**THE CONE GATHERERS**

**REVISION NOTES (SCOTS TEXT: HIGHER)**



**CONTENTS**

SOCIAL CLASS 2

GOOD VERSUS EVIL 6

NATURE 8

RELIGION 9

WAR 11

CHARACTERISATION: CALUM 15

CHARACTERISATION: NEIL 18

CHARACTERISATION: DUROR 22

CHARACTERISATION: LRC 28

CHARACTERISATION: RODERICK 32

MINOR CHARACTERS 35

Tulloch (35)

The Doctor (37)

Mrs Lochie (37)

Peggy (38)

Sheila (40)

KEY SCENE: THE DEER DRIVE 41

KEY SCENE: THE BEACH HUT 42

SYMBOLISM (THE DOLL) 48

**SOCIAL CLASS**

The opening of the novel immediately introduces ideas relating to class:

*“From the tall larch could be glimpsed, across the various-tinted crowns of the trees, the chimneys of the mansion behind its private fence of giant silver firs.”* **(1)**

The idea of the aristocratic landowners isolating themselves from the rest of society is introduced.

The opening description of Neil also indicates his resentment about class differences: *“gazed at the great house with a calm yet bitter intentness and anticipation, as if, having put a spell on it, he was waiting for it to change.”* **(1-2)**

The shed that has been hurriedly constructed by the cone gatherers becomes a symbol of injustice and prejudice: *“a greasy shed, hardly bigger than a rabbit hutch, had been knocked together in a couple of hours”.* **(12)**

The fact that human beings are being housed in such wretched accommodation with no washing or toilet facilities **-** *“the ground round about was filthy with their refuse and ordure.”* **(12)** –is a shocking example of how those in the lower classes are treated as sub-human by those at the top of the hierarchy.

Duror also reflects upon how *“They were allowed to pollute every tree in the wood except the silver firs near the big house.”* **(12)** Again, the idea is created that the aristocratic Runcie-Campbells use the firs as a barrier between them and anything they find displeasing. In addition, during the beach hut scene, Neil observes a hamper of toys and observes how they are *“rotting”* and that *“many a child in Lendrick would be glad to have them.”* **(155)** The idea of the Runcie-Campbells being unwilling to share their wealth is reinforced at this point. This scene involving the beach hut becomes one of the most important in terms of exploring themes relating to class (see section below on Chapter 11).

****

Lady Runcie-Campbell tries to justify her views on class and a rigid social hierarchy: *“She had enough experience in handling servants to know that among the working class itself was a hierarchy as jealously observed as that in church or nobility.”* **(114)** As well as suggesting that she sees servants as being like animals that need “handled” this observation makes an accurate point about the lower classes being conditioned to value status with everyone knowing their place in the social hierarchy. At the end of the novel, as Graham pleads with Neil to help Roderick and describes the boy’s goodness and popularity, he admits that *“he’s a bit soft for his position”* (210) This illuminates how deeply engrained notions of class are when characters like Graham see kindness in aristocrats as a flaw or weakness.

We also find out that Sir Colin *“believed in God…and therefore in heaven: but it was a heaven where there must be rank as on earth.”* **(136)** He believes in a natural social hierarchy and that *“It was beyond even God’s ingenuity to achieve an equality that would work.”* **(136)** This helps display the arrogance and self-satisfaction of the aristocracy in the sense that Sir Colin believes that God – whom he should see as all-powerful if he ***is*** a Christian – cannot create a fair society, even in heaven.

Sir Colin also has clear ideas about how to speak to the lower orders: *“In an infant friendliness towards inferiors was quaint and excusable…in a boy it was unfortunate; but, in a man, it would be downright disastrous.”* **(137)** It becomes apparent that Sir Colin feels that, without a rigid social hierarchy, the fabric of society would be destroyed. In addition, he feels that the claims of class should be stronger than any concerns about religion: *“If the minister was socially inferior, he must even with his robes on be treated with that correct degree of condescension which was never offensive but which indubitably was the true preserver of society.”* **(137)**

Lady Runcie Campbell believes that she *“wished her children to grow up and possess this beautiful earth as their rightful inheritance, but as the truly meek.”* **(138)** However, in her actions and words during key scenes in the novel – e.g. when expelling the cone-gatherers from the beach hut – she is setting the opposite example and engendering a class-conscious arrogance in her children, especially Sheila.

The views of Colin regarding his rights as an aristocratic land-owner are almost comical, seen when Lady Runcie-Campbell considers Roderick’s request to go for a walk on the beach: *“To admire seals in one’s own waters was of course permissible, even laudable, in her husband’s code.”* **(139)** The idea of Sir Colin claiming ownership of the sea and the creatures in it, highlights how ridiculous his notions of entitlement are.

During the beach hut scene, Lady Runcie-Campbell sees the concept of sharing the hut with the cone gatherers as utterly ludicrous. She states, *“It isn’t as if there were two rooms.”* **(159)** Here, Jenkins draws attention to the fact that aristocrats like Lady Runcie-Campbell try to erect physical barriers between themselves and the lower orders, much in the same way that their house is sheltered behind a row of silver firs, creating a clear line and demarcation between the classes. This is also seen in her reluctance to share the car with the cone gatherers when Roderick suggests doing so in Lendrick **(115).** She comments that the idea is *“absurd”.* However, Roderick rightly points out that *“Human beings are more important than dogs.”* **(116)** However, it is clear that Lady Runcie-Campbell does not share this view as the class system encourages her to see the brothers as worthless.

All the characters in the novel are aware of the hierarchy and the way that social interaction is dictated by the power dynamics in Scotland at the time. Tulloch knows that if he offends Lady Runcie-Campbell *“the District Officer, if she complained, would naturally take her side and wish to have the brothers reprimanded or even dismissed.* “ **(165)** When one considers that the supposed crime that the brothers have committed is seeking shelter in a disused building during a storm, it is apparent that Jenkins is portraying the class system as a source of injustice.

When the cone gatherers sit in the forest, sharing memories and lunch with Tulloch, the natural beauty of their surroundings is emphasised, as is the harmony that exists between these characters and nature: *“The lady could have no place in these recollections: she had then been a girl at an expensive school, acquiring polish, accent, and poise suited to her station. Between her and the sharny-toed brier-ragged heather-nibbling boys had been no kinship: just as now there was none, she in her many-roomed mansion perplexed by duty, they in a sunny hollow in her wood, throwing scraps of bread to her birds.”* **(168)**

This key description works on various levels. Firstly, it highlights the contrasting childhoods of the characters and how they were being conditioned to adopt the respective and vastly different roles expected of their classes. However, it also mocks Lady Runcie-Campbell’s upbringing and suggests that, in many ways, the younger versions of Tulloch and the brothers were much more happy and free in their exploration of their beautiful surroundings. In addition, there is a suggestion that they have moments of happiness that are beyond Lady Runcie-Campbell who is “perplexed” by her various responsibilities that come with her role as a landowner. Jenkins also refers to the lack of “kinship” between them and Lady Runcie-Campbell, due to the class divisions that are imposed upon the different layers of society from the earliest stage in their existence, with her attending an exclusive school, surrounded by children and adults who have a class-conscious view of the world and their place in it. Sympathy is created for Lady Runcie-Campbell as we sense her isolation, as well as the idea that she has never really had a chance to develop into a truly good or even contented character, due to the way she has been corrupted by notions of class from an early age. Finally, there is irony in the use of “her” to describe the land and creatures on it, as Jenkins is mocking the presumption of the upper classes in claiming that natural elements in the world belong to them.

During a dialogue with a visiting doctor, Lady Runcie-Campbell asks if Roderick will be fit enough to return to school. This causes the doctor to reflect upon the gentry’s attitude towards schooling: *“One of the most heart-warming sights in his own life was that of his two boys’ return each day from the local Academy.”* **(176)** The doctor also feels that his own home might be *“more fertile in human values as parental love and filial trust”* **(176)** which suggests that he sees the aristocratic tradition of sending children to boarding school as being indicative of a lack of parental affection. When Lady Runcie-Campbell senses his disapproval she tells the doctor that Roderick going to such a school would mean *“he would be among his equals”* **(177)** again indicating how she feels that too much contact with the lower orders is unnatural and might corrupt Roderick.

During a telephone conversation with Mrs Lochie, Lady Runcie-Campbell is initially unsympathetic when the older woman breaks down and sobs. However, her paternalistic instincts rise to the surface and she softens as she realises that, to justify her position, she must show respect to her inferiors and offer *“help and comfort”* **(178)** when they are in distress. However, it is important to note that she ignores the concerns that Duror’s mother-in-law raises with her and does not intervene to protect the cone-gatherers based on her respect for the gamekeeper as a character that knows his place in the class system and accepts it.

When Harry is delivering news of Roderick becoming trapped in the tree, he suggests that *“Maybe he’s lost his nerve, my lady”***(201)** and, despite delivering the suggestion in a timid and respectful manner, he is whacked on the head by Lady Runcie-Campbell for having the audacity to suggest any potential weakness on the part of his social superior. Her treatment of him is paternalistic to the extreme, almost like she is disciplining an unruly child, highlighting how she feels that, as a patrician, she has the right to treat the lower orders that she is responsible for as if they are children. Even Sheila is *“shocked”* at this behaviour and Jenkins tells us that she *“glared”* **(201)** at her mother.

Perhaps one of Lady Runcie-Campbell’s worst moments in the novel is seen in her reaction to being forced to request that the cone gatherers help Rodrick down from the tree: *“her son was to be saved by an obscene misshapen labourer; his virginal body was to be handled by hands, or paws rather, accustomed to bestial practices…”* **(204)** Here, her prejudice comes to the fore and she feels that someone in Roderick’s social position should not have to rely on the help of such obviously inferior characters. In addition, it is also clear that she feels her son will be corrupted by even being touched by Calum, and the reference to “paws” reinforces the impression that she sees him as sub-human and animalistic. Moreover, it is also apparent that she has believed Duror’s lies about Calum, despite obvious signs of madness in the gamekeeper. It is clearly ***ironic*** that she does not identify the true source of corruption due to her class-based prejudices.

**GOOD VERSUS EVIL**

The opening sentence *“It was a good tree”* **(1)** immediately associates the cone gatherers with goodness as they are perched in its branches.

Calum is clearly meant to represent goodness and at one point he is described as *“honest, generous and truly meek.”* **(108)** This makes him, in many ways, the character who most follows Christ’s example in the novel, making Lady Runcie-Campbell’s treatment of him more ***ironic*** and immoral.

***Lendrick:*** *Chapter 7* describes the brothers’ visit to **Lendrick.** This is an important chapter in exploring themes relating to good versus evil. Throughout the novel there are countless examples of evil actions and thoughts in the character of Duror and, to a much lesser extent, Lady Runcie-Campbell, as well as in the prejudice demonstrated in comments by Betty, Harry and others. However, the characters that the brothers encounter on their weekly trip demonstrate that human beings are also capable of goodness. When the bus picks up the brothers, the driver and conductress both grin and the *“passengers looked on in pleasure and sympathy”* **(104)** When a child tries to comment on Calum’s appearance, his mother tells him off for being “rude” but Calum soon realises that there is *“no mockery”* **(104)** in the boy’s wondering stare so they exchange smiles.

Jenkins creates a direct contrast between the wood and the nearby town when he writes: *“As if to prove to Neil that the wood was the only place where unfriendliness flourished and kindness withered, everywhere that afternoon the brothers were received with courtesy, affability, and helpfulness.”* **(104)** The policeman, the draper, the grocer, customers in shops and both the proprietor and waitress in the café are all kind and caring towards the brothers.

In the scene in the bar where the soldier makes a joke about an ape, Jenkins surprises the reader with his reaction after he notices Calum and Neil slinking out the door. Up to that point, he has been portrayed as cocky and loud-mouthed, but he is clearly mortified when he notices his mistake and he apologises repeatedly to the brothers, before downing his pint silently and leaving in shame. When others start gossiping about the brothers and the rumour about their mother killing herself after Calum’s birth and the questions about the paternity of each brother, an old fisherman says, *“they are a pair of harmless decent men…I think we should find something else to talk about.”* **(133)** After this, there is an outbreak of *“affection”* in the bar, with customers insisting on buying rounds. It is almost as if the soldier’s discomfort and Calum’s calm reaction to the incident leads to an outpouring of goodness. However, interestingly, Duror has the opposite reaction and Jenkins describes how he *“put down his glass and left.”* **(133)** The impression that is created suggests that Duror is isolated in his irrational hatred of Calum and that the effect of the cone gatherer’s innocence and goodness is positive on almost everyone he meets. By the end of the novel, we see the effect that Duror spreading his evil has on other characters with fatal consequences for the most truly good character, Calum.

Duror has strange views about evil, seen in his thoughts after telling the Runcie- Campbells that Calum is an *“evil person”* which Roderick openly challenges: *“…he smiled at the rawness of the boy who still saw evil as dwelling only in certain men and women, and not as a presence like air, infecting everyone.”* **(115)** There is a suggestion that Duror sees himself as becoming almost possessed and that he feels his madness is due to some evil influence. In addition, as the novel goes on, Duror seems to take delight in corrupting others, like Mrs Morton, therefore actively spreading evil.

Jenkins creates irony as the plot develops. Despite Duror’s obvious signs of psychological disintegration and his clearly sinister behaviour, the natural prejudices of characters who are in many ways good (Mrs Morton, Lady Runcie-Campbell, etc.) lead them to side with the gamekeeper in his persecution of the cone-gatherers, who are the most honourable and decent presences in the novel. Mrs Morton warns Roderick that *“There’s evil about”* and tells him to stay away from the *“men who gather cones.”* **(141)** The irony is that the characters are being influenced by the truly evil presence in the woods, Duror, to persecute the source of goodness – Calum.

In the scene where Roderick goes to visit the cone gatherers in the wood, and he become intimidated by Duror’s *“lurking”* form outside the hut, Roderick speculates: *“Why did he hate the cone gatherers and wish to drive them away? Was it because they represented goodness, and he evil?”* **(145)** He has clearly been coached in the notion of humans being born in a fallen state and how individuals have been given the free will by God to choose whether to commit good or evil –*“the struggle between good and evil never rested: in the world, and in every human being.”* **(145)**

Out of all the characters in the novel, only Roderick comes to sense the true nature of Duror and he is the only one who fully appreciates the true goodness of the brothers.

Through his description of the estate, Jenkins is clearly attempting to create an allusion to the Garden of Eden, which helps provide an appropriate setting to explore the conflict between good and evil. Clearly, Duror becomes like Lucifer, and he spreads evil and corruption, destroying the harmony in the forest. One clever way that Jenkins reinforces this idea is through describing him whispering his evil lies about Calum into Lady Runcie-Campbell’s ear, much like Lucifer when he takes the form of a serpent and whispers in Eve’s ear in the Bible, tempting her to commit an evil act. During their dialogue in Chapter 8, the doctor senses the *“snakes of damnation”* in Duror’s mind and, by directly connecting him to serpents, an **allusion** to the Bible is created, linking Duror with the Devil and reinforcing the **allegory** that is developed which compares the situation and characters in the estate to the Garden of Eden



**NATURE**


The opening section of the novel introduces ideas and imagery relating to nature in a subtle and complicated manner. There is a cheerful image of seals being compared to children *“playing tag”* **(1)** and disappearing *“like children gone home for tea.”* **(1)**

However, the dark side of nature is hinted at with aeroplanes being compared to *“hawks”* **(1)**, reminding the reader that death and violence is a part of the animal world, as well as the human one. Calum has an awareness of the two sides of nature, seen in his fantasy of becoming an owl that is swooping down and killing a vole. Jenkins describes Calum’s awareness of this as a *“terrifying mystery: why creatures he loved should kill one another.”* **(9)**

Nature is used in his characterisation as, by associating Calum with nature, Jenkins is suggesting that his goodness and acceptance of others is far more natural than Duror’s obsessive hatred or Lady Runcie-Campbell’s class-based prejudices. However, the two sides of nature, that even Calum is aware of, also helps enhance Jenkins’ exploration of ***good versus evil****.*

Even Duror seems to find peace and hope through the beauty of the setting. As he walks towards the big house to hatch his evil plan relating to the deer drive, he is touched by the natural beauty of his surroundings: *“It was a morning that seemed to beguile the mind with recollections of a time of innocence before evil and unhappiness were born.”* **(36)** This creates a clear allusion to the ***Garden of Eden***, and an **Arcadian** sense of simple peace and contentment through a rural setting. Linking the estate to the ***Garden of Eden*** is effective in creating an idea of a setting that is appropriate for exploring themes relating to good versus evil and corruption.

Tulloch feels that Calum is *“busy as a squirrel”* **(182)** as he gathers cones, again connecting Calum to nature and reinforcing the idea that he is at home in the trees. The fact that he is in such clear harmony with nature reinforces the contrast between him and the poisonous presence of Duror.



**RELIGION**

***Have pity on others, just as your Father has pity on you.*** ***(****Luke 6:36)*

***Caring for the poor is lending to the Lord, and you will be well repaid.*** *(Proverbs 19:17)*

***Blessed are the meek, for they will inherit the earth.*** *(Matthew 5:5)*

In Chapter 13, Lady Runcie-Campbell has a talk with her son on the subject of “pity” as a consequence of his anger at the way she has treated the cone gatherers when she ejects them from the beach hut. She asks him, *“How often has your father impressed on you the supreme importance of asserting your inherited position in that world?”* **(173)** Jenkins uses the beach hut scene and Lady Runcie-Campbell’s subsequent words and actions to reinforce our impression that she is a hypocrite. There are repeated biblical references to the way that the poor, gentle and meek should be treated (a few are listed above). However, Lady Runcie-Campbell’s class prejudices and pride blind her to the way that she should be behaving as a true Christian. The way that she chides her son, for demonstrating true Christian attitudes and behaviour, helps sum up how corrupted she has become due to her class consciousness.

When one considers the definition of the word **“meek”** (quiet, gentle, and easily imposed on; submissive), it is the perfect word to describe Calum and, to a lesser extent, Neil. The idea that Jesus had stated clearly that these sort of people would be the true inheritors of the world, suggests meek behaviour from characters should be most valued. Lady Runcie-Campbell has clearly missed some of the most important messages in the bible, based on her treatment of the brothers.

During the dialogue in Chapter 13 when reflecting on the beach hut scene, Roderick argues his case by stating a simple truth: *“There was room for us all, mother.”* **(172)** this creates a biblical **allusion** to the famous parable of *The Good Samaritan*. This is a part of the New Testament in which Jesus is asked about how to treat neighbours and he replies with a parable (or story):

***Jesus answered, "A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among robbers, who both stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead. By chance a certain priest was going down that way. When he saw him, he passed by on the other side. In the same way a Levite also, when he came to the place, and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he travelled, came where he was. When he saw him, he was moved with compassion, came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine. He set him on his own animal, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. On the next day, when he departed, he took out two denarii, and gave them to the host, and said to him, 'Take care of him. Whatever you spend beyond that, I will repay you when I return.' Now which of these three do you think seemed to be a neighbour to him who fell among the robbers?"***

***He said, "He who showed mercy on him."***

***Then Jesus said to him, "Go and do likewise."*** *(Luke 10:30-36)*

This parable highlights the flaws in Lady Runcie-Campbell as a Christian In various ways:

* *It encourages Christians to show mercy and compassion towards those who are poor and suffering and Lady Runcie-Campbell has contempt for the brothers due to their poverty and she offers no compassion when she throws them out of the beach hut and into the storm*
* *The victim in the story is a Jew and, in biblical times, Samaritans and Jews were in conflict with each other, so the parable is encouraging us to help others in distress, even those who are traditionally our enemies*
* *The references to the Samaritan transporting the Jew on “his own animal” highlights how wrong Lady Runcie-Campbell is when she refuses Roderick’s suggestion to offer the cone gatherers a lift in her car from Lendrick*
* *The Samaritan takes the Jew to an “inn”, ensures he is comfortable and pays all the expenses, which creates a direct link to how Lady Runcie-Campbell treats the brothers by not letting them shelter in the beach hut and throwing them out into the storm*

Lady Runcie-Campbell reveals how profoundly she has been influenced by her father’s views on justice and Christianity. She remembers his involvement in a *“sordid murder trial*” and how he inevitably had to sentence the convicted man to death. However, she also remembers being pregnant at the time and feeling a *“dreadful but inescapable kinship with the poor brute doomed to be hanged”* ***(*180)** In addition, she recalls confiding in her father who asks her *“how could she avoid that kinship since, when passing sentence, he had known the miserable creature in the dock to be his brother in God.”* **(180)** This relates to the Christian concept of the Brotherhood of Man and how all human beings are connected to God and, in this respect, part of a single family. The consequence of this connection is summed up by Lady Runcie-Campbell as she realises that she must try to get involved in sorting out the problems with Duror and the cone gatherers: *“By being born therefore, or even conceived, one became involved.”* **(180)**

The irony is that Roderick is the most Christian character in the novel but, every time he demonstrates this (e.g. by wanting to give the cone gatherers a lift in the car), Lady Runcie-Campbell worries about him being corrupted, suggesting how she values her place in the hierarchy more than her religion.

**WAR**

The idea of war being an unavoidable reality of the world – even in an isolated Highland estate – is introduced in the opening description of the woods. There is a destroyer in the sea loch and aeroplanes zooming down from the sky. Obviously, the locals are used to seeing the RAF and Royal navy on exercises in the remote location. There are even gunshots described in the woods, presumably caused by Duror shooting animals on the estate. With the destroyer, aeroplanes and sounds of shooting, it is almost like a war is taking place in this remote Highland location which is, of course, hundreds of miles away from the front-lines. This helps represent how the war and its effects hangs over all the characters, from Duror wanting to join up and Neil being aware of all the deaths that are occurroing.

When describing the doctor’s thoughts, Jenkins mentions how *“Mars had claimed his nymphs and paid them well”* **(20)** when reflecting on how there are far fewer maids in the house these days. They have obviously left domestic service for jobs in the munitions industry or Women’s Land Army.

The book is an anti-war novel in many ways and this is suggested by Jenkins describing Calum’s reaction to the thought of battle:

*“He had been told that all over the world in the war now being fought men, women, and children were being slaughtered in thousands; cities were being burnt down. He could not understand it, and so he tried, with success, to forget it.”* **(3)** Clearly Calum is too innocent and good to understand why any human being would ever harm another.

War has a subtle but profound impact on characters, seen when Neil considers the wireless broadcasts that describe how nations are being enslaved by the Nazis and Jews being taken to concentration camps: **“***Yet without being aware of it, the proud claims of honour and independence and courage made on behalf of his country at war affected him deeply in his own private attitude: it was necessary now for him to fight back against every injustice inflicted on him, and especially on his brother.”* **(101)** Despite realising that he is almost a slave in his own country, Neil begins to feel inspired by the boasts in the propaganda on the radio about Britain standing up against a tyrannical bully (Hitler). Therefore, he is increasingly unwilling to accept his own fate at the hands of arrogant and unjust superiors.



The treatment of the ***conscientious objectors*** is another interesting aspect of the way that the theme of war is portrayed. When they enter the café in Lendrick, the atmosphere changes. We learn that, upon their arrival at Ardmore (Neil and Calum’s usual workplace) two years previously, that *“everyone had united against these outcasts both on and off the hill.”* **(108)** However, we also learn that *“slowly and imperceptibly, like a tree’s growth, the distrust and contempt had been broken down until now the local men accepted invitations to the pacifists’ hut for supper and songs.”* **(108)** Initially, Neil had joined in the hostility towards the men as a way of allowing him and Calum to bond with the local men, *“accelerating their acceptance into the local community.”* **(108)** However, eventually he learns a valuable lesson from the conscientious objectors and their refusal to *“admit the feud or be angered by the animosity.”* **(108)** Their example and eventual acceptance into the community has reinforced Neil’s belief that *“if a man felt he had done no wrong and kept his head held high, he would become respected in the end.”* **(108)** Neil places importance in dignity and stoically enduring injustice and we learn that the conscientious objectors have played a key role in him adopting this philosophy.

We also learn that *“Calum had never taken part in the exclusion”* **(108)**, another sign of his natural goodness and empathy towards the underdog. Tellingly, Neil realises that the men are treating Calum with unusual levels of respect: *“treated him as if he was an adult human being”* **(108-109)** and *“There were some among them with university degrees who were glad to listen to him speaking about birds and animals and flowers.”* **(109)**

Despite this, we learn that the conscientious objectors are *“still not welcome in Lendrick”* **(109)** and their treatment at the hands of the villagers is in clear contrast to the way the brothers are welcomed. Interestingly, even the hostility in Lendrick is fading as Jenkins describes how their bicycle tyres were slashed one evening when they went to the cinema but now their bikes are unharmed when they leave them in the same place and Neil realises that *“hatred could not last but must give way to tolerance.”* ***(*109)**

Later, when Tulloch realises that the best course of action is to remove the cone gatherers, he considers replacing them with conscientious objectors. However, he is aware that their principled stand against the war might make them *“ineligible”* **(165)** in Lady Runcie-Campbell’s eyes. The fact that she does have contempt for them when he asks her about the men coming to the estate to replace the brothers also highlights how war can corrupt the values of potentially good characters, in this case a Christian who should be opposed to the taking of another life.

Ultimately, the conscientious objectors are used by Jenkins to suggest the goodness in humanity and how people can overcome prejudice and

the efforts of propagandists to encourage hatred for those who do not participate in the war.

Neil is also clearly aware of the war and he asks Tulloch, *“Why is it, Mr Tulloch…that the innocent have always to be sacrificed?”* **(164)** Here, he is linking Calum’s experiences to the civilians who are dying horribly in the war, saying *“In this war, they tell me, babies are being burnt to death in their cradles.”* **(164)** This is a clear example of Jenkins suggesting that what happens to Calum over the course of the novel is a microcosm of what happens in war, representing how human nature can be cruel on both a local and global scale. Tulloch has also faced personal tragedy due to the war as we learn that his brother has been killed at Dunkirk.

It is clear that the drawn out nature of the war is causing characters to feel both anxious and fatigued. Lady Runcie sees the war as a *“long bitter winter, with spring not even promised. She thought she might never see her husband and brother again, alive.”* **(171)** The responsibilities placed upon her are clearly wearing Lady Runcie-Campbell down and Jenkins makes it clear that the war casts a shadow on all the characters, no matter their social status.

Later in the novel, a doctor who travels sixty miles at Lady Runcie-Campbell’s bequest, observes that her famed beauty is fading and that her hair has *“the ashes of winter in it.”* **(176)** The doctor makes an acute observation: *“…war was no respecter of persons. The baronet and the farm-labourer were both mortal”* **(176)** However, it is not just the strain of worrying about family members that is causing Lady Runcie-Campbell to look so worn: it is also the responsibility that is being placed upon her in terms of managing the estate and her son’s attitudes towards his alleged inferiors.

When Tulloch suggests replacing the cone gatherers with two conscientious objectors, Lady Runcie-Campbell is offended by his suggestion that he does not object to the men and she says self-righteously, “*I suppose people who have men in danger cannot be expected to look with approval upon those men!”* **(189)** Ironically, Tulloch has lost a brother in war but he still refuses to castigate the conscientious objectors, highlighting, once again, his moral superiority to other characters, including Lady Runcie-Campbell. During this dialogue, Tulloch recalls how the men had *“This is the den of the yellow-bellies”* **(189)** scrawled on their hut when they first arrived but that they had refused his offer to have the paint scrubbed off, highlighting how they are not ashamed of their principled objection to the war and there is an implication that Tulloch has come to approve their stand.

Tulloch also comes to an interesting conclusion when he considers Duror’s motives for hating Calum so much: *“…men were blowing one another to pieces without personal bias or hatred, in pursuance of their respective ideals. Why then seek an explanation of one childish grudge?”* **(194)** This connects Duror’s warped behaviour to humanity on a wider scale – it seems that Jenkins is using the war as an example of how hatred and prejudice can lead to death and horror on a massive scale, just like Duror’s persecution of Calum results in the murder of a single individual. Both Duror and the war come to represent the capacity for evil in all human beings.

Sir Colin obviously sees the national unity that develops during the war as a potential threat to the social order. Lady Runcie-Campbell imagines him lecturing her about her failure to resolve the situation between Duror and the cone gatherers: *“They’re still brutes under the skin, y’know. It’s taken centuries of breeding to produce our kind. For God’s sake, don’t get us mixed. After the war, they’ll be trying to drag us down to their level. It’s up to us to see they don’t manage it.”* **(198)** In reality, there was a demand for an improvement in the lot of the lower orders as they returned from war, leading to a massive social housing programme and the emergence of the National Health Service. Therefore, the social change feared by Sir Colin arrived and Jenkins knows this and creates irony in Sir Colin’s fears, as he wrote the novel a few years after the war ended.

At the climax of the novel, Baird is accompanying Lady Runcie-Campbell to see the cone gatherers and he thinks about possible rewards and his musings are rooted in class-consciousness as he remembers how *“in the war, for instance, there were different medals for privates and officers, although they fought in the same battles.”* **(218)** Here, Jenkins links two of his central themes: social class and war. He points out that there is a rigid social hierarchy and sense of privilege in the army which reflects the class structure of British society in general.

Immediately before she hears the gunshot announcing Duror has murdered Calum, Jenkins describes how Lady Runcie-Campbell sees a warship as it *“steamed down the loch”* **(218)** which connects to the opening description in the novel where a destroyer is present in the sea loch behind the brothers as they gather cones. This gives the novel ***unity of structure*** and also has the machinery of war providing a fitting backdrop to the events in the novel (framing both the opening and ending), symbolising humanity’s capacity to hurt others immediately before Duror demonstrates this on a very personal level.




**CHARACTERISATION: CALUM**

Calum has an affinity with nature and we are told that “the tree-top was interest enough” **(2)** suggesting that he loves being surrounded by the wildlife and greenery of the forest.

He is described as *“indigenous as squirrel or bird”* **(2)** suggesting that he is at home in the animal world and in the treetops. Later, as Tulloch observes Calum in a tree gathering cones, he sees him as *“indigenous”* and *“happy”* **(182).** This reinforces the idea that Calum is naturally at home in the trees and in many ways he is too good to lower himself to ground level and interact with the corrupt and flawed characters that surround him. Towards the end of the novel, Graham considers asking Calum directly to help Roderick but realises that he *“had no opinions at all, any more than a squirrel or seagull had.”***(211)** Again, this links Calum’s simplicity to the wildlife around him, highlighting both his innocent superiority to others, as well as his isolation from the human characters in the estate.

When we are told that *“chaffinches fluttered round him”* **(2)** it creates an ***allusion*** comparing Calum to ***St Francis of Assisi*** who described birds as his friends and is often portrayed with a bird in his hand or surrounded by creatures from the animal kingdom. Later we are told of Calum having *“fed more than half of his morning slice of bread”* **(66)** to the finches, again creating an allusion to St Francis. Later we discover that Calum is known in Lendrick for speaking to *“the dogs in the street and the birds in the sky”* **(109)** reinforcing the connection to St Francis. This idea of Calum being saint-like and a friend to all, animal or human, highlights his moral superiority and goodness.

******

In the opening chapter, whilst waiting for his brother, Calum listens to owls hooting *“as if he was an owl himself”* and he has a fantasy about swooping down and capturing a vole in his *“talons”.* However, this part of nature troubles Calum and he is unsettled by the *“terrifying mystery, why creatures he loved should kill one*

*another.”* **(3)** When Duror approaches the tree to inform the cone gatherers of their role in the deer drive, Jenkins actually makes a direct comparison between Calum and animal:*“He became like an animal in danger with no way of escape. He began to whimper…”* **(67)** Here, Calum is described as (and acts like) the victim of a predator in the wild, enhancing our appreciation of his innocence and vulnerability. Finally, Calum has such a strong empathy for the deer at the drive’s conclusion, he almost switches places with them (**See Notes below in Deer Drive Section**)

***Calum As A Child***

From an early stage in the novel, Calum is also associated with a child, e.g.*“He could not understand it, and so he tried without success, to forget it.”* **(3)** His simple-mindedness and innocence is used by Jenkins to help enhance our understanding of other characters. Neil’s self-sacrifice and protectiveness towards his brother accentuates the fact that he is a naturally good character. Duror’s irrational hatred increases our hostility towards his character and also creates a link between him and Nazism, as they believed in eradicating humans with physical or mental disabilities.

Calum is also child-like in how he struggles to make sense of the world and that is why he is happiest when surrounded by nature and working in silence. Jenkins describes the *“bondage of talk”* suggesting that Calum feels trapped and miserable when involved in discussions he does not understand.

There are various occasions when the child motif appears in descriptions of Calum:

*“he would have to rush past, tears in his eyes, fingers in his ears.”* **(7)**

Like a child, Calum instinctively covers his ears to avoid hearing the sound of the distressed rabbits in their traps. Despite promising to avoid trouble, Calum cannot help freeing a trapped rabbit: *“he had not decided in terms of right and wrong, humanity and cruelty; he had merely yielded to instinct.”* **(7-8)** This is, again, child-like in the sense that children do not have a fully developed sense of morality and they act upon instinct without thinking through the consequences of their actions. Neil adopts the role of a parent but, significantly, he points out Calum’s childish actions: “*You’re a man of thirty-one, not a child of ten.”* **(8)** Ultimately, the repeated comparisons create a child motif that enhances Calum’s characterisation and connects to theme relating to religion as Jesus instructed hi s followers never to turn children away from him as they would “inherit” the earth one day, making Lady Runcie-Campbell’s treatment of Calum all the more un-Christian.

In a moment of bitterness, Neil almost falls into self-pity and he tells Calum, *“You’re a child, Calum. Though you’re past thirty, you’re still a child; and you’ll always be a child.”* **(99)**This piece of dialogue helps explain Neil’s motives for staying with his brother who could not hope to survive on his own.

Calum has a strong love for his brother: *“Every time he caught his brother’s foot and set it on a safe branch it was an act of love.”* **(6)** When Neil accidentally stamps on Calum’s fingers as they are climbing down the tree in the dark, he *“uttered no complaint but smiled in the dark and sucked the bruise.”* **(6)** His love of Neil is also shown when he says, *“I’ll do it. I’ll drive the deer.”* **(73)** He is prepared to participate in an activity that must terrify him if it means keeping Neil out of trouble.

Neil also recognises his own inferiority to his brother in many respects. He tells Tulloch, *“He’s got no bitterness in him…for the lady or anybody else. Not even for the gamekeeper.”* **(183)** Neil himself displays bitterness on various occasions as he is rightly incensed at the way the brothers are treated. However, in many ways, Calum is even more the victim of prejudice and class-based injustice but his natural goodness means that he never resents other characters, no matter how much he is provoked.

A ***biblical allusion*** is created in the final description of Calum’s lifeless body hanging from the tree: *“He hung therefore in twisted fashion, and kept on swinging. His arms were loose and dangled in macabre gestures of supplication.”* **(219)** This description of Calum’s dead body creates a Crucifixion analogy, connecting Calum to Christ on the cross. Like Christ, Calum has died due to the sins of others and he is completely innocent. In addition, Christ’ death was meant to be good in the sense that others learned from it and altered their own behaviour by following his example of self-sacrifice. This helps explain Jenkins purpose in the final sentence as he describes Lady Runcie-Campbell’s reaction to the sight, and the way she feels *“pity, and purified hope, and joy”* **(223).**Despite Calum not offering himself up willingly, there might be an implication that God is sacrificing him so that others can become better characters, like he did with Jesus.

****

**CHARACTERISATION: NEIL**

Neil is portrayed – from the earliest stages in the novel – as being incredibly resentful about the way the brothers are being treated. The refusal to let the cone gatherers stay in the summer house becomes a symbol, for Neil, of class-based injustice and he tells Calum:

*“No, we would soil it for them; and as soon as the war’s over it’s to be knocked down anyway. It just wouldn’t do for us to be using what the grand folk once used.”*

Later in the novel, Jenkins actually makes a direct comment on the big house’s **symbolic** value to Neil: *“Another hindrance had been the constant sight of the mansion house chimneys, reminding him of their hut, which to him remained a symbol of humiliation.”* **(64)**

Despite his hatred of the way that they are treated by their so-called superiors, Neil conforms to expectations and acts in a submissive manner in the presence of aristocrats:*“Those people represented the power of the world, and so long as he was humble it would be benignant.”* **(64)** Neil is sharp enough to understand that the power dynamics in his society mean that he has to accept being treated in a disrespectful and contemptuous manner as he has no means of challenging those at the top of the social hierarchy without losing his job or other consequences. He also feels a grudging gratitude towards Lady Runcie-Campbell when she does not ask for their dismissal after the deer drive but his feelings of powerlessness are clear, comparing him and Calum to *“insects”* and *“tiny flies”* but not to *“bees or ants which could sting or bite”* **(98).** The **imagery** used here suggests that he feels defenceless and vulnerable against the upper classes who control their lives.

Despite Neil’s bitterness at the way he is treated, he still cannot help conforming to expectations and acting in a subservient manner when in the presence of the upper classes. In Lendrick, Roderick says hello to the cone gatherers, then his mother gasps when she sees whom he has greeted so warmly, but: *“Neil’s dignity and composure…crumbled to the abjectness of a peasant. He fumbled at his cap.”* **(110)** Doffing (taking off) caps and hats is a traditional way of acknowledging the superiority of someone who has addressed you. Therefore, Neil instinctively acknowledges his place in the hierarchy, despite his anger at the injustice of the class system. ***(See notes on beach hut for more examples of his intimidated behaviour in the presence of his social superiors).***

However, towards the end of the novel, Neil begins to feel increasingly bitter and this leads to him developing rebellious thoughts. He is *“almost incoherent”* **(161)** when he telephones Tulloch to tell him about the beach hut incident. As well as this, Neil – who is a very dignified character – breaks down in front of Tulloch when they meet the next day to discuss the incident. During the dialogue between the two characters, Tulloch raises the possibility that Lady Runcie-Campbell might say she is sorry when he goes to see her. However, Neil asserts his dignity when he tells Tulloch, *“it would not be an apology at all if she said it to you.”* **(167)** The fact that he would insist on hearing a personal apology from a character who has far more status in the warped society they live in, indicates how Neil feels he is being asked to endure too much injustice and he no longer accepts being treated as sub-human.

Despite there being many reasons for his sense of injustice, Neil’s resentment and pride lead, in some ways, to the fate that befalls Calum at the end of the novel. By refusing to answer Lady Runcie-Campbell’s plea, Neil remains in the tree where Duror is able to track the brothers down, away from the possible protection of the other characters. He tells Graham that *“We are not her servants”* **(208)** and, at this point, all his bitterness at the unjust treatment they have received from Lady Runcie-Campbell emerges, which results in his refusal to be ordered about by her. He explains that they have been treated *“lower than dogs”,* a reference to how Monty is seen as having more value than the brothers as far as Lady Runcie-Campbell is concerned. Despite his disbelief, Graham is *“impressed”* **(209)** by Neil’s determined resistance to the established social order.

Neil is a wonderfully protective and loving brother. In Chapter 1, we are told *“To look after his brother, he had never got married, though once he had come very near it: that memory often revived to turn his heart melancholy.”* **(5)**

Later in the novel, we learn of the rumour, perhaps true, that their mother killed herself soon after Calum was born. Without having to look after his brother, Neil would more than likely have a better job and comfortable living quarters. There are, therefore, many reasons why Neil might resent his brother, but he does not and this proves his true goodness. In fact, despite occasionally getting frustrated with Calum, e.g. when he finds out that his brother has tasted an acorn and he tells him, *“No wonder they come and stare up at you, as if you were a monkey”* **(4)***,*Neil recognises that Calum is superior to others: *“Is it daft never to be angry or jealous or full of spite? You’re better and wiser than any of them.”***(5)**

Neil’s protectiveness also comes to the fore when he talks to Tulloch in the aftermath of the beach hut incident, telling the forester that he feels “responsible” for Calum although he does not know *“to whom I’m to give account for the way I’ve looked after him”* **(163)** The reader comes to appreciate that Neil has made huge sacrifices (including not getting married when the opportunity presented itself) so he could look after his brother and that he has just naturally adopted the role of protector without ever complaining or feeling a grudge against Calum. As Tulloch points out *“No man on earth has ever looked after his brother so well*” **(162)** Tulloch also sees that Neil’s rheumatism is causing him so much trouble that *“it was as if, in some terrible penance, he was striving to become in shape like his own brother.”* **(164)** This idea of him stooping over, like Calum has had to do all his life due to his hunchback, strengthens the connection we see between the brothers.

Neil is also *“overwhelmingly moved to tenderness and stoicism by the sight of his brother’s misshapen body”* **(103)** as they wash in a stream. We are already aware of his compassion towards his brother but *“stoicism”* helps us understand that his feelings of sympathy and loving protectiveness towards his brother mean that he feels that he will endure suffering and injustice if it means helping Calum.

Jenkins also describes how*“the most persistent obstacle to his happiness was, of course, the fear of what would become of his brother if he were to die.”* **(64)** This also highlights Neil’s loving, selfless and responsible nature, as he does not fear death, only what would happen to Calum without Neil being there to protect him. His one real pleasure is the weekly visit to Lendrick where the locals have accepted him and his brother. He cherishes going to the pub where the *“pint of beer in his hand would be the token of his membership of the community.”* **(65)** It is clear that Neil seeks acceptance and he does not enjoy the isolation that taking responsibility for his brother has added to his own existence. He values self-respect and dignity. This impression is reinforced when Neil is pointing out Calum’s childishness: *“But I’m a man, and I’ve got the intelligence and pride of a man”* **(99)**

We learn that Neil is fascinated by ships and that he once confessed to Tulloch that *“if he had not had Calum to look after he would have been a sailor.”* **(106)** Again, Jenkins helps us appreciate just how much Neil has given up. He has a desire to see the world but he is stuck living in a comfortless hut with his brother because he refuses to abandon him.


Despite Neil clearly feeling an affection for the conscientious objectors, he initially participates in ostracising them when they first arrive at Ardmore. This is because he wants to feel part of the community and uses the arrival of the conscientious objectors as an opportunity to gain acceptance for him and his brother by ostracising these men for not fighting in the war. Even after he has befriended the men, he does not defend them when they suffer hostility in Lendrick. Jenkins describes how he *“knew he was wrong in not speaking up in defence”* **(109)** of the men but he feels he *“could not risk being driven from the fold”* **(109)** again showing how desperate he is to be accepted by others and highlighting how much he hates being isolated.

Neil is clearly suffering a lot of pain due to his rheumatism, making his treatment during the beach hut scene even more shocking. In the aftermath of the scene, it becomes clear that being exposed to the storm has exacerbated his pain. Tulloch observes him, from a distance and *“Neil looked like an old man.”* **(162)** However, Tulloch is moved by Neil’s stoicism and clearly admires him, seeing his true qualities because he is not blinded by class prejudice like Lady Runcie-Campbell. He even perceives the sight of Neil gathering cones as *“noble and beautiful”* **(163)**

During his dialogue with Tulloch, we see Neil’s goodness, even when he admits to Tulloch that he deliberately lied to him the previous night when he had told the forester that their hut had leaked during the storm. He has been driven to the lie because he has become so frustrated at the injustice facing him and his brother and the fact that he has no power to improve the situation. He tells Tulloch that he wanted *“revenge”* and that *“She was beyond me, so I told you a lie that would hurt you.”* **(166)** This sums up his frustration at how Lady Runcie-Campbell remains untouchable and beyond criticism, despite the obvious errors she is making.

Neil is obviously wracked by guilt about lying to the honourable Tulloch and he tells the forester**,** *“I deserve no mercy.”* **(166)** However, Tulloch again demonstrates his moral superiority and integrity when he smiles and immediately forgives Neil, having a natural empathy and understanding that is beyond Lady Runcie-Campbell. It is also obvious that Tulloch sees that Neil is a morally superior and loving character who deserves all the sympathy in the world, due to the injustice of his situation.

The plot of the novel builds up to its ***climax*** mainly because Neil can no longer take the injustice of his situation and Lady Runcie-Campbell’s treatment of Calum. His refusal to come running to help Roderick is the ***crisis point*** in the novel. Jenkins makes sure that we sympathise with Neil even though he is leaving another admirable character – Roderick – in danger.



**CHARACTERISATION: DUROR**

In the opening chapter, Jenkins creates hostility towards Duror when we learn that he had *“sworn that he would seize the first chance to hound them out the wood”* over the incident when Calum had released two rabbits from traps. Inaddition,Calum has an instinctive terror of and aversion towards the gamekeeper:*“Calum, demoralised as always by hatred, had cowered against the hut, holding his face.”* **(7)**

It is the first description of Duror’s actions that sets the tone for the rest of the novel: *“He had waited for over an hour there to see them pass.”* **(11)** We learn, later in the novel, that the estate is short-handed due to men being at war, so the fact that Duror gives up so much time out of his busy day to wait to spy on the cone gatherers, immediately establishes that he hasan irrational, obsessive hatred of them.

Duror has always seen the wood as his *“stronghold and sanctuary”* **(12)**but the arrival of the cone gatherers makes him feel like this special place has been *“defiled”* **(12)**or, in other words, lost its purity and innocence. The ***irony*** is, of course, that Calum is the most pure and innocent character in the novel. It is also made apparent that Duror’s objections to Calum are purely based on his appearance, as he sees him as *“one of nature’s freaks”* **(12)**Interestingly, one of the elements of Calum’s appearance that Duror finds particularly offensive is his beautiful, angelic face which he feels is a *“diabolical joke”* **(12)** The word diabolical is associated with The Devil, making Calum almost demonic and evil in Duror’s eyes. In addition, Duror is also sickened by Calum’s ability to carve wooden creatures and the fact that he creates wooden statues that are *“almost alive”* **(15)**

In the early stages of the novel, we also learn that Duror has always had an instinctive and inexplicable prejudice against any creature that is deformed:

*“Since childhood Duror had been repelled by anything living that had an imperfection or deformity or lack: a cat with three legs had roused pity in others, in him an ungovernable disgust.”* **(12)**

There is a hint – that only makes sense as we read on in the novel – that Duror is ready to crack up and that his marriage has become an intolerable burden to him:

*“”he had been under a compulsion inexplicable then, and now in manhood, after the silent tribulation of the past twenty years, an accumulated horror, which the arrival of these cone-gatherers seemed about to let loose.”* **(13)** The word *“tribulation”* suggests a period of great suffering and we begin to realise that Peggy’s condition and growing physical repulsiveness have become an ordeal that he has endured in silence. However, seeing Calum has caused a reaction that is linked to his feelings about his wife, and leads to insanity. When Peggy is first mentioned in the novel, Jenkins offers a concise, blunt description: “*for the past twenty years she had lain in bed and grown monstrously obese; her legs were paralysed.”* **(20)**

In addition, during a dialogue with the doctor, he is blunt and asks Duror,*“Since your wife’s illness you have never had relations with her.”* **(124)** He sees Duror’s clear signs of instability as being caused by the lack of physical intimacy between him and Peggy. The doctor rightly sees Duror’s life as miserable and seems to admire his stoicism: *“You’ve got a burden to carry, it’s getting heavier as you grow older.”* **(125)**

Duror is meant to symbolise Nazism with its belief in eugenics and racial purity. He perceives Calum as a *“half-man, a freak, an imbecile”* **(15)** In addition, a direct link with Nazism is created when Jenkins describes how *“He had read that the Germans were putting idiots and cripples to death in gas chambers. Outwardly, as everyone expected, he condemned such barbarity; inwardly, thinking of idiocy and crippledness not as abstractions but as embodied in the crouch-backed cone-gatherer, he had secretly approved.”* **(15)** The **irony** is that Duror has tried to enlist to fight the Nazis but been turned down for being too old. We hear of his *“envy”* **(22)** towards young John Farquharson who is off fighting in Africa but he would be fighting a regime that he secretly approves of.

We also learn – during a dialogue between Duror and Captain Forgan, Lady Runcie-Campbell’s brother – that Duror would *“prefer to be going with you”* **(39)** when he returns to war but that the army have turned him down three times, presumably due to his age. The irony is that he is desperate to be fighting the Nazi regime, but he has prejudices against the disabled and a belief in eugenics and the master race which makes him close to their ideology. In addition, perhaps his desperation to go to war is rooted in his desire to escape his wife and his miserable domestic life.

Later in the novel, when Duror’s sanity is breaking down, we see more evidence of his irrational hatred of Calum: *“…he knew there was one thing on earth he did not want ever again to see: the smile of the hunchback. He swung from it as a pony from an adder.”* **(117)** The thought of someone as deformed as Calum living a happy existence seems to cause a violently hostile reaction in Duror which is irrational and instinctive.

During his dialogue with the doctor, when he makes his false claims about Calum masturbating in the woods, Duror is asked whether he kicked the cone gatherer up the backside and he replies *“I would never have soiled my foot.”* **(123)** This creates the impression that he feels Calum’s physical deformities make him unclean. He also tells the doctor, *“This is hardly a man.”* **(123)** This chilling statement is another indication that Duror sees Calum as sub-human, particularly as he avoids using the personal pronoun, “he”. Furthermore, the doctor is also perturbed by the *“ferocity”* **(123)** of Duror’s tone when discussing Calum, with the word making us think of a wild predatory animal.

Obviously, Duror’s madness is connected to his disgust at Peggy’s condition. He is clearly repulsed by his wife and Jenkins describes how *“with a shudder”* **(25)** he enters her room. After speaking to Lady Runcie-Campbell later in the novel, Duror has a violent fantasy: *“She had not seen him suddenly grow enormous and loom over her like a tree falling; she had not heard him shout, in a voice to be heard in the heaven of her faith, that in the wood his wife had changed for an instant into a roe-deer and he had cut her throat and tried to appease his agony in her blood.”* **(116)** There is a lot going on here – firstly, the tree motif makes another appearance in the novel. In addition, he sees himself as a “falling” tree, creating a ***biblical allusion*** to ***The Fall***, linking him once more with corruption. However, it is at this point that Jenkins explicitly reveals Duror’s homicidal hatred of his wife, just in case we hadn’t guessed his motives for his strange behaviour in the deer drive already.

Duror also feels a strange affinity with the cone gatherers which adds a strange layer to his obsession. His mind often wanders to the hut and, at one point, he actually finds himself almost jealous of the peace they have there compared to his own domestic environment: *“…suddenly he realised that he was envying the tranquillity and peace of mind in the cone-gatherers’ hut.”* **(30)** This envy actually adds even more intensity to Duror’s hatred as he feels that the brothers’ presence has corrupted him and blames them for the madness that starts to consume him.

Duror’s own domestic circumstances – with his repulsion for his wife and his eagle-eyed mother-in-law constantly reminding him of his coldness – adds a layer of ***pathos*** and ***sympathy*** to his **characterisation**. Mrs Lochie points out that he spends more time with his dogs than his wife and he does prefer their company. However, he is aware that they sense his turmoil and that they almost fear him: *“…afraid that it might at any moment goad him into maltreating them.”* **(34)** He actually does have a moment where he fantasises about *“thrashing them till their noses and eyes dripped faithful blood.”***(34)** It becomes clear that he is very close to losing control and descending into murderous violence. His isolation and decades of suffering, as well as his awareness of his impending loss of sanity, add an element of sympathy to his characterisation. When he returns to his house, he is informed that his wife *“sobbed herself to sleep”* then Mrs Lochie herself can be heard *“sobbing.”* **(35)** Again, being surrounded by all this misery, year after year, makes us feel sorry for Duror, as well as helping us understand why he has an emotional and psychological breakdown. At the end of chapter 2, he mutters that *“It is too late.”* **(35)** Duror himself does not know what he means but he senses what is happening to him and that there is no hope of a painless solution to his ***internal conflict***. When Jenkins tells us that *“he felt as terrified and desolate as an infant separated from his mother in a great crowd.”* **(35)** it becomes apparent that he has a profound sense of isolation as well as a despairing hopelessness.

Duror also seems aware that he is corrupt and that he is involving others in his moral degradation: *“His tragedy was now to be played in public: it must therefore have a crisis, and an end.”* **(41)** By creating a link between his own situation and a tragedy, Jenkins makes us aware that Duror knows that his fall is going to involve the destruction of others, as well as himself. Tragedies involve the self-destruction of a character due to a ***hamartia*** (or fatal flaw) which results in their downfall. Of course, the ending of the novel, with Calum’s murder, and Duror’s suicide, means that this ***imagery*** helps to create ***foreshadowing*** in the novel. His suicidal tendencies are also revealed to other characters when we are told he tells Lady Runcie-Campbell: *“I’ll live till I’m eighty, my lady,” he said, in an agony of bitterness.”* **(89)**

He also seems to delight in involving the morally upright ***Mrs Morton*** in his corruption, playing strange power games with her: *“…he thought that the surely the next step in the drama should be the involvement of her.”* **(42)**

As he hints that he is attracted to her, she begins to blush and he wonders *“To his own destruction, and the cone-gatherers’, ought he to add hers?”* **(44)** He does not really have any genuine desire for her but he seems to get a perverse enjoyment of seeing how far he can corrupt her.

When Lady Runcie-Campbell is on the phone to Tulloch to request the cone- gatherers’ involvement in the deer drive, Jenkins describes how Duror has a *“strange clear neutrality: his ignoring of Peggy, his lying to Mrs Morton, and above all his resolution to torment the cone gatherers and destroy them, if he could.”* **(57)** One of the most chilling aspects of his behaviour is how cold and unfeeling he is, no matter how perverse and immoral his actions are, creating a subtle link once more between him and Nazis as they exterminated their enemies in a cold, systematic manner.

Duror’s lies about Calum are where he begins to lose any sympathy previously generated. Mrs Morton cautions him about the potential consequences of Duror’s claim that Calum has exposed himself in the wood: *“The wee one would be dragged off to jail or the asylum, and the big one would break his heart.”* **(48)** However, Duror’s response is callous and Jenkins establishes that he would relish this destruction of the cone gatherers’ peaceful existence due to his lies.

As Duror’s sanity unravels, he has visions, e.g. *“he suddenly saw himself standing up to the neck in a black filth, like a stags’ wallowing pool deep in the wood.”* **(51)** This vision ***symbolises*** how he realises that he is going to be destroyed by his own corruption. He also considers suicide from an early stage in the novel, particularly when his courage fails him as he climbs the tree to break the news about the deer drive: *“His gun was close by; he thought that, salvation being impossible, it offered at least an end.”* **(73)** The fact that he sees himself beyond hope (or salvation) adds to the impression that he is in despair and beyond redemption – and he knows this.

This incident when Duror panics when he is climbing the tree to give the brothers the news about the deer drive only serves to increase his hatred of the cone-gatherers, due to his “shame”, and *“He had never dreamed that he would not be able to do once only what the hunchback did several times a day.”* **(71)** His failure to achieve what Calum can do increases Duror’s bitterness and feelings of inadequacy.

We also discover that Roderick has *“disliked”* **(53)** Duror for years after seeing him with a dead roe deer. Like Calum, Roderick seems naturally repelled by death and Duror’s role in killing animals. The impression that Duror comes into conflict with any good character is seen when he considers agreeing to Lady Runcie-Campbell’s request to have her son involved in the shooting of the deer as he could hurt himself by accident and this event might make her “*inconsolable, for all her goodness and beauty”* **(54)** He feels that this might *“add this shade to the encompassing darkness”* **(54)** which is another example of him seeking ways to corrupt and hurt those characters who try to choose goodness.

As Duror becomes more deranged, it becomes clear that he is ready to lash out at someone, with the most obvious target being Calum. However, after the dialogue with the doctor Duror heads for the nearest bar with violence on his mind: *“he felt in a mood for murder, rape, or suicide.”* **(128)** He also considers picking a fight in the bar and feeling *“his fist crashing against someone’s face.”* **(128)** It is clear that he is a danger to everyone, and not just Calum.

As the novel reaches its horrifying climax, Graham tells Duror of the situation with Roderick and Neil’s refusal to help, and the gamekeeper grabs the old man: *“Duror’s face was so compulsively fascinating that pain, indignity, and even fear, were momentarily forgotten. He could not have described that expression…”* **(212)** Increasingly, as the plot develops, we see Duror more from a distance and do not share his thoughts as intimately as we do in the early chapters, when we are often restricted to his perspective. Here, we are left to imagine Duror’s expression, with the assumption being that he is in a state of fury at Neil’s audacity, which threatens his belief in a rigid social hierarchy, as well as creating anger in Duror through his resentment at the idea of Neil feeling that he and his brother are human.

Lady Runcie-Campbell is the last character to see Duror and he is described as *“walking away among the pine trees with so infinite a desolation in his every step”* **(219).** We learn that this image of Duror will *“torment her sleep for months”* **(219)** highlighting how disturbing his isolation is, as well as how troubled her conscience will be in the months that follow the novel’s ending. She is finally confronted with the evidence that she has failed to support the gamekeeper as both a landowner and a Christian, just like she has failed in these capacities when it comes to protecting Calum.

***Tree Motif***

Duror is frequently described using tree-related imagery. The opening description of his character is one example: *“the overspreading tree of revulsion in him; but he could not tell the force that made it grow.”* **(11)** This image suggests that he is like a poisonous, deformed tree with corruption in its very roots causing it to become something ugly and horrible. Trees are strong and powerful – like Duror is physically – but they also branch out in different directions, ***symbolising*** how complicated his evil nature is and how it has far-reaching consequences for various characters as the plot develops. There is clearly something inexplicably evil within Duror’s nature.

One of the reasons for the tree motif is to suggest that Duror is corrupting and spreading his poison in a way that makes the wood a place of corruption and evil.

Duror also feels a connection with one of the trees on the estate:

*“A large elm tree stood outside his house. Many times, just by staring at it, in winter even, his mind had been soothed, his faith in his ability to endure to the end sustained. Here was a work of nature, living in the way ordained, resisting the buffets of tempests and repairing with its own silent strength the damage suffered: at all times simple, adequate, pre-eminently in its proper place.”* **(23)**

Duror’s admiration for the tree comes to ***symbolise*** his belief that he should be stoic and endure all that life throws at him. The reference to “proper place” also refers to his belief in a natural hierarchy, not just in terms of class, but also in relation to physical attributes, with the deformed and grotesque receiving the least status. He likes to touch this tree but he cannot “bear” to look at it anymore as he can no longer share the *“burden of endurance”* **(23).** The cone gatherers’ arrival has provoked a significant change in Duror, almost like they have tipped him over the edge and brought his repulsion at his wife and his irrational hatred of disability to the surface.

When Mrs Lochie tells him she says the way that “things are shaping”, Duror himself uses a tree metaphor: *“Do you really, he thought, see this tree growing and spreading in my mind? And is its fruit madness?”* **(32)** Duror is clearly aware that he is heading towards a breakdown and that he is in danger of losing his sanity.

Interestingly, during his pretend seduction of Mrs Morton he tells her *“Given the circumstances, Effie…I could blossom again like a gean tree.”* **(45)** Even here, he cannot help using ***imagery*** relating to trees, again involving them in his corruption of others. However, he almost has an epiphany and realises that a healthy, loving relationship might offer salvation: *“…realising that her feeling for him was genuine, he saw another way, clear, like a sunlit ride in a thick wood.”***(48)** However, he quickly dismisses the idea and reveals a contempt for Mrs Morton and her feelings: *“Did she think he could be saved by her offering him her fifty-year-old body in a dark room, with gasps of conscience mixed with any sounds of satisfaction?”* **(49)**

When Duror has a panic attack as he climbs the tree to give Calum and Neil the news that they have to go on the deer drive, he uses another tree metaphor to describe the moment: *“He was like a tree still straight, still, showing green leaves; but underground death was creeping along the roots.”* **(71)** The idea of Duror being corrupted at the roots represents how, outwardly, he seems healthy, but internally he is twisted and depraved.

During the key scene in Chapter 10 describing Roderick catching sight of Duror spying on the cone gatherers’ hut with gun in hand, the gamekeeper is actually leaning against the tree, almost becoming a physical part of it. Roderick senses Duror’s corruption and Jenkins describes how he feels that *“Every single leaf was polluted”.* **(147)**

Moreover, when Lady Runcie-Campbell finally realises that Duror is disturbed, she sees him as a *“straight stalwart immaculate ash tree turning into a squat warty bush swarming with worms.”* **(177)** This helps ***reinforce the tree motif*** and the image sums up Duror’s increasingly apparent corruption.

One of the last times Duror is seen in the novel is when Graham passes him: *“he caught sight of the gamekeeper under the dead Chili pine: and though Duror seemed to be as still as the tree itself, Graham assumed he had been sent to hasten the arrival of the cone gatherers.”* **(211)** Again, Duror is described as if he is an actual tree reinforcing the motif that has been used over the course of the novel to emphasise his corruption. As Duror heads off towards the cone gatherers with murder on his mind, *“it was as if the rotting tree had moved”* **(212)** This final use of the tree motif is used to create a lasting impression of Duror’s corruption and evil.

****

**CHARACTERISATION: LADY RUNCIE-CAMPBELL**

In the opening description of Lady Runcie-Campbell in Chapter 4 (from Duror’s perspective), we learn of her *“outstanding beauty”* and *“her earnestness of spirit”* **(50)** but also of her *“almost mystical sense of responsibility as a representative of the ruling class.”* **(50)** Therefore, Jenkins immediately makes us aware of her potential for goodness, but also that her belief in a social hierarchy and the rights of the aristocracy are the main source of corruption in her character. We also learn that her father, a judge, had given her *“a passion for justice, profound and intelligent; and a determination to see right done, even at the expense of rank or pride.”* **(50)** Moreover, we discover that her religion has*“been much influenced by him”* **(136)** and her father had strong views about Christians sharing their wealth with unfortunate others.

Throughout the novel, there is a clear ***internal conflict*** in Lady Runcie-Campbell as the two paternalist influences on her (in a male-dominated society) have instilled different values – her father is much more of an **egalitarian** and **true Christian**, whilst her husband believes in ***rank*** and that his birth gives him the ***right to rule***. Jenkins sums this up as *“…the contradiction between her emulation of Christ and her eminence as a baronet’s wife.”* **(51)** Therefore, she believes in following Christ’s example but her belief in her rights as an aristocrat often clash with this religious fervour.

There are also hints that she married Sir Colin for reasons of status and wealth, rather than compatibility or physical attraction. Duror reflects upon how Sir Colin is *“as gawky as she was beautiful, as glum as she was gay, and as matter-of-fact as she was compassionate.”* **(52)**

Later, when Tulloch suggests exempting Calum from the deer drive due to his empathy for animals, Duror senses insecurity on Lady Runcie-Campbell’s part:

*“He guessed that within her was a struggle between her Christian sympathy for the weak-minded hunchback and her pride as a patrician.”* **(59)** Later, he tells Neil that *“She’s a good woman, really; but she’s got a code to live by.”* **(164)** He is clearly aware that she is trying to be good but that her potential to be a truly moral character is being corrupted by her class-consciousness. Tulloch also uses a tree-related ***metaphor*** to describe the isolation that he senses in Lady Runcie-Campbell: “*He saw her confronted by a vast multitude of people, as thick as his own conifers at Ardmore: even though she had her hands outstretched, she must repulse them all. Because of her code.”* **(165)** This ***image*** sums up her desperate desire to do good and help others, but Tulloch sees how she cuts herself off form the vast majority of other human beings because of her belief in the class system and her corrupt *“code”.*

Lady Runcie-Campbell does have a conscience which troubles her but she rarely shows any signs of learning from her mistakes*: “she could not see in the circumstances she had done wrong”* **(169)** Here, after reflecting upon the beach hut incident, Lady Runcie-Campbell refuses to see the error in her ways. She considers herself in the right, as a *“conscientious parent”* **(169)** – this suggests that she feels that she would not be bringing Roderick up properly unless she set an example in how to deal with the lower orders. It also implies that she feels her children are in danger of becoming less civilised if forced to share a confined space with the cone gatherers. She also sees herself in the right as a

“*responsible landowner”* **(169)** highlighting her view that social order will break down if the lower classes are not treated in a firm manner.

Ironically, Lady Runcie-Campbell finds *“comfort”* in Duror due to his *“aloof submissiveness”* ***(*112).** Clearly, no character should feel comfortable in Duror’s presence but, again, Lady Runcie-Campbell’s views are influenced by notions of class: *“Surely an order of society in which so honourable a man as Duror knew his subordinate place without grievance or loss of dignity, must be not only healthy and wise, but also sanctioned by God?”* **(112)** Basically, because Duror is so dignified and accepts his place, she believes that God must have created the class system!

When Duror interrupts Lady Runcie-Campbell’s dialogue with Tulloch, and makes his obscene and false accusations against Calum, it is interesting that she finally realises what is happening to him: *“Have you gone mad*?!” **(192)** However, she does not take the necessary action – when she tells him to go home, he replies *“I have work to do, my lady.”* **(193)** and she says, *“Then, for heaven’s sake go and do it.”* **(192)** This is her final interaction with Duror, who then proceeds to murder Calum shortly afterwards. This is the “work” he has to do and, by commanding him to go away and do it, this dialogue becomes a ***metaphor*** for Lady Runcie-Campbell’s **complicity** in what happens to Calum. Throughout the novel, her prejudices have caused her to ignore the nature of Duror’s behaviour and she has, in many ways, condoned the maltreatment of the brothers, leading to an inevitable conclusion.

In the last few pages of the book, Lady Runcie-Campbell finally seems to realise the significance of Duror’s behaviour – when she discovers he was last seen by Graham heading in the direction of the cone gatherers, she asks*,” Did he have his gun?”* **(215)** As she rushes to the cone gatherers, she tries to build up a hatred of them and plans to insist on their dismissal, thinking surely as *“a mother, as a landowner, as a Christian, even”* she is right but *“not for a second of that dreadful journey to the point did she convince herself.”* **(217)** Therefore, at the moment in the novel where she should feel some justifiable anger at the cone gatherers, her conscience does not allow her to blame them, suggesting that she realises what is going to happen and her part in the injustice that they have suffered. This helps build up to the hopeful concluding sentence in the novel which troubles many readers. We are told that *“Fear, anxiety, love, sorrow, regret, and hope, were in her mind, but not anger.”* **(218)**

Lady Runcie-Campbell is the most important character in the novel in many ways and this is reflected in the fact that Jenkins devotes the final chapter to her point of view. The whole experience is mortifying and humiliating for her, even before the sight of Duror walking away to kill himself and then the dead body of Calum swinging from the tree.

However, most important are the final sentences: *“Then she went down on her knees, near the blood and the spilt cones. She could not pray, but she could weep; and as she wept pity, and purified hope, and joy, welled up in her heart.”* **(220)** The experience becomes ***cathartic*** for Lady Runcie-Campbell and her tears are for Calum, as well as her own son and the innocence he will have lost. As she is on her knees, it is almost as if she is sub-consciously asking for the forgiveness of Calum, and she is not praying, so she is not seeking absolution from God. She is acting this way in front of Baird and the way that she is not trying to hide her shame and the manner in which she humbles herself, kneeling in the dirt, suggests that there is hope for her and, by extension, society in general. For her to find true “joy” as a Christian, she must first lose her pride and that is what Jenkins suggests the long-terms impact of these experiences will be on her. If a powerful character like Lady Runcie-Campbell loses her pride and begins to see all other characters as her equals, there is hope that she might become a true Christian, freed from her corrupting belief in a class system. Therefore, that is another reason that Calum is portrayed as Christ-like at the end of the novel, as his death may well be the spark that allows Lady Runcie-Campbell to become a true Christian and finally use her status and wealth for good over the rest of her life.

When Roderick suggests offering the cone-gatherers a lift, her instinctive reaction is to call the idea *“absurd”.* **(113)** The definition of absurd is wildly unreasonable or inappropriate. The fact that the idea of sharing the car with the cone gatherers seems almost insane makes her (as well as her class-conscious views and apparent religious hypocrisy) appear to be absurd. This idea is enhanced when Roderick points out that they have their dogs in the car, which also highlights how she sees the cone gatherers as sub-human.

Later, when she ponders over her refusal of Roderick’s suggestion to offer the cone gatherers a lift in the car, she highlights her deep-rooted, paternalistic views on class: *“It is our duty to find an attitude to them, and to all like them, which recognises that inferiority, but not offensively. The maintenance of society on a civilised basis depends upon it.”* **(172)** The idea of the destruction of class-consciousness leading to a possible breakdown in social order and cohesion is one that clearly preoccupies Lady Runcie-Campbell. The fear is that if there is too much social mobility or a lenient attitude towards so-called inferiors, there could be a revolution. She also claims that an offer of a lift might offend the cone gatherers and be seen as *“patronising condescension”* **(172)** Again, irony is created here as, by treating the brothers as if they are sub-human inferiors, her attitude is offensive and we know from Neil’s feelings of bitterness that it causes him deep-rooted irritation. Ironically, Lady Runcie-Campbell sees her late father as the “corrupter” of Roderick, but the values he has instilled in his grandson have resulted in him becoming the most Christian character in the novel.

When we find out that she *“would have given the cone-gatherers the use of the beach hut, if Duror had not dissuaded her”* **(51)**, this is another reason why our initial impression of her sympathetic although there is a hint of insecurity and weakness as she has been persuaded by Duror to act in such a petty and unjust manner. We also find out that she accepts Duror’s *“lie”* when she enquires what the hut is like, but the fact she accepts his word without bothering to check implies that she doesn’t really care about the welfare of the brothers despite how seriously she think she takes her paternalistic responsibilities..

When Tulloch goes to confront Lady Runcie-Campbell about her treatment of the cone gatherers in the beach hut, Jenkins makes use of **symbolism**. She sits on a *“chair that had not been chosen for comfort; with its upright back and carved top it looked like a throne or a judgement seat.”* **(186)** She has clearly chosen this chair to seem imposing and to reinforce her authority, but she looks uncomfortable and unnatural in it, representing how her class-consciousness and efforts to seem authoritative do not come easily to her. The reference to a “throne” and

“judgement seat” symbolise her internal conflict caused by the tension between the notions relating to class forced onto her by her husband and the belief in justice that she has inherited from her judge father. Tulloch senses how false this situation is and how *“she seemed to be impersonating some goddess in disdainful contemplation of human frailties.”* **(186)** The use of “impersonating” suggests that he senses she is adopting a role and he perceives how false the one that she is adopting has become for her. As he gets closer, however, he also realises that *“if she were condemning those frailties, she was not omitting her own.”* **(186)** Tulloch becomes aware that her conscience is troubling her and that she is not just sitting judgement on the cone gatherers, but also on herself.

Lady Runcie-Campbell has many flaws, almost all based on her values being corrupted by her strong belief in the class system, but she is also a sympathetic character who wants to do good in the world. Jenkins describes her *“knowledge of her own unworthiness”* and her guilt over *“her refusal to listen to Roderick’s plea that she should give the cone-gatherers a lift home in the car.”* **(135)** Therefore, it is clear that she has a conscience and realises she makes mistakes due to pride. That is one of the reasons for the hopeful conclusion, based on her reaction to Calum’s murder – she has status and influence but also an unusual level of conscience and goodness for someone of her class.

**CHARACTERISATION: RODERICK**

Roderick is an ungainly, weak and plain boy but his character performs a vital role in the novel. We learn that he has *“had to be removed from school”* **(37)** and the implication is that he could not handle the brutality of boarding at a public school. On one level, this helps explain his goodness and innocence as he has not been corrupted by the emphasis on class consciousness that he would have been exposed to in such an environment. In addition, his father’s prolonged absence at war has also allowed him to develop a strong conscience without this corrupting, class-conscious parental influence.

Interestingly, we find that he *“had never liked Duror”* **(37),** almost as if he senses the evil nature of the gamekeeper and, in his purity and innocence, he naturally shies away from it.

We learn that Roderick is *“too weak physically to attend school like other boys of his class”* **(111).** This suggests that typical upper class boarding school life – which in the time that the novel is set in was often brutal – is too intense for Roderick. In addition, his father is clearly concerned about his son’s failure to act in the way that other characters of his class do: *“He did not see things or people as a baronet’s heir should.”* **(111)**

Roderick’s belief in justice and equality clearly clashes with his father’s proud ways. We also learn of Sir Colin’s anxious enquiries in *“almost every letter”* and how he *“wanted to be reassured about his manner of speaking to servants and the lower orders generally.”* **(137)** However, when Graham pleads with Neil to rush to Roderick’s aid, he tells him *“He’s a good lad, with no conceit in him. Nobody has a bad word for him, even me.”* **(210)** It is clear that Roderick has garnered more respect amongst the workers on his estate than his pompous father.

Lady Runcie-Campbell’s attitude to Roderick is more complicated than her husband’s: *“Yet there had been a corrupter: her own father now dead; and perhaps there still was one, herself the Christian.”* **(111)** The values that Roderick’s grandfather have instilled in him are clearly in opposition to what he is being told by his parents, particularly Sir Colin. Interestingly, Lady Runcie-Campbell sees her own Christian values as, in some way, corrupting her son, an ironic viewpoint but one which highlights how she prioritises class-consciousness above her religion. We also discover that Lady Runcie-Campbell’s father had a *“natural fondness”* ***(136)*** for Roderick and their relationship has clearly had a profound influence on his grandson’s strong belief in justice.

However, Lady Runcie-Campbell approves of her son’s attitudes in some ways, recognising how he has always had a tendency towards *“opposing any act of injustice or cruelty”* and his goodness is described as *“refreshing as faith”* **(137)** to his mother. His goodness also forces his mother to appreciate her own flaws: *“that simplicity in his soul which so often showed up the twisted doubts in hers.”* **(137)**

Lady Runcie-Campbell perceives the confidence growing slowly in her son *“like some rare, beautiful, and fragile flower”* **(169).** This ***imagery*** highlights her protectiveness towards Roderick but also that she is grudgingly admitting that he is unusual and wonderful in many ways due to the way he sees the world and the goodness in him.

As Lady Runcie-Campbell hears the gunshot at the end of the novel, she has a moment of hope that Duror has not hurt the cone gatherers, *“not for their sakes, nor for his, nor for his wife’s, but for her son’s”* **(219)** This might be considered as a display of over-protectiveness and stemming from a lack of concern for the brothers, but it is as if Lady Runcie-Campbell senses that the murder of these innocents might be an incident that her son will find impossible to deal with. In addition, she has ignored his warnings about her treatment of the cone gatherers and there is a chance that their relationship will never recover due to a bitterness and recriminations on Roderick’s part.

Lady Runcie-Campbell’s reaction to the news that Roderick is stuck in the tree is telling. Despite her fears, when she hears that Harry is too scared to rescue him as he had *“never climbed as high as that before”* **(200),** she feels *“elated”* that *“her own son had not been afraid”* **(200).** It is almost as if she has been waiting for years for Roderick’s natural superiority to emerge and she sees this incident as a possible indication that this has finally happened. When she sees him ninety feet up in the tree she is both *“proud and terrified”* **(203)** again showing her ambivalent reaction to his actions.

Roderick is also unusual in the sense that he actually seems genuinely interested in the natural elements on the estate that he will inherit (e.g. the seals). He also has a dialogue with Tulloch about trees in which he mentions how he has been *“trying to identify as many as I can”* **(185).** The impression is created that he is not just going to treat his land as a possession – he will take an active interest in all elements of it, including the people, animals and plant-life. Interestingly, by creating an affinity between Roderick and nature, Jenkins is drawing attention to the similarities between his character and Calum’s - they are both innocent, good and isolated within their respective spheres of society because of their differences to the characters that surround them

It is in the key scene in Chapter 10 that we learn about Roderick’s heroes: Sir Galahad and Christian from The Pilgrim’s Progress. Sir Galahad was one of Arthur’s knights who manages to find the Holy Grail after many adventures. He is known for his bravery and purity. He also ascend to heaven after his death, carried by angels. The Pilgrim’s Progress is a seventeenth century ***allegory*** describing Christian’s efforts to reach The Celestial City – or heaven. He encounters many trials and tribulations but manages to avoid temptations and sins and reaches the end of his journey, ascending into heaven. Both of Roderick’s heroes represent the idea of bravery but combine it with religious conviction, with each character ultimately reaching heaven, suggesting that, like many boys, he fantasises about being a warrior but he feels that the cause he fights for should be his religion.

One of the most important scenes – in terms of Roderick’s character development – is when he goes through the woods to deliver the cake to the cone-gatherers. His childish innocence and goodness are represented by the similarities between the way his situation is described and a ***fairy tale***. In many fairy tales, children set off on a journey with some sort of quest involved, similar to Roderick’s intention to reach the cone gatherers’ hut and give them the gift, with the cake being described as a *“symbol of reconciliation.”* **(144)** In addition, a wood is often used as the setting for a fairy tale. The style of the passage also evokes ideas relating to fairy tales, e.g. the reference to the wood holding both *“magic and terror.”* **(143)** and being *“enchanted”* **(143)** There is also a description of how *“A knot in a tree glowered like a green face.”* **(143)** In addition,there is a*“dark glade”*and*“black-spotted toadstools.”* **(143)** Jenkins also describes how *“Each creature he saw was a prisoner of that enchantment.”* **(143)** As his journey goes on, the seemingly simple quest is described as seeming as *“important as life itself”* **(144)**

Roderick begins to feel isolated and scared with a feeling that he must ensure that the cone gatherers receive his cake which would *“protect them from the spite of Duror.”* **(144)** In many ways, Duror becomes part of this ***fairy tale analogy***, representing an evil presence in the wood, like an ogre or a troll, which is the main source of danger to the child, Roderick. When Roderick sees Duror, his courage fails him, and the gamekeeper’s *“evil presence”,* leaning against the tree, makes Roderick feel *“cold, and frightened, and sick at heart.”* **(144)** Finally, when Roderick retreats back to his house, he leaves the *“cake under the yew to be devoured by beetles and ants*” **(147)** The cake being destroyed by these insect predators becomes a symbol of how Roderick’s innocent naivety is lost forever through this encounter with evil in the form of Duror.

Later in the novel, Lady Runcie-Campbell reflects on Duror’s *“sinister transformation”* and compares it to a *“macabre fairy tale.”* **(177)** This helps to reinforce the earlier allusion to fairy tales when Roderick goes on his pilgrimage through the woods.

The idea of the sight of Duror leaning against the tree introducing Roderick to corruption and forcing him to lose his innocence forever creates a ***biblical allusion*** to the Tree of Knowledge. Roderick becomes like Adam and Eve who lose their innocence and fall from grace, due to being exposed to the knowledge of evil contained in the Tree.

****

**Minor Characters**

**Tulloch**

He is portrayed as a voice of reason, with a firm belief in justice, but Lady Runcie-Campbell does not follow his example or truly trust his judgement. The first time he is mentioned by Neil, a positive impression is created:*“Where will the likes of us ever find anybody as good and fair as Mr Tulloch’s been?”* **(10)** Later, Neil feels that Tulloch has betrayed them by allowing Lady Runcie-Campbell; to force them to participate in the deer drive but *“there could be no satisfaction in accusing him; he had always been their friend.”* **(73)** It is apparent that Neil recognises how good Tulloch has been to him and his brother and he is grateful for this support.

Interestingly, we learn that Tulloch has been the victim of prejudice and bullying as he has high cheekbones, narrow eyes and a yellowish tan, meaning he has been given the nickname *“Chinese”* **(182)** and laughed at due to his Oriental appearance. Perhaps this explains how he has a natural empathy for Calum. In addition, his laid back nature means that he is unperturbed by such comments and he laughs them off, again adding to our sympathetic response to his character.

Tulloch is seen in the most positive light during the aftermath of the deer drive (See notes below in ***The Deer Drive*** section).

We learn that Tulloch has a keen belief in fairness that causes trouble for him on occasion as he is also aware of the hierarchical nature of society: *“Tulloch smiled bleakly towards that wife and children. These were hostages which had already thwarted him in his desire to champion his underlings against his superiors. Though he loved them he loved justice to.”* **(92)** Here, it becomes clear that Tulloch knows that he could lose his job if he is too persistent in fighting injustice, but that he cannot help himself sometimes, despite having a wife and children who depend on his income.

**Symbolism** is created when we hear that *“Tulloch laid his hand on the deformed back”* **(92)** as he comforts Calum after the deer drive. The fact that he has no qualms about touching Calum on his hunched and deformed back creates a clear contrast between Tulloch and Duror, with the moment representing how he is lacking in the sort of prejudice that has destroyed Duror’s psyche.

We learn that Tulloch has noticed that Neil is unusually touchy when his father is mentioned and he senses that the brothers might be illegitimate. However, Jenkins portrays him as non-judgemental when we discover that he says to his wife: *“…after all, gulls were wild and white and bonny, and none of them knew their fathers.”* **(106)** This attitude is particularly admirable in an age where children born out of wedlock often suffered abuse and prejudice.

Tulloch is the only character who comes close to analysing what is wrong with Duror – he tells Lady Runcie Campbell that the gamekeeper is *“ill”* **(194),** sensing Duror’s insanity. He also wonders about the nature of Duror’s hatred towards Calum, coming up with three theories *– “disgust at the deformed man, unreasonable and instinctive”* (or prejudice in other words); *“resented their intrusion into the wood”* (territorial) or *“the dislike was simply inexplicable”* (comparing it to a horse’s instinctive hostility to a man who has never harmed it). **(194)** By the end of the novel, the reader has become aware that all three theories are possible interpretations of Duror’s feelings towards Calum and that they might all be present in his attitude.

Tragically, Tulloch sense that the cone gatherers are in danger and he considers warning them and changing his plans by fetching them out of the estate the next day. However, he realises that this suggestion might build their hopes up and that he might not be able to organise transport for them. However, *“even when his decision was made, and he was walking down the avenue towards his car, he went slowly and twice paused, in doubt.”* **(193)** Jenkins suggests that the perceptive Tulloch almost predicts what will happen to Calum and his hesitation demonstrates his feelings of deep unease. Unfortunately, he ignores his instincts and does not go to the cone gatherers, sealing Calum’s fate.



**The Doctor**

The Doctor is street-wise, intelligent, sensible and Jenkins creates the impression that he likes to indulge himself. Our first introduction to him, sees him hint to Duror about getting hold of some venison. He is astute and perceptive and he senses a *“fanaticism”* lurking in Duror and senses *“inhibitions, repressions, and complexes” that are “coiling there like the snakes of damnation.”* **(20)** However, rather than fear Duror, the doctor admires his *“stoicism”.* **(21)** Like other characters in the novel, the doctor never really suspects Duror’s evil, deranged nature.

**Mrs Lochie**

Although she is, in many ways, a flawed character, Mrs Lochie is the one who is closest to Duror and the only character who suspects his instability:

*“By everyone, except Mrs Lochie, he was known as a man of restraint, reticence, and gravity; she alone had caught glimpses of him with the iron mask of determination off for a rest.”* **(22)**

She is also in a state of permanent anger at her daughter’s plight:

*“It was her intimation that never would she allow her daughter’s misfortune to conquer her, but that also never would she forgive whoever was responsible for that misfortune. Even in sleep her features did not relax, as if God too was a suspect, not to be trusted.”* **(24)**

It is clear, that like Duror, Mrs Lochie is determined to be stoic but, unlike him, she is not prepared to be silent! In an early dialogue between them words like *“accusation”* and *“condemnation”* **(24)** are used to describe her tone towards Duror. It is not so much that she blames him for Peggy’s condition, it is more to do with his coldness towards his wife: *“Do you think I don’t ken what an effort it is for you!”* **(24)** She even accuses Duror of wishing his wife dead, which turns out to be true, based on his later fantasies as he slips into madness and his eventual murder of Calum.

Mrs Lochie also represents the Calvinist side of Scottish Christianity. Calvinism was a severe interpretation of the Christian message, which had a focus on hell, damnation and punishment. Mrs Lochie says, *“I have my own religion…I don’t think the Lord’s a wean, to be cruel one minute and all sugary kindness the next.”* **(29)**

She clearly believes in a firm, stern and patriarchal god.

During a telephone call, Lady Runcie-Campbell feels disgusted by Mrs Lochie’s behaviour: ”*It must be, she decided, a plebeian weakness, to grieve in public and whine for sympathy; people of her class suffered too, but privately and with dignity.”* **(178)** There are some valid reasons for the lady’s distaste as Mrs Lochie repeatedly displays self-pity in her dealings with others. This highlights Mrs Lochie’s flaws as a Christian because, despite the bible encouraging compassion towards others, it is highly critical of self-pity.

**Peggy**

Jenkins makes it clear that Peggy is physically repulsive but she is a tragic figure. She clearly spends most of her days lying in wait for Duror to return and she cherishes any time she spends with him. The fact that she was once beautiful is made apparent in Jenkins’ opening description:

*“The sweetness of her youth still haunting amidst the great wobbling masses of pallid fat that composed her face added to her grotesqueness a pathos that often had visitors bursting into unexpected tears.”* **(25)**

Despite portraying Peggy as childish in many ways, Jenkins also makes her appear flirtatious and hints that she still wants to have a physical relationship with her husband. In their opening dialogue she continually pesters him for a *“kiss”* **(25**).

The signs of her youthful beauty move those who see her, making her current condition even more tragic. Her previous physical attractiveness also helps us understand why a character with Duror’s prejudices would have married her in the first place, as well as making us aware that her husband did not sign up for this sort of a marriage, adding a layer of sympathy to his characterisation.

The tragic nature of Peggy’s life is summed up by how *“She loved children but they were terrified by her; she would for hours dandle a pillow as if it was a baby.”* **(25)**Her strong maternal instincts, combined with her childless state, add ***pathos*** to her situation. She is characterised as a babyish character, like Calum in some ways. She uses the pillow almost as if it is a doll. In addition, she has layers of puppy fat, ribbons in her hair and acts in a childish way, whining sometimes and feeling sorry for herself. Jenkins escribes how *“Her voice was squeaky with an inveterate petulance”* **(25)** which are childish attributes.

We also find out that, in the early days of their marriage, she *“had loved to race with him hand-in-hand over moor and field”.* The fact that any *“old skirt and jumper had done then”* **(25)** suggests that she has only started caring about her appearance as she has become increasingly horrible to look at. She wears elaborate white nightdresses and this highlights how she is desperately trying to make herself as attractive as possible to Duror, as well as reinforcing the childish elements in her character as white is the symbol of purity and innocence.

Jenkins wants to further develop the similarities between Peggy and Calum.

As well as using the ***child motif*** in his descriptions of each character, Jenkins deliberately creates an explicit connection: *“Her wheedling voice reminded him of the hunchback’s”.* **(25)** The clearest connection is the way that Calum and Peggy’s hair is described. They both have striking hairstyles, with Calum’s curls and her*“wonderfully black and glossy”***(25)** hair that she wears down to her shoulders and decorates with ribbons. Therefore, his hatred of Calum is really a manifestation of his hatred of Peggy, which is rising to the surface after being repressed for so long. Killing Calum is, ***symbolically***, representing Duror murdering his wife.

However, there is a clear ***contrast*** between how Peggy and Calum respond to their respective conditions. Calum accepts his misfortune with good grace and gets on with life, almost always with a smile on his face, whereas Peggy is full of self-pity. Indeed, this self-pity actually makes her even more repulsive, as seen in Lady Runcie-Campbell’s recollections of a visit: *“…she would fawn and simper”* and the whole visit is *“piteously degrading.”* **(134)**



**Sheila**

In many ways, Sheila represents how corrupting class-conscious values are. She is arrogant and turning into a female version of her father. When her mother and brother are arguing about giving the cone gatherers a lift she says, *“Monty’s more important to me than they are.”* **(114)** Like her mother, she sees her social inferiors as almost sub-human.

She also mocks the brothers during the beach hut scene, commenting on how “they’ve left a nice perfume behind them” **(159),** and ridiculing them because they have to work for a living, which reflects the way that aristocrats were brought up to see manual labour as a sign of inferiority. She also seems delighted by Neil’s obvious humiliation as she remarks that *“The big one was just about dropping with shame”* **(159)** highlighting her complete lack of empathy for the cone gatherer.

Ironically, Lady Runcie-Campbell tries to get Roderick to use his sister as an example of how to behave within society: *“your sister has a far more intelligent and mature attitude towards people below us in the social scale.”* **(172)** This observation creates ***irony*** as there is nothing intelligent or mature about laughing at the way that poorer characters are dressed or showing no sympathy when they are suffering. It is clear that Jenkins feels that Lady Runcie-Campbell and her daughter should be following Roderick’s example.

After she witnesses Duror’s disturbing behaviour from a distance, Sheila asks her mother if the gamekeeper is *“drunk”* **(197)** Her mother senses the *“slyness~ and “impropriety”* in her daughter. Jenkins wants Sheila to come across as a manipulative, spoiled and calculating character, with the idea being that notions of class and her own supposed superiority have corrupted her. When Sheila is told that she has a *“vulgar mind”* **(197)** by her mother, her smile suggests that she *“took that as a compliment.”* **(197)** Her mother has ordered her indoors as she senses that Duror is dangerous. However, Lady Runcie-Campbell has not fully explained her motives to Sheila, who tries to manipulate the situation to her advantage and get information from her mother. When Sheila asks to go outside, Lady Runcie-Campbell senses it is *“not simply a request, it was a move in the game.”* **(197)**

Ultimately, Jenkins uses Sheila’s character as an example of the corruption that class-consciousness causes – she is devious, manipulative, arrogant and dismissive of her social inferiors, seeing the cone gatherers as not worthy of her concern or attention.

**Key Scene: The Deer Drive (Chapters 5-6)**

In Chapter 2, when ***Duror*** first conceives his plan for the deer drive, his motives are made immediately apparent: *“…surely the dwarf, who slobbered over a rabbit’s broken legs, must be driven by the sight of butchered deer into a drivelling obscenity.”* (33) He knows that such a degrading spectacle will lead to Lady Runcie-Campbell dismissing the cone gatherers, which Duror feels *“might lead to his own liberation.”* **(33)** Duror seems to sense that long-term exposure to Calum will lead to him surrendering to his madness and prejudice so he sees his only chance of redemption and hope involving getting rid of the brothers from the estate, meaning he does not have to look at Calum and, in the process, confront his own personal demons.

It is during this scene that Duror’s madness becomes increasingly apparent, when the others assembled at the pond hear him shouting *“Peggy! Peggy!”* in a tone of *“anguish”.* **(77)** The others also see him*“rise up with his hand at his head and stagger about as if he was drunk or had just wakened from a nightmare.”* **(77)** In his nightmare, he had seen Peggy pecked to death by thousands of thrushes. The description of Peggy in the dream is grotesque with *“legs pale and swollen like monstrous slugs.”* **(77)** He is still in a hallucinatory state when he wakes up and when he sees the cone-gatherers approaching*“he could not be sure whether they were really there in the actual world or had entered the garden.”* **(78)** Due to the fact that he is struggling to separate reality from fantasy, it is clear to the reader that he has finally lost his sanity. Even more disturbing is his analysis of the dream: *“Was Peggy dead? Suddenly it was as if the burden of misery was lifted from him. He began to laugh.”* **(79)** It is apparent that he desires to be free from Peggy and, therefore, his act at the end of the novel in killing Calum is a manifestation of his sub-conscious desire to murder his wife and be free from her as a “burden” forever.

Duror’s isolation also comes to the surface in this scene as others notice his strange mood: *“They thought he might be ill: but none cared to ask.”* **(81)**

The description of Duror killing the deer is horrific and provides further, public evidence of how far his insanity has developed: *“…came leaping out of the wood. He seemed to be laughing in some kind of berserk joy. There was a knife in his hand. His mistress shouted to him: what it was she did not know herself and he never heard. Rushing upon the stricken deer and the frantic hunchback, he threw the latter off with furious force, and then, seizing the former’s head with one hand cut its throat savagely with the other.”* **(86)** His insanity, his hatred of Calum and his homicidal urges come to the surface here but Lady Runcie-Campbell ignores all the signs, preferring to blame Calum instead. The ***irony*** is that Calum has demonstrated the Christian values of compassion and love, but her class-based prejudices cause her to blame him for the deer drive becoming so *“sordid.”* **(86)**

The most disturbing aspect of the incident is that Duror, as he gradually comes back to his senses, murmurs, *“What’s happened to Peggy?”* **(87)** This makes sense to the reader, as we are aware of his repressed hatred and disgust at his wife. As the deer was *“scrabbling about on its hindquarters”* **(86)** immediately before he murdered it, there is a suggestion that he created a link between the stricken animal and his wife, as both are damaged and unable to walk. This helps explain his savage reaction to the sight of the deer rolling around on the ground. This reinforces the idea that Duror killing the deer is actually symbolising his desire to murder his wife.

When Tulloch and Captain Forgan have to physically restrain Duror to prevent him from attacking Calum, the assumption is that he blames the cone gatherer for the way that the drive has turned out.

Duror has an epiphany at the end of the scene: *“…he understood for the first time why he hated the hunchback so profoundly and yet was so fascinated by him. For many years his life had been stunted, misshapen, obscene, and hideous, and this misbegotten creature was its personification. Had the face been savage, brutal, ugly, in keeping with the body, there could have been no identification with his own case…”* **(88)** Here, Duror realises what the reader already suspects – Calum represents Peggy and his hatred of the hunchback is symbolic of the disgust that he feels towards his wife. In addition, when he realises that his dream about Peggy dying has not come true, he is overpowered by *“misery”.* **(89)**

It is important to note that **Calum** agrees to participate in the deer drive out of loyalty towards his brother and desire to prevent Neil having to fight on his behalf. In addition, Neil feels forced into going along because of class and the power dynamics in society at the time, and he feels scared of offending Lady Runcie-Campbell. Neil’s protectiveness towards his brother comes to the fore as he demands that Calum be given any clear stretch and that he should be placed alongside his brother.

Calum is the first character to see the deer and he utters a *“cry of delight and friendship”* **(84)** forgetting the purpose of the drive. When he remembers what is going to happen to the deer, he issues a *“terrified warning”* **(84)** Deer and his dogs provide a clear contrast here as Jenkins describes how *“they rushed in pursuit.”* **(84)** Calum’s instincts are to protect, while Duror is like a predator, naturally attacking the deer as soon as he sees them. Jenkins’ sympathies are clearly with the deer and he describes them as moving with *“marvellous grace and agility over such rough ground.”* **(84)** He clearly sees the deer as at home in their natural surroundings and the implication is that it is a tragedy that such elegant, beautiful creatures might die so violently.

Furthermore, Calum identifies and empathises with the deer so much that *“he too was a deer hunted by remorseless men. Moaning and gasping, he fled after them, with no hope of saving them from slaughter but with the impulse to share* *it with them.”* **(84)** It is almost as if Calum switches places with the deer as his empathy for them in their moment of need is so intense and overwhelming. When an unfortunate deer is shot, Calum rushes to it, ignoring the danger he is in, again highlighting how he cannot avoid easing the suffering of any creature in pain. When Calum tries to fling his arms around the mortally injured deer, Jenkins describes how *“Its blood came off onto his face and hands”* **(85)** which symbolises how the innocent Calum has been stained and corrupted by the horrific violence he has just seen.

Interestingly, in the aftermath of the brutal murder of the deer, Calum is described as *“sobbing like a child, his face smeared with blood”* **(86).** By using the ***child motif*** here, Jenkins is reminding us of Calum’s innocence as well as using the blood to symbolise the corruption of this innocence.

***Lady Runcie-Campbell*** is at her very worst during the deer drive scene where all her prejudices against Calum and errors of judgement concerning Duror are exposed. By ignoring the obvious evidence of Duror’s insanity and violent intentions towards Calum, she fails in her duty as a patrician, as one of the responsibilities of the upper classes was to take care of the lower orders. Her awareness of Tulloch’s displeasure means she gets more bad-tempered as the scene develops: *“On Tulloch’s long thin bony face appeared a dour huff. She would not argue with him, she decided; if he made himself troublesome, she would go over his head to the District Officer, a man of education, breeding and discernment.”* **(89)** Here, the injustices of the class-based hierarchy are seen in her characterisation. Despite Tulloch clearly being in the right, it is clear that Lady Runcie-Campbell intends to cause trouble with his supervisor and perhaps even insist on his dismissal if he complains too much about Calum’s treatment. Moreover, the references to *“breeding”* and *“discernment”* highlight how she believes in the natural superiority of the aristocracy. The dialogue between Lady Runcie-Campbell and Tulloch also highlights her selfish and warped response to the incident: *“I object to being subjected to such a humiliation on my own land.”* **(93)** Her response is class-conscious and egocentric – no one else matters, even Duror.

When Roderick challenges her reaction to the incident she finds herself *“embarrassed”* by him raising objections in front of *“inferiors”* **(94)** Again, she seems most concerned about her place and authority being respected. In addition, when Tulloch rightly claims that the cone gatherers *“have done no wrong”* **(94-95),** she responds, *“Is it not enough that I wish them to go?”* **(95)**, again highlighting that her pride and position as a landowner are more important than any notion of justice.

Incredibly, despite what has happened, she asks Duror for his opinion on what should happen to the cone gatherers.

***Tulloch*** is, in many ways, the most rational and perceptive of all the characters assembled for the deer drive. He rushes towards Calum in the aftermath of the gruesome spectacle, demonstrating he realises where his sympathy should lie. In addition, when it becomes clear that Lady Runcie-Campbell is blaming Calum, he glances at her *“with a frown”* **(88)** Having sensed irrational hatred in Duror, Tulloch makes sensible enquiries, asking Neil if there has been a fallout or another reason that might explain the gamekeeper’s motives for his hostility towards Calum.

***Roderick’s*** response to Lady Runcie-Campbell’s declaration that Calum is to blame again reveals his moral superiority compared to his mother. He makes an obvious point: *“But that’s not fair, mother. You said yourself he didn’t want to take part in the deer drive.”* **(94)**  He also uses his mother’s own Christianity against her: *“You told me yourself….never to be quiet if I saw injustice being done.”* **(94)** Here, he is highlighting his mother’s hypocrisy and failure to abide by her own supposed values.

However, when Lady Runcie-Campbell relents and does not insist on the removal of the cone gatherers, Tulloch is grateful, as he knows that she is powerful enough to *“dispense with conscience”* but she is *“too honest in her endeavour to be a Christian.”* **(96)**

Therefore, despite her obvious flaws, Tulloch senses a sincerity and desire to be just and good. An interesting link is created with a scene later in the novel – in Lendrick, Lady Runcie-Campbell does not want to let the inoffensive cone gatherers in her car, but at the end of the deer drive scene, she insists on Duror, who is covered in blood and clearly unhinged, being given a lift home. This flawed behaviour symbolises how she has become corrupted by notions of class and prejudice.

***Minor Characters: The Other Beaters***

The prejudice facing Calum is shown when ***Betty***, who is a sympathetic character for the most part says, *“God forgie me…but he fair gies me the creeps.”* **(79)** In addition, ***Harry*** mentions a picture of a man with a pet ape that he has seen once. He declares *“It looked just like him.”* **(79)** These comments help generate tension as we fear for Calum’s well-being in the face of this ignorance and hostility.However, ***Erchie Graham*** defends Calum, stating firmly, *“Shut your mouths…the man’s working for his keep.”* **(79)** His character is meant to be the comical element in the novel, particularly in this scene, and his moans about how hard his lot is and how unfair the world is, offer light relief as the deer drive builds up towards its horrific climax.

Jenkins declares that *“Deer drives can be revealers of personality.”* **(82)**

***Erchie Graham*** is described as a *“conscript”* **(82)** – i.e. he has been forced to do it – so the noises he makes are described as *“to express his disapproval as to terrify any deer in front of him.”* He doesn’t want to be there and wants everyone to know that. In addition, he takes an easy route along the road, shirking his role in the drive. But he suddenly *“hopped back over the fence into the wood and bellowed loudest of all”* **(85)** as he hears the commotion as the deer are sighted. Overall, the impression created is of a loveable, irascible rogue. Graham also has the most honest and accurate reaction to the horrific events when he is asked to remove the beast from the scene: *“Which beast your ladyship? he wanted to ask.”* **(87)** He seems to recognise that Duror has become like a savage animal. In the build up to the novel’s horrific climax in the final chapter , Graham is again used to offer comic relief as the plot races towards its inevitable conclusion, and once more, like on the deer drive, Jenkins allows us access to his moans and resentment about being sent on a task that he is too old for. He is almost caught by a bull that chases him and he has to leap over a fence to avoid harm and he roars at the bull, shaking his fist angrily, which again offers light relief as we move towards the novel’s horrific climax.

***Charlie*** – the gardener’s apprentice – is rather simple and he gets confused by the drive and eventually *“exhaustion and confusion bewilder him”* **(83).** He is not suited to such an activity and is actually in danger of wandering in front of the guns, showing how selfish it is, on Lady Runcie-Campbell’s part, getting him involved.

***Betty*** reveals homesickness as she instinctively yells *“Glasgow street cries”* **(83).** However, her natural high spirits come to the fore and, when she grazes her knee on a sharp stick and takes fright, she ends up laughing and imitating a hyena or crazy person. She is clearly a young woman who finds the fun in every situation.

***Harry*** becomes *“an intrepid commando”* **(83)** and, his youthful boyishness means that he uses the experience to pretend to be at war, with these fantasies suggesting both his immaturity and desire to fight at the front like many young men at the time.

**Key Scene: The Beach Hut (Chapter 11)**

From the opening page in Chapter 11, Jenkins makes it clear that Neil is in serious pain due to his rheumatism which is affected by dampness and had *“heralded the rain.”* **(148)** We are told that*“his legs and arms ached.”* **(149)** This makes the reader’s anger about his treatment, when seeking shelter in the beach hut,even more extreme later in the chapter.

The use of ***nature*** in Calum’s characterisation is apparent once more as he senses the change in the weather as the storm approaches, becoming *“frightened and exhilarated”* **(148)** like an animal sensing atmospheric changes.

***Pathetic fallacy*** is used in the description of setting with the *“black clouds”* and the way that the thunder *“snarled”* **(149)** hinting at the uneasiness felt by the brothers and preparing the reader for the stormy conflict that erupts later in the chapter.

The ***child motif*** appears again in this scene as Neil reminds his brother, *“You’re not a child.”* **(149)** In addition, Calum is terrified of the lightning, just like a child might be. He also talks to his brother about heaven, showing a childish and naïve understanding of it. Linking Calum to a child at this point of the novel adds to our sympathy towards him when he is cast out into the storm later in the chapter, as well as emphasising how heartless Lady Runcie-Campbell is in her treatment of him. However, Calum also claims that he has seen his mother in a vision looking down on him from heaven, which might be an attempt on Jenkins’ part to create foreshadowing, hinting at his impending death at the hands of Duror.

Neil tells Calum that he does not believe in heaven which is *“just a name to please children.”* **(151)** Whilst reinforcing the idea of Calum’s naivety, this also helps us understand how despairing Neil is and how injustice has caused him to become cynical. He also feels that *“There was no such place. There was no merciful God.”* **(150)** It is clear that Neil has become bitter at the way he has been treated.

Neil’s love for his brother comes to the fore as he worries about his rheumatism being *“so aggravated it would cripple him for ever.”* **(150)** He is selfless, though, as his main concern is *“who would look after Calum with his derided body and his mind as foolish as a child’s.”(***150)** In addition, his appreciation of his brother’s goodness is made clear when he says, *“Keep being yourself. You’re better than all of us.”* **(153)**

At one point the brothers are described as *“helpless as woodlice”* **(151)** at the mercy of the elements. On one level, this connects to Neil’s earlier complaints that they are as powerless as *“insects”* or *“tiny flies”* **(98)** However, the whole scene could be a ***metaphor*** for their lives in general – tiny, insignificant men who are at the mercy of powerful forces (the upper classes) that, like the storm, can make their life miserable and uncomfortable. Neil actually makes this connection when he asks rhetorically *“Haven’t we got a right to keep ourselves alive? Is the lady like the rain, and the thunder and lightning, that we should be forced to flee from her as well?”* **(153)** Therefore, Jenkins wants the storm to become a ***metaphor*** for Lady Runcie-Campbell’s terrifying power – later they are forced to flee from her like they do in the face of the storm.

***Symbolism*** is also created when the beach hut is described: *“represented not only dryness and warmth, but also humanity.”* **(153)**  By making the hut a ***symbol*** of human achievement and hospitality, this creates more symbolism later in the scene. When Lady Runcie-Campbell expels them from the hut, it represents how she sees the cone gatherers as sub-human.

Once the fire is lit and the brothers are comfortable, Jenkins describes how *“Neil felt his rheumatism particularly painful.”* **(154)** It becomes clear to Neil that he has suffered unnecessary discomfort due to being forced to live in the awful hutch-like quarters that have been hurriedly put together for them. Again, his bitterness at class-based injustice increases as he asks the uncomprehending Calum, *“Didn’t somebody say on the wireless that in war-time everybody’s equal?”* **(154)**

There is more ***symbolism*** created through the description of the “rotting” toys, representing how corrupt the Runcie-Campbells are and how they do not indulge in Christian charity by donating the playthings to local children, whom Neil observes would be *“glad to have them”* **(155)** In addition, when Calum choose a doll that has one leg missing, Neil tells him he knew it would be *“that one you’d pick.”* **(155)** Calum’s choice of doll represents how he has a natural empathy for anything damaged or deformed. In addition, he wants to take the doll away to fix it, ***symbolising*** how he has a desire to repair anything that is damaged,perhaps a sign that he wishes, subconsciously, to repair himself.

The beach hut scene is very important in exploring the ***theme of class-consciousness***. Jenkins describes how Neil is immediately intimidated and ashamed when the aristocrats arrive: *“Every second of silent abjectness was a betrayal of himself, and especially of his brother who was innocent.”* **(156)** Despite having not really done anything wrong, Neil wishes that the pain from his rheumatism was *“twenty times greater to punish him as he deserved.”* **(156)** He feels incapable of looking Lady Runcie-Campbell in the eye but he cannot raise his head as a *“lifetime of frightened submissiveness held it down.”* **(157)** Here, Jenkins suggests that Neil has been conditioned to feel inferior to his social superiors and that their power over him has led to a fear that makes him accept his inferior status.

After expelling the cone-gatherers from the comfort and safety of the hut, Lady Runcie-Campbell exclaims: *“You’re father’s right. After this war, the lower orders are going to be frightfully presumptuous.”* **(158)** Again, she sees the behaviour of the cone gatherers seeking shelter from the storm as a danger to the social hierarchy and, therefore, to the order of society.

Irony is created when Lady Runcie-Campbell says, *“For God’s sake.”* **(157)** Her use of this term is clearly ironic on Jenkins’ part because the way she acts in this scene is clearly going against the Christian charity called for in the Bible.

At the end of the scene, the family sit near the fire and Sheila says that she is *“almost dry…and so is Monty”* **(160)** The idea that the aristocratic family shows more concern for the dog’s comfort is important – this connects to the earlier scene where Lady Runcie-Campbell thought the concept of the cone gatherers sharing a car with her was ridiculous, but she had no qualms about sharing the space with Monty. In addition, Neil has obviously noticed that the family see him and his brother as being of less value than Monty and he tells Tulloch later that “Her dog was to be saved from the storm, but not my brother.” **(164)** He also refers to Lady Runcie-Campbell treating the brothers as *“lower than dogs”* **(209)** in the final chapter when he refuses to come to Roderick’s aid. Therefore, the kind and caring treatment of Monty becomes a ***metaphor*** for the injustice that the brothers face and Neil’s awareness that they are seen as sub-human by Lady Runcie-Campbell.

The fact that Sheila and Lady Runcie-Campbell move close to the fire – while Roderick stays away from it on the other side of the room – could also create religious ***symbolism***, suggesting that they are damning themselves through their actions, as fire connects to hell and the idea of punishment for sins.

In the final lines of the chapter, Lady Runcie-Campbell has totally forgotten about the cone gatherers and their potential discomfort and the danger facing them through exposure to the storm – her only worry is Roderick’s *“over-sensitive conscience”* **(160)** He is clearly troubled by her treatment of the men, which sets him apart from his family once more and enhances our sympathetic response towards his character. The final sentence of the chapter is: *“She determined to have a long talk with her son on this subject of pity*” **(160)** which sums up Lady Runcie-Campbell’s flaws in terms of her hypocritical views. The Bible often refers to pity being a good quality – unless it is self-pity. Once again, Lady Runcie-Campbell’s views on class override the message of her religion. She clearly sees Roderick’s pity for other human beings as being inappropriate and immoral (if the recipients of this compassion are of a lower social class).

However, when she confronts her son, Roderick’s reflections on the beach hut incident are clearly meant to illuminate how ludicrous his mother’s notions of class are: *“There was room for us all, mother.”* **(172)** Jenkins clearly wants the reader to sympathise with Roderick’s decency which ***contrasts*** with his mother’s attitudes and, once again, helps illuminate her flaws as a character and Christian.

****

**Symbolism:The Doll**

Jenkins creates different layers of ***symbolism*** through the differing reactions of Calum and Duror to the doll. Calum is drawn to it as it is damaged and he wants to *“fix it”* representing his intrinsic goodness and desire to do good. The way he plays with the doll is also used to ***reinforce the child motif*** that is created to enhance his ***characterisation*** as well as to symbolise his purity and innocence.

Duror’s reaction – as well as the way that he uses the doll in his nefarious schemes – serves as a ***symbol*** of his corruption. Mrs Lochie is clearly distressed by his behaviour when he returns home with the doll. We never hear what he says, but she tells Lady Runcie-Campbell that she never suspected that *“such foulness could lie in a man’s mind so many years without showing”* **(179)** Again, the fact that Duror uses a doll to spread evil and malicious rumours about Calum helps to ***symbolise*** how he is corrupting anything he comes into contact with, no matter how innocent.

Lady Runcie-Campbell become increasingly unsettled by Duror and she is appalled that “*He was from some gruesome other world where a child’s toy become an obscene symbol.”* **(190)** However, she does not intervene and her failure to act upon the obvious signs of his instability and malice means that she fails in her duty as both a Christian and aristocratic patrician by failing to protect Calum.

When Duror approaches Lady Runcie-Campbell towards the end of her dialogue with Tulloch, the doll becomes an obscene, corrupted object in Duror’s hands, and she sees it as *“unutterable, shameful”* **(191).** In Duror’s hands, it is as if the doll means that *“her daughter’s innocence was somehow being publicly outraged.”* **(191)** When she takes the doll off the gamekeeper, it is as if *“it was visibly soiling her hand.”* **(191)** In addition, Duror starts to whisper accusations against Calum and in his *“repetitious incoherence the word seed kept recurring.”* (192) Despite never learning exactly what Duror says here, it is clear that there are masturbatory references and that the gamekeeper is accusing Calum of indecent acts involving the doll. Lady Runcie-Campbell’s reaction is almost comical as her right hand jerks about *“like a dying rabbit’s paw”* **(192)** as she tries to raise it to tell him to stop. Through using various references to corruption in terms of Duror’s contact with the doll and his use of the innocent toy as part of his nefarious plot, Jenkins uses it as a recurring symbol or ***motif*** to represent his corruption.

The ending also uses the doll to highlight Lady Runcie-Campbell’s flaws. Initially, she is repelled by the idea that her son is going to *“be saved by an obscene misshapen labourer: his virginal body was to be handled by hands, or paws,rather, accustomed to bestial practices.”***(207)** This description proves that, despite all Duror’s actions and his disturbing behaviour, Lady Runcie-Campbell believes his lies about Calum. However, as she rushes to the Point to make her final plea to the brothers to help Roderick, she keeps having flashbacks *to “Duror with the naked doll in his fist and the obscene accusations so lusciosuly on his lips”* **(220).** There is clear **symbolism** in the name of her destination – she is literally rushing to the Point, but also finally getting the point about what has been happening on her estate for the past few days. The image of Duror with the doll in his fist comes to represent her awareness of how he is the one who is corrupting and destroying goodness and innocence. The image will also be significant for readers as Calum has been compared to a child throughout the novel and he is about to finally be destroyed by Duror, signified by him crushing the doll in his fist.