

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF UKRAINE

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

Institute of Philology

Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

**GENDER CONTEXT IN THOMAS HARDY'S NOVEL "FAR FROM THE
MADDING CROWD": LINGUOCULTURAL ASPECT**

Master's thesis

written by the student of the 2nd year

of studies of the Master's program

«English Communication Studies and Translation

and Two Western European Languages»

Field of science: 03 "Humanities"

Specialty: 035 "Philology"

Bilokobylskyi Yurii Olexandrovych

Supervised by:

prof. Neborsina N.P

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 8 від 12.05.2020

Завідувач кафедри _____ проф. Бєлова А.Д.

KYIV - 2020

Contents

Introduction.....	3
CHAPTER 1 THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATION OF THE RESEARCH.....	7
1.1 Gender studies: the state of the art.....	7
1.2 Conceptual framework of the research.....	17
CHAPTER 2 THE CONCEPT OF MASCULINITY IN THE NOVEL “FAR FROM THE MADDING CROWD”.....	25
2.1 The case of Gabriel Oak.....	27
2.2 The case of Francis Troy.....	46
2.3 The comparative analysis.....	59
CHAPTER 3 THE CONCEPT OF FEMININITY IN THE NOVEL “FAR FROM THE MADDING CROWD.....	63
3.1 Concept of personhood of feminine characters.....	64
3.2 Concept of emotions of feminine characters.....	66
3.3 Concept of actions of feminine characters.....	74
CONCLUSIONS.....	83
REFERENCES.....	87
ABSTRACTS.....	94

Introduction

The era of the Internet and social networks has exacerbated the discussion about gender roles, the very notions of man and woman. The ability to hide or change your gender in virtual space has catalyzed similar processes in ordinary reality. Today, gender self-identification and disputes regarding gender stereotypes and relevant gender roles are becoming more and more widespread. The attention of society is focused on the problems of the LGBTQ+ movement, people of the “third sex”, children’s conscious choice of their gender, the fight against all kinds of oppression (with the development of the new term - harassment), the planetary movement of #MeToo etc. In developed countries, not a single election program can do without clear accents in gender policy; television regularly reports condemnations, often even criminal ones, of sexually assaulted celebrities. All this makes the problem of gender construction relevant and modern. These processes cannot be adequately understood without referring to classical ideas about cultural and social roles of men and women. Linguistics has developed a strong tradition of studying gender, called gender linguistics. One of the important issues of gender linguistics is the problem of constructing gender in literary discourse. Among those, who made a significant contribution to the development of scientific ideas about this process, are scientists such as Robert Staller, Robin Lakoff, Judith Butler and others. Among the scholars, who made their contribution to the gender studies we may single out works of Goroshko Kirilina, Voronina.

The issue of gender began to be widely discussed in the Victorian era - the era of rethinking cultural and social values - and which was reflected in English literature of that time. A special contribution to the rethinking of the gender context of the era was made by the English writer Thomas Hardy. In his work, contemporaries saw a peculiar project of new ideas about masculine and feminine features, which is formed on the basis of rich linguistic tools and a transposition of gender roles.

A special place in the work of Thomas Hardy is occupied by the novel “Far from the Madding Crowd”, in which the writer introduced the type of a new woman with the

help of the main female character - Bathsheba Everdene. The sociocultural portrait of the era, created by the author around the life of the main feminine character of the novel, allowed to rethink the classical ideas about gender roles.

Due to the **lack of the knowledge** of the classic examples for constructing a gender context in the world literature in general and in English literature in particular, which are needed more than ever in our times, it seems relevant to focus on one of the examples of classical literature - the novel "Far from the madding crowd". by Thomas Hardy.

The **object** of the research is the gender context of Thomas Hardy's novel "Far from the madding crowd", the subject is the **linguistic means** of construction of the gender context in the novel. The goal of the research is to highlight and clarify the methods and tools that were used by Thomas Hardy during the formation of the gender context of the novel "Far from the madding crowd".

To achieve this goal, it is necessary to solve the following **objectives**:

1. To conduct a linguistic analysis of the process of constructing gender context of the novel by the author
2. To identify the concept of masculinity in the novel
3. To identify the concept of femininity in the novel
3. To identify deviations of masculine and feminine characters from classical norms of Victorian novel
4. To identify nonverbal features of linguistic construction of the gender context in novel
5. To evaluate the literary and cultural significance of the innovations of Thomas Hardy

The master's paperwork is **based** on a general scientific methodology and is **aimed at** obtaining objective and generally valid results. As a special research method, a

linguistic analysis of the process of constructing gender in the novel “Far from the madding crowd” is used. The analysis sequence is selected on the basis of works, which are central for gender linguistics, which include the works of such linguists as Robin Lakoff, Robert Staller, Don Zimmerman, Olga Voronina etc.

In addition to the works of the linguists mentioned, the experience of modern researchers on the problem of constructing gender is also considered. This includes works of such scholars as Laurel Westbrook, Olena Levchenko, Richard Watts and others.

In particular, in the second chapter of the master's work, categorical, semantic, syntactic, communicative and pragmatic analysis of the gender discourse of the novel is consistently carried out.

The results obtained as a result of a master's study, which are distinguished by **novelty**, can be formulated in the following theses:

1. The gender context of Thomas Hardy’s novel “Far from the madding crowd” is formed at various structural levels, which include 1) the level of the linguistic picture of the world for the era, 2) the level of central gender categories, 3) the syntactic level, 4) the communication and pragmatic levels.
2. The main features of the means of linguistic construction of gender context by Thomas Hardy in the novel should include verbal and nonverbal features and also gender transpositions performed in the novel
3. The gender context formed in the novel “Far from the madding Crowd” introduced contemporaries a new type of woman, who changed ideas about gender roles and anticipated the movement towards gender equality.

The **theoretical value** of the work lies in the fact that this work is one of the first attempts at the linguistic analysis of the process of constructing the gender context of a classic English novel in its communicative, semantic, categorical and pragmatic features. This will provide a deeper understanding of the logic and content of the

process for forming gender roles, as well as to identify the features of its historical transformation.

The **practical value** of this research is the possibility of applying the findings of the study to the modern practices, in particular in political, social, and cultural discourses.

CHAPTER 1 THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ORIENTATION OF THE RESEARCH

1.1 Gender studies: the state of the art

The problem of understanding gender roles has become important in recent years. Moreover, the study of gender is impossible without a comprehensive analysis of the gender discourse, in which the notions of the era divide female and male positions and roles, which are not only articulated, but also largely constructed. That is why in the last decades of the twentieth century a new direction in linguistics is actively being developed that is gender linguistics.

It should be noted that the term “gender” was first introduced by Robert Stoller in the late 60s of the 20th century, which denoted the social and cultural aspect of gender and became a continuation of such notions as feminology and feminism. [1, p.102] Later in 1975 Robin Lakoff published her book “Language and Woman’s Place” with the studies of gender and language in sociolinguistics field. In this book Lakoff also proposed a gender deficit model, which distinguishes women’s speech from men’s [13, p.46]. Prominent scholars in the field of gender studies also include works of Deborah Tannen [20], Mary Bucholtz [52], Janet Holmes [53], whose studies were focused on the difference in speech practices between men and women. Such differences include verbal aggression [20, p.29], questioning, dominance and submission [Lakoff, p.48] and politeness [53, p.32].

Modern gender studies are majorly influenced by the movement in identity theories, which has caused an emergence of queer theory in gender studies and necessitated the field expanding its purview to sexuality [54, p.21]. These influences led to the reconsideration of questions of sexuality and the modern scholars are now arguing that the “social construction of gender doesn’t undo the fact of oppression between genders”

As for gender studies in the Post-Soviet states, Boldirev and Serova, for example, suggest their theory of gender interpretation, which allows to study the gender relations between the interpreted object and the subject of interpretation, which allows to combine existing approaches to studying the knowledge of men and women about men and women and features of its implementation. [3] From their study, it is clear that in the process of creating a model of an object with gender values, the sources of the formation of a gender-marked situation (GMS), which can be the real or imaginary gender of the object, the gender identity of the addressee, as well as the gender identity of the observer (interpreter). Their study also includes a model of prototypical masculine and feminine features, which are observed in the Victorian novel and also creates an opposition of masculinity/ femininity in the literature of Victorian period:

ФЕМИНИННОСТЬ	МАСКУЛИННОСТЬ
зависимость, несамостоятельность	независимость, самостоятельность
подчинение, покорность	власть, доминирование
слабость	сила
мягкость, нежность, чувствительность	суровость, грубость
пассивность	активность
внешняя привлекательность, добродетель	интеллект
иррациональность	рациональность

Таблица 1. Опозиция *фемининность/ маскулинность* по данным английской художественной литературы Викторианского периода.

[2, p.125]

Another scholar is Petrova, who studied general methodological approaches to gender studies and summarized them in the book “Genderology and Feminology”. In this work she concludes that “the essence of being doesn’t specifically include men or women, but the types relationship between them” [24, p.5].

Same ideas are shared by Parsons, who made a clear distinction between social and cultural strata, claiming that “real social life, i.e social strata, which consists of the processes, events and facts, have a masculine function in society, that is, the destruction of stereotypes, society’s development and destabilization. Social strata are a way how people view their social reality, while the cultural component of our

society is a women's function. This function means to ensure the stability, inheritance and the conservation of social relationships” [55, p.302].

As for today, fields of interest for the gender linguistics are focused on two main subjects:

- Gender representation in language (both male and female features are represented in language as a system): nominative system, vocabulary, syntax, category of grammatical gender, and a number of similar objects with the purpose to describe and explain how the presence of people of different sex is manifested in the language, what are the attributes of men and women, and in which semantic areas they are most prevalent, what linguistic mechanisms underlie these processes;
- Speech and generally communicative behavior of women and men (whether there are differences in the language of men and women): it is explored by what means and in what contexts gender is constructed, how social factors and the communication environment (ex. the Internet) influence this process. Socio-cultural determinism theory and bio-determinism theory still compete in this field. [2]

Thus, by the 21st century, gender studies are now considered as an independent field and allows to set and solve tasks that are significant for society and humanitarian knowledge in terms of questions of gender.

For our research it is important to also mention two terms, which exist in the field of gender studies: gender construction and gender stereotype.

Gender stereotyping, which has been suggested by Walter Lipmann with an initial meaning of small pictures in an individual's head, which related to certain people and events, that persons have in their heads in order to perceive difficult social situations easier and also protect their personal values, positions and rights. Gender stereotyping includes three groups, which are:

1. Behavioral and psychological features of men and women.
2. Professional stereotyping, which is connected with typical masculine and feminine types of jobs
3. Stereotyping connected with a division between professional and family roles. [6]

Working with gender stereotypes allows one to deepen the linguistic analysis, better understand the actions of the heroes of the novel and the author's intent.

Gender construction is the combination between the process and the result of "embedding" an individual in socially and culturally conditioned models of masculinity and femininity, which are accepted in the distinguished society at a certain historical period. Discursive reproduction of gender meanings is also considered an important part for constructing gender. [4] Nicholas Abercrombie, Bryan Turner and Stephen Hill in their work titled "Dictionary of Sociology" distinguish a number of social and cultural grounds for gender differences, which are:

1. specific female qualities and gender identity, which are attributed to women by means of socialization;
2. women are often isolated from social activities women are attributed the least significant and often demeaning forms of production activity;
3. stereotypical ideologies remain dominant; [5]

In linguistic studies, analysis of the processes of gender construction allows to reveal the nature of the characters and the author's intent.

As highlighted above, from the middle of the 20th century the development of gender linguistics leads to the further attention of genderologists to the inclusion of the gender characteristics of the subject and the object of speech-cognitive activity in the processes of cognition[Anderson,30] and communication[Kirch,33]. In linguistic genderology, two relatively independent areas of research are

distinguished, namely, sociolinguistic and linguacultural studies. In sociolinguistic studies, gender is understood as a stratification category, while in linguacultural studies, gender is studied as a cultural category, using the femininity / masculinity opposition to explicate a wide range of cultural phenomena. [7, p.55]

At the present stage, discussions about the subject of gender studies in linguistics have led researchers to highlight several different positions. For example, in the work titled “Gender: linguistic aspects” Alla Kirillina, while analyzing the methodology of gender, the scholar singles out three points, which are considered as scientific:

1. Gender is a general scientific category and the principles of gender approach are applicable to any of the private sciences, however, they must be implemented taking into account the specific features and through the methods of this scientific direction.
2. Gender is a product of the development of culture and society. It is institutionalized and ritualized, and therefore relational and conventional.
3. As a construct, gender is changeable and dynamic in time (and in linguistic space [9, p.138])

Each of the described positions has objective grounds.

- Each person is a carrier of a certain national mentality, language and participates in joint speech activities with other representatives of the national community.
- The notion of linguistic personality always exists within the framework of the culture and is reflected in the language and furthermore, in various forms of social consciousness at the scientific, every day and other levels, in behavioral stereotypes and norms, and in objects of material culture.

- A linguistic and cultural personality is a basic national-cultural prototype of a certain language's native speaker enshrined in the language, which constitutes a timeless and invariant part of the personality's structure. [9, p.141]

However, one cannot distinguish a general notion of a "human being" without the reference to their gender. In the vast majority of cases, we are talking about men and women. Hence, gender roles are an integral part of ideas about the linguistic and cultural personality, and their interaction between each other is one of the main cultural interactions. Thus we may acknowledge that at any examination, a human being appears in two guises - a man and a woman. The opposition "male/female" is fundamental to the whole human culture.

For our research we are focusing on gender context and also acknowledge the linguocultural aspect. Linguacultural studies can be defined as culture considered as subject matter for the methodology of teaching the language, which serves it, as a subject, which has been simultaneously studied in that language. It is "a holistic theoretical and descriptive study of objects as a functioning system of cultural values reflected in the language, a contrastive analysis of linguaculturological spheres of different languages (peoples) based on the theory of linguistic relativity".[49, p.56] One of the goals of linguacultural studies is a selection and compact presentation of those aspects of culture which have become crystallized in language and their determination of effective ways to present, assimilate and activate them. Facts of culture are presented in such a way as to lead to a deeper understanding of the facts of language. Language is an integral part of culture; it expresses specific features of national mentality. Since each native speaker is simultaneously a native speaker of a culture, linguistic signs acquire the ability to fulfill the function of cultural signs and thereby serve as a means of expressing the main provisions of culture. That is why the language is able to reflect the characteristics of the cultural-national mentality of its speakers. Basing on this theory, we are able to say that gender relations is an important component of social organization and cultural studies. [24,

p.8] The study of linguistic and cultural objects is proposed to be carried out using the systemic method, which consists in the unity of semantics, sigmatics, syntactics and pragmatics and allows you to get a “holistic view of them as units in which the linguistic and extralinguistic content is dialectically connected”. They, in a special way, reflect its systemic characteristics and establish relationships between speaking subjects. [56, p.32] Gender relations are present in the language in the form of culturally determined stereotypes, leaving an imprint on the speech behavior of the individual and on the process of its linguistic socialization. Therefore, the study of femininity and masculinity should include a description of the stereotypes associated with them, and means of formal expression of these stereotypes in the language. [56]

Understanding the gender context of a literary work as well as the gender context of the era presented in it is impossible without understanding the interactions described above. A concern with difference in the field of language and gender has underpinned a growing emphasis within cultural studies on the operation of difference in the domain of culture, and on questions of gender and ethnicity (as forms of difference) in particular. After Saussure (1960) and Bathes (1972), cultural texts could no longer be regarded as transparent bearers of universal meanings but rather they were to be understood as historically contingent productions premised on inclusions, exclusions and operations of power. Consequently, as Chris Barker notes, the analysis of texts has become “the primary tool for the understanding of culture” [51, p.139] Further, signifying practices of language endow material objects and social practices with meanings that are brought into view and made intelligible to us in terms which language delimits. Language structures which meaning may or may not be deployed under determinate circumstances by speaking subjects. Thus, language is implicated in forms of power with cultural politics operating at the level of signification and text.

As Scidler (1989) has argued, since the Enlightenment, men have traditionally associated masculinity with metaphors of reason. Enlightenment philosophy and the

discourses of modernity have championed reason as the source of progress and knowledge, manifested in science and increased levels of material production. At the same time, the price industrial growth and the rise of rational decision-making procedures based on calculability, rules and expert knowledge was that people submitted to a rigorous discipline and urban anonymity. Hence the new society produced new forms of subjectivity. Reason, control and distance are central metaphors of contemporary masculinity: control over other people and control over ourselves; distance from other people and distance from ourselves. In particular, the association of rationality with masculinity involves the self-discipline of, and distance from, the language of emotions. While it is part of contemporary common sense that men “suppress” feelings [29, p.41], this is better put as the failure to learn a productive language of emotion. Instead, men's relationships are often inscribed by spatial metaphors - including emotional “distance” and 'controlling their own space'- that mark a lack of communication. The male imperative to control emotion, allied to men's lack of experience with the language of feelings, including their inability to name emotions and recognize them as such, can lead to confrontational incidents [28, p.740-741]. Thus emotions like anger can be controlled, metaphorically held within, only to burst out in an explosive moment. The language of modernity stresses the gulf between the feminine coded private world and the masculine coded public world where men are acculturated to seek esteem through public performance and the recognition of achievement. This can take many forms, from violence, through sport, to educational qualifications and occupational status. It also lends itself to hyper-individualism, competitiveness and separation from the relational, for it is “I” who must perform and “I” who will take the glittering prize. Performance orientation of this kind - from work to sexuality-is manifested in grandiosity, on the one hand, and deep feelings of inadequacy and depression, on the other (for the performances are never outstanding enough to satisfy the internal parents) [29].

Masculinity and femininity are important attributes of public consciousness. Being concepts that are present in any culture, they at the same time include in themselves a certain specificity, which is inherent in every society.

Anderson notes on this occasion that “cognitive styles (styles of cognition) are also gender-symbolized. Deductive, analytical, non-contextual and quantitative styles are labeled as masculine, while intuitive, synthetic, holistic, contextual and qualitative are labeled as feminine”. [30, p.71]

Explaining the behavioral and speech differences between the sexes, modern gender studies do not allow explicit preference to be given to biological reasons or to sociocultural dominants. In the scientific discourse there is a reasonable evidence of the impact of both the first and second causes. Therefore, today it is common to talk about the biosocial nature of sexual dimorphism. A study of the speech behavior of men and women shows that the choice of vocabulary units, the preference of certain parts of speech, syntactic structures and stylistic devices are gender-based.

Moreover, the emphasis on gender construction, gender stereotypes, understanding of masculinity and femininity in their opposition and interaction are an effective tool for gender-linguistic analysis of literary works. However, these tools are more suitable for the analysis of "static" elements of a literary works as a linguistic system. Its dynamic connections can be studied with great success with the help of linguistic agency.

The notion of agency has been developing mainly in the area of sociocultural studies and refers to the “socioculturally mediated capacity to act” [35, p.112]. The notion of “linguistic agency” (also called “agentivity” or “animacy”) refers to the linguistic labeling of various points of view in which the characters are considered to refer to objects and other characters in the (represented) world. For the construction of character or event different lexical and grammatical choices are used by speakers in order to signal different perspectives that refers to the amount of agency (more or

less), dynamism and impact. Thus, speakers can downplay or in the foreground the participation of characters (as well as their own) in the events being narrated and sequences of events, as well as create assessments and attitudes regarding who is morally right or wrong. According to Robert Dixon, all languages work “in terms of three basic relations, which are Subject, Object and Agent” [31] in relations to the intransitive verb. In every speaker, a language can still produce an infinite number of grammatically correct sentences with these limitations. In addition, studies provided by Sapir, Lightfoot, and de Saussure show that languages, like cultures, change over time as a result of drift and contact, despite their structure, which is also self-reproducing. From the point of view of literary practices, which are an area of interest in our research, there are three approaches to learning the language and the ability to literary practices: “autonomous”, “ideological” and “dialogical”. It is believed that the autonomous model “conceptualizes, regardless of the social context, an autonomous variable whose consequences for society and cognition can be derived from its internal character” [36, p.128-130] Another proponent of the autonomous model, Ong argues that “without writing, human consciousness cannot reach its full potential, cannot produce other beautiful powerful creations. In this sense, orality should be and is intended to produce writing.” [37]. Goody and others who support the autonomous model see a “Great Divide” separating “oral” societies from “literate” ones — a gap similar to that which anthropologists of the turn of the century are accustomed to claiming that exists between “primitive” and “civilized” societies. On the opposite side of the question are those scientists who do what Street calls “New Literacy Studies.” Researchers such as Street himself, Basso, and Finnegan prefer the “ideological” model for literacy. This approach is described as follows: “Instead of looking for a comprehensive and non-contextual description of the cognitive and social consequences of literacy, ideological model advocates focus on actions, events, and ideological constructs associated with specific manifestations of literacy.” This approach explores the specific implications of literacy in every society, arguing that there are no universal attributes of literate societies, and arguing that literacy skills cannot be acquired neutrally. Most anthropologists agree with

Baynham [38] that it is important to understand literacy as a form of social practice (or agency) and to explore how it interacts with ideologies and institutions to shape and define the possibilities and life paths of people.

From the point of view of our study, the dialogical approach is considered the most suitable for further analysis. This approach is supported by scholars such as Bakhtin, who writes that “language only lives in the dialogical interaction of those who use it.”; Dialogic approach is also supported by Vygotsky, Mannheim and Tedlock. Mannheim and Tedlock explain that dialogue may include any or all of the following: direct verbal exchange, a social field of which has numerous voices and multiple cultural logics struggling, or a text that is ambiguous and egalitarian rather than unambiguous and authoritarian. In all cases, however, the traditional relationship between structure and action, in which the action is seen as a reflection of the previous structure, is rejected in favor of the one in which the structure arises through located actions. Words and texts are socially located, not created by individuals. [40]

Tedlock and Mannheim give numerous examples of how scientists can study the words and actions of specific people, and also the location of these people within sociocultural areas, which are always changeable and in the process. One of the most prominent examples on this topic is an example provided by Hill, who, with the help of Bakhtin’s notion of heteroglossia, a term which many forms of discourse and the means by which some seek to dominate, analyzes how the narrator Don Gabriel, a native Mexicano speaker, tells of his son’s murder. Hill concludes that “narrative reveals a veritable kaleidoscope of emotional selves, which are all art, distributed in fragments across rhetorical systems of the narrative” [41]

The means and methods of gender linguistics are quite extensive, but in order to achieve our goals it seems appropriate to focus on gender construction, gender stereotypes, the dialectics of male and female relations, as well as agency in the context of gender.

1.2 Conceptual framework of the research

In the novel “Far from the madding crowd” by Thomas Hardy, the reader is confronted with a fairly rich history of the relationships between 4 central characters, the main one of which is a woman. Actually, metamorphoses of the fate of the main character make up the plot of the novel. We see how for several years Bathsheba Everdeen from a young woman, who moved from the city to the countryside, turns into an adult and enterprising farm-owner. This process is revealed by the author in a number of artistic techniques. However, this research centers non-verbal communication, as well as the dialogues / polylogues of the heroes as a field of interest. Therefore, in order to achieve stated goals a linguistic analysis of the novel “Far from the madding crowd” is going to be provided. The analysis is focused on three approaches, which are: critical discourse analysis, non-verbal communication and speech acts.

The first approach goes back to works of scholars such as Norman Fairclough[44], Ruth Wodak[48] and Teun van Dijk[42], the notion of nonverbal communication was developed by Peter Andersen [50], Vera Labunska [47] and other scholars, the third approach is suggested for our research in the form that John Austin and later John Searle[46] gave it. For critical discourse analysis, a major area of interest is the study of discourse changes that occur through intertextuality, a mechanism by which text engages elements and discourses of other texts. The combination of elements of different discourses leads to a change of a certain discourse and, consequently, to a change of the sociocultural world [42].

The agenda, which is supported by many scholars in this area, is originally suggested by Fairclough, which is: to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power'. [44]

Therefore, texts, language, communication should always be viewed in their social context; they both form and inform broader processes in society. In this way, texts not only passively inform the world, but also fill it with meaning, invent it, form perspectives and invite the world to exist. In these circumstances, the broad term "discourse" may be used, since it refers to different ways of establishing communication between people.

Fairclough distinguishes three characteristics of discourse, which are:

- Genres (ways of acting)
- Discourses (ways of representing)
- Styles (ways of being)

Fairclough's line of research is particularly concerned with the reciprocal effects of formal linguistic textual properties, sociolinguistic speech genres, and formal sociological practices. The main essence of his analysis is that if, according to Foucault's theory, practices are formed and put into action discursively, then the internal properties of the discourse, which are linguistically analyzed, should become a key element of their interpretation. Thus, he is interested in how social practices are discursively formed, as well as the further discursive effects of social practices. [44]. As for gender studies, we acknowledge the researches provided by Ruth Wodak in her work titled "Gender and discourse", in which the scholar studies gender-specific language behavior within the socio-cultural space.

As Teun van Dijk writes: "One of the most important prerequisites for an adequate analysis of critical discourse is an understanding of the nature of social power and dominance. Once we have such an understanding, we can begin to formulate ideas on how discourse contributes to their reproduction." [45]. In this regard scholar suggests focusing on social power and ignoring the fact of personal kind of power. Van Dijk distinguishes direct control over actions (for example, the case of police violence against demonstrators or the violence by men against women). Apart from

that, the scholar acknowledges “modern” type of power, which is mostly cognitive and driven by persuasion, deception or manipulation.

In the novel “Far from the madding crowd” the object of critical analysis is the interaction between the main feminine character and masculine characters, their conversation, inner thoughts and actions.

Therefore, critical discourse analysis examines the form, structure, and content of discourse, from the grammar and formulations used to create it, to its perception and interpretation by a wider audience. The use of verbs, pronouns, and nouns in discourse is as much a part of this analysis as the assessment of the content and tone of discourse. The methodology facilitates an assessment based not only on simple quotations but also on what the discourse does and what it is asked to do in its production, distribution, and consumption.

Another approach for our analysis we consider to be the speech act theory. An individual act of speech, in normal cases, is a two-sided process of generating a text, encompassing speaking and proceeding simultaneously and simultaneously auditory perception and understanding of what is heard. In written communication, the speech act covers, respectively, writing and reading (visual perception and understanding) of the written, and the participants in communication can be distant from each other in time and space. A speech act is a manifestation of speech activity.[51] A text is created in the speech act. Linguists denote this term not only recorded, fixed in one way or another text, but also as any created (anyway, described or only uttered) "speech product" of any length - from a single-word remark to a whole story, poem or book. In the internal speech, an “internal text” will be created, that is, a speech work that has developed “in the mind” but has not been embodied verbally or in writing.

According to Searle speech acts do not exist on their own - it is "precisely due to the connection with consciousness that they are able to represent the things existing in the world. A theory of representative language content should be based on an

appropriate theory of consciousness. Searle uses in this connection the concept of intentionality, i.e. focus of consciousness on objects. In contrast to traditional theories, he considers the carriers of intentionality not beliefs and desires, but perceptions and actions. During the debate caused by his theory, Searle put forward the thesis that in the intentional content of perceptions there is a moment of self-reflection: if, for example, a person sees a tree, the very content of this visual perception assumes the existence of a tree. In addition, the scholar believes that intentional content can only be understood on a non-intentional basis of practical skills and abilities. [46] Types of speech acts, which form part of our analysis, include:

- Representatives: assertions, statements, claims, hypotheses, descriptions, suggestions.
- Commissives: promises, oaths, pledges, threats, vows.
- Directives: commands, requests, challenges, invitations, orders, summons, entreaties, dares.
- Declarations: blessings, firings, baptisms, arrests, marrying, juridical speech acts such as sentencing, declaring a mistrial, declaring s.o.out of order, etc.
- Expressives: Speech acts that make assessments of psychological states or attitudes: greetings, apologies, congratulations, condolences, thanksgivings...
- Verdictives: rankings, assessments, appraising, condoning (combinations such as representational declarations: You're out!) [46]

In order to distinguish the type of a speech act, context and setting play an important role. For the analysis of our novel, we also take into consideration that the novel is mostly written in a form of dialogues between main and secondary characters, thus the organization of the conversation between male and female characters is an important part of our analysis.

Third position for our analysis is a nonverbal elements of communication between characters. There are two problems of understanding nonverbal communication:

Firstly, in linguistics and verbal communication, the process of transmitting and receiving information is realized by both parties, while in nonverbal communication it is carried out on an unconscious or subconscious level - this introduces some complication into the understanding of this phenomenon and raises the question of the justification for using the concept of “communication”. Therefore, when it comes to nonverbal communication, some experts consider it acceptable to use another concept - “nonverbal behavior”, understanding it as the behavior of an individual that carries certain information in itself, regardless of whether the individual is aware of it or not;

Secondly, in many scientific works there is confusion in the concepts of “nonverbal communication”, and “nonverbal behavior”, which are most often used as synonyms. However, it is important to separate these concepts and clarify the context. According to the definition proposed by V. A. Labunska, “nonverbal communication is a type of communication that is characterized by the use of nonverbal behavior and nonverbal communication as the main means of transmitting information, organizing interaction, forming an image and concept of a partner, and influencing another of man. [47]

The nonverbal encoding sequence includes facial expressions, gestures, posture, tone of the voice, tactile stimulation such as touch, and body movements, like when someone moves closer to communicate or steps away due to spatial boundaries. The Decoding processes involve the use of received sensations combined with previous experience with understanding the meaning of communications with others. [50, p.234-237] During the analysis on nonverbal communication one must also take into the consideration some factors, which influence the nonverbal communication, which are:

- national and cultural features;
- health status;
- professional etiquette;
- social status;

- belonging to a certain age group.

Sociological variation is also apparent in nonverbal communications, since there are different keys, levels, registers or styles of language, similar differences are apparent in gestures too, most gestures are restricted to intimate or casual levels rather than more formal ones. [50] In kinesics certain postures are used in consultative interaction, and others in intimate or casual relationships. In proxemics the various distances for personal interaction are closely linked to the levels of the relationships. Moreover, non-verbal signals in general may have multiple meanings just as linguistic homonyms do. In both cases we depend on the context to resolve the ambiguity and determine which meaning is appropriate.

A question of deviation from the classical image of men and women during conversations in the novel plays an important part in our research. One of latest and at the same time generalized and integral studies in the field of masculinity and femininity in the Victorian novel one must acknowledge the study provided by Olga Serova. Methodology suggested in her work, in particular, the table of prototypical masculine and feminine features, is relevant to be used for the goals of our research.

Despite the sufficient amount of methodological material, the issue of linguocultural aspect in the analysis of the novel remains important for our study. This question has become the subject of study in such a field of knowledge as cultural discourse analysis. Many scientists, such as Acheson [58], Braithwaite [59], Carbaugh [57], Covarrubias[60], have contributed to the development in this area. In our analysis, we agree with the methodology suggested by Carbaugh, in which he distinguishes such meanings as personhood, relationships, action and emotion and will apply those meanings during the analysis, which will allow to expand the boundaries of the analysis and also identify the deviation from prototypical feminine and masculine traits depending on the context.

An important part of the research includes the concept suggested by

<i>Male characters</i>	<i>Female characters</i>
self-centred	sacrificing
decisive	dependent
self-confident	anxious to please
seeing a place in the larger world	defining the world through family relations
rational and conniving	emotional and sentimental
dominant	subordinate
paternal	maternal

[51, Table 9.1]

Therefore, the linguistic analysis, which is going to be provided in the second chapter, focuses on three aspects: critical discourse analysis, the analysis of speech acts in dialogues and the nonverbal communication between characters of the novel. The structure of the analysis is based on meanings of personhood, relationships, action and emotion in order to distinguish the context, which influences gender construction the most and where one is able to distinguish a deviation from the model of prototypical traits of masculinity/femininity.

Chapter 2

The concept of masculinity in the novel “Far from the madding crowd”

In “Far from the madding crowd” Thomas Hardy depicts a love story between the main feminine character, Bathsheba Everdeen, and her three suitors: Gabriel Oak, sergeant Francis Troy and Mr. Boldwood, in a village called Weatherbury.

While being considered as a Victorian realist, Hardy in his novels raises problems of rural people from the South West England, where he was born and lived, and also criticizes Victorian beliefs on marriage, sex and social inequality. By creating his “Wessex” Hardy describes and examines the social constraints on the lives of people living in Victorian England, which affected lives of many and caused unhappiness.

For the analysis the term “Thomas Hardy’s Wessex” is going to be used, thus needs to be clarified. “Thomas Hardy’s Wessex” – a territory in the south and southwest of England under Queen Victoria, though the author denied this idea and described his scenery as “a merely realistic dream country” [61, p.1]. To put some clarification, it is needed to be mentioned that “Hardy’s Wessex” varied widely throughout Hardy's career, and was not definitively settled until after he retired from writing novels, since the writer didn’t limit himself with historical boundaries.

In this chapter the analysis provided is focused on the figures of Francis Troy and Gabriel Oak as novel’s prominent masculine characters. The analysis conducted is focused on the characters’ interactions with the main feminine character, Bathsheba Everdene, in order to distinguish deviations from the prototypical features of men and women and also to determine the linguistic means used in the novel to achieve the switch in gender roles, in particular.

Each of the suitors differs from each other. For example, Gabriel is described as a man, who “had just reached the time of life at which “young” is ceasing to be the prefix of “man” in speaking of one.” He “*was at the brightest period of masculine growth, for his intellect and his emotions were clearly separated... and not yet influenced by a wife and a family... In short, he was twenty-eight, and a bachelor*”

[61,p.4]. In terms of the gender context, the narrator starts Gabriel's character description with several gender markers, such as "man", "masculine growth" and "bachelor". Referring to the prominent masculine and feminine features for the Victorian literature mentioned above, we're able to witness a match between the mentioned traits and Oak's image. Narrator's presentation of farmer Oak emphasizes his masculinity to the reader so that during the further narration he is perceived as a key masculine figure. In terms of literary devices one of the most impactful stylistic devices being used is speaking names, since Gabriel's last name – Oak – is a reference to an oak tree, which symbolizes in literature such traits as strength, morale, resistance and knowledge [64, p. 6], which indirectly complements his masculine image in the novel and describes his inner personality. This practice is reflected in all the main characters and will be discussed further during the analysis;

A contrary to Gabriel's personality we consider to be sergeant Francis Troy. Though he's described as a "fairly well-educated man for one of the middle class" he's considered to be speaking fluently and unceasingly, because "he could speak of love and think of dinner; call on the husband to look at the wife; be eager to pay and intend to owe.". Troy's depicted as a person, who only has two methods on dealing with "womankind" as he marks them himself – flattery or cursing and swearing, since if you "Treat them fairly, you are a lost man" [61, p. 49]. Such an attitude is reflected, as well as in the case of Gabriel Oak, in his last name, which is the reference to the city of Troy that has been destroyed with a help of a lie and deception. The narrator mentions this himself during the further description of sergeant Francis by writing that "He was moderately truthful towards men, but to women lied like a Cretan" [61, p. 49].

The further analysis is divided into two parts: the first one is dedicated to the analysis of Gabriel Oak, while the second part analyzes the figure of Francis Troy due to his later appearance in the novel. In the end of the analysis, intermediate conclusions will be provided on the topic.

For the analysis the term “Thomas Hardy’s Wessex” is going to be used, thus needs to be clarified. “Thomas Hardy’s Wessex” – a territory in the south and southwest of England under Queen Victoria, though the author denied this idea and described his scenery as "a merely realistic dream country"[61, p.1]. To put some clarification, it is needed to be mentioned that “Hardy’s Wessex” varied widely throughout Hardy's career, and was not definitively settled until after he retired from writing novels, since the writer didn’t limit himself with historical boundaries.

2.1 The case of Gabriel Oak

In chapter I Gabriel meets Bathsheba for the first time near the toll-bar. He is witnessing a dispute between her wagoner and the gatekeeper over the fee of twopence to let them through. In order to clarify the context of the created situation, there’s a need to note that Bathsheba is the one that refused paying the fee:

Oak looked from one to the other of the disputants, and fell into a reverie. There was something in the tone of twopence remarkably insignificant..."Here," he said, stepping forward and handing twopence to the gatekeeper; "let the young woman pass." He looked up at her then; she heard his words, and looked down.[61, p.6]

The narration in this part is focused on the figure of Gabriel and his involvement in the dispute between two men. While wagoner and gatekeeper are performing an action in the form of dispute, both are showing the masculine traits of power and dominance by their attempts to win the argument. By the situation it’s supposed that they’re unfamiliar and are probably meeting each other for the first time. In order to solve the problem, Oak decides to pay the twopence for the wagoner and Bathsheba since the sum in his opinion is “remarkably insignificant”. By participating as a conflict solver in this situation, Gabriel is also performing a gentlemanly gesture in order to impress the feminine character. He’s acting rationally since in order to avoid the escalation of the conflict, based on the “insignificant” fee, he pays himself so that the conflict wouldn’t exist, which is a masculine trait in Victorian novel. The important role lies in the connection between verbal and nonverbal communication

in this episode. By performing a speech act in the form of directive (“*let the young woman pass*”) Oak is immediately looking at Bathsheba, who, after “hearing” the words he said, “looked down at him”. Gabriel’s instant glance at Bathsheba reflects his additional intention to drag woman’s attention to him and when Bathsheba is looking at Gabriel, she’s making an eye contact with him, which is, according to Ekman, is a “major channel of nonverbal communication” [63, p.142]. The eye contact between two characters concludes their positions towards each other: Gabriel being dominant and Bathsheba being submissive to him.

The episode, which creates the switch in gender roles and also a symmetry in relationships between masculine and feminine characters, is described in chapter III. In this chapter Oak is saved by Bathsheba when Gabriel nearly suffocates in his hut:

Gabriel had always known that when the fire was lighted and the door closed one of these must be kept open—that chosen being always on the side away from the wind. Closing the slide to windward, he turned to open the other... On second thoughts the farmer considered that he would first sit down leaving both closed for a minute or two, till the temperature of the hut was a little raised. His head began to ache in an unwonted manner... Oak decided to get up, open the slide, and then allow himself to fall asleep. He fell asleep, however, without having performed the necessary preliminary ... How long he remained unconscious Gabriel never knew. His dog was howling, his head was aching fearfully—somebody was pulling him about, hands were loosening his neckerchief... The young girl with the remarkably pleasant lips and white teeth was beside him. More than this—astonishingly more—his head was upon her lap, his face and neck were disagreeably wet, and her fingers were unbuttoning his collar [61, p.9].

Although the narrator emphasizes that Gabriel “had always known” how to avoid the situations like the one that happened in the episode, he remains “passive” and this idleness leads to the situation of him nearly dying. However, this time the

position of power and decisiveness is obtained by the female character in the face of Bathsheba and is also breaking the canonical rule that it is a woman, who is saved by man and not the opposite [62, p.48]. What is peculiar about this scene is also the fact that Gabriel finds himself lying on Bathsheba's lap, which might be considered as a nonverbal act of closeness between characters and also the fact that the heroine was saving Oak's life. This switch is also seen not only in the action performed by her but also in the dialogue between characters that follows:

"Ah, the hut!" murmured Gabriel. "I gave ten pounds for that hut. But I'll sell it, and sit under thatched hurdles as they did in old times, and curl up to sleep in a lock of straw!" Gabriel, by way of emphasis, brought down his fist upon the floor.

"It was not exactly the fault of the hut," she observed in a tone which showed her to be that novelty among women—one who finished a thought before beginning the sentence which was to convey it. "You should, I think, have considered, and not have been so foolish as to leave the slides closed." [61, p.12]

Here Gabriel uses a commissive, which is aimed at creating the impression of him unwilling to own a hut and rather "selling it". He is also emphasizing the illocutionary force of this commissive by using a primitive speech act, which is repeating (the word hurt is repeated twice) and by the nonverbal gesture of bringing down his fist upon the floor, which shows his irritation. On the other side, Bathsheba replies in a tone, which is a "novelty among women" because it reflects the masculine trait of "intelligence", whereas Gabriel reflects the feminine trait of "sensitivity". Bathsheba is also showing the masculine trait of paternity in this dialogue, since the indirect speech act that is aimed at Gabriel to consider "not being so foolish" is given in a form of an admonition, which also carries a perlocutionary effect of convincing him in the recklessness of his own actions. The episode in chapter III is the first case of the shift in gender roles when the dominant position is occupied by the feminine character and when the masculine character deviates from prototypical masculine traits such as "active" and "rational". What's also peculiar about the commissive said by Oak is that it contradicts the reality since the farmer

dreamed about becoming independent and owning his own farm one day. However, in chapter V the mentioned commissive becomes reality when Oak loses his flock of sheep and has to sell it in order to cover his debts.

Another episode for the analysis is the dialogue between Bathsheba and Oak in chapter IV. In this particular dialogue, Oak confesses to Bathsheba and asks her to become his wife. The relationships between Oak and Miss Everdene is not compared to ordinary acquaintances at this point, since previously Bathsheba has performed an action of saving Gabriel's life and Gabriel from his point performed an action of paying for her to the gatekeeper in order to let her through. Their social status differs since Gabriel is an owner of the farm whereas Bathsheba is an ordinary girl, who moved from town in order to help her aunt. Oak is feeling a certain mix of emotions between gratitude and also love to his savior so therefore he decides to confess. However, Bathsheba rejects Gabriel's proposal:

"I cannot," she said, retreating.

"But why?" he persisted, standing still at last in despair of ever reaching her, and facing over the bush.

"Because I don't love you."

"Yes, but—"

She contracted a yawn to an inoffensive smallness, so that it was hardly ill-mannered at all. "I don't love you," she said.

"But I love you—and, as for myself, I am content to be liked."

"Oh Mr. Oak—that's very fine! You'd get to despise me."

"Never," said Mr Oak, so earnestly that he seemed to be coming, by the force of his words, straight through the bush and into her arms. "I shall do one thing in this life—one thing certain—that is, love you, and long for you, and keep wanting you till I die." His voice had a genuine pathos now, and his large brown hands perceptibly trembled.

"It seems dreadfully wrong not to have you when you feel so much!" she said with a little distress, and looking hopelessly around for some means of escape from her moral dilemma. "How I wish I hadn't run after you!" However she seemed to have a short cut for getting back to cheerfulness, and set her face to signify archness. "It wouldn't do, Mr Oak. I want somebody to tame me; I am too independent; and you would never be able to, I know." [61,p.14]

In this dialogue both characters are arguing in order to achieve the desired result. From Gabriel's perspective the result is to convince Bathsheba to marry him, Bathsheba's perspective is to reject Gabriel so that he would discontinue proposing to her. Bathsheba is starting with an utterance, which reflects her inability to marry farmer Oak. In terms of nonverbal communication, she's starting to retreat from Gabriel, which also points at the desire to escape the conflict. Gabriel, on the other hand, is showing the traits of power, since he's approaching Bathsheba and performs a speech act in a form of a question. Asking her the question is aimed at the heroine's reaction, i.e perlocutionary act. The perlocutionary act is revealed in a form of an assertive, which is supported by a nonverbal gesture of a small yawn, which is perceived as "hardly ill-mannered" yet shows Bathsheba's disinterest in the conversation. However, Oak doesn't remain satisfied with the answer received and replies in the form of a primitive speech act, which is protesting. Oak is protesting and objecting Bathsheba's answer, which also reveals one of his masculine traits – "self-centred". Oak's position in the argument is focused on his personal belief at this point, which is proved by his personal feeling of being "content to be liked". Still, Bathsheba replies with an indirective speech act, which is divided into two sentences. The phrase "that's very fine" is used to show the normality of Oak's desire to be liked by someone, although it can't be Bathsheba since she doesn't have any feelings to him. The second part of the phrase is also considered an indirect speech act since Bathsheba doesn't love Gabriel mutually and for that reason he may "despise" her one day for that. This phrase is also considered to carry a function of perlocutionary act as well because it is aimed to make Gabriel realize that Bathsheba

doesn't feel any sort of feelings to him and therefore his unshared feeling might turn into hatred and despise towards her. As for the attributes of masculinity/femininity Bathsheba's speech acts and the way of handling the conversation shows signs of masculine trait of rationality. As for Oak, his reaction to the perlocutionary act performed by Bathsheba makes him to again refer to the primitive act of protesting that lies only in one word, which is "Never" and then proceeding to illocutionary speech act in the form of a commissive, during which he makes a promise of loving Bathsheba for his whole life. This commissive is also followed with the nonverbal attributes such as pathos, which is aimed to evoke person's pity and the sense of empathy and also show the speaker's feelings, and also the tremble in his hands, which reflects his emotional state. From the standpoint of masculine/feminine features Gabriel is performing a feminine feature of sensitivity in this piece of dialogue. Bathsheba's last piece in this dialogue starts with the indirect speech act which again reflects her indifference to Gabriel's proposition and makes an attempt to make him understand that the relationships between them at this point are unequal. Nonverbal aspect is reflected in the emotional state of "distress" in the beginning but then a sudden change in the mood to "cheerfulness", which is also connected with Bathsheba's attitude to the situation. At first, she seems to express the feminine trait of weakness after hearing Gabriel's commissive, but then she changes her mind and finishes the conversation between them with assertives, which express her personal vision, which in her being "too independent" and the will for someone to "tame her", which would never be someone like farmer Oak. In this part Bathsheba is also becoming self-centered because she doesn't want to sacrifice herself but for the sake of Gabriel's happiness and therefore doesn't submit to him. This episode largely depicts the withdrawal from the canonical masculine and feminine characteristics, which is observed not only in the representative of a male figure, but also a feminine one.

Next encounter between Bathsheba and Gabriel happens in chapter VI when Gabriel is trying to hire for the position of a shepherd at the fair. Through the time, which

has passed, the narrator describes Oak's journey as "an ordeal of wretchedness which had given him more than it had taken away. [61, p.15]" The sudden change in Bathsheba's character is revealed during Oak's attempt of getting a position of farmer at the fair, when Oak finds out that Bathsheba became a farm owner:

"Where is your master the farmer?" asked Gabriel, kindling with the idea of getting employment that seemed to strike him now.

"'Tisn't a master; 'tis a mistress, shepherd."

"A woman farmer?"

"Ay, 'a b'lieve, and a rich one too! Took on her uncle's farm, who died suddenly." [61, p.17]

This time the encounter between main characters doesn't only create the shift in gender, but also in social roles. In two previous episodes Gabriel had a social status of a farmer, however, in this episode he's only a shepherd, who's willing to offer his service. The affiliation of a social role to a certain gender is shown in Gabriel's first question, when he adds a gender marker "master" before the word "farmer". When the other employee corrects Oak, that his potential employer is a "mistress", Oak is performing a locutionary act in the form of an additional question so that he could understand whether he's heard the employee correctly. The situation seems confusing for Gabriel since during the Victorian era women had to give away all their possessing after getting married to their husbands and the right of inheritance belonged to a woman only in case of absence of male inheritor, hence the social role of a farmer was associated with the male figure [65, p.156]. This shift in social role is explained by the employee, who mentions his mistress inherited the farm from the uncle, who "died suddenly". In terms of gender relations Oak, who used to be an independent farmer, becomes a shepherd, who depends on the farmer. From this perspective the switch in gender roles in terms of the opposition dependent/independent is clear, since Gabriel starts depending on Bathsheba and

performs a feminine trait, whereas Bathsheba remains independent which fits the masculine characteristic.

This is worth noting that through the novel all characters are trying to leave a good impression about themselves. From the linguistic standpoint this interpersonal behavior is connected with the term *face*. As Erving Goffman writes: “Face is an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes – albeit an image others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself.”[66] The characters of the novel want to create a face, which makes them “feel good” when they seek the support and approval of others. On the contrary, if “interactive expectations do not materialize, you can expect the person to “feel bad ”or“ be offended”.

From the linguistic standpoint, Bathsheba’s role in the novel can also be described with a term “doing gender” implemented by Don Zimmerman. This term essentially refers to gender as to a “routine accomplishment embedded in every day interaction” [16]. If, according to this notion, someone performs an action, which is considered to be “incorrect” for that gender, the person is committing an act of social deviance. Bathsheba, by the decision to act like a farmer, which is perceived as a masculine form of activity, diverged the social norm of Victorian society and therefore the confusion about her persona seems understandable because their representation of everyday life doesn’t correlate with Bathsheba’s position and thus becomes a social deviance.

To the notion of face another linguistic term is closely related, which is linguistic politeness/impoliteness. Lakoff argues that there are “rules of politeness that participants must follow (Don’t Impose; Give Options; and Make A feel good – be friendly)” [13]

Although Gabriel becomes a common shepherd this doesn’t affect his character. Despite the fact he became Bathsheba’s employee he’s immediately been recognized

by other farm workers for his competence and personal traits mentioned earlier. This recognition among them is seen in the dialogue in chapter XV when Joseph Poorgrass expresses his opinion about Gabriel's future:

As to shepherd, there, I'm sure mis'ess ought to have made ye her baily—such a fitting man for't as you be." says Joseph Poorgrass

"I don't mind owning that I expected it," said Oak, frankly. "Indeed, I hoped for the place. At the same time, Miss Everdene has a right to be her own baily if she choose—and to keep me down to be a common shepherd only." Oak drew a slow breath, looked sadly into the bright ashpit, and seemed lost in thoughts not of the most hopeful hue. [61,p.33]

Despite not having close relationships, Joseph Poorgrass sees in the figure of Gabriel a perfect candidate for obtaining a social role much higher than his current one. However, this piece of dialogue is also emphasizing that “mis’ess” ought to perform the action, whereas Gabriel himself doesn’t mind obtaining the role of “a common shepherd”. The nonverbal element reflected in the sad look reveals Gabriel’s true emotion about the situation. While being grateful for the opportunity to start everything over, Oak is feeling dependent on the situation and also remembering the fact that he has been rejected by a woman, who is now his mistress.

What is notable is the fact that the relationships between characters are also observed in terms of appeals. Gabriel and Bathsheba remain here the only characters, who refer to each other as to “mr. Oak” and “miss Everdene” when the rest of the characters appeal to them only in the context of their social role (mi’ess, shepherd) or the simple form of appeal as “you”. This peculiarity points at Gabriel’s and Bathsheba’s difference from other characters and are only seen as obtainers of their social roles. An appeal to Gabriel as to the shepherd reflects his discrepancy to his role of the subordinate, which contradicts to the period when he possessed a position of a farmer and he was referred to as “Farmer Oak”. As for Bathsheba, the appeal “mistress” is not only used as an exclusive gender marker for her during the

conversation but also shows her deviation from other character's social roles. As an opposition to his uncle, from whom she inherited the farm, and Oak, who used to be a farmer, an appeal to Bathsheba from her workers is only used without her last name. This episode also creates a contrast between a simple farm worker and Gabriel, who, according George Wotton, is the carrier of "traditional norms and values" that "represents the voice of respectability, duty, the work ethic. He is the responsible subject, the center of initiatives, author of and responsible for, his actions, who works by himself and wishes that Joseph would also show himself 'a man of spirit' " [67, p.66].

After chapter XV the narrator presents a new character in the face of William Boldwood. Mr. Boldwood is a middle-aged man, respectable, handsome, but serious all in all. He has never married and, despite the gossip of the villagers, has never really been in love. Mr. Boldwood is considered to be a successful farm owner with rational attitude and doesn't care about women's attention or questions of love in general. Things have dramatically changed through the story development, however, which would be discussed later on. In comparison to two other characters, Boldwood remains neutral and rather cares about his household. Further analysis will explain the appearance of farmer Boldwood on the scenery be but for current needs of the analysis his figure would serve as a conductor between Gabriel and Bathsheba.

Boldwood's interference in relationships between Gabriel and Bathsheba are firstly described in the dialogue between him and Gabriel. In this dialogue Boldwood receives a letter from Bathsheba on Valentine's day, which consisted of two words "Marry me". The letter wasn't signed thus farmer Boldwood wanted to find out the addresser:

"I was going to ask you, shepherd," he said, with unreal carelessness, "if you know whose writing this is?"

Oak glanced into the book, and replied instantly, with a flushed face, "Miss Everdene's."

Oak had coloured simply at the consciousness of sounding her name. He now felt a strangely distressing qualm from a new thought. The letter could of course be no other than anonymous, or the inquiry would not have been necessary.

Boldwood mistook his confusion: sensitive persons are always ready with their "Is it I?" in preference to objective reasoning.[61, p.34]

The question addressed to Oak by Boldwood is delivered with an “unreal carelessness”, which appears to describe Boldwood’s relationships with Gabriel. They’re acquaintances, however, farmer doesn’t consider Gabriel his rival for a woman’s heart therefore shows the letter written by Bathsheba to him. Oak’s reaction to the letter he sees is uncommon for the masculine character: his face flushes. Normally, a flushed face is a nonverbal behavior, which is attributed to female characters in order to show such emotions as timidity or embarrassment. In the case of Gabriel seeing a letter from Bathsheba, which says “Marry me” the reader could make an assumption that he flushed because of the anger he experienced towards Boldwood. However, the narrator explains Oak’s reaction is being caused not by the letter, but because he had to sound Bathsheba’s name. The thought of him being vulnerable to pronounce the name of “miss Everdene” provoked a feeling of “strangely distressing qualm” however, Gabriel is still performing the masculine role in this dialogue, since he doesn’t reveal his true emotions but rather reconsiders his attitude to the matter. As for William Boldwood, he is performing a feminine trait of sensitivity, which is caused by his personal feeling of hurting Oak with his question. As the narrator himself mentions this is one of the features of sensitive persons – instead of hearing the voice of reasoning such people are always trying to blame themselves in the first place. The interaction between Gabriel and Boldwood also allows to compare two masculine characters, which are in the center of narration. As it’s been highlighted Oak is considered a main masculine figure of the novel, which includes all prototypical masculine traits in his character. As on the of first oppositions to this image is the figure of farmer Boldwood, whose first appearance is already highlighted with the feminine trait. Also Boldwood’s last

name is a combination of two words – “Bold” and “wood”, which is also a speaking name.

The difference between this to character and the role of William Boldwood in this novel is to also create a contrast between two masculine figures” – his and farmer Oak’s. This can be distinguished through their behavior in regards to Bathsheba. Along the storyline both men have been rejected when they proposed to her, however, the reaction of those two characters differs. For instance, when Oak has been rejected in chapter IV, he finishes the conversation with the phrase “Then I’ll ask you no more”. In comparison to the prototypical model of men’s and women’s behavior, which is suggested for the analysis, Gabriel deflects from it, because despite his attempt to convince Bathsheba in his true feelings he decides to retreat in the end. The contrary to Gabriel’s action is the action performed by farmer Boldwood, who is not endowed with the same traits as Oak, hence his behavior differs.

Boldwood’s proposal to Bathsheba is depicted in chapter XIX, when he approaches her at the farm. Although he’s also been rejected he remains persistent with his attempts to win Bathsheba’s heart. His status is equal to Bathsheba, in contrast to the situation with Gabriel, because both Bathsheba and Boldwood are farm owners. The degree of their relationships though differs since farmer Boldwood didn’t even communicate with Bathsheba before he receives a letter from her. Boldwood performs an action which is to get Bathsheba’s consent to marry. Also during the conversation Boldwood is trying to make a good impression of himself:

“I am now forty-one years old,” he went on. “I may have been called a confirmed bachelor, and I was a confirmed bachelor. I had never any views of myself as a husband in my earlier days, nor have I made any calculation on the subject since I have been older. But we all change, and my change, in this matter, came with seeing you. I have felt lately, more and more, that my present way of living is bad in every respect. Beyond all things, I want you as my wife.” [61, p.37]

As a parallel to Gabriel's personality Boldwood is also a bachelor but he emphasizes his social status with the word "confirmed". As opposed to the main character, farmer hasn't considered changing his status from "bachelor" to "husband". Such form of revelation has a perlocutionary effect of convincing Bathsheba that her persona has changed his way of thinking. This phrase is followed with an indirect speech act and an expressive that "we all change" and his personal change is aimed at the desire to see Bathsheba. As the opposite to Gabriel, Bathsheba doesn't make an eye contact with Boldwood – she's "hiding the look", which also means her personal desire to abandon farmer Boldwood in this conversation. However, the latter remains self-centric and despite the expressive mentioned and the reveal of personal feelings he remains such through the whole dialogue, which is a masculine trait. Boldwood is performing a primitive speech act in a form of repeating by starting each new sentence with the pronoun "I" and often repeating it through his monologue, though the situation is described as a dialogue between him and Bathsheba. Boldwood also doesn't want to submit to Bathsheba's rejection just like Gabriel did and despite the indirect speech act said in the beginning of him not considering himself in the role of "husband" and not making any "calculations" on this topic, he sums up his monologue with an assertive that he wants Bathsheba to be his wife, however, it may also be perceived as directive since it carries a perlocutionary effect for Bathsheba not to consider William's candidature to be his wife, but rather be such.

In order to keep his "face" after the rejection Boldwood refers to Bathsheba in order to restore his reputation in the eyes of the heroine by performing another dialogue with her:

Boldwood: "Say then, that you don't absolutely refuse. Do not quite refuse?"

Bathsheba: "I can do nothing. I cannot answer."

Boldwood: "I may speak to you again on the subject?"

Bathsheba: "Yes."

Boldwood: "I may think of you?"

Bathsheba: "Yes, I suppose you may think of me."

Boldwood: "And hope to obtain you?"

Bathsheba: "No -- do not hope! Let us go on."

Boldwood: "I will call upon you again tomorrow."

Bathsheba: "No -- please not. Give me time."

Bathsheba: "Yes -- I will give you any time," he said earnestly and gratefully. "I am happier now." [61,p.38]

This piece of dialogue also creates a contradiction between two masculine images in particular. As opposed to Gabriel, when receiving the rejection from Bathsheba Boldwood doesn't switch his attributes – he's trying to paraphrase Bathsheba's words in order to prove his point and preserve the position of a dominant figure in the dialogue. By rephrasing Bathsheba's rejection with an addition of the word "absolutely" he creates a perlocutionary act with a purpose of the reconsideration of the change in her speech act from "refuse" to "doesn't directly refuse". The impact of this speech act influences Bathsheba, since her feeling to Boldwood is not the complete "rejection" as their relationships are not constructed in the manner of having such an emotion since they barely know each other. Hence, Bathsheba replies that she "can do nothing" because the confirmation of Boldwood's request that she "absolutely" refuses would have an impolite accent in this situation and she would lose her face. Two next questions asked by Boldwood are indirect speech acts: by asking her "*I may speak to you again on the subject?*" has a communicative meaning that "I will speak to you again on the subject"; the question "*I may think of you?*" reflects a communicative meaning that Boldwood "will" think of Bathsheba. Apart from that the question seems incorrect because the person is not able to make another not to "think" about something or someone therefore the perlocutionary effect of the

question is aimed at Bathsheba submitting to Boldwood. However, the next question, which refers to the Boldwood's desire to "obtain" Bathsheba is answered with a refuse since the action of "thinking" and "speaking" on a certain subject is the type of action won't influence the position of the other speaker and his opinion, but when Boldwood reveals the question, which is also an indirect speech act but with a perlocutionary effect for Bathsheba to reconsider her position of marrying Boldwood, she rejects and replies negatively. Boldwood once again tries then to gain dominant position in the conversation by saying with the primitive speech act that he would "call upon her tomorrow", however Bathsheba again rejects his offer but not completely in order not to lose her face in front of other people, thus is answering with a protest in the beginning but then is also adding a directive in a form of request to "give her time".

In comparison to the dialogue, which happened between Gabriel and Bathsheba and the one between her and Boldwood, the latter shows the dominance in the face of a masculine character, which follows the canon. Unlike Gabriel, farmer Boldwood's proposition is not affected by the rejection. In fact, with a help of manipulation with words he makes Bathsheba reconsider her rejection due to the degree of the relationships between her and Boldwood. One should remember that Boldwood received a letter from Bathsheba, which consisted of an indirect speech act, which is "Marry me"; Boldwood, however, perceives this as a directive hence is implementing the command. After being rejected Boldwood like Gabriel is self-centered but the difference here is in the climax of dialogues. Whereas Oak is asking for a reason for being rejected and is being polite with Bathsheba, Boldwood's questions are aimed at proving his point of view in order to remain dominant. Therefore the reader observes the difference: whereas Gabriel is completely rejected and submits to Bathsheba, Boldwood remains dominant and follows classical masculine features of a Victorian novel. During the conversation his task was to prove his point from the very beginning, which he achieved with the help of manipulations with words.

The implementation of the second suitor in the novel awakens masculine traits of Gabriel Oak. Whereas before meeting farmer Boldwood he remains passive and submits to the will of his mistress, he's starting to reconsider his masculinity. This may be seen in the dialogue between him and Bathsheba in chapter XX, during which the heroine discusses the question of marrying farmer Boldwood. Gabriel reveals to her that people started talking about the potential marriage between her and farmer Boldwood:

Gabriel: "Farmer Boldwood's name and your own were likely to be flung over pulpit together before the year was out."

Bathsheba: "I thought so by the look of them! Why, there's nothing in it. A more foolish remark was never made, and I want you to contradict it! that's what I came for."

Gabriel looked incredulous and sad, but between his moments of incredulity, relieved." [61,p.39]

From this part one can see that the relationships between Gabriel and Bathsheba are followed in the form of relationships between mistress and his subordinate. This is reflected in the heroine's directive for Gabriel to "contradict a foolish remark". The reason why Bathsheba understood that there's a rumor about her marriage with farmer Boldwood is caused by the workers' "look", which signaled their hidden thoughts to her. The situation also reflects the impact of Boldwood's dialogue between them and the opinion of the masses. Despite not getting the direct approval, rural people interpret the situation from Boldwood's perspective and indirectly think a marriage between those is going to take place. This is also shown in the "incredulous" look of Oak, which proves that he shares the opinion of others and not the position of Bathsheba; however, he's also feeling "relieved" since Boldwood has also been rejected and by assuming that Bathsheba is not lying since she gave him a

directive to “contradict” the rumor, he understands the possibility to disapprove public opinion.

The culmination in this dialogue lies in the moment when Bathsheba makes Oak express his opinion about her action of sending the Valentine’s letter to farmer Boldwood. Gabriel says that it “is unworthy of any thoughtful, and meek, and comely woman” [61, p.40]. This indirect speech act has a perlocutionary effect to make Bathsheba understand that her behavior is inappropriate and she shouldn’t be that careless when sending the letter to Boldwood. In terms of the gender context, Gabriel changes his role during the conversation from a “submissive subordinate” figure to the “dominant paternal”, which is caused with the help of the conversation between Bathsheba and Boldwood, in particular.

Here’s how the narrator describes Bathsheba’s reaction:

In an instant Bathsheba's face coloured with the angry crimson of a Danby sunset. But she forbore to utter this feeling, and the reticence of her tongue only made the loquacity of her face the more noticeable. [61,p.40]

The nonverbal aspects of Bathsheba’s image allow to not only understand the perlocutionary effect of the speech act received from Gabriel but also to see the change in their relationships. Her face “coloured” because of her being angry and she’s trying to hide her emotions, which is seen in the “loquacity” of the face expression. She is visibly irritated because of Gabriel’s response and in order to regain the position of a leader in the conversation she’s directly asking Gabriel:

“I may ask, I suppose, where in particular my unworthiness lies? In my not marrying you, perhaps!” [61,p.40]

The indirect speech act used by the heroine in the phrase “In my not marrying you, perhaps!” is appealing to the fact that Oak has been rejected by her in the past, thus wants to insult Bathsheba. From the perspective of the gender factor Bathsheba is also performing a mix of masculine and feminine attributes: on one hand she’s applying the masculine attribute of dominance, on the other she’s affected by the

feminine trait of “sensitivity”. As for Oak, he remains self-confident, which suits the masculine attribute, because he understands the rightness of his position and that the action performed by Bathsheba in sending a farcical letter is wrong in terms of politeness and etiquette hence remains calm and answers:

"My opinion is (since you ask it) that you are greatly to blame for playing pranks upon a man like Mr. Boldwood, merely as a pastime. Leading on a man you don't care for is not a praiseworthy action. And even, Miss Everdene, if you seriously inclined towards him, you might have let him find it out in some way of true loving-kindness, and not by sending him a valentine's letter." [61, p.41]

Here, Oak is directly judging the action performed by Bathsheba. Her perception on the occasion of sending love letter is criticized therefore Bathsheba lost her face in this situation. Despite the fact that the situation has been created by this action, Bathsheba herself is trying to hide from the fact that she's not the one to blame that the letter has been understood in a wrong manner by Boldwood. What is interesting is the fact that the relationships between Boldwood and Bathsheba are built on manipulations with words. Bathsheba's letter doesn't carry a directive, which can be understood in one way as well as questions asked by Boldwood during their conversation. Their relationships between each character are presented in a form of a symmetry and only if one of the participants admits being wrong and retreats they can be settled; Nevertheless, none of them is able to do so since it is motivated with a matter of losing the face – if Bathsheba admits her sending a joky love letter she will be judged for her action as she was by Gabriel and if mr. Boldwood, who proposed to Bathsheba in front of her workers, would submit to Bathsheba's will of not marrying him, he would be considered a rejected bachelor, which will affect his masculinity.

Farmer Boldwood plays an important role in building Gabriel's character. By looking at the situation created between him and Bathsheba, Gabriel is reconsidering

his masculine features. Before the appearance of Boldwood he remained a submissive subordinate of his mistress, whose thoughts and actions were only represented by the narrator in the form of inner thoughts. When he sees the letter from Bathsheba and is then she asks his opinion on this regard, however, Gabriel decides not to retreat from the situation but expresses his true opinion of the situation hence regains the confidence in his actions. This is also worth mentioning that his actions in terms of Bathsheba are also symmetrical: when he, after being rejected, asks her for the reason she honestly replies him that she “doesn’t love him” and when Bathsheba is asking Gabriel the reason why he believes her attitude was “unworthy” he replies honestly that “Leading on a man you don't care for is not a praiseworthy action.”. The later development of Gabriel as a character leads to his action of leaving the farm and the disposal of his role of Bathsheba’s subordinate. Starting from the moment of Gabriel leaving the farm he’s leaving the feminine trait of “submission” and gradually evokes the trait of dominance.

An example of him regaining his masculinity in the face of Bathsheba is shown in chapter XXI, in which Bathsheba’s flock of sheep suddenly starts dying. Understanding that she has to save her farm she’s sending for Gabriel. However, she doesn’t switch her gender role in this episode – as a mistress she remains dominant i.e performing a masculine role. She’s sending a verbal directive in the face of one of her workers: “*Jump on the bay mare, and ride across, and say he must return instantly—that I say so.*” [61,p.43]. As a subordinate he should have submitted to his mistress, according to the social relationships. However, Oak left the farm and therefore was able not to obey the directive and this is what he performs. He’s sending the worker back to the farm with his message for Bathsheba:

"He says beggars mustn't be choosers," replied Laban.

"What!" said the young farmer, opening her eyes and drawing in her breath for an outburst. Joseph Poorgrass retired a few steps behind a hurdle.

"He says he shall not come unless you request en to come civilly and in a proper manner, as becomes any 'ooman begging a favour." [61,p.45]

Oak's indirect speech act delivered from one of the subordinates puts a stress on the role distribution. While being the subordinate Gabriel couldn't dispute orders from his mistress. But when he loses the position of shepherd the discourse loses the social dependence, leaving the dialogue to obtain the feature of masculine and feminine roles. The speech act also delivers a perlocutionary effect of affecting Bathsheba to reconsider her position in the dialogue between them and not to give orders but ask for a "favour" as women normally do. The episode analyzed creates another switch in gender relations between Bathsheba and Oak: from the very beginning the latter has been applying feminine traits, whereas Bathsheba has obtained a masculine position of power. However, after the episode in chapter XXI Oak for the first time makes Bathsheba reconsider her role and becomes a dominant figure himself.

At this point the analysis of the figure of Gabriel Oak is considered to be complete. The analysis showed the metamorphosis of the character in terms personal traits and traits of masculinity and femininity. The analysis provided so far reflects the impact of additional masculine character in the face of farmer Boldwood to indirectly affect Gabriel's reconsideration of his attributes in terms of masculinity/femininity. The next subparagraph will consist of the analysis of another masculine character, whose appearance influences the attributes of masculinity/femininity among all characters – sergeant Francis Troy.

2.2 The case of Francis Troy

Although the appearance of Francis Troy happens in chapter XI for the first time and he also appears in chapter XXIV, his official presentation as one of the main characters is happening in chapter XXV.

The narrator begins Troy's description with the words:

"Idiosyncrasy and vicissitude had combined to stamp Sergeant Troy as an exceptional being." [61,p.48]

In terms of linguistics, "idiosyncratic symbol" means, referring to Hugh Chisholm "a thing, which may have an opposite meaning for different people. For example, a blade could mean war, but to someone else, it could symbolize a surgery [68]. In terms of the character description this term means eccentricity therefore the narrator presents Francis Troy as an "eccentric, exceptional being"

It has already been mentioned that Troy has been considered to speak truthfully only "towards men" whereas to women he "lied like a Cretan". Troy is described as a total opposition to Gabriel Oak prominent traits. While Oak is represented as a "calm and modest" man, who passed "through an ordeal of wretchedness", Troy, on the contrary, is eccentric and doesn't care about "the day after" since to him "only today matters". Troy's first encounter with Bathsheba happens when the latter had her skirt tugged to Troy's spur. This sudden action creates a dialogue between them:

"A rum start, upon my soul!" said a masculine voice, a foot or so above her head.

"Have I hurt you, mate?"

"No," said Bathsheba, attempting to shrink away.

"We have got hitched together somehow, I think."

"Yes."

"Are you a woman?"

"Yes."

"A lady, I should have said."

"It doesn't matter."

"I am a man."

"Oh!" [61, p.47]

The conversation begins with Troy's appeal to Bathsheba as "mate", a masculine appeal. When Troy is directly asking Bathsheba whether she's a woman or, perhaps, a lady Bathsheba replies that "it doesn't matter". By neglecting her gender identity she's also creating a reference to her figure in the novel. She possesses the masculine role of the farm owner and also through the novel only two characters appeal to her by her name (Gabriel and Oak), while the rest of the characters refer to her as "mistress". Troy, however, emphasizes this fact because the role of gender is important for him due to the personal belief. This primitive speech act in the form of labeling also refers to the norms of etiquette, which should be followed according to the gender roles. By pointing out that he's a man and Bathsheba is a woman he's referring to how they must behave in front of each other.

The episode continues along with an attempt of Troy to untangle Bathsheba's dress from his spur. What's notable is that Troy starts flirting with Bathsheba when her gender identity is revealed:

Troy: "... But why should such a fair and dutiful girl have such an aversion to her father's sex?"

Bathsheba: "Go on your way, please."

Troy: "What, Beauty, and drag you after me? Do but look; I never saw such a tangle!"

Bathsheba: "Oh, 'tis shameful of you; you have been making it worse on purpose to keep me here—you have!"

Troy: "Indeed, I don't think so," said the sergeant, with a merry twinkle.

Bathsheba: "I tell you you have!" she exclaimed, in high temper. "I insist upon undoing it. Now, allow me!" [61, p.48]

The emotions, which both characters experience in the created situation differs. While Troy seems to be teasing Bathsheba and making a laugh from the situation.

Bathsheba, however, is feeling irritated and is giving Troy a directive to “go on his way”. Troy from his side is making fun of the situation with an indirect speech act of “I never saw such a tangle” is referred to Bathsheba in order to reflect Troy’s inability to untangle her dress from his spur. From the perspective gender relations Troy considers Bathsheba to have an “aversion” to men because of her attitude to him, but also Troy calls Bathsheba “Beauty”, which is the first time when the male character is using a compliment in her regard. This distinguishes Troy’s personality from two other suitors: As a masculine figure Troy is complementing Bathsheba, which is appealing to her femininity.

Their second encounter happens in chapter XXVI when Troy had come “haymaking for pleasure”:

“As soon as she (Bathsheba) had entered the field Troy saw her, and sticking his pitchfork into the ground and picking up his crop or cane, he came forward. Bathsheba blushed with half-angry embarrassment, and adjusted her eyes as well as her feet to the direct line of her path.” [61,p.49]

In terms of nonverbal features in this part when Bathsheba sees Troy she “blushes” and the emotion she expresses, in comparison to her other suitors, is unpredictable. It is described as a “half-angry embarrassment”, however the situation seems strange due to the fact that it is their second time seeing each other. Still, Bathsheba reminds the compliment mentioned by Troy, which explains the half - measure of heroine’s embarrassment.

In this chapter Troy also confesses to Bathsheba and presents her a golden watch, which belonged to his father:

I loved my father: good; but better, I love you more. That's how I can do it," said the sergeant, with an intonation of such exquisite fidelity to nature that it was evidently

not all acted now. Her beauty, which, whilst it had been quiescent, he had praised in jest, had in its animated phases moved him to earnest; and though his seriousness was less than she imagined, it was probably more than he imagined himself. [61, p.51]

Unlike Gabriel and Boldwood, Troy does not only confess to Bathsheba but also presents her a thing, which is his personal relic, and opposing to other characters by the fact that he doesn't ask for anything from her. Troy's deviation to the feminine trait of "sacrificing" instead of "self-centric" leads to the phrase "I love you more" gaining a stronger perlocutionary effect, which is aimed at convincing Bathsheba in his true feelings. Still, from the reader's angle it is understandable that Troy was acting at the beginning but a nonverbal element, which is "an intonation of such exquisite fidelity to nature" made Troy's saying seem to not be acted at all. Troy's words and a gift gave the dialogue the seriousness that has been overestimated by Bathsheba but still underestimated by Troy.

The episode in which the switch in gender roles can be observed is an episode from chapter XXVII. In this episode Troy visits Bathsheba at the apiary and expresses a desire to help her. In order to help Bathsheba, he needs to change his military robe into the robe of a beekeeper, however, Bathsheba only has a woman's robe and hence Troy is performing an act of cross-dressing:

"So a whimsical fate ordered that her hat should be taken off—veil and all attached—and placed upon his head, Troy tossing his own into a gooseberry bush. Then the veil had to be tied at its lower edge round his collar and the gloves put on him.

He looked such an extraordinary object in this guise that, flurried as she was, she could not avoid laughing outright. It was the removal of yet another stake from the palisade of cold manners which had kept him off."

The act of Troy performing a cross-dressing had a purpose of making Bathsheba laugh in the first place, which is emphasized by the narrator's phrase that it was the removal "of one of the stakes" i.e relationships improvement between both. In terms of gender factor Troy is performing an act of cross-dressing on purpose and by showing his carelessness in this question he improves Bathsheba's attitude to his persona. Another important aspect in this act of cross-dressing is that when Troy is putting on the feminine veil and a hat he has to get rid of his military clothes, which he "tosses into the bush". While it seems like a "whimsical fate" does everything in order to strengthen the relationships between Bathsheba and Troy, it is Troy who purposely executed this plan in order to get rid of the manners that "kept him off". Thus by performing a gender switch in a form of cross-dressing from a military form to the woman's robe of a beekeeper Troy doesn't gain feminine traits but rather does this in a form of a joke to gain Bathsheba's trust to his persona. By playing on the contrast between being masculine and also applying feminine traits to his image Troy wants to achieve a goal of making Bathsheba fall in love with him.

Serving as a contradiction to the main masculine character, the personality of Francis Troy becomes interesting to Gabriel Oak. Oak doesn't carry a direct role of Bathsheba's suitor – in fact, after her rejection, Oak has sworn to "ask her no more". Oak has retrieved his masculine position of a dominant figure in terms of farm ruling as it has been highlighted, yet his relationships with Bathsheba remain professional and he is still a shepherd at her farm. With the appearance of sergeant Troy, a competition is held by two men - farmer Boldwood and sergeant Troy. Gabriel remains an observer of the situation, however the figure of Bathsheba's new suitor also influences the personality of the shepherd. It needs to be mentioned that throughout the novel Oak becomes a carrier of other people's secret, which is delivered in a form of letter. As in the case with farmer Boldwood, Oak has known about the existence of Francis Troy in advance. A reason to that lies in a letter from the novel's second main character – Fanny Robin. Due to the focus on the personality of Francis Troy in this subparagraph, the figure of Fanny Robin will be

analyzed further in the next chapter and for current needs the research focuses on the analysis of the letter received by Gabriel in chapter XV, in which Fanny mentions sergeant Troy:

“Dear Friend,—I do not know your name, but I think these few lines will reach you, which I wrote to thank you for your kindness to me the night I left Weatherbury in a reckless way... All has ended well, and I am happy to say I am going to be married to the young man who has courted me for some time—Sergeant Troy, of the 11th Dragoon Guards, now quartered in this town. ... I should be much obliged to you if you would keep the contents of this letter a secret for the present, dear friend. We mean to surprise Weatherbury by coming there soon as husband and wife, though I blush to state it to one nearly a stranger. The sergeant grew up in Weatherbury...”
[61, p.34]

After receiving a letter from Fanny, Oak knew that somebody will eventually come back to Weatherbury with a woman he met and helped in the past. When Troy comes to the town and Gabriel finds out that Fanny is not with him he’s starting to suspect a young sergeant in being dishonest. As for Bathsheba, Troy has emerged her feminine side of the character and gradually made her falling in love with him and gaining her absolute trust. The interference of Oak in the potential love relationships between Bathsheba and Troy is described in chapter XXIX:

“I believe him (Troy) to have no conscience at all. And I cannot help begging you, miss, to have nothing to do with him. Listen to me this once—only this once! I don't say he's such a bad man as I have fancied—I pray to God he is not. But since we don't exactly know what he is, why not behave as if he might be bad, simply for your own safety? Don't trust him, mistress; I ask you not to trust him so.” [61, p. 56]

In terms of the created situation we understand that Oak possesses an information against Francis Troy, hence is able to understand his hidden motives. The reason why Oak decides to not reveal a secret lies in his gentleman’s traits - in her letter Fanny indirectly expresses a commissive of Gabriel keeping the fact that Troy and

her are married a secret. Moreover, as a representative of Victorian Society Oak understands that Bathsheba will lose her public face if the secret is revealed and turns out to be true because she will then be considered as a lover of a married man. Therefore, the phrase “why not behave as if he might be bad, simply for your own safety?” is a perlocutionary act aimed at convincing Bathsheba to analyze the personality of sergeant Troy more thoroughly. After that Oak is using a directive in a form of the command to “not trust” sergeant Troy. Bathsheba, on the contrary, defends him. What is interesting about her counterargument is the piece, in which she mentions Troy attending regularly the church:

“ Bathsheba: "He is as good as anybody in this parish! He is very particular, too, about going to church—yes, he is!"

Gabriel: "I am afraid nobody saw him there. I never did, certainly."

Bathsheba: "The reason of that is," she said eagerly, "that he goes in privately by the old tower door, just when the service commences, and sits at the back of the gallery. He told me so." ” [61, p.57]

It needs to be clarified that church played an important role in the lives of Victorian people, especially the ones who belonged to the rural class. When Oak mentions in the previous episode that he “prays to God” in a hope that he’s incorrect about Troy points at the importance of God in the life of ordinary people. Bathsheba from her point is also comparing the persona of Troy with the rest of the “parish” i.e inhabitants of Weatherbury and people who attend local church. In the attempt to protect Troy in the eyes of farmer Oak Bathsheba is not led by her mind as she used to but rather her emotions. When she’s saying that Troy is “very particular about going to church” she herself agrees with this information, which has a perlocutionary effect of rather convincing herself in the righteousness of her words rather than Gabriel. As a contrary Oak appeals to facts and says that “nobody saw him there” and certainly not him. Oak here perceives the information in a rational way and answers to Bathsheba’s emotional statements with facts. Bathsheba is still not

convinced with the prove Gabriel says, because she explains this with Troy “going privately by the old tower door” and also mentions that the information has been received from his directly. The fact that Bathsheba is plainly relying on the words of Troy proves her trust to the words he says. What is more important, sergeant’s figure makes Bathsheba turn to her feminine traits during the conversation between her and Oak. While during previous conversations Bathsheba always tried to obtain the role of a mistress when Gabriel mentions Troy she puts the role of a woman in the first place. Her prominent traits, which were rationality, intelligence and independence are now replaced with emotion, irrationality and submissiveness.

The second person to know Troy’s secret of engaging Fanny Robin is farmer Boldwood, who mistakenly opened the letter addressed to Gabriel and read it. The function of William Boldwood as well as in the case with Gabriel is to create an impulse, which will lead to the character’s unveiling his true inner attributes. When Boldwood shows Gabriel the letter from Bathsheba and finds afterwards that is it has been a joke he’s reconsidering his position of mistress’ subordinate and therefore regains masculine traits. As for Francis Troy, the emergence of his real character is happening in chapter XXXIV during the dialogue between him and Boldwood.

In this scene Boldwood is approaching Troy in order to make him reveal the truth about his affair with Fanny Robin and Troy, who didn’t meet Boldwood before that but becomes instantly interested in the matter of question:

“Very well, I'll listen with pleasure,” said Troy, placing his bag on the ground, “only speak low, for somebody or other may overhear us in the farmhouse there.”

Boldwood: “Well then—I know a good deal concerning your Fanny Robin's attachment to you. I may say, too, that I believe I am the only person in the village, excepting Gabriel Oak, who does know it. You ought to marry her.”

Troy: “I suppose I ought. Indeed, I wish to, but I cannot.”

Boldwood: "Why?"

Troy was about to utter something hastily; he then checked himself and said, "I am too poor." His voice was changed. Previously it had had a devil-may-care tone. It was the voice of a trickster now.

Boldwood's present mood was not critical enough to notice tones." [61,p.66]

The dialogue starts with Troy's directive to lower the tone of the voice since "somebody may overhear", which also gives Troy a role of a conversation's host. Boldwood, whose narrative is affected with the rivalry with Troy, mentions him acknowledging the affair between Troy and Fanny Robin and also adds that he and Gabriel Oak are the only people knowing. What's important about their current relationship is also the fact that Troy's secret is known only by two other suitors, who are keeping his secret in order to save Bathsheba's reputation, i.e face. Boldwood also says a speech act that Troy is "ought to marry her". This speech act has a perlocutionary effect that Troy must correct the situation created with Fanny. As it has been mentioned Troy was considered to be married to Fanny, however the action hasn't been performed, hence Boldwood wants Troy to complete the commissive addressed to Fanny. Also Boldwood is driven by personal motives – he's Bathsheba's second suitor and wants to get rid of the competition in order to remain the only candidate, since Gabriel remains a passive observer and by making Troy into marriage with Fanny he would potentially achieve a goal of marrying Bathsheba. Troy's wanted to reply something to Boldwood "hastily", however, he interrupts himself and then replies that he's "too poor". The nonverbal aspect of a change in his voice reflects the duality of Troy's thinking. He's hiding an important detail, which he was eager to share in the first place but decides to hide in the end. This is also proved by a change in his voice. When Troy remembers the matter he wanted to share with Boldwood his tone changed from "devil-may-care" to "trickster". Again the interaction with mr. Boldwood causes a masculine character to reveal his inner-self. As opposed to Gabriel, Troy creates an image, which would attract the opposite sex and is unseen to speakers. Yet, Boldwood's action of

revealing the hidden truth about him affects Troy as it did with Oak; but Troy is a contradiction to Gabriel's masculine image. In his conversation Gabriel remains intelligent, but also is following a gentleman's code by being polite and at certain moments submissive. Troy, on the contrary, appeals to treachery, which is seen in his actions and the narrator's description. The conversation between him and Boldwood reveals this tone of a trickster for the first time in the novel and this has proved Gabriel's assumption of Troy to "might be bad". As for Boldwood, he doesn't see recognize the change in Francis' tone due to his "personal mood". His attitude to Troy is firstly presented as rivalry between two men fighting for a woman's heart, therefore his perception of a Troy is originally bad not because of his personality but due to the fact that he might become Bathsheba's partner, hence he must make him abandon the role of one of the admirers.

Boldwood's later action is conducted in a form of paying money to Troy in order for him to marry Fanny and abandon Bathsheba. This scene is also the field of interest due to its gender context:

" I'll pay you well now, I'll settle a sum of money upon her, and I'll see that you don't suffer from poverty in the future... Bathsheba is only playing with you: you are too poor for her as I said; so give up wasting your time about a great match you'll never make for a moderate and rightful match you may make to-morrow"

In making this statement Boldwood's voice revealed only too clearly a consciousness of the weakness of his position, his aims, and his method. His manner had lapsed quite from that of the firm and dignified Boldwood of former times; and such a scheme as he had now engaged in he would have condemned as childishly imbecile only a few months ago. Boldwood exemplified this to an abnormal degree: he knew nothing of Fanny Robin's circumstances or whereabouts, he knew nothing of Troy's possibilities, yet that was what he said."[61, p.67]

What is needed to be discussed in this part is Boldwood's attitude of settling such things as love matters by simply paying for them. He emphasizes him being a better candidate by comparing their social statuses and thus being a dominant figure – he's repeating and self-centering the dispute around himself because it is "him", in comparison to Troy, who is rich, thus the perlocutionary effect here is to persuade Troy that Boldwood is a better candidate in comparison to him, therefore make him submit. The manner of him to pay for Francis Troy to leave is carried, however, with a "consciousness of the weakness" and it's also stated that by attempting to solve the dispute with a help of money Boldwood's attitude towards the question is described as "childishly imbecile" therefore, in spite trying to become the dominant figure in the dialogue, Boldwood remains the weaker side, since unlike Troy his actions are not carried out with a certain plan. As Gabriel Oak Boldwood understands the duality of Troy's personality and considers him being disingenuous. However, he "knew nothing of Fanny Robin's circumstances or whereabouts, he knew nothing of Troy's possibilities" and by trying to buy Bathsheba from Troy is based on Troy's speech act with a perlocutionary effect that he's "too poor". As well as Bathsheba, Boldwood is driven by his emotions and is irrational in regards to his persona, which leads to his loss of the dominant position in the dispute. Troy, however, has a masculine attribute of dominance in the dialogue from the very beginning and his personal attribute of trickery gave him an opportunity to make Boldwood follow his scenario and reveal his true self in the process. The perlocutionary effect of Troy's speech act has influenced Boldwood and therefore he built the rest of his argumentation basing only on Troy's statement. As for the gender context in this piece is that Boldwood is not taking into consideration feminine figures – he's only focused on the masculine figure of Troy and his belief that if he "buys" his refuse to marry he would immediately own Bathsheba distinguishes the Victorian perception of gender relations – the attention lies in the masculine figure, whereas a feminine one is the addition to the case.

Despite the fact that Troy is perceived as an antagonist of the novel he himself judges Boldwood's attitude. This is shown in the climax of their dialogue when Troy shows him the newspaper, which writes about the marriage between Troy and Bathsheba. This action is aimed at humiliating Boldwood's attempt to buy him and thus owning Bathsheba:

“Fifty pounds to marry Fanny. Good. Twenty-one pounds not to marry Fanny, but Bathsheba. Good. Finale: already Bathsheba's husband. Now, Boldwood, yours is the ridiculous fate which always attends interference between a man and his wife. Bad as I am, I am not such a villain as to make the marriage or misery of any woman a matter of huckster and sale... You say you love Bathsheba; yet on the merest apparent evidence you instantly believe in her dishonour. A fig for such love! Now that I've taught you a lesson, take your money back again.” [61, p. 68]

Troy's performance here reveals his masculine traits and also his moral-code. He himself considers him to be “bad”, but bad in terms of personal traits and not the actions he performs. The opposition between him Boldwood, thus, is not an opposition of “good-bad” but rather “bad-evil”, since Troy doesn't perceive women equal to men, which is described indirectly in chapter XXV, but he's still not a “villain” to treat relationships between men and women as a matter of “huckster and sale”. His additional action of deconstructing Boldwood's attitude towards Bathsheba is aimed at proving that Boldwood doesn't, in fact, experiences an emotion of love to Bathsheba and treats her not like a person, but believes her to be an object that he's willing to own. The goal of such actions he explains himself – to “teach a lesson”.

As it has been mentioned before, in the Victorian era women had to give all their possessing to the husband and therefore man will become an absolute owner of the whole property. Troy, however, doesn't put this fact in the first place and in comparison to farmer Boldwood is focused on the question of relationships. This episode proves that both Gabriel and Troy, who become an opposition of “good-bad” in this novel share the same ideas, unlike Boldwood. His representation

symbolizes the classical norms of Victorian people that are gradually being left in order to accept new standards.

2.3 The comparative analysis

The comparative analysis between two characters of Gabriel Oak and Francis Troy shows:

- The story of Gabriel Oak is in general a story about the loss and restoration of strength and masculinity. Because of his initial failure as a farmer and also being rejected by Bathsheba, he loses all hopes for the better life and must start over, becoming a shepherd of a farmer, who reveals to be Bathsheba. In fact, he becomes one of her servants, who is obeying all her commands and is treated like an ordinary rural person despite his abilities and knowledge, which is shown to be above their level. But also, the story of Gabriel reveals a gender blurring. Despite the fact that he represents a classical masculine image, in many episodes Gabriel deviates from them due to the influence of circumstances, which is corrected by the interference of other masculine characters.
- The connection between three suitors lies in the hidden goal of Oak to restore his power and obtain a “correct” gender role, since masculinities of Troy and Boldwood are aimed at helping him. Oak may become a powerful masculine figure again only through his relationship to them (his difference from them) and their relationship to each other. He derives strength not only from sexual opposition through his attitude to Bathsheba, or simply from comparability with other men who have relations with her, but also from actions and manners performed by other men. The main question here is whether Oak will return his masculinity by defeating Bathsheba’s image of ruling figure that performs a masculine role as Troy did in the form of trickery or will find his own way as an opposition between good and bad

- All three masculine characters perform actions, which lead to the deviation from the classical traits of masculinity/femininity. Each of them is followed by a certain goal: Oak applies feminine traits through the dialogues to express his true feelings about Bathsheba and his behavior is explained by emotions he experiences and the desire to own Bathsheba's heart. Troy performs actions such as cross-dressing and deviation from the classical norms in order to achieve the same goal as Gabriel, however his masculinity remains due to the fact that his application of feminine traits, in comparison to Gabriel's, is implemented as a part of a certain plan in order to gain woman's trust. As for farmer Boldwood, his deviation is performed due to the inability to achieve his masculine goals. He fails as a suitor and therefore is using every possible action in order to not particularly win the heart of Bathsheba, but rather to achieve the goal of marrying her. To him marriage is perceived as not a result of love but the result of the successful implementation of his personal plans of being married.
- The storyline creates an opposition between Gabriel and Troy when William Boldwood remains a conductor through the course of the novel. Actions performed by Boldwood reflect on the development of other two characters and the emergence of their true identities. Interaction with farmer Boldwood makes Gabriel and Francis lose their public faces i.e masks and unveil their true selves. Interactions between Gabriel and Boldwood lead to the first questioning his own masculinity and the retrieval of his gender position, whereas Troy is made to switch from the eccentric easy-going military man with feminine traits to the cold-blooded and rational strategist.
- The relationships between three characters may be perceived in a form of the triangle, which is connected from three sides. Therefore, the interaction and the character development seems impossible without the existence of one of them. Their close connection also lies in the fact of shared secrets, which are used in certain way by each of them.

- In the novel, Hardy often hides the notion of gender identity in order to emphasize the commonality of male and female features in solving a number of issues. By referring to his feminine character as to “mate”, “mistress” from her employees, the writer also is making her question her feminine side, which often makes her doubt the rightness of her choice. The questions of gender is connected with the difference between Bathsheba’s personal understanding on the social norms of gender and norms accepted by the society. Considering herself from a position of public opinion, Bathsheba cannot find any reason to consider her social role controversial and in this regard uses her status through the dialogues between her and men. He herself contradicts the importance of her gender status by saying “It doesn’t matter” to Troy in one of the episodes
- Through various episodes of the interaction between main female character with the key male characters, writer, in the person of the narrator, emphasizes the key differences between his image of a woman and the classic vision on the Victorian woman. If we consider Bathsheba from the position of femininity, it shows that Bathsheba breaks many stereotypes, one of which is an ability to obtain masculine role as a farm owner.
- At the interpersonal level three masculine characters depict contrasting norms in a communication between men and women. Though they are following the norms of Victorian behavior and politeness, their interpretation differs due to the human factor hence is implemented differently.

So far the analysis on male characters is considered to be completed. Due to the involvement of male characters in the development of a main feminine character in the face of Bathsheba Everdene, their further analysis will be provided with the focus on the feminine figure.

Chapter 3

Concept of femininity in the novel “Far from the madding crowd”

This chapter is focused on the analysis of main feminine characters of the novel “Far from the madding crowd”, who are Bathsheba Everdene, a young farm owner, and Fanny Robin, Bathsheba’s youngest servant and the woman, who was promised to be married by Bathsheba’s future husband, Francis Troy. As well as masculine characters, both feminine characters are carriers of speaking names. Bathsheba’s name is an allusion to the Biblical figure of Bathsheba, who, as the novel’s character, was a love matter between two men, king David and Uriah the Hittite. As well as the biblical heroine, Bathsheba unwillingly became a matter of love

Fanny’s last name, Robin, is a name of a bird, which is a symbol of joy and happiness in literature [69]. Her last name is also an ironical symbol because while being a symbol of joy, Fanny’s storyline is, on the contrary, tragic. However, this is not the only ironical allusion due to the fact that the title “Far from the madding crowd” is a line from a poem by Thomas Gray “Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard”. It is notable that with this line Gray idealized noiseless and sequestered calm, however, Hardy, on the contrary, uses it to introduce a story, which is filled with love, fury and many other human emotions.

In order to understand the uncommon change for the feminine character in the case of the novel “Far from the madding crowd” it is needed to be explain a classical image of a woman in the literature of a Victorian literature, which is an image of a wife from “Angel in the house” by Coventry Palmore. This image represents a faithful and loyal wife with a soft and slightly disrupted voice, who’s self-sacrificing and is ready to do everything in order to her husband and family to be happy and not carrying about herself. Such a devotion has been seen by many people as a perfect example of a woman, therefore Victorian women had this role-model during the formation of their own character and behavior. [70]

The following analysis is divided into three constituents: first part is dedicated to the personhood of feminine characters, second part is focused on the actions performed during their interaction with masculine characters and the third part analyzes emotions of feminine characters during their interaction in order to distinguish deviations from the prototypical features of men and women and also to determine the linguistic means used in the novel to achieve the switch in gender roles, in particular.

3.1 Concept of personhood of feminine characters

Bathsheba Everdene is firstly described by the narrator in chapter I:

“The handsome girl waited for some time idly in her place... a small swing looking-glass was disclosed, in which she proceeded to survey herself attentively. She parted her lips and smiled... She simply observed herself as a fair product of Nature in the feminine kind, her thoughts seeming to glide into far-off though likely dramas in which men would play a part.” [61,p. 4]

From the beginning she's described as a “handsome girl” and this is worth mentioning that through the novel the appeal to Bathsheba as to the “girl” will be performed only by the author. From the point of gender identification, Bathsheba doesn't describe herself as a “girl” directly. She doesn't put a gender marker on herself but rather refers to herself as to the “fair product of Nature in the feminine kind”. In spite of this fact, her thoughts are oriented at the “likely dramas in which men would play a part”. These thoughts are strengthened with the nonverbal action of her looking at herself in the mirror. This action is usually performed by women and carries a function of self-assessment and in this piece is also done “attentively”, which articulates Bathsheba's particular interest in her feminine attractiveness. This nonverbal action is followed with another one when Bathsheba “parted her lips and smiled” to her reflection. It proves that Bathsheba is amused by her look and behaves in a self-confident manner of being not simply a “product of nature” but more a “handsome girl”. Following the table of prototypical masculine and feminine

attributes it can be stated that Bathsheba is not only self-confident but is also seeing her place in the larger world in a form of dramas caused because of her.

Fanny Robin's description is not presented directly as in the case of Bathsheba. Fanny's first appearance happens in chapter VI when Gabriel asks her for directions. The only way for the reader to create an image of Fanny is by the second part of the title of the chapter, which states "timid girl". The narrator describes Fanny through the dialogue between her and Gabriel. In this particular scene Oak was asking Fanny if she needs any money and she replies positively:

"She extended her hand; Gabriel his. In feeling for each other's palm in the gloom before the money could be passed, a minute incident occurred which told much. Gabriel's fingers alighted on the young woman's wrist. It was beating with a throb of tragic intensity. It suggested a consumption too great of a vitality which, to judge from her figure and stature, was already too little.

The young girl remained motionless by the tree, and Gabriel descended into the village of Weatherbury, or Lower Longpuddle as it was sometimes called. He fancied that he had felt himself in the penumbra of a very deep sadness when touching that slight and fragile creature. But wisdom lies in moderating mere impressions, and Gabriel endeavoured to think little of this." [61,p.6-7]

Though this episode is focused more on the action performed between two characters, which is a nonverbal action of touching hands, through this action and the description of a heartbeat the narrator describes the personal traits of Fanny. Her heartbeat is described with a "throb of tragic intensity", and by looking at the figure and stature Oak summarizes that she physically and morally exhausted. This description also correlates with the description of people, who Oak is later speaking too because rural people and those, who knew about Fanny Robin always add an adjective "too", which fits the description of the character in this piece.

Many characteristic features are also received through additional characters. Bathsheba's personality was described by her aunt in chapter IV, for example:

"You see, Farmer Oak, she's so good-looking, and an excellent scholar besides—she was going to be a governess once, you know, only she was too wild." [61,p.5]

In this piece the peculiar feature about Bathsheba's description is that her aunt is mixing two attributes, which are opposed in the table of masculinity/femininity. While being good-looking and charming is a feminine attribute, intelligence is a masculine trait, therefore by mentioning Bathsheba's appearance she's also emphasizing her intelligence. The thing her aunt criticizes here, however, is her temper, which is explained by her speech act that Bathsheba "was going to be", which has a perlocutionary effect of her being intelligent enough to obtain such a high rank, but because of her being "too wild" she couldn't achieve it.

The reader is not presented with a detailed information about origins of any of the main characters. The fact that has been mentioned about Bathsheba's origin and parents is that they were "townfolks" and also the characterization of Bathsheba's father in chapter VIII by one of her workers:

"Well, now, you'd hardly believe it, but that man—our Miss Everdene's father—was one of the ficklest husbands alive, after a while. Understand? The pore feller were faithful and true enough to her in his wish, but his heart would rove, do what he would. He spoke to me in real tribulation about it once. 'Coggan,' he said, 'I could never wish for a handsomer woman than I've got, but feeling she's ticketed as my lawful wife, I can't help my wicked heart wandering, do what I will.'" [61, p. 16]

This piece explains Bathsheba's attitude to men and the reason why she's not driven by emotions in love matters. By applying the speech act of Bathsheba's father being "one of the ficklest husbands alive" her worker carries a perlocutionary effect that he was never loyal to Bathsheba's mother, thus Bathsheba, in terms of the gender factor, perceived all men as disingenuous since the masculine model for Bathsheba was her father. He's also described with the heart that "rove" and in terms of our

analysis this characterization an important part because Bathsheba's first husband, Francis Troy, was also experiencing the same problem by splitting his feelings between two women.

The narrator doesn't give any additional information regarding Fanny Robin, therefore we are able to only analyze her from the perspective of her image. The only thing, which is noticeable, is an appeal to Fanny with the word "poor". Along the storyline Fanny is recognized as an individual, who is in a constant movement in order to achieve the goal of knowing happiness, but only finds a tragic end. The only direct description of Fanny as a character is in the chapter XLIII when Gabriel finds her dead:

"The mother had been no further advanced in womanliness than had the infant in childhood; they both had stood upon the threshold of a new stage of existence, and had vanished before they could well be defined as examples of that stage." [61, p.85]

In this piece the narrator for the first directly addresses to Fanny's gender by mentioning her "womanliness". As opposed to Bathsheba, Fanny represents classical feminine attributes and the existence of her having a child adds not only her role of a woman, but also a role of the mother. According to the social norms of Victorian society, Fanny carried function of a Victorian woman as a "child bearer" [62, p.57], which also confronts Bathsheba, who wasn't described as a mother in the novel.

3.2. Concept of emotions of feminine characters

This part of the analysis is focused on the emotions revealed by feminine characters according to a certain matter or event.

Bathsheba's attitude to her femininity is also connected with the social perception of relationships between men and women. As mentioned before, women of Victorian period were considered to be an addition to the masculine persona therefore people of older age, such as, for example, Mr. Boldwood didn't acknowledge the feminine

position in disputes. Bathsheba herself criticizes this perception during one of her conversations with Oak:

“What I meant to tell you was only this - that nobody has got me yet as a sweetheart, instead of my having a dozen, as my aunt said; I hate to be thought men's property in that way, though possibly I shall be had some day.” [61,p.5]

Bathsheba contradicts her aunt's statement that she's a love matter of different men, therefore she also declines her status of a “sweetheart”, which is a notion used by people, who have a love interest to the representative of the opposite sex, and in this manner put stress on how they perceive the person. Referring to the previous piece analyzed, in terms of gender relations the word “sweetheart” remains gender-neutral, since both men and women are able to implement it, however, this word also puts emphasis on the dependence between two individuals. Bathsheba mentions the fact that this word disgusts her in a form of a word, which appeals to the nonverbal aspect of emotion i.e “hate”. This is explained by her with the fact that this word also makes her a part of “men's property” and doesn't correlate with her personal inner beliefs. Still, Bathsheba acknowledges the fact that “some day” she “shall” reconsider her opinion, which also proves that she doesn't directly opposes Victorian views on marriage, but is rather performing a male attribute of being “self-centric” in a sort of a way by putting her own opinion above the established canons.

Fanny's views on marriage and falling in love are an opposition to Bathsheba's and also suit the established canons. Although her appearance in the book is occasional, she expresses her thoughts in a letter to Gabriel, in which she sends her regards to him:

All has ended well, and I am happy to say I am going to be married to the young man who has courted me for some time—Sergeant Troy, of the 11th Dragoon Guards, now quartered in this town. We mean to surprise Weatherbury by coming

there soon as husband and wife, though I blush to state it to one nearly a stranger.
[61, p.32]

Unlike Bathsheba, Fanny is afraid to reveal her secret to a person she barely knew. However, we are able to observe that she's also "happy" to be called a wife. While Bathsheba is considering love matters and a change of social status of becoming a "property", which provokes her emotion of hate, Fanny is on the contrary, feeling a sense of joy by mentioning her being "happy to say". Fanny doesn't perceive the matter of marriage the way Bathsheba does and in a reference to the table of prototypical masculine and feminine features she applies a canonical feature of women – she's sensitive, when Bathsheba is performing a masculine feature of showing "intelligence" in this matter due to the actual understanding of becoming someone's wife.

A moment when Bathsheba forgets about her status of a farm owner and expresses her feminine side is an episode from chapter XXI:

"He says beggars mustn't be choosers," replied Laban.

"What!" said the young farmer, opening her eyes and drawing in her breath for an outburst. Joseph Poorgrass retired a few steps behind a hurdle.

Bathsheba turned aside, her eyes full of tears. The strait she was in through pride and shrewishness could not be disguised longer: she burst out crying bitterly; they all saw it; and she attempted no further concealment.

"I wouldn't cry about it, miss," said William Smallbury, compassionately. "Why not ask him softer like? I'm sure he'd come then. Gable is a true man in that way."

Bathsheba checked her grief and wiped her eyes. "Oh, it is a wicked cruelty to me—it is—it is!" she murmured. "And he drives me to do what I wouldn't; yes, he does!—Tall, come indoors."

After this collapse, not very dignified for the head of an establishment, she went into the house, Tall at her heels. Here she sat down and hastily scribbled a note between

the small convulsive sobs of convalescence which follow a fit of crying as a groundswell follows a storm. The note was none the less polite for being written in a hurry. She held it at a distance, was about to fold it, then added these words at the bottom:

"Do not desert me, Gabriel!" [61, p.46]

From the perspective of Gabriel Oak, this episode is one of his first to show masculinity and the position of dominance during the conversation between him and Bathsheba. Gabriel's speech act sent with by one of the Bathsheba's workers also carries an indirect of a speech act with a perlocutionary effect of making Bathsheba change her position from "dominant" to "submissive", i.e perform a feminine role. Despite the fact that Bathsheba is still feeling herself a mistress, she understands that in order to save the farm she carries about, she needs to also reconsider her attitude towards Gabriel thus perform a role of a woman. She reacts to the situation by "bursting into tears", which is perceived as a feminine reaction to express bitter and being hurt. Though she doesn't want to switch to the role of a woman she writes a letter, in which she writes "Don't desert me", despite the fact that she was the person who made him leave the farm because of him criticizing her. This letter in a form of an indirect speech act, which aims at convincing Gabriel to come back to the farm. What's peculiar about this episode is when Bathsheba enters the house in order to write a letter to Oak, her worker is following her "at the heels", which is a nonverbal aspect of him being afraid of Bathsheba.

The person, who makes Bathsheba reconsider her femininity is also Francis Troy, who, as it has been described, is another suitor and Gabriel's masculine opposition. Troy's role is also connected with the matter that he is also Fanny Robin's husband-to-be. Despite the fact that Fanny mentions "being happy to soon marry him" Troy comes back to Weatherbury alone by himself and meets Bathsheba. In the previous chapter the dialogue between her and Troy has been discussed; this part is Bathsheba's perception if the dialogue with Troy:

After all, how could a cheerful wearer of skirts be permanently offended with the man? There are occasions when girls like Bathsheba will put up with a great deal of unconventional behaviour. When they want to be praised, which is often, when they want to be mastered, which is sometimes; and when they want no nonsense, which is seldom. Just now the first feeling was in the ascendant with Bathsheba, with a dash of the second. Moreover, by chance or by devilry, the ministrant was antecedently made interesting by being a handsome stranger who had evidently seen better days.

So she could not clearly decide whether it was her opinion that he had insulted her or not.

"Was ever anything so odd!" she at last exclaimed to herself, in her own room. "And was ever anything so meanly done as what I did—to skulk away like that from a man who was only civil and kind!" Clearly she did not think his barefaced praise of her person an insult now.

It was a fatal omission of Boldwood's that he had never once told her she was beautiful. [61, p. 48]

This is the moment when Bathsheba is feeling guilty for being impolite to the man. Unlike Gabriel and Boldwood, Troy wasn't trying to make Bathsheba become his wife – he was simply playing a joke with her skirt being tied to his spur. Therefore, Bathsheba, when being rude to him, acts irrationally, which is a feminine trait according to the table. The emotion Bathsheba is experiencing is a sudden compliment she has never experienced before – she is called “Beauty” for the first time by the masculine character. In comparison to Boldwood, who cared only about his own emotions and feelings and Oak doing the right thing i.e marrying a woman, who saved his life, Troy seems to care about Bathsheba's physical qualities and is assessing her as a man. By experiencing a new feeling of being praised by the man without an appeal to the personal desires and with the focus only on her persona, which is formed with a primitive speech act of labeling (Bathsheba – beauty),

Bathsheba experiences an emotion of affection to the opposite sex for the first time. It also needs to be mentioned that her being praised by Gabriel is also affected of him being her subordinate.

The emotion of falling in love is described in chapter XXVI, when Troy compliments Bathsheba again:

"I again say you are a most fascinating woman. There's nothing remarkable in my saying so, is there? I'm sure the fact is evident enough. Miss Everdene, my opinion may be too forcibly let out to please you, and, for the matter of that, too insignificant to convince you, but surely it is honest, and why can't it be excused?"

"Well, it doesn't seem quite true to me that I am fascinating," she replied evasively.

"... But surely you must have been told by everybody of what everybody notices? And you should take their words for it."

"They don't say so exactly."

"Oh yes, they must!"

"Well, I mean to my face, as you do,"

"But you know they think so?"

"No—that is—I certainly have heard Liddy say they do, but—" She paused.

Capitulation—that was the purport of the simple reply, guarded as it was—capitulation, unknown to herself.

This emotion is highlighted with the word “capitulation” due to the fact that Bathsheba doesn’t in fact know people’s feelings about her as a woman. Before meeting Troy she wasn’t analyzing herself from the feminine perspective. As mentioned earlier her perception of herself is described as a “product of nature in feminine kind”, which proves her not understanding whether she is beautiful or not. When Troy tells her in a form of a speech act, which has a perlocutionary effect of acknowledging an opinion, which is potentially shared by other people, that

Bathsheba is “beautiful” and “fascinating” she is acting “evasively”, which is a nonverbal behavior of feeling uncomfortable. It is explained with the fact that she is unable to answer the question directly because the attitude to her persona is done through the prism of hierarchical relationships. By behaving impolitely and saying without the hints and using the comparatives, which are self-centered as in the case of Boldwood, Troy’s compliments affect Bathsheba as a woman and not as a farm owner. More than that, Troy’s question of whether she knows or not what people think about her is the one that makes her “capitulate” because Bathsheba didn’t care about the opinion of other people since before that and being a farm owner her own position was masculine in a form of being self-centered. Troy’s question, on the contrary, has a perlocutionary effect to make Bathsheba reconsider her attitude to this question and potentially is planned due to his knowledge of how Bathsheba perceived people around her.

Bathsheba, after marrying Troy, always reconsiders her role and tries to gain feminine traits. The moment when she directly asks Troy about her role from the point of view of gender is when he confesses to her that he has always loved Fanny in chapter:

Troy: "Ah! don't taunt me, madam. This woman is more to me, dead as she is, than ever you were, or are, or can be. If Satan had not tempted me with that face of yours, and those cursed coquetries, I should have married her. I never had another thought till you came in my way. Would to God that I had; but it is all too late!" He turned to Fanny then. "But never mind, darling," he said; "in the sight of Heaven you are my very, very wife!"

This episode is a direct comparison of two feminine characters – Fanny and Bathsheba. Here Troy explains his marriage with Bathsheba as being “tempted” by the Satan, whereas “in the sight of Heaven” he’s Fanny’s husband. Bathsheba to him loses the role of a wife in comparison to Fanny and despite them being officially married, Troy chooses Fanny, who gave birth to his child, as his true love. Bathsheba then questions her femininity:

Bathsheba: "If she's—that,—what—am I?" she added, as a continuation of the same cry, and sobbing pitifully: and the rarity with her of such abandonment only made the condition more dire.

Troy: "You are nothing to me—nothing," said Troy, heartlessly. "A ceremony before a priest doesn't make a marriage. I am not morally yours."

A vehement impulse to flee from him, to run from this place, hide, and escape his words at any price, not stopping short of death itself, mastered Bathsheba now. She waited not an instant, but turned to the door and ran out.

Bathsheba's question is a speech act, caused by her emotions, has a perlocutionary effect of making Troy tell her the role she plays in his life. She's seen in a state of "cry" and "sobbing pitifully" as she's feeling hurt by Troy's rejecting her, which is a nonverbal aspect. Just as Bathsheba did to Gabriel she now understands Gabriel's inner emotions when the person, who you love, rejects you. When Troy replies with a speech act, which is an expressive also, Bathsheba's emotion lead to performing a nonverbal action, which is to run away from Troy and "hide". Her marriage ends with Troy's response metaphorically in this dialogue

3.3 Concept of actions of feminine characters

This part of the analysis is focused on the action performed by feminine characters in the face of Bathsheba Everdene and Fanny Robin in order to define deviations from the table of prototypical masculine/feminine attributes in the Victorian novel.

The first piece to analyze is the dialogue between her and Gabriel in chapter IV. This is the episode, which has been analyzed previously from the perspective of Gabriel and this time a stress is going to be put on the piece of dialogue said by Bathsheba in this conversation:

"Mr. Oak," she said, with luminous distinctness and common sense, "you are better off than I. I have hardly a penny in the world—I am staying with my aunt for my bare sustenance. I am better educated than you—and I don't love you a bit: that's my side

of the case. Now yours: you are a farmer just beginning; and you ought in common prudence, if you marry at all (which you should certainly not think of doing at present), to marry a woman with money, who would stock a larger farm for you than you have now." [61, p. 10]

Bathsheba's appeal to Gabriel is performed with "luminous distinctness and common sense", which reflects the nonverbal aspect of the tone of her voice. She's behaving herself from the perspective of the opposition between masculine/feminine, as a rational and intelligent participant of the dialogue. One shall remember the contradiction in the face of Gabriel, who behaved himself irrationally and held by his emotions in this dialogue. This is one of the first cases when Bathsheba's deviation from prototypical feminine features is observed. In terms of politeness, Lakoff argues that women tend to be politer during their conversations and one of the strategies of talking to women is "being polite" [13]. Bathsheba, however, can be perceived as impolite due to the harshness of her words, which also tend to be self-centric ("I am better educated than you—and I don't love you a bit"), hence performs a masculine attribute. Last but not least is that she's also becomes dominant in this conversation by dividing the matter into "her side" and "his side" because with such an argumentation Bathsheba doesn't leave any ways to contradict her, but rather agree and submit as what is done by Gabriel. The only thing left for him after Bathsheba's argumentation and the description of the situation leads him to naively say: "*That's the very thing I had been thinking myself!*" [61, p.10].

The action performed by Fanny is described in chapter XI when she visits Francis Troy in the barracks. As mentioned in the novel, she left the farm, where she's a servant, in order to pay a visit to her husband-to-be, Francis:

Fanny: "Is it Sergeant Troy?" said the blurred spot in the snow, tremulously.

Troy: "Yes," came suspiciously from the shadow. "What girl are you?"

Fanny: "Oh, Frank—don't you know me?" said the spot. "Your wife, Fanny Robin."

Troy: "Fanny!" said the wall, in utter astonishment.

Fanny: "Yes," said the girl, with a half-suppressed gasp of emotion.

There was something in the woman's tone which is not that of the wife, and there was a manner in the man which is rarely a husband's. The dialogue went on:

Troy: "How did you come here?"

Fanny: "I asked which was your window. Forgive me!"

Troy: "I did not expect you to-night. Indeed, I did not think you would come at all. It was a wonder you found me here. I am orderly to-morrow."

Fanny: "You said I was to come."

Troy: "Well—I said that you might." [61, p.26]

Nonverbal aspect in the form of Fanny's tone describes relationships between her and Troy as a "not that of a wife", whereas nonverbal aspect of Troy's manner is describes as "rarely a husband's". Fanny starts a conversation "tremulously", which points at her submission to Francis and also emphasizes her feminine attribute of "submission" against Bathsheba's "dominance". The act performed by Fanny in this episode is her coming to visit Troy, what the latter wasn't expecting. This is emphasized with his "utter astonishment", which is also a nonverbal action of emotion. Troy's indirect speech act "I am orderly tomorrow" carries a perlocutionary effect of him leaving the barracks and moving elsewhere, which is aimed to convince Fanny that she should leave. The difference in this dialogue also lies in speech acts used by Fanny and Troy in different manners: while Fanny implements the speech act "you said I was to come", which means a directive, Troy's speech act seems indirect since he's using the word "might", which carries perlocutionary effect of the speaker to consider performing a certain action, but is not obligatory. In comparison to the previous dialogue analyzed Fanny fits every feminine attribute: she's caring, emotional and shows submission and is anxious to please. Bathsheba, on the contrary, is being dominant, rational, self-centric and applies intelligence

instead of emotions to the dialogue while performing an action of rejecting Gabriel Oak.

The performance of a certain social role is another aspect of this analysis. As it has been already described, Bathsheba becomes a farm owner, which is supposed to be considered a masculine role. Still, Bathsheba doesn't want someone to rule the farm and decides to do this on her own. Her motive is described by herself in chapter X, which is called "Mistress and Men" and has two gender markers: mistress, which is a general appeal to Bathsheba in this novel and also a feminine variation of a position, and men, which is not only the marker for Bathsheba's workers, who mostly are representatives of masculine kind, but also appeals to every masculine character in the novel in general:

She then rose; but before retiring, addressed a few words to them with a pretty dignity, to which her mourning dress added a soberness that was hardly to be found in the words themselves.

"Now mind, you have a mistress instead of a master. I don't yet know my powers or my talents in farming; but I shall do my best, and if you serve me well, so shall I serve you. Don't any unfair ones among you (if there are any such, but I hope not) suppose that because I'm a woman I don't understand the difference between bad goings-on and good. "I shall be up before you are awake; I shall be afield before you are up; and I shall have breakfasted before you are afield. In short, I shall astonish you all." [61,p.24]

Bathsheba in this episode obtains her role of a farm owner and her whole speech to her workers carries a perlocutionary effect of making them acknowledge it. Her position her also deviates from feminine, since she remains self-centric by her implementation of primitive speech acts, which are repeating of the pronoun "I" and her commissives such as "I shall" "I will". Apart from that Bathsheba in this episode directly appeals to her gender and by mentioning her being a woman wouldn't change the fact that her ruling is going to be different from a masculine one. This

particular piece shows the change in the social status of a feminine character, who deviates from the classical presentation of a Victorian woman, who is considered to be carrying a role of a wife. Going back and referring to the image of a wife from “Angel in the house” it may be understood Bathsheba’s deviation from this classical image. By accepting the masculine role of a farm owner she’s refusing from the role of a caring and devoted wife due to the fact if she had performed the opposite she would have had to give the role of a farm owner to the male figure. More than that, Bathsheba puts emphasis that she, as a woman, will be able to handle the role of ruling a farm even better than a man in a form of a speech act that she “will be up before you are awake, afield before you are up” because her directive here also carries a perlocutionary effect of convincing her workers of her competence in dealing with the farm.

Bathsheba’s opposing feminine character, Fanny, also changes her social status, but not from a “farmer’s niece” to the “farm owner” like Bathsheba, but from a “timid girl” to the “mother”. Narrator doesn’t show the particular episode, in which Fanny is described to soon becoming a mother; the only episode describing it is in chapter XLII when her coffin is described:

Oak imagined a terrible discovery resulting from this afternoon's work that might cast over Bathsheba's life a shade which the interposition of many lapsing years might but indifferently lighten, and which nothing at all might altogether remove.

Suddenly, as in a last attempt to save Bathsheba from, at any rate, immediate anguish, he looked again, as he had looked before, at the chalk writing upon the coffin-lid. The scrawl was this simple one, "Fanny Robin and child." Gabriel took his handkerchief and carefully rubbed out the two latter words, leaving visible the inscription "Fanny Robin" only. He then left the room, and went out quietly by the front door. [61,p.83]

Referring to the notion of the “face” described earlier in the second chapter, one may understand the consequence of Fanny obtaining the role of a mother in the case

of relationships between Bathsheba and Troy, which happened later in the novel. Bathsheba, who doesn't obtain a role of a child-bearer and mother, who even after becoming Troy's wife is still carrying functions of a farm owner, would lose her public "face" due to the fact that her husband has a secret love affair. Apart from that Fanny's unforeseen action of dying with Troy's child has arranged her role of a classical feminine figure in the Victorian novel. Fanny remains sacrificing and devoted to Troy until the very end and her role in the novel may be perceived as metaphorical death of this classical image. The narrator doesn't give the reader a classical concept of a "happy-ending" to the story of Fanny Robin and her storyline remains to be all along a story of a "poor" Fanny Robin, yet this time the word "poor" refers to her fate and not to the social status. Speaking about Oak, it is notable him performing an act of wiping the word "child" from the coffin. This action also has a perlocutionary effect of attempting, as a classical masculine character, to save Bathsheba from the anguish, which is influenced by the unveiled truth about Fanny.

Both women obtain the complete opposite roles in the social hierarchy and also in terms of femininity. While Bathsheba tries to become a feminine interpretation of a supposedly masculine role of an owner and the master, Fanny shares the classical feminine roles of a woman, lover, wife and a mother. Fanny and Bathsheba are both in love with the same man, who is Francis Troy. However, Bathsheba doesn't hate Fanny and opposes the competition between Boldwood and Troy, since she acknowledges that Troy loved Fanny, which is proved by their mutual child. Bathsheba, however, performs an act of "atonement" as it is described in chapter XLIII:

She knelt beside the coffin, covered her face with her hands, and for a time the room was silent as a tomb. Whether from a purely mechanical, or from any other cause, when Bathsheba arose it was with a quieted spirit, and a regret for the antagonistic instincts which had seized upon her just before.

In her desire to make atonement she took flowers from a vase by the window, and began laying them around the dead girl's head. Bathsheba knew no other way of

showing kindness to persons departed than by giving them flowers. She knew not how long she remained engaged thus. She forgot time, life, where she was, what she was doing. [61,p.85]

This scene carries aspects of nonverbal communication. The action of laying flowers around Fanny's head has a perlocutionary effect of sympathizing the fate of Fanny, who despite the role of Bathsheba's rival for the heart of Troy, is also a woman, whose feminine attribute of "self-sacrificing" led to her death. Bathsheba while performing an action of "laying flowers" is at the same time applying the feminine attribute of "caring" and also "sacrificing" because she forgets her competition between them and tries to pay final respects to her.

It can be stated that Bathsheba, who in the beginning of the novel behaves and applies masculine features to herself, slowly progresses to feminine characteristics, which is caused by the external factors. Her opposition in the depiction of a feminine image, which is Fanny Robin, doesn't go through the development of her character, but as farmer Boldwood for masculine characters serves as a conductor, whose actions motivate main characters to reconsider their masculinity/femininity. As well as Bathsheba's masculine analogy in the face of Gabriel Oak, who starts as a passive figure ready to accept all fate's challenges, her character goes through the process of development throughout the storyline, which concludes in her mixing feminine and masculine traits in order to perform right actions. She remains the owner of the farm and becomes dominant, when things concern the matter of doing business, still, she reconsiders her attitude to the opposite sex and matters of love after being affected by challenges of the harsh reality.

One of the scenes to confirm Bathsheba acknowledging her feminine side is when Liddy offers her to leave Troy behind due to his love affair with Fanny and run away:

"No; I've altered my mind. It is only women with no pride in them who run away from their husbands. There is one position worse than that of being found dead in your husband's house from his ill usage, and that is, to be found alive through having

gone away to the house of somebody else. I've thought of it all this morning, and I've chosen my course. A runaway wife is an encumbrance to everybody, a burden to herself and a byword—all of which make up a heap of misery greater than any that comes by staying at home—though this may include the trifling items of insult, beating, and starvation. Liddy, if ever you marry—God forbid that you ever should!—you'll find yourself in a fearful situation; but mind this, don't you flinch. Stand your ground, and be cut to pieces. That's what I'm going to do."[61, p. 87]

Despite the fact that Bathsheba finds out about Troy choosing Fanny instead of her, she still makes a decision not to run away from him. Her personal choice is also a feminine trait of sacrificing due to the opposition of masculine/ feminine. In the conversation Bathsheba with a phrase “God forbid that you ever should” uses a perlocutionary effect of convincing Liddy not to ever make her faults and sacrifice her independence for someone else’s sake. Understanding that she has sworn to be Troy’s wife and not to lose her public face, Bathsheba has to submit to the norms of society and remain Troy’s wife. This is expressed with her assertive that “A runaway wife is an encumbrance to everybody”. Also Bathsheba underlines one of the norms of Victorian society, which might be given in an ironical manner that “being alive by having gone away” is worse than “being found dead from husband’s ill usage”. This line in particular puts stress on the situation and views on marriage in the Victorian society.

It is worth mentioning that “Far from the madding crowd” is being also criticized for the main feminine character – Bathsheba. As an example, The Westminster Review describes Bathsheba as the character: “*Mr.Hardy may be proud of, but she also a character not to be admired*”[71,p.272]. Hardy’s choice of identifying Bathsheba as a character who fights the conflict between her personality and society’s expectations confirms his understanding of the problems of a Victorian woman and gives her a voice to openly make social commentary on a Victorian patriarchal society. This is, for example, is actualized in the chapter LI:

“I don't know—at least, I cannot tell you. It is difficult for a woman to define her feelings in language which is chiefly made by men to express theirs.” [61, p.99]

In this piece Bathsheba expresses an indirect speech act with a perlocutionary effect, which points at the inequality caused by the question of gender. It also emphasizes the problem that Hardy brings through her character – question of gender roles in the society. In the end, Bathsheba returns as a wife to the new husband - Gabriel, who is greeted by his Although Bathsheba yields to Oak as a female, the narrator emphasizes her intention to do so and as she herself mentions: *“it seems exactly as if I had come courting you—how dreadful!”* [61, p.110]. One of the last Bathsheba's actions reflects how she remains independent in her life choices, which is proved by her personal action of “courting” Gabriel.

Troy creates a love triangle between him and two women – one, who is a continuation of the wife's image from the “Angel in the House” and Bathsheba created by the novel, whose characteristic features diverge from the classical Victorian canons. But things are changing when Bathsheba meets Troy – right from the very beginning she's starting to doubt her sexuality. Until their meeting we always see Bathsheba as a character, who doesn't want to accept the difference between male and female class positions. In many episodes Bathsheba was confused with a man, because she occupies traditionally the male space, she is called “sir” by her employees and asked: “Are you a woman?”

To this moment we consider the analysis of the concept of femininity on the example of two heroines – Bathsheba Everdene and Fanny Robin – to be completed. Basing on the research provided the work will be concluded in the “Conclusions” section.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions are obtained after the conduction of the analysis:

As a result of the linguistic analysis of Thomas Hardy's novel "Far from the madding crowd", the main means of constructing the gender context of the novel by the author are explicated, which include:

1. The communication between masculine and feminine characters in the novel.
2. The deviation from the table of prototypical masculine and feminine traits suggested by Irina Serova for the Victorian novel and from the table of masculine and feminine attributes proposed by Charles Barker.
3. Nonverbal actions analyzed by scholars such as Robin Lakoff and Deborah Tannen and their interpretation in the novel.

The main subject of analysis in the novel by Thomas Hardy is the linguistic means for constructing gender context. Based on the theory of speech acts developed by John Searle, notions of critical discourse analysis and the comparative mode suggested by Donal Carbaugh, main components of which include the cultural meanings of personhood, emotions, relationships and actions, the following conclusions are being made:

The most important means of constructing a gender context in the novel are situations of interaction between female and male characters, in particular acts of communication and dialogues;

To form the personal interpretation of traits of masculinity, Thomas Hardy resorts to contrasting the main characters with minor characters, who obtain prototypical masculine and feminine traits. For Gabriel, the figure of Francis Troy reveals deviations from the classical masculine image, and for the main female character - Bathsheba Everdene- the image of Fanny Robin performs this role.

It is shown that the female character of Bathsheba Everdene is endowed by the author with an uncharacteristic role of the farm owner for the era, which contradicted the norms of Victorian people due to laws and beliefs of the most of the villagers.

Her personal circumstances and beliefs led to a deviation from female traits and the acquisition of masculine qualities, which are due to her social role as the owner of the farm. Like Gabrielle Oak, she was able to gain feminine gender characteristics through interaction with male characters, as well as with another female character represented in the face of Fanny Robin.

Gabriel Oak himself, while remaining a representative of Victorian society, adjusts his personal beliefs and position of masculinity through the interaction with other male characters, as well as in the process of interaction with the main female character of Bathsheba Everdene. Only through the cases of communication with other male characters, Oak was able to restore his masculinity and move from the female traits of “submission” and “passive” to the masculine traits of “active” and “dominant”.

A linguistic analysis of the dialogue between male and female characters of the novel showed that, in general, following the prototypical model of femininity and masculinity characteristic of the Victorian era, each character at a certain point deviates from the features of femininity / masculinity suggested by Irina Serova;

The main deviations for the male character in the Hardy's novel from the prototypical traits of the Victorian novel are:

- feminine dependence vs masculine independence (the character of Oak is subordinate to the main character of the novel, Bathsheba, who in the novel performs the role of his mistress, which makes him dependent on her will and desires)
- feminine passive vs masculine active (after Oak was rejected by Bathsheba, he performs the role of an “observer” for the most part of the novel and, therefore, remains the feminine trait of passive)
- masculine rudeness vs feminine politeness (the characters of Troy and Gabriel, when interacting with female characters, often resort to an open expression of feelings, which was considered a manifestation of more feminine than masculine

traits; though this is worth noting that Troy, unlike Gabriel, performs speech acts, which are considered to be rude, thus preserving this trait as a masculine),

- feminine weakness vs masculine strength (often minor characters, such as Mr. Boldwood, resort to manipulation and blackmail and often lose temper when feel them losing the argument, which is a manifestation of weakness).

The main deviations from prototypical for a female character in a Hardy's novel are:

- masculine dominance vs feminine submission (Bathsheba becomes the owner of the farm, which automatically puts her at the head of the enterprise and gives her the status of power, which she doesn't want to lose by marrying)

- masculine rationality vs feminine irrationality (throughout the novel Bathsheba in dialogues with male characters does not lose her temper and reasonably explains her position),

- Masculine severity vs feminine tenderness (in dialogues with Gabriel Bathsheba shows the trait of severity, which is considered characteristic of male behavior),

- Masculine intellect vs feminine goodness (the quality of goodness is contrasted with the intellect of the heroine, which is directly or indirectly indicated by other characters of the novel)

The main nonverbal elements of constructing a gender context in Thomas Hardy's novel include gazing between the characters, blushes of embarrassment of masculine characters, a change in the tone of the voice, and touch of hands, are used to express the change in the emotions of the characters and their characteristic traits. Nonverbal actions are introduced by the author to emphasize the nuances of the relationships between male and female characters.

In general, the novel "Far from the madding crowd" can be assessed as one of the first literary attempts to reconsider the classical roles of men and women in the Victorian society. Using the image of an atypical but convincing main female character, Bathsheba Everdene, who alone owns a farm and builds her own fate

contrary to the ideas of others about the role of a woman, the reader and the whole society are offered a new type of woman - a woman entrepreneur, a feminine character with masculine traits of independence and power.

REFERENCES

1. Stoller R. Sex and Gender: On the Development of Masculinity and Femininity / Robert Stoller. – New York City: Science House, 1968. – 383 p.
2. Serova I. Ways to represent gender knowledge in a language / Irina Serova. – Saint Petersburg: ЯЗЫКИ славянских культур, 2009. – 850 p.
3. Serova I. Sociocultural aspect of gender development in English / Irina Serova. – Moscow: Cognitive Linguistics Issues, 2014
4. Goroshko E. Linguistic Consciousness: A Gender Paradigm / Elena Goroshko. – Kharkiv, 2003. 326p.
5. Turner B. Dictionary of Sociology / B. Turner, N. Abercrombie, S. Hill. – Boston: Penguin Books, 2006. – 496 p. – (Penguin).
6. Public Opinion // Harcourt, Brace & Co. – 1922. – p. 89.
7. Magirovskaya O. SUBJECT OF LANGUAGE KNOWLEDGE: LEVEL AND TERMINOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY [E-source] /Oksana Magirovskaya. – 2011. – Link: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/subekt-poznaniya-v-yazyke-urovnevaya-i-terminologicheskaya-slozhnost>.
8. Doleschal, 1995a - Doleschal, U. Referring to women // Reference in Multidisciplinary Perspective. Philological Object, Cognitive Subject, Intersubjective Process. Ed. by R.A. Geiger.- Hildesheim-Zürich - New York, 1995.- P. 277-298.
9. Kirillina A. GENDER: LINGUISTIC ASPECTS / Alla Kirillina. – Moscow, 1999. – 417 p.
10. Fatkullina F. Basic notions of linguocultural analysis / Flyuza Fatkullina – Ufa, 2017. -184 p.
11. Esaulova Yulia, Lisa von Stockhausen (2015) Cross-linguistic evidence for gender as a prominence feature. Source: frontiersin.org
12. Eckert, Penelope and Sally McConnell-Ginet. (1992) Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-Based Practice. Annual Review of Anthropology. P.21-28

13. R.Lakoff. Language and woman's place: text and commentaries. // Robin Lakoff// New York: Oxford University Press. - 1975
14. Weatherall, Ann. Gender, language and discourse. Hove [England]: Routledge. 2002, 177 p.
15. Pichler J. Language and gender : a reader. Coates, Jennifer, Pichler, Pia. (2nd ed.). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell. 2011.
16. West, Candace; Zimmerman, Don H. "Doing gender". Gender & Society. 1987
17. Hannah, Annette; Murachver, Tamar "Gender and conversational style as predictors of conversational behavior". Journal of Language and Social Psychology. June 1999 , p.18 (2)
18. Tannen, Deborah. You just don't understand: women and men in conversation. New York, NY: 1990 Moscow.
19. Coates, Jennifer. Women, men and language: a sociolinguistic account of gender differences in language (3rd ed.). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge. 2016. 245p.
20. Tannen, Deborah. Gender and discourse. New York: Oxford University Press. 1996
21. Kostomarov V. Linguocultural Studies and the Linguocultural Dictionary / Vitaliy Kostomarov. // The Slavic and East European Journal. – 1986. – №1. – pp. 40–48.
22. Coates, J. Women, men and language. A sociolinguistic account of sex differences in language. New York, 1986.
23. Leet-Pellegrini, Helena M. (1980). "Conversational dominance as a function of gender and expertise"
24. Petrova. Genderology and Feminology / Petrova. – Moscow: Dashkow and K, 2010. – 266 p
25. Newsome, David. The Victorian world picture: perceptions and introspections in an age of change/ David Newsome - New Brunswick, N.J. : Rutgers University Press – 344 p.

26. Kobyakova I.K Creative design of secondary formations in English-language artistic discourse: monograph / Kobyakova K.I - Vinnytsia: New book, 2007. - 128 p.
27. Ekman, P. Emotions revealed: Recognizing faces and feelings to improve communication and emotional life – New York: Times Books, 2003, - 267 p.
28. Woolard, Kathryn A. Language Variation and Cultural Hegemony: Toward an Integration of Sociolinguistic and Social Theory. - American Ethnologist. 12 (4): 738–748 pp.
29. Seidler Victor J. Unreasonable Men: Masculinity and Social Theory. – Routledge, 1993- 272 p.
30. Anderson, John R. The architecture of cognition.// Psychology Press, 1995. – 360 p.
31. Dixon, Robert M.W. What Is Language? A New Approach to Linguistic Description. –London: Longmans, Green, 1966.
32. Correa-Chávez, M. & Roberts, A. A cultural analysis is necessary in understanding intersubjectivity // Culture & Psychology. 18 (1)- pp.99–108
33. Kirch, M. S. Non-Verbal Communication Across Cultures. - Modern Language Journal 63 (8): pp.416–423.
34. Levine, Deena R. Beyond language: cross-cultural communication. – Internet archive, 1993–285p. Link: <https://archive.org/details/beyondlanguagecr00levi>
35. Ahearn, L.M. Language and agency - Annual Review of Anthropology, 2001 – 109-137 pp.
36. Street, B. Literacy and Development: Ethnographic Perspectives. - New York: Routledge. 2001, 287 p.
37. Ong, W.J. Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word. - London: Methuen, 1982
38. Baynham, Michael. Literacy Practices: Investigating Literacy in Social Contexts. – London: Longman - 1995 – 320 p.
39. Chomsky N. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. - Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965.

40. Tedlock D, Mannheim B. . The Dialogic Emergence of Culture. – Urbana: University Press – 1995, 302 p.
41. Hill J.H. Language and world view. – Annual Reviews. Liverpool. 1992. – pp.381-406.
42. van Dijk T. Handbook of Discourse Analysis / Teun van Dijk. – London: Academic Press, 1985. – 921p.
43. Tannen D. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation / Deborah Tannen. – New York City, 2007.
44. Fairclough N. Discourse and Social Change / Norman Fairclough. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992. – 272 p
45. van Dijk T. Text and context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse / Teun van Dijk. – London: Longman, 1977. – 261 p.
46. Searle J. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language / John Searle. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.
47. Labunskaya V. Non-verbal behavior: structure and functions. / Vera Labunskaya. - Rostov: “Phoenix”, 1988. - 246 p.
48. Wodak R. The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual / Ruth Wodak. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. – 189 p.
49. Holland D. Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds / Holland David. – Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2001. – 349 p.
50. Andersen P. Nonverbal Communication: Forms and Functions / Peter Andersen., - 2007. 428 p.
51. Barker, C. Making sense of cultural studies: central problems and critical debates/ Chris Barker – 2002.
52. Bucholtz M. Gender articulated: language and the socially constructed self / Mary Bucholtz. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975. – 528 p.
53. Holmes J. Women, Men and Politeness / Janet Holmes. – London: Longman, 1995. – 265 p.
54. Wright E. Lacan and Postfeminism (Postmodern Encounters) / Elizabeth Wright. – Cambridge: Icon Books. – 75 p.

55. Parsons T. Family, socialization and interaction process / Talcott Parsons. – London: Free Press, 1995. – 422 p.
56. Voronina O. Theory and methodology of gender research / Olga Voronina. – Moscow, 2011. – 234 p.
57. Carbaugh D. Cultural Discourse Analysis: Communication Practices and Intercultural Encounters [Электронный ресурс] / Donal Carbaugh // University of Massachussetts. – 2014. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238318676_Cultural_Discourse_Analysis_Communication_Practices_and_Intercultural_Encounters.
58. Achenson K. Silence in Dispute / Kris Achenson. // Arizona State University. – 2007. – №31. – Pp. 1–57.
59. Braithwaite C. Sa'ah naaghai bik'eh hozhoon: An ethnography of Navajo educational communication practices. [Электронный ресурс] / Charles Braithwaite // Communication Education. – 1997. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03634529709379097>.
60. Covarrubias P. (Un)Biased in Western Theory: Generative Silence in American Indian Communication / Patricia Covarrubias. // Communication Monographs. – 2007. – №2. – Pp. 265–271.
61. Hardy T. Far from the madding crowd [E-source] / Thomas Hardy // Cornhill Magazine. – 1874. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: http://loveread.ec/read_book.php?id=10708&p=86#gl_45.
62. Riley M. "The Ties that Bind" / Megan Riley. – Routledge: Borders and Crossings, 2009.
63. Ekman P. "A methodological discussion of nonverbal behavior" / Paul Ekman. // Journal of Psychology. – 1957. – №43. – pp. 141–49.
64. Dore J. Holophrases, Speech Acts and Language Universals / John Dore., 1975.

65. Davidko N. Oak tree symbolism [E-source] / Natalia Davidko. – 2018. –
Link: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327764931_Oak_tree_symbolism.
66. Goffman E. Interactional Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour / Erving Goffman. – New York City: Doubleday.
67. Newsome D. The Victorian world picture : perceptions and introspections in an age of change / David Newsome. – New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2006. – 310 p
68. Chisholm H. Idiosyncrasy / Hugh Chisholm., 1911.
69. A Dictionary of Literary Symbols [E-source] // Cambridge University Press. – 2007. – Режим доступа до ресурсу: https://www.academia.edu/37252353/A_Dictionary_of_Literary_Symbols.
70. Moore N. Victorian Poetry and Modern Life: The Unpoetical Age. / Natasha Moore., 2015. – 29 p.
71. Rundell M. Macmillan English Dictionary / Michael Rundell. – Hannover: Schroedel Diesterweg, 2002.
72. Shires L. Narrative, Gender, and Power in Far from the Madding Crowd / Linda Shires., 1991. – 177 p.
73. The Westminster Review. – 1866. – №30. – pp. 268–280.
74. PRATIWI R. WOMAN AS A RATIONAL BEING IN THOMAS HARDY'S FAR FROM THE MADDING CROWD (1874): A FEMINIST APPROACH / RISK A ENDAH PRATIWI., 2017. – 17 p.
75. Mugford G. Face, linguistic (im)politeness and polyphony in Thomas Hardy's Far from the Madding Crowd / Gerrard Mugford. – Guadalajara: Universidad de Guadalajara, 2013. – 13 p.
76. Griffin E. Genderlect Styles / E. Griffin. // Communication: A First Look at Communication. – 2011. – №8. – pp. 435–446.
77. Page N. Thomas Hardy: the Novels / Norman Page. – Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.

78. Leech G. *Principles of Pragmatics* / Geoffrey Leech. – London: Longman, 1983.
79. Wotton G. *Thomas Hardy: Towards a Materialist Criticism* / George Wotton. – Ireland: Gill and Macmillan, 1985.
80. Kramer D. *Critical Approaches to the Fiction of Thomas Hardy* / Dale Kramer. – London: Macmillan, 1979.

ABSTRACTS

The era of the Internet and social networks has exacerbated the discussion about gender roles, the very notions of man and woman. The ability to hide or change your gender in virtual space has catalyzed similar processes in ordinary reality. Today, gender self-identification and disputes regarding gender stereotypes and relevant gender roles are becoming more and more widespread. The attention of society is focused on the problems of the LGBTQ+ movement, people of the “third sex”, children’s conscious choice of their gender, the fight against all kinds of oppression (with the development of the new term - harassment), the planetary movement of #MeToo etc.

The issue of gender began to be widely discussed in the Victorian era - the era of rethinking cultural and social values - and which was reflected in English literature of that time.

A special contribution to the rethinking of the gender context of the era was made by the English writer Thomas Hardy. In his work, contemporaries saw a peculiar project of new ideas about masculine and feminine features, which is formed on the basis of rich linguistic tools and a transposition of gender roles. A special place in the work of Thomas Hardy is occupied by the novel “Far from the Madding Crowd”, in which the writer introduced the type of a new woman with the help of the main female character - Bathsheba Everdene. The sociocultural portrait of the era, created by the author around the life of the main feminine character of the novel, allowed to rethink the classical ideas about gender roles.

Due to the lack of the knowledge of the classic examples for constructing a gender context in the world literature in general and in English literature in particular, which are needed more than ever in our times, it seems relevant to focus on one of the examples of classical literature - the novel “Far from the madding crowd”. by Thomas Hardy.

The object of the research is the gender context (gender discourse) of Thomas Hardy's novel "Far from the madding crowd", the subject is the linguistic means of construction of the gender context in the novel. The goal of the research is to highlight and clarify the linguistic tools (methods and tools) that were used by Thomas Hardy during the formation of the gender context of the novel "Far from the madding crowd".

Chapter 1 outlines the methodology, methods and tools used for the analysis

The analysis sequence is selected on the basis of works, which are central for gender linguistics, which include the works of such linguists as Robin Lakoff, Robert Staller, Don Zimmerman, Olga Voronina etc.

In addition to the works of the linguists mentioned, the experience of modern researchers on the problem of constructing gender is also considered. This includes works of such scholars as Laurel Westbrook, Olena Levchenko, Richard Watts and others.

Despite the sufficient amount of methodological material, the issue of linguocultural aspect in the analysis of the novel remains important for our study. This question has become the subject of study in such a field of knowledge as cultural discourse analysis. Many scientists, such as Acheson, Braithwaite, Carbaugh, Covarrubias have contributed to the development in this area. In our analysis, we agree with the methodology suggested by Carbaugh, in which he distinguishes such meanings as personhood, relationships, action and emotion and will apply those meanings during the analysis, which will allow to expand the boundaries of the analysis and also identify the deviation from prototypical feminine and masculine traits depending on the context.

Chapter 2 begins with a brief analysis of the characterization of the two male characters in the novel, which Thomas Hardy gives.

The first subsection of Chapter 2 is devoted to the analysis of the masculine features of the figure of Gabriel Oak, the second - to the figure of Troy. Linguistic analysis is based on the method of identifying the opposition of male and female traits proposed by Serova. The goal is to identify deviations (deviations from the norm of masculinity for the Victorian era), manifested during the interaction of the characters with the main female character, Bathsheba Everdene. Sections consist of 1) author's description of characteristics of the masculine figure in the role of the narrator; 2) analysis of communicative situations with the participation of a character, with the establishment of cases of deviation of the image from the classic male features characteristic of the Victorian novel; 3) refinement of the results based on an analysis of the communicative interactions of the characters with the secondary characters of the novel. The speech acts of the characters in communication are analyzed, special attention is paid to the perlocutionary effect of speech acts. Attention is paid to the characteristics of personhood of the characters, the relationship between them, emotions and actions they perform. In the second section, these points of analysis are supplemented by the opposing masculine figure to the image of Gabriel Oak in the face of Francis Troy.

Intermediate conclusions are provided regarding the development of the characters of the novel, as well as their gender and social deviation.

Chapter 3 begins with a brief analysis of the characterization of the two male characters in the novel, which Thomas Hardy gives.

First section is dedicated to the constituent of personhood, in which the perception of both characters and their brief storyline by the characters and the narrator is analyzed. The analysis is aimed at finding deviations from the classical image of a woman, who is considered to be Fanny Robin due to her similarities with the tables of masculine/feminine attributes used for the analysis. Second section focuses on the constituent of emotions in order to find the reaction of each heroine to the social

situations and caused by the interaction with masculine characters. Constituent of emotion distinguishes behavior of heroines from rather feminine or masculine side of the character. Third section, which is dedicated to the constituent of action, which aims at finding deviations from classical attributes of masculinity/femininity.