awkward in their behavior, feel much confident in themselves and what they achieve, which is actually losing their status. In fact, they are shown as the subaltern group of the society who are marginalized and, in some cases, ashamed of their own situation. Fancy's influence on her father and Mr. Dewey, the tranter, at the end of the novel, and Dick's as well as his father's expanding their own job situation are the signs of Hardy's criticism of these people and the revelation of the shame of their

physical behavior as well as the way they lead their lives. Besides, the final result of the conflict between the choir and the vicar is, in a way, the silencing of the choir. Actually, the choir, considered as the subaltern group, "will aspire to the values and tastes of its superiors" and they see their "lowly status reinforced" (Jones, 2006, p. 52).

The choir is considered as the low--Other-- of the society against the vicar, Mr. Shiner and Fancy Day. Both the vicar and Mr. Shiner are authorities of the church; hence, representations of the ruling class who try to transform a culture. Therefore, both desire to eliminate and exclude the members of the choir from the social activity; that is, their presence as well as their playing in religious ceremonies, yet the vicar recognizes the church's dependence upon these subjects; hence the ruling class's dependence on them. The vicar realizes his job as an ISA agent, and understands that he should not reveal his opposition but conceal it. It is the vicar's fear of losing their presence at the church that pushes him to treat them gently. His thanking the choir for their performance works as hailing the villagers and interpellating them as religious subjects. The hail makes them realize that they are of significance in the vicar's view; a false notion and identity is transmitted to them. Of course, they are already religious subjects, but this subjectivity should be reinforced. Since that moment, their respect for the vicar increases and they become much more docile subjects.

The choir constitutes a part of the community and their subjectivity helps to strengthen the dominant culture; therefore, their real elimination is impossible. They can only be pushed to periphery, not being present at the center of social activities. It is the transition of the age that has resulted in the transition of the culture; the dominant ruling class demands the choir to be the inferior, the low, the Other, and not the center, as it was in the previous age. However, Barbara Babcock believes that "what is socially peripheral is often symbolically central" (qtd. by Dollimore, 2004, p. vi). These peripheral beings help one understand the society which ignores them. They reveal how the society defines itself by ignoring the deviation from its ruling discourses, and how they are

needed to reveal the potential subversion in the society. Also, the resistance of the choir can be considered as a sort of co-option to support hegemonic discourse because this counter-discourse is a kind of reactionary tool rather than a subversive weapon. However, the substitution of the choir creates a sense of control over them through the organist who is neither a lower class member, nor chosen by the lower class people, but a higher class person who has been appointed by the dominant class and its representative; that is, the vicar. Everybody is also assigned a specific place at the church, and there is a separation and division between the controller and the controlled, between the ruler and the ruled. In a sense, the suspension of the hierarchal rank is removed, and the subjects understand that there is a line of distinguishing division between them and those controlling the ceremony.

Fancy Day possesses most of the required subjective qualities by the Victorian dominant class. Although Mr. Shiner has apparently singled her out as the organist because of his love of her, his real intention is the selection of one with higher education, behavior and rank. Even the vicar's love for Fancy is not the real cause of his approving to have her as the organist. In the question of marriage, both are rejected by Fancy, yet she retains her position, and their failure in gaining her hand does not lead to her elimination. She is the only educated female of the village, loveable, attractive, tender in her emotions, caring for and respecting her family, believing in and submitting to the patriarchal requirements, respecting the elders, docile to her future husband and, in short, a real subject of the society. She is tested and accepted as the embodiment of femininity and sexuality by Dick Dewey, Mr. Shiner, and Mr. Maybold. She behaves in this direction to lead the men to treat her in this way. Her role as a female subject is to attract the gaze of the males and evoke sexual desire in them. In fact, she is treated as a commodity in the patriarchal system, and her subjectivity is a sort of contribution to it.

Dominant ideologies exist in ISAs and their practices. Dick's notion of marriage and the consequent rules of fraternity are formed in the Deweys' party. He starts to be hailed as a man, just as Fancy is strongly

hailed as a female. The hail leads Dick to realize that, in his way toward manhood, there is rivalry and hence struggle, alongside with other problems. Mrs. Dewey's inviting Fancy to the party is a hail to her as a member of their community. It is this hail that proves her to be capable of attracting a great number of males of the patriarchal society. In fact, the party provides her a place to perform and exhibit her art as a woman who can play on the emotions of the opposite sex. The marriage party is the conclusion to the novel to state that both Fancy and Dick have acquired the necessary means and knowledge needed to establish a family. The ritual hails them as responsible individuals who can handle a new family in which the governing ideologies of the age are pervasive. In other words, the marriage party announces that they are both real subjects of the society who have been interpellated as such and that they are going to remain as the real subjects of that community.

It is part of the patriarchal dominant discourse of the age that the narrator should take side with the hero, presenting him as the most desirable one. That is why Dick is shown as an intellectual who is open minded, simple hearted and a person who easily forgives his beloved. The seed of temptation is always *naturally* in the women. Dick is not reproached by the narrator for leaving his mistress alone and going to a party, and thus preparing the ground for her manipulation by Mr. Shiner. On the contrary, she is presented as a sinful and miserable creature who considers her own manipulation as a sin and feels sorry for being touched by the man. On different occasions, she disturbs Dick by avoiding to show him strong affections. On their obligatory Thursday afternoon, Dick asks Fancy to spend the afternoon together and go nutting. Fancy occupies herself with repairing her blue dress which she is to wear on Sunday. Her occupation takes so much time that Dick becomes irritated and disturbed. Thus, the reader is led to sympathize with him and to put all the responsibility on the selfish and coquettish girl whose only role is to play with men's affections and attract the males' attention, always thinking of how to look attractive and preparing its means. Fancy's miserable situation following the occasion is a sort of punishment. The

punishment is brought in the novel to lead to Fancy's insignificance and her misery. Moreover, consistency and loyalty are attributed to Dick throughout the novel. Dick's ubiquitous love for Fancy is emphasized, and his loyalty to her is pervasive, while Fancy's love is shown to be inconsistent.

The hegemonic ideas of the Victorian society demands the females to attempt to perceive the first males' gaze and respond to it to establish a family. What is unusual about Fancy is that she does not stop perceiving the gaze, but continues to be observed again and again. That is why, she provokes the vicar to become earnest in his marriage proposal to her. As a matter of fact, through her unusual manner of appearing in the church at the organ, she announces to the vicar that she is ready to perceive his gaze. Looked at from another perspective, Fancy's behavior can be justified in the sense that hailing is not just once done and finished. The process of hailing takes place throughout the individuals' life, and their sense of subjectivity should be always reinforced. In this sense, Fancy is hailed again and again as a female, and her sense of femininity is strengthened every time she becomes the object of a male's gaze. Hardy opens both senses in front of the reader of his age to stress his own as well as his society's patriarchal ideology: it is the man who is to define the woman; the woman is always the secondary. Also, both senses of Fancy's act suggest that Hardy introduces the repetition of the gaze as a kind of reaction against the dominant discourse, as a kind of subversion, only to reject it; that is, to strengthen the validity of the dominant discourse, demanding the female to attempt to perceive the first gaze and to establish a family based on it, as it finally happens to Fancy who marries Dick, the first gazer.

Although Fancy's consent to her father's opposition to Dick is the sign of her subjectivity and of a hail to her father, her insistence on visiting Dick is considered subversion. Through this subversion she tries to establish her own individuality. On the one hand, she hails her father as the patriarchal head of the family who should decide for her future husband; on the other hand, she chooses to subvert her patriarchal

society's rules silently, and it works since her father submits to her choice, and finally, she becomes a true subject of her society. Through silent subversion she shows her father a kind of disobedience. This sense of her disobedience is revealed through Dick's continuous visits from the time Geoffrey expresses his firm opposition. Of course, her disobedience is not because of her love for Dick; she "had loved him more for the opposition than she would otherwise dreaming of doing" (p. 161). Her visit to Elizabeth Endorfield is very significant in this respect. Elizabeth Endorfield is the only figure who is an outsider, one who behaves against the dominant discourses of the age: "she never went to church; she wore a red cloak; she always retained her bonnet indoors" (p. 162). These characteristics were considered to be "satanic" (p. 162). Such a figure, who is called a witch, plays the role of counter-hegemonic ideas of the age. Fancy's acquaintance with Elizabeth can be interpreted either as providing the ground for her silent rebellion against her father, or it can be said that the witch is inside Fancy herself. What is of interest is that the witch releases the desire in Fancy to subvert the dominant discourse of the society. She exposes the hidden desire in her to release herself from the boundaries prevailing in the society. The witch undermines Fancy from within, revealing in her a lack which drains her individuality. Therefore, after this visit, she is flooded up from within herself and starts silent subversion. Her action of putting herself on the verge of starvation is actually the manifestation of her subversion. So far her father has tried to manage her through coercion and authority, one of the fundamental means of managing dominance over the subjects, but coercion and authority do not always work. Sometimes the authorities have to moderate their own values and think of their subordinates' interests. Therefore, when Geoffrey realizes how his daughter is suffering, he tries to stick to the consent aspect of her individuality. Undoubtedly, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, family units underwent significant modifications because of capitalism. According to Ross Shideler (1999), "Women's lives in particular were revolutionized because of their access to salaried positions." He summarizes the sociologist Edward Shorter's view,

arguing that according to Shorter, "industrialism and capitalism created a movement away from authority, tradition, and sexual repression and replaced these forces with an ideology of individuality and sentiment" (p. 11).

Dick's response to Geoffrey Day is a strong evidence of his familiarity with the dominant discourse; that is, the ideology of hierarchy. Dick, as a subject of his society, understands that he is naturally lower than Geoffrey, the Subject, and that he should not expect any other treatment than what he has encountered when courting Fancy. Geoffrey's response to Dick's proposal is a hail to Dick as a subject, and the latter realizes his status as well as his obligations in the society. Therefore, he simply leaves Geoffrey's place. However, his docility works its own reciprocal function. Mr. Day's visit to Mr. Dewey's place and his inviting Dick to his own house are because of Dick's hailing him as his own superior in social and financial matters, but Geoffrey realizes that Dick is superior in manners to Mr. Shiner. Dick is an educated subject, while Mr. Shiner has financial superiority. The ideology of gentility is observed by Dick, and it works toward its own aim. Just as the inferior Dick reveals his own gentility, politeness and docility, the superior reciprocates with an honorable manner, the gentility proffered to him reveals his own respect for that. It is far from gentility as well as manliness to oppress his daughter and her desires, at least, in public eyes.

Hardy's growing up in a patriarchal society leads him to the creation of paternal characters who have manly characteristics and transmit them to all the individuals. All characters of the novel, male or female, have internalized the patriarchal social values. Men discuss all aspects of life and decide all the important issues, while no notion of women is seen in these matters. Following the dominant discourse of the age, the gender division of labor has produced the home as a site of leisure for the male workers and labor for the housewives. The women's job and their world are summarized in rearing and feeding their families. Leisure has no place for these females at all. Paula Black (2006) declares,

In order to appear fully feminine and reap the rewards of male approval (or at least avoid male disapproval) they must learn the skill of feminine bodily compartment and appearance. However, by being associated with such trivialities, women are unable to achieve power or status. (pp. 147-48)

Fathers feel their own responsibility to decide for their children. Dick's obsessive moments of falling in love with Fancy creates the best situation to reveal Mr. Dewey's worries about his son's situation. Geoffrey's decision to reject Dick's proposal and thinking of Mr. Shiner as his son-in-law is something natural, too. In fact, Geoffrey has enforced the dictates of patriarchal ideology upon her daughter since her childhood. Besides, all outside jobs and social activities are performed by men, while women do the domestic work. Even if, on a rare occasion, a man is shown to do a sort of domestic job, as Reuben Dewey's trying to tap the barrel, he is rejected strongly by his wife who considers him unfit for it. Females' participations in social activities are so strange and unconventional that the girls' participation in the song in the church creates strong opposition in all the choir, and Leaf's remarks on the subject is highly condemned by William.

Talking of patriarchal ideology, Davidoff (1987) argues that, to be "manly" is "to be careful and considerate, to be authoritative without aggression, to be thoughtful and to reason with others" (p. 169). Dick Dewey and all other characters of the novel have what Raymond Williams calls "the 'inherent dominative mode'" (Stallybrass and White, 1987, p. 4). The ruling class leads its individuals toward these high discourses through its institutions. Therefore, they become inherent in the subjects of a society. Dick's docility and his gentle treatment of Geoffrey are inherent in him. Actually, he has been taught not to annoy elders. He is considerate, even to his rivals. The choir members have also been depicted as considerate people. When going to the vicarage to discuss the substitution of the organ, the tranter is selected as the choir's spokesman

to avoid any kind of aggression. They are already subjects of the community. The tranter's words are the best to show how they want to argue reasonably: "I hope you see our desire in reason" (p. 90).

A sense of false notion has already been given to the individuals by the ruling system to make good subjects out of them. At the beginning of the novel, the male characters are seen talking and discussing about everything as if they were familiar with all aspects of life surrounding them. They feel they are individuals with their own notions of the world, while they are tools in the hands of their manipulators and, in fact, very insignificant compared to them. This sense of false notion goes so far that Mr. Spinks claims: "Show *me* a man's foot, and I'll tell you that man's heart" (p. 27). The manner of their approach to the vicarage emphasizes their interpellation. They have accepted themselves as a part of the society in which they live, and that they should show their dignity in important occasions as a social group. The system has internalized in them not only the respect for the vicar but also for the vicarage.

The vicar reinforces this sense of false notion in the choir. He is intelligent and quite familiar with his role in creating docile subjects through consent and negotiation, not through force. The vicar is the representative of the ruling class who tries to compromise the choir. Without the choir's submission the replacement might have not taken place so easily. He accompanies them in their thoughts and ideas to play on their individuality, to make them feel that they belong to gentility thus playing upon them to his own benefit. This kind of treatment is a hail to the choir which results in interpellation. Before their meeting with the vicar, they had strong convictions against the vicar, but he obliterates their previous convictions by his friendly, gentle and wise behavior. He offers old William his own seat to hail him as a subject and to convey the notion of respect for the elders. Although he is younger than most of the choir, his manners, depicted by Hardy, seem to belong to the eldest member and the leader of the community. He is depicted quite manly and civilized. His manliness and civilized manner strengthen his authority over the individuals of the choir. The false notion created in the choir

goes so far that after their meeting, the tranter feels they have managed the vicar:

‘he fact is,’ said Reuben confidentially ‘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. (pp. 93-94)

It is the job of the ISAs to push the individuals toward such a feeling in order to accept the dominant ideologies and help the society to have a stable system.

### 3. Conclusion

On the whole, all the components of *Under the Greenwood Tree* become the true means of ISA in which the families, the school and the church--as the most important ISAs--work together to transform the individuals to docile subjects. All the characters of this novel move in the direction of their community. They do not need to be told to follow the rules of the community; the governing rules have been with them from the moment they started to breathe, and they have been hailed as the subjects of their community in every moment of their lives. These three institutions have so much surrounded them with the practices of ideologies that they have internalized those ideologies. Just being a member of every one of these institutions is enough to put them in the domain of subjectivity because every one of them exposes them to the same notions practiced by the others. Each one addresses them in a specific way to make them subjects. Even to make the hail more obvious, Hardy, consciously or unconsciously, has put very explicit expressions in the mouth of some of the characters to depict their way of addressing the individuals, and hence hailing them. The vicar's calling the individuals as villagers is actually a hail; this way he announces to them that they are members of the community of the village, and they are expected to understand their own place in the system of that community and work in that direction.

Even Mr. Dewey's use of "sonnies" in addressing everybody, whether male or female, young or old, is a hail to the addressee. Thus doing, he tells them that they are all members of the same community, and that they should function as its members. Besides, there are only very slight signs of dissident in this novel to show that it is natural to have hegemonic and counter-hegemonic norms of values in a society. These counter-hegemonic ideas can only work as subversive if they take consensual support of the subjects and go through the process of legalization.

### References

- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. (B. Brewster, Trans.). New York & London: Monthly Review Press.
- Althusser, L. (2004). Ideology of ideological state apparatuses. In Rivikin, J. & Ryan, M. (Eds.), *Literary theory: An anthology*, (pp. 693-702). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Barthes, R. (1973). *Mythologies*. (Annette Lavers, Trans.). London: Paladin.
- Black, P. (2006). Discipline and Pleasure: The uneasy relationship between feminism and the beauty industry. In Hollows, J. & Moseley, R. (Eds.), *Feminism in popular culture*, Oxford and New York, NY: Berg.
- Boumelha, P. (1981). *Tomas Hardy and women: Sexual ideology and narrative form*. Brighton: Harvester Wheat sheaf.
- Brockett, O. G. (1994). Power, censorship, and validation. *Theatre Topics*, 4 (1), 1-13.
- Davidoff, L. & Hall C. (1987). *Family fortunes: Men and women of English middle class, 1780-1850*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fontana, B. (2005). The Democratic philosopher: Rhetoric as hegemony in Gramsci. *Italian Culture*, 23, 97-124.

- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. Hoare, Q. & Smith, G. N. (Edited and translated), London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gramsci, A. (2004). Hegemony. In Rivkin, J. & Ryan, M. (Eds.), *Literary theory: An anthology*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hall, S. (1980). Encoding and decoding. In Rivkin, J. & Ryan, M. (Eds.), *Culture, media, language*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (2000). Deviance, politics, and the media. In Goodman, L. & de Gay, J. (Eds.), *The routledge reader in politics and performance*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hardy, T. (1930). *Under the greenwood tree*. London: Macmillan.
- Kramer, D. (1975). *Thomas Hardy: The forms of tragedy*. London: Macmillan.
- Law, J. (2000). On the subject of the object: narrative, technology and Interpellation. *Configurations*, 8, (4), 913-38.
- Morgan, R. (1988). *Women and sexuality in the novels of Thomas Hardy*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shideler, R. (1999). *Questioning the father: From Darwin to Zola, Ibsen, Strindberg, and Hardy*. Stanford: Stanford, CA: University Press.
- Spanos, W. V. (2001). Pierre's extraordinary emergency: Melville and 'The voice of silence'. *Boundary*, 228, (2), 105-31.
- Stallybrass, P. & White, A.. (1986). *The politics and poetics of transgression*. Cornell, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Waldoff, L. (1979). Psychological determinism. In Kramer, D. (Ed.), *Tess of the d'Urbervilles. Critical approaches to the fiction of Thomas Hardy*. (pp. 135-54) London: Macmillan.
- Wotton, G. (1985). *Thomas Hardy: Toward a materialist criticism*. Cambridge: Gill and Macmillan.
- Zylinska, J. (2005). *The ethics of cultural studies*. London: Continuum.