

APPALACHIAN ANIMALS ON OUR MIND: A SURVEY OF HUMAN-ANIMAL
RELATIONSHIPS IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE

A Thesis
by
APRIL LEIGH WALTERS

Submitted to the Graduate School
Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

MAY 2012
Center for Appalachian Studies

APPALACHIAN ANIMALS ON OUR MIND: A SURVEY OF HUMAN-ANIMAL
RELATIONSHIPS IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE

A Thesis
by
APRIL LEIGH WALTERS
May 2012

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Katherine E. Ledford
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Dr. Jeanne A. Dubino
Member, Thesis Committee

Dr. Patricia D. Beaver
Member, Thesis Committee

Dr. Kathryn Kirkpatrick
Member, Thesis Committee

Dr. Patricia D. Beaver
Director, Center for Appalachian Studies

Dr. Edelma D. Huntley
Dean, Research and Graduate Studies

Copyright by April Leigh Walters 2012
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

APPALACHIAN ANIMALS ON OUR MIND: A SURVEY OF HUMAN-ANIMAL RELATIONSHIPS IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE. (MAY 2012)

April Leigh Walters, B.A., Virginia Commonwealth University

M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Dr. Katherine E. Ledford

Humans have lived with nonhuman animals in the Appalachian Mountains for thousands of years. The relationships formed between these two groups of life have changed over the course of that time, but remained complex, nonetheless. This thesis begins to study Appalachian human-animal relationships by dissecting various relationships represented in prominent works of Appalachian literature, such as Harriette Simpson Arnow's *Hunter's Horn*, Wilma Dykeman's *The Tall Woman*, and James Still's *River of Earth*.

This study moves through some of the current trends in the field of Critical animal studies (CAS) and, for the first time, pairs these trends with different concepts scholars have created in the varying disciplines under the umbrella of Appalachian studies. "Appalachian Animals on Our Mind" begins with a brief history of interactions between animals and humans in Appalachia, then moves into an analysis of literature. This thesis uses the literature to further examine differing human-animal relationships through psychological, ecofeminist, and anthropological models.

DEDICATION

As you will see in the final chapter of this study, family is relative. Pun intended.

With that said, I dedicate this study to my stepfather, Jonathan Dale Chittum.

It is a wasted and unhappy thought to imagine what my life would have been like without Johnny. He has brought all sorts of happiness, kindness and love into our family. I count myself damn lucky to be related to such a thoughtful, understanding, intelligent, caring, patient, supportive, dedicated and hard-working person. Even though I don't get to see him nearly as much as I'd like to, in my heart, I carry his loving praise, confidence in my ability and pride in my accomplishment, always.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appalachian State University's Office of Student Research supplied with me instrumental support for the dissemination of my research in two separate circumstances, which I greatly appreciate. Their contributions helped fund a trip to American University in Washington, D.C., to present chapter one of this thesis, as well as a trip to Indiana University of Pennsylvania in Indiana, Pennsylvania, to present chapter four of this thesis.

I joke that Dr. Katherine E. Ledford is "in charge of me in so many capacities," but it's actually very true. Dr. Ledford has been my academic advisor throughout this program and was brave enough to take me on as her first thesis advisee. I am very thankful for the myriad of things she has done for me in those two aspects, as well as all the work she has done and advice she has given me in general. She has improved my writing and my arguments a thousand-fold, as well as guided me in all my academic endeavors with an understanding and reinforcing hand.

Dr. Patricia D. Beaver has been an encouragement all throughout my matriculation in the Appalachian studies program. She has consistently been full of good ideas and advice. I am very thankful to have been involved with the program under her guidance, as well as having the ability to work with her in two separate classes in addition to this thesis.

I met Dr. Jeanne Dubino by chance, but I am pretty sure it was fate that brought us together. Dr. Dubino is the first person I ever spoke with about the field of critical animal studies, and oddly enough, it was during a class on Appalachian travel writing. The

circumstance could not have been more random, but everything which has happened since then has been, in a sense, “divine.” There has never been a happier accident.

I met Dr. Kathryn Kirkpatrick relatively late in my duration at Appalachian, but in that short amount of time, she has been a wealth of knowledge. Dr. Kirkpatrick is a strong, compassionate, dedicated and intelligent woman whom I am very happy to have gotten the chance to know. She is a positive force throughout the community and in all the roles she fulfills for the university.

I absolutely could not have made it through the Appalachian studies program without the help and guidance of Ms. Debbie Bauer. I don’t think anyone could have, actually. She keeps the Center for Appalachian studies and all those who are involved with it running smoothly, all while remaining calm (at least outwardly) and kind. Thank you, Debbie, for all you do. I know it’s a lot.

I am truly a child it took a village to raise. There are a great deal of people in my family, and a few animals, to acknowledge and thank for getting me this far:

I thank my “Mom,” Chrissie Mundy Chittum, for trying her hardest to make the right decisions, always encouraging me and my undertakings and instilling in me a ridiculously intense love for animals of all shapes and sizes. My mother has an incredible work ethic, is compassionate, helpful, and generous and loyal to the ones she loves. I hope some of those characteristics rubbed off on me.

I thank my maternal grandmother, my “Gramall,” Kathy Hanlon Stevens, for teaching me about music and literature, allowing and encouraging me to be the “genius of the world,” and cheering all my creative endeavors. Gramall is probably most responsible for prepping my brain for the world of academia, and I hope she sees her hard work paying off.

I thank my paternal grandmother, my “Granny,” Linda Mason Ewing, just for being her. She is the most wonderful grandmother a person could have; philanthropic, kind, intelligent and generous. She is a pillar in her community and has always been a positive force in my life, providing encouragement, support and love. I am proud to be her granddaughter and I hope to carry on her legacy.

I thank my ever-patient and loving boyfriend, Jon Kirchner. Jon has been by my side for nearly six years now, through all the ups and downs life has offered us. He is my best friend, biggest support and most frequent source of laughter. I am thankful for him each and every day.

I thank Flip, my childhood dog. He taught me the fundamentals of friendship. When he went, a piece of me went with him. I thank my dearly beloved Fourpy. He was always a welcome distraction, whom I still think of and miss daily. I thank Pilot and Kapper, my and Jon’s dogs. Coming home to their sweet, smiling faces and wagging tails is usually the best part of my day. Finally, I thank Mao and Meep, our cats. I believe that having a warm, purring cat on your lap or in your bed is one of the great joys in everyday life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	IV
DEDICATION	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VI
INTRODUCTION	1
HISTORY OF CRITICAL ANIMAL STUDIES	3
WORKS INCLUDED IN “APPALACHIAN ANIMALS ON OUR MIND”	4
LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY	6
WHAT IS INCLUDED	7
CHAPTER 1: A BRIEF HISTORY AND LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF SETTLEMENT AND INDUSTRIALIZATION ON THE APPALACHIAN NONHUMAN ANIMAL	9
1. THE MISSING LINK	9
1.2. ACCOUNTS OF ANIMALS	10
1.2.1. APPALACHIAN SETTLEMENT	12
1.2.2 APPALACHIAN INDUSTRIALIZATION	20
1.2.3. HOW REVEALING IS THE HISTORY?.....	30
1.3. CONNECTING HISTORY AND LITERATURE	32
1.4. TYING LITERATURE AND HISTORY TOGETHER	41
CHAPTER 2: LITERARY ANIMALS: REPRESENTATIONS OF THE NONHUMAN ANIMAL IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE	43
2.1. APPALACHIAN ANIMALS ON OUR MIND	43
2.2. NONHUMAN ANIMALS AND CULTURAL STUDIES THROUGH LITERARY ANALYSIS	44
2.3. EMOTIONAL SCIENCE	46
2.4. LITERARY ANIMALS	48
2.4.1. THE COW	48
2.4.2. THE DOG	57
2.4.3. THE HORSE	67
2.5. WHEN WE STARTED MINDING ANIMALS	69
2.6. CONCLUSION	71

CHAPTER 3: THE “WOMEN-ANIMALS-NATURE ASSOCIATION”: APPALACHIAN LITERATURE THROUGH AN ECOFEMINIST LENS.....	73
3.1. THE “WOMEN-ANIMALS-NATURE ASSOCIATION”	73
3.2. APPLYING ECOFEMINISM IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE.....	76
3.3. IDENTIFYING WITH ANIMALS	77
3.4. THE AUTHOR’S MODEL.....	88
CHAPTER 4: THE MOUNTAINEER AND HIS MUTT: EXPANDING KINSHIP TIES TO ANIMALS IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE	91
4.1. KINSHIP IN APPALACHIA.....	91
4.2. WHAT IS KINSHIP?	92
4.3. STUDYING KINSHIP THROUGH LITERATURE	93
4.4. EXPANDING KINSHIP TIES TO ANIMALS IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE	94
4.4.1. PEARLY	96
4.4.2. JACK	98
4.4.3. ZING.....	100
4.4.4. GROVER	103
4.4.5. BOB.....	106
4.5. CONCLUSION	109
CONCLUSION	111
WORKS CITED.....	115
VITA	126

INTRODUCTION

In the early 1960s, anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss suggested that scholars should pay closer attention to animals. He believed by "thinking with" them we might understand human societies in new ways.¹ Since this time, scholars in the social sciences and humanities have begun to pay closer attention, and we have realized that animals have cosmological significance, kinship meanings, subsistence values, economic values, social exchange meanings, and socio-ecological importance. Additionally, we have come to understand that people have social relationships that encompass animals, as well as social relationships with animals themselves.

While the attention to animals is clearly not new in the social sciences and humanities, the nonhuman animal population of Appalachia, specifically, has long been overlooked by scholars. Today, the only area of Appalachian scholarship where nonhuman animals are routinely discussed is in environmental histories, and these studies are mainly about Appalachian wildlife, in its many forms. There are Appalachian scholars who have attempted to discuss and examine the existence, origin, biology and behavior of nonhuman animals in Appalachia, with regard to their link to evolution and nature; however, no one has yet studied the relationship between Appalachian people and nonhuman Appalachian animals.

¹ See Claude Levi-Strauss, *Totemism*, Trans. Rodney Needham (Boston: Beacon Press, 1971).

I believe the consideration of animals and their place within and outside of human Appalachian society will greatly contribute to our understanding of Appalachian culture. Therefore, the goal of this project is to discover and examine the ways human experiences with nonhuman animals have shaped Appalachian culture by merging, for the first time, the two fields of Appalachian studies and critical animal studies (CAS). Throughout this thesis, I introduce a new approach to the study of Appalachian culture which recognizes that the “proliferation of nonhumans in human society makes it impossible to recognize a pure human society” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 3). Examining Appalachian culture through the critical animal studies lens will ultimately allow for a deeper understanding of Appalachian humans and nonhumans, as well as the co-evolutionary process these two groups have undergone.

The emerging field of critical animal studies (CAS), paired with Appalachian studies, is the ideal forum for this new discussion to take place. CAS is an interdisciplinary field of study, with the main goal of “transform[ing] higher education into a more inclusive environment for all species” so that it may be possible for humankind “to eliminate the domination and oppression of animals” (“About ICAS” np). CAS’s commonly held belief is that in order for this to happen, it is necessary for scholars to “come together under one common field of study, similar to that of other marginalized fields of study, [to] constructively debate theories, tactics, and strategies” (“About ICAS” np). CAS’ activist and interdisciplinary nature fits well with Appalachian studies because Appalachian studies is a discipline that seeks to “promote and engage dialogue, research, scholarship, education, creative expression, and action among scholars, educators, practitioners, grassroots activists, students, individuals, groups and institutions” (“Mission, Policies and Bylaws” np). Both

fields of study strive to understand a marginalized population and often misunderstood subject.

History of Critical Animal Studies

“Critical animal studies” is a term that emerged from dialogue between scholars and animal rights activists around the world in 2006. In 2007, the Center on Animal Liberation Affairs (CALA) changed its name to the Institute for Critical Animal Studies (ICAS) to accommodate this rapidly growing discipline. Since this change, many important advancements in CAS have taken place. These include the first critical animal studies minor and concentration, at Brock University in Ontario, Canada, which has since been followed by many others throughout Canada, the United States, and other countries; and the development of the Journal for Critical Animal Studies (JCAS), also in 2007.

One of this interdisciplinary field of study’s main goals is to “transform higher education into a more inclusive environment for all species” so that it may be possible for humankind “to eliminate the domination and oppression of animals” (“About ICAS” np). CAS’s commonly held belief is that in order for this to happen, it is necessary for scholars to “come together under one common field of study, similar to that of other marginalized fields of study, [to] constructively debate theories, tactics, and strategies” (“About ICAS” np). Since CAS’s introduction to the world of academia, scholars from a variety of fields, such as anthropology, ecology, ethology, sociology, social work, literature, and philosophy, have been able to work together to accomplish these goals in a variety of ways.

The Journal for Critical Animal Studies is one forum for these scholars to come together. JCAS is a blind peer-reviewed journal which is published four times a year by ICAS. The focus of this academic journal is to “promote, encourage, support and enable the

publication of research and writing that develops the dynamic field of critical animal studies” (“Journal for CAS” np). Journal editors publish work that seeks to critique the hierarchies of “multifaceted and systemic phenomenon, [including] racism, sexism, classism, and speciesism and their intricate interrelationships” in the field of animal studies (“Journal for CAS” np).

Another way in which ICAS has created an environment for scholars and activists to work together is through the Annual Conference for Critical Animal Studies. This conference has been held at a variety of locations in North America over the past few years, with SUNY Cortland, Yale University and the University of Montana holding the three most recent conferences. Prior to ICAS’s creation, similar conferences were held by the CALA, and go back to the year 2002. In addition to holding their own annual conference, ICAS sponsors several similar conferences throughout North America, as well as abroad.

Organizations that ICAS frequently works with include the Australian Animal Studies Group, the Institute for Animals and Social Justice (based in the United Kingdom), the Nordic Animal Studies Network, the New Zealand Centre for Human-Animal Studies, the Group for Society and Animal Studies (based in Germany), and the Animals and Society Institute, which, like ICAS, is based in the United States. All of these institutions and groups have been founded relatively recently, much like ICAS. Their existence rests on the same basic foundations: fostering the link between activism and academic studies relating to the welfare of animals throughout the world.

Works Included in “Appalachian Animals on Our Mind”

Some of the literature analyzed in this thesis is in the literary genre of local-color. Within the field of Appalachian studies, there is somewhat of a disagreement as to whether or

not Appalachian local-color writing should be considered Appalachian literature. The reasoning behind this difference in opinion has much to do with definitions of what makes literature Appalachian. Writers such as Lee Smith, Wilma Dykeman, James Still and Harriette Simpson Arnow, who will be discussed later in this essay, are generally considered to be Appalachian writers because they each meet two criteria. Each of these writers is from Appalachia, and the majority of their stories are set in Appalachia. This is not always the case with local-color writers.

Mary Noailles Murfree, Constance Fenimore Woolson and John Fox, Jr. are some of the most recognizable names associated with Appalachian local color. Though many of their stories are set in the mountains of Appalachia, meeting one criterion, they are not natives of the region. Their “outsider” perspective on Appalachian culture has been charged with creating and contributing to long-standing stereotypes and misinformation about the region. Henry D. Shapiro, a well-respected scholar of Appalachian history, was one of the first researchers to study the effects local color had on America’s perception of Appalachia. Shapiro argues that local color “involved the selection of certain aspects of reality for consideration instead of others, and an attempt to order the aspects of reality thus perceived” (4). Furthermore, “the scenes and events [writers] described were presented as typical of scenes and events which anyone visiting the area might observe, the persons typical of those whom anyone might meet” (Shapiro 18). What the careful choice of characteristics and presentation of truth led to was the placement of “Appalachia and America in radical opposition” (Shapiro 4). Americans soon began to believe that Appalachia had “physical,

social, and cultural characteristics that made it fundamentally different from the rest of” (Shapiro 18) the United States, thereby making Appalachia America’s “other.”²

Although local color carries with it these negative connotations within the community of Appalachian studies, for the purposes of this study, local color writing about Appalachia will be considered Appalachian literature. The local color stories examined here are all set in Appalachia. They were written and published roughly between the 1870s and 1890s, during the period of industrialization.

With this noted, the works of Appalachian literature that are examined in this thesis include, Harriette Arnow’s *Hunter’s Horn*, Wilma Dykeman’s *The Tall Woman*, John Fox, Jr.’s *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*, Bobbie Ann Mason’s “Lying Doggo,” Mary Noailles Murfree’s “A Mountain Storm,” Lee Smith’s *Fair and Tender Ladies* and “Bob, A Dog”; James Still’s *River of Earth*, and Constance Fenimore Woolson’s “Up in the Blue Ridge.”

Limitations of this Study

The literature I have chosen to discuss in the following chapters of this work is by no means all-inclusive of the Appalachian works of fiction that include animals and animal characters. I was introduced to many pieces of fiction during my first semester of graduate studies in a class on Appalachian literature. I use several works I discovered during that class in this study. Other works have come from classes on southern literature and Appalachian short stories, as well as those I discovered on my own. The analysis I perform on the

² America’s “othering” of Appalachia carries its own set of issues. Postcolonial theorist Edward Said examines a dominating society’s need to “other” a people in order to control them in *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) and *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993).

literature in this thesis could be done on just about any piece of Appalachian fiction.

Animals, whether they are pets, domesticated livestock, or wild, appear in the majority of the Appalachian literature I have read.

Similar to the limited amount of Appalachian literature appearing in this thesis is the limited types of animals studied. The majority of the animals discussed later in this work are pets, such as dogs; working animals, such as cows and horses; and very few wild animals. The animals analyzed in the following chapters are but a small sample of the abundance of animals in Appalachia and Appalachian literature. These animals have been chosen based on two primary criteria. The first criterion is the development and importance of the animal characters in the works of literature I have chosen. The second criterion is the type of animals human characters most commonly built relationships with. It is more common for characters to build relationships with dogs than it is for them to have relationships with turkeys, for example.

Finally, though this thesis studies the human-animal relationships in history and literature, it is important to recognize that this is not the only way to go about combining the fields of Appalachian studies and Critical animal studies. There are many other ways this could be done, including through different historical, anthropological, and sociological methods. There is much rewarding work to be done in this area. This thesis is only a beginning.

What is Included

The first chapter of “Appalachian Animals on Our Mind” is a brief history of trends in the animal population in Appalachia beginning at the onset of Euro-American settlement in the mountain region. This historical analysis combines both primary and secondary

sources to provide an overview of the history, so readers can better understand the ways Appalachian people and animals have related to one another since their relationships first began to form. The historical section of chapter one is followed by a study of a few works of literature that reflect the historical themes laid out in the beginning of that chapter. This is done to illustrate the links between Appalachian history and Appalachian literature.

The remaining three chapters of “Appalachian Animals on Our Mind” explore the literature using different methods of literary criticism to reveal themes other than historical ones. Chapter two, for example, combines the studies of human psychology and cognitive ethology to reveal the emotional side of relationships between humans and animals in Appalachia. Chapter three looks at the same literature from chapters one and two, but adds two new stories to the analysis, which are then carried on into chapter four. Specifically, chapter three looks at works of Appalachian literature using an ecofeminist approach to examine the similarities and differences in the ways men, women, and children form and maintain relationships with nonhuman animals. Chapter four, the final chapter of this study, applies an anthropological model to the study of human-animal relationships to see how nonhuman animals can be viewed as extended family and function in kinship networks. Finally, the conclusion of “Appalachian Animals on Our Mind” summarizes the findings and offers new directions for scholars to take in the study of human-animal relationships in Appalachian literature, as well as in the broader scope of Appalachian studies.

CHAPTER 1: A BRIEF HISTORY AND LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTS OF
SETTLEMENT AND INDUSTRIALIZATION ON THE APPALACHIAN NONHUMAN
ANIMAL

1. The Missing Link

In the introduction to her edited collection *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans and Other Wonderful Creatures* Erica Fudge notes that “humans cannot think about themselves—their cultures, societies, and political structures—without recognizing the importance of nonhumans to themselves, their cultures, societies, and political structures” (4). As revealed later in this chapter, animals have not been entirely absent from the study of Appalachia. However, the study of Appalachian animals thus far has been an anthropocentric one. Until now, scholars have taken “an instrumental attitude” toward Appalachian animals “by which animals are objectified” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 2) and seen as “objects of analysis” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 3).

The goal of this chapter is to change the direction of the study of animals in Appalachia. First, I wish to reveal how the study of animals in Appalachia thus far has regarded “animals as creatures who are objects of human analysis” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 3) through a summary of the research which has been done. Second, I hope to show that animals in Appalachia “may themselves [have] create[d] change” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 3) in humans by discussing the extent to which Appalachian humans have adapted to and evolved along with Appalachian animals.

I further plan to argue that “[a]nimals can be agents within culture [and that] they are never always only objects” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 4). This argument will develop through an analysis of prominent works of Appalachian fiction. Literary analysis will shed light on how prominent themes regarding animals in Appalachian history have been and continue to be explored in literature of the region. Looking at animal-related historical themes in Appalachian literature will offer CAS and Appalachian studies scholars “new ways of thinking about the place, role, and understanding of animals” (Fudge, *Renaissance* 3) in the history of Appalachia.

1.2. Accounts of Animals

Environmental histories not only provide information regarding wildlife and nonhuman animals that are native to Appalachia, they also include discussions of domesticated animals and those used for agricultural purposes that, though central to Appalachian life, may not have originated in the region. Scholars such as Donald Edward Davis and Chris Bolgiano, Scott Weidensaul, Susan Yarnell, and George Constanz³ have written environmental histories which include information about the nonhuman animal population of Appalachia. Several of these studies, including Weidensaul’s *Mountains of the Heart: A Natural History of the Appalachians*, focus on the Appalachian wilderness and wild

³ For comprehensive works on Appalachian environmental history that include discussions of animals, see Donald Edward Davis, *Homeplace Geography: Essays for Appalachia* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2006) and *Where There are Mountains: An Environmental History of the Southern Appalachians* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000); Chris Bolgiano, *Mountain Lion: An Unnatural History of Pumas and People* (Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 1995); Scott Weidensaul, *Mountains of the Heart: A Natural History of the Appalachians* (Golden: Fulcrum Pub., 1994); Susan Yarnell, *The Southern Appalachians: A History of the Landscape* (Asheville: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, 1998); and George Constanz, *Hollows, Peepers, and Highlanders: An Appalachian Mountain Ecology* (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2004).

animals. Weidensaul, in particular, takes a scientific approach to Appalachian wildlife and examines the evolution of animals in the Appalachian Mountains.

Other academics who have attempted to account for the nonhuman animal population in Appalachia have done so by studying the economy. In *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860*, Wilma Dunaway discusses the financial structures that once surrounded nonhuman animals in the Appalachian Mountains. She describes the money earned and spent from raising, marketing, and selling livestock over a period of more than 150 years. Ron Eller provides similar information for a later period in *Miners, Millhands and Mountaineers: Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880-1930*. He discusses the importance of livestock and other nonhuman animals to the livelihood of individual families in Appalachia, whether livestock raising was their main source of income or not.

Like Eller's study, Donald Edward Davis's work sometimes focuses on the importance of particular nonhuman animals to singular Appalachian families. However, unlike Eller, Davis tends not to emphasize the financial value of the animal, and instead, directs his critical attention toward the other ways nonhuman animals have been useful for people living in the Appalachian Mountains. For example, his essay "Feist or Fiction?: The Squirrel Dog of the Southern Mountains," which appears in his collection *Homeplace Geography*, reveals the importance of a specific breed of dog, the Feist, to Appalachian hunters and their families. He notes that these dogs not only served as companions in hunting, they were also used as guard dogs and family pets.

Though several scholars have analyzed nonhuman animals' importance to Appalachia in limited ways, no one has yet done a comprehensive study of the importance of nonhuman

animals in Appalachian history. Researchers who are currently seeking information on the nonhuman animal population and the variety of ways Appalachian people interacted with that population have no authoritative resource to turn to. Instead, investigators must locate and read between the lines of the written history that does, however minimally, contain information on Appalachian nonhuman animals, and form their own ideas. The purpose of this section is to provide a brief history of two eras of Appalachian history that affected wild and domesticated nonhuman animals in significant ways.

1.2.1. Appalachian Settlement

The period of Euro-American settlement in Appalachia began in the late eighteenth century. Prior to this time, the Royal Proclamation of 1763 prohibited settlers from moving west of the Blue Ridge Mountain chain.⁴ The Proclamation had been put in place so that the British government would not have to handle the ordeals that came along with white settlers moving into Native American territory. Native Americans had been living in the Appalachian Mountains for thousands of years before European colonists began to encroach on their territory. Over this time, the Native American population of Appalachia had developed their own way of living with the fauna of the region.⁵ The Proclamation became obsolete at the end of the American Revolutionary War. Settlers were then able and encouraged to cross the mountain crests and move into the trans-Appalachian region.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, Appalachia “contained almost half a million [European] inhabitants” (Salstrom 3) and was continuing to grow in population.

⁴ See Colin Calloway, *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁵ For information regarding the ways in which the Native American population of Appalachia lived with nonhuman animals, see Shepard Krech III, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1999).

When settlers found a suitable spot of unclaimed land, they stopped, made their stake and built their homes. As time went by, they had to travel further and deeper into the woods to find bits of land where they could make their new lives.⁶

During the period of Appalachian settlement, hunting was the main means of survival and a daily activity for new Appalachian families. Guns and ammunition “were typical of the investments pioneers made” (Salstrom 4), and the purpose for this lay in the need to provide nourishment for their families. There was a large variety of wildlife available to hunt in the beginning of settlement, including deer, elk, buffalo and bear, as well as smaller game, such as turkeys, ducks, geese, swans, rabbits and squirrels. Many of these nonhuman animals were in abundance in the Appalachian wilderness.

On the domesticated front, perhaps the most important nonhuman animal to these new Appalachian people was the dog. Dogs were used in a variety of ways and “good dogs were not only valued for their hunting ability, but also because of their assistance in daily chores or their important role as watchdogs” (Davis, *Homeplace* 77). Dogs were a “source of family pride and community identity” (Davis, *Homeplace* 77). The Feist, in particular, may have been the most important breed of dog to Appalachia settlers. These “small, energetic and alert hunting dogs” (Davis, *Homeplace* 77) were used as family companions and protectors, as well as to provide assistance in hunting opossum, raccoon, groundhogs, squirrels and even black bears. The most popular dog for hunting black bears, however, was the North Carolina Plott hound. Without the assistance of this dog, “pioneers could not kill black bears in large numbers” as it was the dog who actually tracked down the bear and

⁶ For detailed land ownership patterns during the period of Appalachian settlement, see Wilma Dunaway, *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

“forced the bears up trees or held them at bay under rock ledges or in caves” (Davis, *Where* 115) until the hunter could shoot.

As this hunting lifestyle persisted, some elements of Appalachian wildlife quickly began to fade. As early as the late 1770s, traveler William Bartram began to notice a decline in variety and numbers of wild animals in Appalachia. He wrote,

As for the animal productions, they are the same which originally inhabited this part of North America, except such as have been affrighted away since the invasion of the Europeans. The buffalo (*Urus*) once so very numerous, is not at this day to be seen in this part of the country; a few elk, and those only in the Apalachian mountains. (45-46)

The American buffalo and elk were not the only animals that began to disappear from the mountains.⁷ Deer, in particular, were hunted en masse. During the middle-to-late 1700s, a deer harvest could include up to 2,300 deer (Davis, *Where* 112).⁸ With numbers like these, the flesh of the animal was often left to rot in the woods, while the skin was taken to market and sold. Realizing this loss, many areas of Appalachia put restrictions on the practice of hunting deer, including the killing of does and fawns.

Similar to deer; elk, buffalo and other Appalachian nonhuman animals were not only important for their flesh. Their hides were also a source of value. In 1822, in some areas of Appalachia, “rabbit skins sold for two cents each, raccoon skins sold for twenty cents, fox skins for fifty cents, deer skins for fourteen cents a pound, bear skins for \$1.25 and otter

⁷ For a more complete list of extinct Appalachian animals, see Benita Howell, *Culture, Environment, and Conservation in the Appalachian South* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

⁸ Wilma Dunaway describes many aspects of the fur trade, including deer skins, in p. 33-48 of *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

skins for \$3.00” (Salstrom 4). The fur trade was not only a way for Appalachian people to enter the world market, but also a way for them to earn credit at trading centers, making it a very important activity in Appalachian history (Davis, *Where* 64).

In certain cases, nonhuman animals that were seen as predators were targeted by the newly emerging class of Appalachian farmers. The timber wolf, for example, was eradicated from the Appalachian Mountains by the beginning of the American Civil War. Before then, though, in the 1830s, a timber wolf scalp went for three dollars at market. Bartram had mentioned an abundance of wolves and other predatory nonhuman animals just fifty years before, writing,

Bears, tygers (This creature is called, in Pennsylvania and the northern States, Panther; but in Carolina and the southern States, is called Tyger; they are very strong, much larger than any dog, of a yellowish brown, or clay colour, having a very long tail; they are a mischievous animal, and prey on calves, young colts, &c.) wolves, and wild cats (*Felis cauda truncata*) are numerous enough.

(46)

Soon afterward, however, these nonhuman animals became all but extinct in Appalachia, as settlers began to clear the land and make the necessary modifications for raising livestock.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, alterations in the environment of Appalachia were becoming more and more noticeable. As some of the woods began to be cleared and tighter restrictions were placed on hunting, Appalachian people began to keep livestock. Settlers had adopted a technique for creating pasture land from the Cherokee people called slash-and-burn. The slash-and-burn method of preparing a field for livestock took years, but was at that time the most efficient technique. This practice involves two main

stages: cutting trees and other vegetation, then burning what has been felled once it has dried.

In the initial phase,

[f]armers begin to prepare a field by cutting down many of the trees and woody plants in an area. Trees that provide fruits, nuts, building materials or other useful products may be spared. The downed vegetation or "slash" is allowed to dry until right before the rainiest part of the year, at which time the slash is burned. (Cornell np)

Once the land has had time to regenerate some edible vegetation, livestock can finally be introduced.

Despite the time that it took people to prepare their land for livestock, the mountainous environment of Appalachia still may have been the greatest factor in choosing the livestock a family was to keep. Hogs are not native to Appalachia; they were introduced by Spanish explorers in the sixteenth century, but they “found very little to dislike about the native mountain ecosystem” (Davis, *Where* 110). Hogs were sustained cheaply as well, mostly feeding off large amounts of chestnuts, hickory nuts, acorns, cane stalks, and even the burl roots of trees and shrubs. Furthermore, a “hog could survive on much less pine forest” than a cow, which needed a full “fifteen acres of pine forest to survive during the winter months” (Salstrom 7). Because of this, hogs were the primary domesticated animal of Appalachia during the beginning decades of the 1800s, and are credited with “directly influencing mountain culture [and] changing eating habits, land-use practices and eventually, the landscape itself” (Davis, *Where* 110).

In due course, raising livestock became vital to the agricultural economy of central and southern Appalachia. Cattle, in addition to pigs, were driven from the mountains to

Philadelphia markets by the thousands. According to Frederick Jackson Turner, in 1824, “more than one million dollars’ worth of horses, cattle and hogs” (qtd. in Davis, *Where* 130) passed through Asheville, North Carolina, on their way to South Carolina. The Buncombe Turnpike, which was completed in 1827, “[l]argely follow[ed] the French Broad River,” and allowed drovers to travel “from Greenville, Tennessee through to Greenville, South Carolina” (Salstrom 7). Salstrom has estimated that during the following few years, 150,000 to 175,000 hogs “travelled the Buncombe Turnpike south toward South Carolina” (8). Because of this turnpike and paths similar to it, by the middle of the nineteenth century, “livestock herding was unquestionably the central occupation of families along the French Broad” (Davis, *Where* 130) and other large rivers in Appalachia.

The popular notion about Appalachia during this time, and until recently, was that Appalachia was the epitome of self-sufficiency (Dunaway 3). While, to some degree, this may be true, it is important to note here that during this period, many Appalachian farmers were interested in mass production. Many were pre-capitalists or capitalists who wanted to be more than self-sufficient (Dunaway 5). The primary markets for Appalachian commercial farms that began to develop were the Deep South plantations in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. In an effort to maximize land that could be used for cotton, many plantation owners decided to plant where they had once put aside land for “the breeding of plow animals and food animals” (Salstrom 9). Instead, these animals were ordered from Appalachia. In the beginning of the 1800s until around 1840, “hogs, cattle and mules were driven out of the mountains in large numbers to be sold in the cotton areas of the Deep South” (Salstrom 9).

Livestock generated cash and credit for more people than those who owned the nonhuman animals and those who were directly involved in getting the animals to market. Because these nonhuman animals had to be driven such great distances, there was a large need for grain to keep them going. These animals mostly fed off mast provided by trees in the fall but while they were being driven to market, horses, pigs and cattle stopped in at stock stands, which were places where the nonhuman animals were fed with essential grains, and the drovers and herders had a place to spend the night indoors. After these routes had been established, “some enterprising farmers even timed their fall grain harvest to correspond with the annual hog and cattle drives” (Davis, *Where* 131) so they were able to maximize their profits.

There are conflicting accounts of whether sheep or cattle, which were both introduced to Appalachia by European explorers, were the second most popular animal kept by Appalachian farmers in the early nineteenth century. In *Where There are Mountains*, Davis notes that “sheep were second only to hogs in the mountains, outranking all other livestock, including cattle, in actual numbers” (134) in Appalachia during this period. However, Salstrom states in *Appalachia’s Path to Dependency* that when holdings of hogs, cattle and sheep are compared between western North Carolina farms, sheep usually account for the third largest holding, behind cattle. Nevertheless, the conclusion that can be drawn from this contradictory information is that, in addition to hogs, cattle and sheep were the most frequently kept animals on Appalachian farms in the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Although raising sheep was central to the household economy in central and southern Appalachia, it has been argued that sheep were not value-added products, meaning “few external markets existed for the products of sheep” (which are wool and mutton) and that

“raising the animals brought little additional cash into” the home (Davis, *Where* 136). Davis further asserts that sheep did not bring income into the household because required shelter, fencing, hay and salt. Instead of income, sheep provided the family with wool, which was an essential element of the Appalachian household.⁹

Cattle in Appalachia were not strictly limited to those non-human animals being taken to market and sold for beef. Dairy cows and working oxen were also prevalent in Appalachia during this period. Individual households relied on dairy cows and oxen to meet a variety of basic needs of the family. Oxen were mainly used for labor. Their duty was to pull items such as carts and plows, and those with the right temperament pulled buggies with families aboard. Dairy cows provided families with milk and products made from milk, such as butter and cream. In dire times, milk from a cow would serve as one of the largest sources of caloric intake in a typical Appalachian household.

Information provided by the 1840 United States Department of Agriculture’s United States Population and Agriculture Census reveals that the overwhelming majority of Appalachian families in the mid-1800s were involved in agriculture. In present day West Virginia, which is the only state that is considered wholly Appalachian, 95,944 out of 114,764 employed people were engaged in agricultural pursuits. Furthermore, the northern districts of Alabama and Mississippi, which by Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) definition is considered part of Southern Appalachia, boasted the same sort of percentages. In Alabama, 52,656 out of 55,327 working people were laboring in the agricultural industry,

⁹ On the other hand, it has been suggested that “the combination of selling wool and lambs proved to make sheep a profitable venture for a farmer” (Jarrell 48) in particular regions.

and in Mississippi, the fraction was 51,766 out of 53,554. Finally, in eastern Tennessee, 50,781 out of 56,185 were employed in agriculture.

What can be concluded from this information is that the typical Appalachian family was involved in agriculture in some way during the beginning to the middle of the nineteenth century. Because the census does not provide a distinction between raising livestock and raising crops, or between working for oneself versus working for a commercial farm or being a tenant farmer, it is not possible to determine which families were more heavily involved with which agricultural ventures from this set of data. It may be assumed, however, that most families were involved in raising at least a small amount of both crops and livestock to sustain their households.

1.2.2. Appalachian Industrialization

The period of industrialization in Appalachia was from 1880 until 1930. However, it has been estimated that a sustained decline in livestock raising in Appalachia began as early as 1840 (Salstrom xviii). There are at least two main causes of this decrease. One is that Appalachian farmers began working for wages, and the second cause is that there was a substantial loss of available farming land.

From 1840 until 1860, the Deep South's "demand for animals had begun to outstrip Appalachia's supply" (Salstrom 9). This lack of stock of work animals was paired with the decline of the amount of food animals in Appalachia during the mid-nineteenth century. In earlier years, Appalachia had been supplying the South with both work and food animals. To meet the demand for labor, families had been having many children who would eventually help with the duties involved in taking care of the farm. In addition, while people were raising these large families, more and more settlers continued to move into the region and

began using land that could be used for livestock grazing or crop production. Statistics show that because of the high rate of settlement and childbirth,

The population grew roughly sixty-two percent in the late 1840s, forty-nine percent in the 1850s and eighteen percent in the 1860s. The next leap-of forty-six percent in the 1870s-must be considered the brink of a “frontier closing” as far as Appalachia was concerned. (Salstrom 13)

Furthermore, this large population growth forced settling families into narrow hollows where it was difficult to grow food or keep livestock.

This change was reflected in the following years of the USDA Agriculture Census. By 1860, the USDA had begun to take account of much more information on the livestock and other agricultural products than it had in previous years, including the value of all livestock in the state. Records indicate that Alabama’s value of all livestock was 43,411,711 dollars in 1860; 26,690,085 in 1870; and 23,787,681 in 1880. These numbers reveal that Alabama’s value of livestock dropped forty-six percent over these three censuses.

Kentucky’s statistics are quite similar, with a total value of 61,808,237 dollars in 1860; 66,287,343 in 1870; and 49,670,587 in 1880. Though there is a spike in 1870, Kentucky still lost twenty percent of its value in livestock from the 1860 census to the 1880 census.

Mississippi does not diverge from this downward trend. In 1860, the total value was 41,801,692 dollars; 29,940,238 in 1870; and 24,285,717 in 1880. This reveals a total drop of forty-two percent for Mississippi. Tennessee’s value went from 60,211,425 dollars in 1860; to 55,084,075 in 1870; to 43,651,470 in 1880. Tennessee’s overall percentage drop was thirty-eight percent. Finally, West Virginia, which did not become its own state until after the

census of 1860, had a value of 17,175,420 dollars in 1870; and 17,742,387 in 1880. The value of West Virginia's livestock actually went up three percent over the represented years.

A few concerns regarding the interpretation of this data should be addressed. First, the figures for individual counties in Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi and Tennessee are not provided. This means that the total value of livestock in these states includes livestock from counties that are not considered Appalachian by the ARC definition. Secondly, the censuses of 1880 and 1870 only counted livestock that was being raised on farms; the 1860 census took a count of all livestock. A "farm" constituted of operations that were "sufficient to require the constant labor of at least one person" ("Relation of the Statistics" xvi). So, although no concrete evidence can be gathered from this set of data, what the data does provide is a line showing a generally downward trend in livestock value for these states. West Virginia happens to be the outlier.

Though this area is one that certainly warrants further investigation, for the purposes of this study it may be assumed that the trend in all of Appalachia was not one that typically followed the trend in West Virginia. This idea is assumed because historians who have gone into further detail, such as Paul Salstrom and Donald Edward Davis, have generally agreed on the idea of a decline in livestock worth during these years in Appalachia. In addition, it was noted in the 1890 census that

[e]ver since the census of 1850, if not from a still earlier period, it has been in the North Central division of states, a division embracing the main portions of the upper and central Mississippi valleys, that the greatest additions have been made to the number of farms. (Hyde 1)

This indicates that the largest areas of growth in value of livestock took place in states such as Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Missouri, Michigan, Iowa, Wisconsin and Illinois. Appalachia, as a whole, was not adding value in livestock during this time.

The waning in suitable space for cultivation and grazing in Appalachia did not only result in a drop of livestock-rearing, however. There was an additional drop in the production of grain that had once been used to feed the livestock. Two components of agriculture, which are grain production and livestock-raising, are “dependent upon each other and are mutually helpful, and each stimulates and increases the production of the other” (“Relations of Cereal” 150). They are usually grown on the same farm, with the farm being “evenly divided between the production of crops and the production of domestic animals” (“Relations of Cereal” 150). Farmers in the Midwest began to use the mechanical reaper and the thresher, which sold for about forty dollars in 1840. In Appalachia “the thresher was simply not worth its price, for it could not increase the average mountain farmer’s money income as much as it would cost him in money outlay” (Salstrom 24). Appalachia’s lack of mechanization at this time caused many parts of the region to lag behind the growing Midwest in terms of crop production.

As the losses kept piling up, there began a deterioration of the infrastructure that had been built around marketing hogs, horses and cattle to the South. Similar to the way grain farms began to be moved and grow larger in the Midwest, much of the livestock relocated out of the region as well. Drovers, or cowboys, are more easily associated with Texas and the open fields of the southwest than they are with the Appalachian hillsides.

The reason behind all of the changes throughout the middle to late nineteenth century is industrialization in the nation, as well as in the mountains. Around the American Civil

War, many farms in Appalachian were consolidated into large private and federal timber holdings or became sites for natural resource and mineral extraction.¹⁰ The same eastern capital that had once “helped to finance the export from Appalachia of its agricultural surpluses” had now taken “new forms, such as timbering and mining” (Salstrom 25). Because of the change in investment, farm sizes and the availability of farming land in Appalachia faced yet another significant decrease. The mountaineers found themselves no longer independent producers, but wage-earning employees as they moved their families from their farms into towns depending on coal, other extractive industries, mills or textiles (Salstrom 25).

Fathers who had once been able to divide their land among their offspring and continue the family’s legacy of farming and who still wanted to do this, found it more difficult to acquire new lands for their children and even to maintain a modicum of productivity on their own land. In addition, farmers often had to sell portions of their land holdings to earn cash to pay taxes. In 1880,

[t]he average farm size in the mountains was 187 acres, with one quarter cultivated, one fifth pasture, and the remainder in woodlands. By 1910, [just thirty years later] the average farm across the region had dropped to fewer than ninety acres, [more than 50 percent] then by 1930, to only seventy-six acres (Davis, *Where* 179).

¹⁰ For more information on land acquisition in Appalachia, see Wilma Dunaway, “Settlers, Speculators, and Squatters: Competition for Appalachian Land Resources, 1790-1860” in *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

Once the land was sold and the taxes were paid, there was a very small amount of land to be used for grazing.

Land consolidation and relocation, as well as shrinking ownership, were soon combined with the introduction of fence laws. Once Appalachia had provided space for [h]undreds of cattle, horses, sheep, and hogs [to] roam at will during the summer over the ridge, which afford[ed] the finest grass for grazing, and [to] grow fat without further care or attention than the occasional visits of the herdsman to “salt” them. (Carpenter 8)

Caring for livestock had apparently been relatively easy until “[t]he advance of railroads and the growth of towns and tourism called “fence laws” into being” (Williams, *Appalachia* 218). Fence laws made the owners of livestock “liable for damages done by wandering animals” and it “imposed restrictions on the traditional habit of treating the mountain forest as open range for cattle and hogs” (Williams, *Appalachia* 218). The end of the “open range” tradition of raising hogs and cattle and “the imposition of fencing constituted a major setback for small farmers, depriving their livestock of many acres of mast, which still at that time fell in abundance from Appalachia’s forests” (Salstrom 26). Farmers simply no longer had the space or the money to feed animals that once ate mast for free.

Those who remained “on the land” during the period of industrialization were forced back into self-sufficiency, with no surplus. People who made the decision to stay were “denied capital investment because [their farms] produced no cash income from which interest could be paid or capital could be repaid” (Salstrom 25). This lack of security forced many people to the coal mines and company towns, even if on a part-time basis.

Although much more work needs to be done in this area of scholarship, we do know that working animals remained an essential aspect of the Appalachian way of life until the end of the period of industrialization. Animals were still being used by Appalachian people regularly in the 1930s, when “mechanized farming retired many remaining draft teams” (Howell 77) and other working animals. These animals were valued, again, not for their flesh, but for their ability. Working horses, mules, and oxen were proverbial “beasts of burden” that were used to pull anything and everything that needed pulling. Working animals were present in all of the extractive industries, as well as on remaining farms.

Timber and lumber were the largest industries in antebellum and post-bellum Appalachia (Blethen 24). Timber

[s]upported a host of other industries—supplying fuel for saltmaking, charcoal for ironmaking, bark for tanning leather, support beams for constructing mine shafts, barrels for transporting salt and meat—and provided building material for the production of most artifacts in a wood-based culture. (Blethen 24)

Before mechanization, horses were often used in this industry. They dragged sixteen feet long logs out of the deepest and narrowest of hollows in the backcountry and took them to the rivers and streams which floated them down to the lumber mills. Horses were very valuable to those who worked in the timber business. It has been said that the “the timber industry did not seriously inhibit livestock production in most of Appalachia until after the turn of the century” (Salstrom 26) when the industry became mechanized.

However, the timber industry and subsequent wholesale deforestation of Appalachia can be blamed for the loss of many wild animals that were once native to Appalachia. Cutting down large areas of timber drastically changed the ecosystems all over the land.

Animals that were able to live in the center of the forest were not always able to live on its edges, which were created when a large section of timber was cut. Furthermore, the creation of paths and roads into the mountains was devastating to Appalachian wildlife, and in some cases, prevented wooded areas of Appalachia from being considered forests by the United States government, thus allowing those areas no protection from logging endeavors.¹¹

Though logging remained a thriving business throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, coal and other extractive industries became the largest industry in the Appalachian Mountains after the Civil War (Dunaway 164). Mules, which are the products of female horses and a male donkeys, were the working animals of choice in the coal mines. They were valued for their strength and endurance, as well as their short legs, which allowed them to fit in the mine shafts easily. Mules carried tons of coal out of dark mine shafts per day. Many men who worked for these lumber and coal tycoons would often make metaphors between the ways that they, the workers, and the animals were seen and used by the business owners. Some even believed that the companies valued the mules more than they valued the men. Much like the commercial farming business before, these industries were done on a large scale. The idea was to create as much product as possible.¹² One popular saying during this time was that a good mule was difficult to find; a man, on the other hand, was easily replaced.

¹¹ For more on environmental protection in Appalachia, see Benita Howell, “Appalachian Culture and Environmental Planning: Expanding the Role of the Cultural Sciences” and Mary Hufford, “Reclaiming the Commons: Narratives of Progress, Preservation, and Ginseng.” Both essays can be found in Benita Howell, *Culture, Environment, and Conservation in the Appalachian South* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

¹² In Marxist economic theory, the idea of increasing quantity is known as the Capitalist Accumulation Model. For information on this model, see Ernest Mandel, *Marxist Economic Theory* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969) and Henryk Grossman, *Law of Accumulation and the Breakdown of the Capitalist System* (London: Pluto Press, 1992).

Families that were living in coal camps during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were often encouraged by coal operators and owners to keep a few head of livestock with which to feed themselves.¹³ This was a way for the coal companies to prevent having to pay miners and their families more money, or scrip, in most cases, so that they could buy food. Typically, miners would keep a cow for their dairy products and a few chickens for eggs, and occasionally, meat. However, the scale on which miners and their families relied on animals forms “a contrast with the initial self-sufficiency of Appalachia’s agriculture, and with its people’s earlier capacity to produce a marketable surplus of farm products to fill their other needs” (Salstrom 13). Not everyone was keeping nonhuman animals, and certainly not everyone was selling their surplus. Many were using the company stores to get their food.

Despite the majority of people in Appalachia living in rural industrial¹⁴ areas during the period of industrialization, some people in Appalachia were still farming. The 1920 USDA Census reflects this. Results from this census divide data among geographic areas. Those that are considered Appalachian would be the “South Atlantic,” which includes Delaware, Maryland, D.C., Virginia, West Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, and the “East South Central,” which includes Alabama, Kentucky, Tennessee and Mississippi. In terms of head of dairy cattle within the state, both “South Atlantic” states and “East South Central” states fall right in the middle of the rest of the United States. The

¹³ For more information on maintaining a subsistence lifestyle while living in the coal camp, see Paul Salstrom, “Labor-intensive Mining and the Subsistence Reproduction of Labor Power, 1880-1930” in *Appalachia's Path to Dependency: Rethinking a Region's Economic History, 1730-1940* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994).

¹⁴ “Rural industrial” is a term used by John Gaventa in *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980). “Rural industrial” describes areas of industry in Appalachia better than the term “industry center.”

division with the most head of dairy cattle is “East North Central” with 5,050,798. The fewest belongs to the “Mountain” division (which includes states in the Rocky Mountain Range) with 619,645. The “South Atlantic” and “East South Central” divisions show 1,673,035 and 1,882,361, respectively.

Out of the sixteen leading wool-producing states between 1909 and 1919, there is not a single central or southern Appalachian state that falls in the list. The “South Atlantic” and “East South Central” divisions fall near the bottom of the list regarding total number of sheep, reporting 1,209,424 and 1,318,349 respectively. The “Mountain” division boasts the highest total number of sheep, at 13,206,983, with the absolute lowest being the “New England” division at 242,706 sheep.

Hogs, once the favored nonhuman animal of Appalachia, fall in the middle of data reported on the 1920 census. The “South Atlantic” and “East South Central” divisions show 5,480,150 and 5,506,355 hogs, respectively. The division with the highest total number of hogs is “West North Central” with a resounding 23,985,421 hogs; and the fewest belongs, again, to “New England” with 464,688 hogs.

As mentioned before, the census data is collected only from what is considered a farm. This does not include nonhuman animals used in a working environment or those that are considered pets or for personal use. What can be drawn out from this information is that, although Appalachia was by no means leading the country in livestock production, there were still many, many animals roaming the hillsides during the final years of the Industrial Revolution.

Looking from 1920 into the middle part of the twentieth century, one can see how the mechanization and modernization of the Appalachian region and its industries would, yet

again, drastically change the landscape, people and animals of Appalachian. Machines and motors would soon be developed that would replace the beast of burden forever. Oxen and their carts would be swapped for trucks, horses for tractors and hardy mules for coal elevators and other mining equipment, leaving these majestic beasts to be seen only at county fairs and hobby farms.

1.2.3. How Revealing is the History?

The history laid out in this chapter describes a series of major movements regarding humans and nonhuman animals in central and southern Appalachia, beginning with the period of Appalachian settlement. During that period, the immediate need for survival and the lack of cleared land on which to farm led to a hunting lifestyle that persisted for several decades. Wildlife that was once native to the Appalachian Mountains, such as buffalo and elk, quickly disappeared from the region after the arrival of white settlers. Other wildlife, such as deer and black bears, were hunted en masse, not for their flesh, but for their pelts.

In many areas of Appalachia during this time, the new residents began to prepare their land for cultivation and livestock. Nonhuman animals such as cattle, hogs, horses and sheep had been introduced to the mountains a few hundred years before by European explorers. They were some of the best suited nonhuman animals for life in the high elevations, and they rapidly began to show up in the cleared valleys and on hillsides as well as sunny mountain balds, or areas on the ridges of mountains where trees and shrubs do not grow. While the land was being cleared, the natural habitats of some nonhuman Appalachian animals were undoubtedly destroyed. Furthermore, those nonhuman animals that were the natural predators of newly introduced livestock, such as the timber wolf and mountain lion, were continually being hunted in an effort to remove nonhuman predators from the region.

The decimation of Appalachian forests, and as a by-product, the Appalachian ecosystem, continued well beyond the period of settlement. The ruination of the woodlands in Appalachia ran well into the twentieth century, fueling the Industrial Revolution that was taking place all throughout the United States. During this time, mass deforestation devastated many remaining wildlife habitats. Horses and other beasts of burden were used to drag logs to rivers, where they could be floated down the mountain to mills, sawed up and sent to the north where “huddled masses” needed new housing.

The period of coal and the need for massive amounts of it to fuel America’s Industrial Revolution and the First World War, contributed greatly to an already growing decline in local land ownership in Appalachia. This, too, had effects on Appalachian animals. Mules were once used in the mines to pull out coal, but there came a point when a mule, much like a man, just could not bring out enough coal. This eventually resulted in mechanized mining equipment and the loss of jobs for both mules and men. Furthermore, as a result of the American Civil War and the concomitant development of the coal industry, railroads capable of exporting Appalachia’s natural resources to northeastern cities began to spring up in Appalachian valleys and along rivers. Along with the railroads came fence laws and an end to the free-range lifestyle farmers had been used to practicing with their livestock. Fences and the shrinking availability of farmland began to drastically reduce both the amount of livestock, and the number of families who still kept livestock, during the middle to late 1800s.

As the Industrial Revolution raged on, many Appalachian families moved to industry centers, including coal and timber camps deep in the heart of Appalachia or mill towns and textile centers on the periphery of Appalachia and in the piedmont areas of the American

southeast. The availability of store-bought goods in these towns turned keeping livestock, which was once essential for the survival of typical Appalachian families, into a secondary source for sustenance. Even those who remained on the land during this era often took part-time work in one of the above industries. Because farm sizes in Appalachia had continued to shrink, capital from outside investors no longer went to struggling Appalachian farmers. Instead, outside investment began to be poured into the extractive industries, while farming production moved further west.

The conclusion which results from this information is that the primary relationship between humans and nonhuman animals in Appalachia during this time was an economic relationship. Finances were the deciding factor in decisions such as which nonhuman animals should be killed, which ones should be kept and how many should be kept. Finances also determined how useful particular nonhuman animals were to Appalachian residents, as well as which ones were not worth having around.

1.3. Connecting History and Literature

Appalachian literature based in and around the periods of settlement and industrialization reflects the history laid out in this chapter. In addition, there is clear progress in the extent to which the literature reflects the history. Literature written by Appalachian people during the twentieth century, such as Lee Smith and James Still, reflects historical themes more deliberately and accurately than does literature written during the eighteenth and nineteenth century by “outsider” explorers, such as William Bartram, and “outsider” local colorists like Constance Fenimore Woolson and Mary Noailles Murfree. The reasoning behind this idea is an area in need of analysis; however, this analysis will not be done here. Perhaps the simplest explanation is timing. Writers whose subject matter is one-hundred or

so years before their date of publication have the advantage of being able to read histories and understand time periods better than writers whose subject matter and date of publication are roughly a decade or so apart. Nevertheless, because animals were such an integral part of Appalachian culture throughout history, they are evident in all types of Appalachian literature.

One of the most prominent historical themes shown in the literature is the idea of cleansing the landscape of animals that were seen as treacherous. An Appalachian work that best exemplifies this theme is *Hunter's Horn* by Harriette Simpson Arnow. The novel was first published in 1949. It is set in the southeastern Kentucky mountains, beginning in the fall of 1939 and tells the story of Nunn and Milly Ballew and their young family.

In this novel, one of the primary sources of conflict is a red fox named "King Devil." The elusive fox spends her nights preying on the agricultural community's small livestock, earning a bad reputation and a bounty on her head. Neighbors of the Ballews keep King Devil's infamy alive by telling stories about glimpses and traces of the red fox. In one such story, a neighbor "had seen him [they had not yet realized that King Devil is female at this point] walking down the road past his barn, walking along and taking his time like somebody going to church" (Arnow 30). Another neighbor complained about all of the hens King Devil had killed during the night, remarking that "[t]hey'd hear one short, smothered-down squawk, sometimes not even any cackling from the others; [King Devil] slipped up so slyly nothing saw him, not even the hen he killed" (Arnow 31). Actions such as these led to many nights of fox hunting.

During a particularly captivating fox hunt one fall night, Old John Ballew, Nunn's second cousin, offers ten dollars to the person who finally kills King Devil, noting that King

Devil will “kill five times that in lambs... this comen spring” (Arnow 36). Earlier in the night, “[t]hat damned red fox [ran a hound] to death” (Arnow 36), and this event probably prompted the bounty more so than the impending loss of lambs. However, ten dollars in 1939 was certainly a good deal of money. It was enough to prompt one of the hunters, Ernest Coffee, to give up killing King Devil “fair an true with a hound” (Arnow 38), and to go get his gun from his truck and handle the business himself.

Before the bounty had been announced, the method primarily used to try to rid the landscape of King Devil in *Hunter’s Horn* had always been hounds. These hounds were not only good for hunting foxes, though. They are depicted throughout the novel as working animals that provide for the family in many ways. This point is evident when Nunn reflects on the death of his dog, Zing, who happened to come the closest to chasing down King Devil. After he rolls Zing up into his jumper, Nunn says his dog “never lied to me or any man, nor swore, nor used his teeth on anything but a varmint I wanted him to kill” (Arnow 36), calling attention to the good character, trustworthiness, and usefulness of his departed companion.

Wilma Dykeman’s classic 1962 novel, *The Tall Woman*, is another story that exemplifies working animals. The novel is set in a fictional place called Thickety Creek, which is nestled in the North Carolina Mountains, on the eve of the American Civil War. It tells the life story of protagonist Lydia McQueen from early adulthood until death. After receiving a cow, who was later named “Pearly,” as a wedding gift from her husband, Lydia almost immediately has to put the animal to work.

With the men gone to fight in the war, the women and animals are left behind to fulfill the agricultural duties of the family’s farm. Plowing is usually the duty of an ox, mule, draft horse or other strong animal; however, Pearly is all Lydia has to work with at the time.

So, with “ill-fitting gear” (Dykeman 48), Pearly and Lydia set out for the fields. Pearly “pulled and kicked a few times, [and] backed and balked as the weight of the plow became heavy in the field” (Dykeman 48). Nevertheless, “With Lydia leading her by the halter she made it down the length of one row and back again” (Dykeman 48). Like many working animals, Pearly continues to fulfill a multitude of roles for the Moore and McQueen families throughout *The Tall Woman*.

Another prominent theme throughout Appalachian literature that matches the historical analysis of this chapter is having livestock while the family lives in a rural area, then not needing livestock anymore once the family moves into a town or industrial center. This is shown in both *Fair and Tender Ladies* and *River of Earth*. James Still’s novel *River of Earth* narrates three years of the life of Brack and Alpha Baldrige and their young family as they try to make ends meet during Great Depression-era Appalachia, both outside and inside of mining towns suffering from a boom and bust economy in the mountains of Eastern Kentucky. The story begins with the Baldrige family living on the outskirts of a mining camp called Blackjack, which has been closed, leaving its workers, including Brack Baldrige, to fend for themselves.

In *River of Earth*, the father in the Baldrige family, Brack, explicitly tells his wife that they would have no use for a cow once they moved into the mining town (Still 49). Once Brack was able to secure employment with the mine again, though it was temporary, he stood by his word and immediately brought home,

A five-pound bucket of lard with a shoat drawn on the bucket. Brown sugar in a glass jar. A square of sowbelly, thin-rinded and hairy. A white-dusty sack of flour, and on it a picture-piece of a woman holding an armful of wheat straws.

And there was a tin box of black pepper, and double handful of coffee beans.

(Still 69)

Brack announced that he was to “start digging tomorrow” and that he “drew this victuals out of the storehouse on credit” (Still 69-70). Though the family had not yet moved to the mining town, they were just two miles away, which made relying on the company store’s goods relatively easy for the family to do. Furthermore, to this poor family, buying food was possible because the company store allowed them credit. No one could afford to give this family a cow or another head of livestock on credit and hope they would somehow be able to pay the lender back.

Lee Smith’s 1988 critically acclaimed novel *Fair and Tender Ladies* contains the same sort of story. *Fair and Tender Ladies* is a mono-epistolary novel that tells the life story of Ivy Rowe Fox, beginning around the turn of the twentieth century, in a fictional area in southwestern Virginia. The setting begins in a rural area, moves to a town, then to a coal camp, then back to a rural area, as it follows Ivy through her life’s ups and downs.

Before Ivy’s father dies, while the family is still living on their farm in rural Sugar Fork, she writes to her “Pen Friend,” Hanneke, and explains that the Rowe family has a cow named Bessie, and that they “grow cabbages and sweet taters and white taters both and shucky beans” (Smith, *Fair* 16). Ivy tells Hanneke that her family raises what they need and that they “don’t go to the store for nothing but coffee and shoes and nails and to get the mail” (Smith, *Fair* 16). Ivy seems awestruck by the store and expresses to Hanneke her wonder, saying “I wish you could see Stoney Branham’s store at Majestic” (Smith, *Fair* 16). After the death of Ivy’s father, her mother moves what is left of their family to the nearest town, which

is Majestic, Virginia. They move into a boarding house that is run by Ivy's mother's friend, whose name is Geneva Hunt.

Ivy writes to her friend Molly and describes herself as "a town girl" (Smith, *Fair* 93) and tells Molly not to pity her if she is ever of a mind to do so. While living in Majestic, Ivy works at the boardinghouse as a sort of server. She describes it as a very busy place with "so many people coming and going... that a girl can slip away to come and go all over town, and see what ther is to see" (Smith, *Fair* 91). Since moving to town, Ivy had begun to live quite a different lifestyle than she did on the farm back in Sugar Fork. The family no longer grew everything they were in need of; they bought goods and sold them to travelers, instead.

Finally, the financial value of the animal is a theme explored in almost all types of Appalachian literature, including travel writing, local-color writing and more contemporary literature. Value is frequently illustrated through the worth of horses. By the period of industrialization in Appalachia, horses had already become a status symbol in the United States and other industrialized countries, and were only affordable for people who were wealthy.¹⁵

Several scenes from *River of Earth*, though some are, at times, comical, display the lack of good, able-bodied horses in poor Appalachian communities. In one such scene, Clabe Brannon, a neighbor of Brack and Alpha Baldrige, brings a nag¹⁶ for Brack to ride over to his house because he knows that the Baldrige family does not possess any animals capable of transportation. Perhaps if Clabe had been a wealthier man he would have had more horses

¹⁵ See Thorstein Veblen, "Pecuniary Canons of Taste" in *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions* (New York: Viking Press, 1967) for a more in-depth discussion of pets and animals as status symbols.

¹⁶ "Nag" is a term for a horse that is either old or in poor health, or both.

in good condition and he would not have had to bring a nag. The same idea is present in the scene where “Uncle Jolly,” Alpha’s brother, must dismount his old, tired nag, and push her the rest of the way up the hill to the Baldrige’s house. If Uncle Jolly had the funds to be able to afford a proper horse, he more than likely would have done so to prevent having to carry the animal who was supposed to be carrying him.

Although the value of animals may be understated, like many other animal-related themes in travel writing and local-color, the ideas are still present. The rather long short story, “Up in the Blue Ridge,” by Constance Fenimore Woolson, is one such work where profits stand to be made from horse-lending. “Up in the Blue Ridge” was first published in *Appleton’s Journal* in August 1878. The story revolves around Stephen Wainwright, socialite traveler with “a large fortune [and] a good intellect” (Woolson 277), and Miss Honor Dooris, a young girl and librarian from a small mountain town called Ellerby.

During the carriage ride to Ellerby, Wainwright finds himself in the company of Bethuel Head, a “little minister” (Woolson 287) and apparent horse dealer. After a little discussion, Head tells Wainwright that if he is going to stay in Ellerby for a while, he will need horses. Following this idea, Head suggests people “will cheat [Wainwright] in the village; better apply to [himself]” (Woolson 287) for horses instead. Wainwright agreeably takes down Head’s name after a bit more prompting by Brother Bethuel.

The next time Wainwright is bothered about applying for horses from Head comes when he ostensibly visits Colonel Eliot, Miss Dooris Honor’s uncle. Miss Honor suggests to the Colonel that she take Wainwright up to see “the view.” With the Colonel’s consent, the two head up the side of the mountain. Once there, Miss Honor reveals the real reason why she had asked to take Wainwright to the top of the Colonel’s hill, which was to suggest to

him that if he “should stay [in Ellerby], and need – need horses, or a – guide [he should] apply to Mr. Head” (Woolson 299). Immediately, Wainwright thinks, “They are in a conspiracy against me with their horses” (Woolson 299). His fears are allayed, however, once Miss Honor tells him that “Mr. Head is poor, and – and tries to make a little money now and then with his horses” (Woolson 299) and that Miss Honor, herself, tries to help him by finding clientele.

Expressing similar sentiment is a short story titled “A Mountain Storm.” It was written by Mary Noailles Murfree, under her penname, Charles Egbert Craddock. “A Mountain Storm” is a piece of local-color writing from a collection of Murfree’s short stories titled *The Young Mountaineers: Short Stories*, which was first published in 1897. The story marks no date, and is set in an unnamed hilly and cavernous area.

“A Mountain Storm” begins with a “fraternal quarrel [over a filly] which neither [brother] forgot for years” (Murfree np). In the first scene of the short story, two brothers, Ben and Thad, stand in conflict over whether or not Ben’s filly is fit to be ridden by Thad, in his effort to fetch their father from a moonshining still before he and it are discovered by authorities. The reader is introduced to the story during the midst of their argument. Ben begins to excuse his refusal to allow Thad to use his horse by saying, “Ef the filly war bridle-wise” (Murfree np) before he is abruptly cut off by Thad’s retort that “The filly _air_ bridle-wise” (Murfree np). Somewhat conceding to his brother’s comment, Ben then remarks that he does not think the revenuers are looking for stills anymore, saying “I don’t believe that thar word ez them men air a-raidin’ round the mountings no more” (Murfree np). After this exchange, Thad becomes infuriated with his brother and eventually leaves on foot, leaving Ben on the side of the hill below the barn.

Ben sits in this spot for quite a while, until lightning flashes and a storm begins to approach. At the sudden gust of wind and flash of lightning, “Ben turned, and ran like a deer up the steep ascent” (Murfree np) toward the barn in an effort to protect the filly in case the strong wind were to “blow that thar barn spang off’n the bluff” (Murfree np). Once at the barn, Ben realizes his horse is missing, and immediately blames his brother, declaring Thad “air no better ‘n a low-down horse-thief” (Murfree np).

At the resolution of the story, Ben realizes that instead of stealing the horse, Thad had left the horse’s gate unlatched, which allowed her to run away when she had been scared by the lightning. What the story never resolves, however, is why Ben did not want to let his brother borrow the horse for a short trip down the mountain. He made multiple excuses that Thad was able to call into question at the beginning of the story, but did not give the real reason before Thad became upset and left the situation. The filly is obviously very valuable to Ben, for when he discovers the horse is missing, he calls his brother a horse thief, then returns to the house and tells their mother he “hopes ter conscience she’ll [the filly] break his [Thad’s] neck” (Murfree np). Although Ben said this in a moment of frustration and anger, it expresses how strongly he wanted his horse to remain with him.

One of the most overt themes in “A Mountain Storm” is the stereotype of the quarrelling, feuding mountain family. Using the horse as the cause of the feud suggests, however, that the horse was such a valued addition to the family that she was worth the two brothers fighting over. Though we do not know for sure, the horse may well have been the family’s most valuable possession.

1.4. Tying Literature and History Together

Appalachia's land and people underwent many important changes and saw encroachments that impacted the lives of humans and nonhuman animals in drastic ways during the periods of settlement and industrialization (1770s-1930s). Examples of these changes include the confiscation of land by European colonists from Native Americans, the American Civil War and the subsequent "discovery" of Appalachia by northern capitalists, the deforestation of Appalachian hillsides and mountains, and finally, the mass extraction and exportation of timber and coal. All of these changes in the land led to differing ways of surviving and making a living for people who were living in the region. The majority of Appalachian people who had once been able to feed themselves and make a little extra money from farming, were forced to move into one of the many mining camps near extractive sites, whether the site be for coal, salt, iron, copper or mica. All of these changes in the land and people led to changes in the animal population of the mountains as well.

Settlement in Appalachia and the desire to raise livestock in the mountains caused the extinction and near-extinction of several nonhuman animal species native to the Appalachian Mountains. Both periods led to the deforestation of Appalachia, devastating many nonhuman animals' natural habitats. Furthermore, the introduction of large-scale mining operations caused people to move into mining company towns, and rely largely on a company store, instead of their own livestock.

The points of view literature brings into focus make thinking about the place, role, and understanding of animals in the history of Appalachia more accessible (Fudge, *Renaissance* 3). Instead of the anthropocentrism and objectivity we see throughout the environmental histories of Appalachia, fictional literature allows us to learn about humans

and animals together. After all, it has been said that “[r]eading about animals is always reading through humans, and . . . , reading about humans is reading through animals” (Fudge, *Perceiving* 3). In literature, the two entities that have seemed so separate for so long are able to come together and work in unison to provide a more complete picture of Appalachian culture.

CHAPTER 2: LITERARY ANIMALS: REPRESENTATIONS OF THE NONHUMAN ANIMAL IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE

2.1. Appalachian Animals on Our Mind

When trying to understand the social and cultural side of nonhuman animals in Appalachia, one should turn to fiction. An idea for the frame of mind regarding human attitudes and relationships with nonhuman animals can be attained by analyzing characters in Appalachian works of fiction and creative nonfiction. Though cultural,¹⁷ intellectual¹⁸ and literary¹⁹ histories of Appalachia have been created over the past fifty years, feelings and attitudes, or emotional history, generally has remained unexplored. In this chapter, the goal is to begin to gather the emotional history of Appalachia by starting with human to animal relationships.

The histories which already exist do not uncover the more intimate side of keeping animals. Histories of Appalachia do not provide any information on the emotional comfort given, or in other cases, heartache, nonhuman animals caused their keepers and companions. History does not address, for example, how a mother felt when her family's cow, which provided so much, had to be sold, or how the children felt when they were forced to give up their nonhuman animals and move into a coal camp. Finally, histories of Appalachia do not

¹⁷ Loyal Jones, *Appalachian Values* (Berea: Berea College Appalachian Center, 1984); Horace Kephart, *Our Southern Highlanders* (New York: Outing Pub. Co, 1913).

¹⁸ Henry D. Shapiro, *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978).

¹⁹ Cratis D. Williams, *The Southern Mountaineer in Fact and Fiction* (New York: New York University, 1961).

make available any discussion of how the nonhuman animals were treated by the family or how the animals treated the family.

These deficits in the history of Appalachia are significant because nonhuman animals have been such an integral part of the Appalachian way of life. History tells us that nonhuman animals were indicators of social class,²⁰ and that they were factors in decision-making and the political economy of Appalachia.²¹ Animals also served Appalachian humans as modes of transportation, as aides in responsibilities such as plowing and planting, and as lifelines in the forms of nourishment and financial investment. Looking at animals through this anthropocentric lens does not allow us to get a complete picture of the life of animals in Appalachia. The goal of this chapter is to pick up the metaphorical slack in this area by using Appalachian literature as a vehicle for the exploration of Appalachian culture.

Literature is not only an important commentator on culture, but also a potential model for culture. Writers often make artful recommendations for the cultures they write about, as well as set up experiments for cultures in their imaginative work. In addition to locating and discussing the emotional quotient of Appalachian humans revealed through works of literature, this chapter will complicate the interaction of Appalachian literature and culture and seek out any instances where recommendations on or experiments with culture have been made.

2.2. Nonhuman Animals and Cultural Studies through Literary Analysis

Scholarship has been done in human and nonhuman animal relationships in literature. In 2005, Jennifer Mason undertook an in-depth analysis on the representation of nonhuman

²⁰ See Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (New York: Viking Press, 1967).

²¹ See Paul Salstrom, "The New Deal and Appalachia's Agriculture" in *Appalachia's Path to Dependency: Rethinking a Region's Economic History, 1730-1940* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994).

animals in nineteenth century urban American literature and how nonhuman animals contributed to shaping American culture.²² Similarly, Erica Fudge has written numerous books over the past fifteen years about human and nonhuman animal relationships in Renaissance literature and the nonhuman animal's role in human life during the early modern period.²³ These types of literary and cultural studies have profoundly shaped the field of critical animal studies as well as the writers' respective literary disciplines. New discussions have begun regarding the nonhuman animal's role in human life through examining the relationships between humans and nonhuman animals in literature.

This study uses similar analytical strategies to those used by Mason and Fudge to examine the nonhuman animal and human relationships in Appalachian literature, with the hope that it will ultimately allow for a deeper understanding of Appalachian culture. In doing so, I address some of the same assumptions informing the works of Mason and Fudge. In an effort to avoid redundancy, these ideas will be discussed throughout the chapter instead of individually and summarized in the closing.

The first idea I address in this essay comes from Fudge's *Perceiving Animals*. In her book, Fudge posits that "the treatment of animals in written material has always been similarly bound up with animals as absent-presences: there, but not speaking" (2). I wish to examine works of Appalachian literature with an eye toward themes regarding the emotions Appalachian people and animals have shared in order to further scrutinize the human-animal

²² See Jennifer Mason, *Civilized Creatures: Urban Animals, Sentimental Culture, and American Literature, 1850-1900* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).

²³ Fudge, *Animal* (London: Reaktion, 2002); *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006); *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture* (Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 2000); and *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004).

relationship and understand in what ways Fudge's idea of absent-presences has been utilized. The second idea I address in this chapter comes from Mason's *Civilized Creatures*. In this study, Mason states "that animals became important to the American literary imagination precisely at the point they became absent from most people's everyday lives" (3).²⁴ After completing the study of how human-animal relationships and emotions are represented, I will comment on how Mason's statement can be applied to works of Appalachian literature, specifically.

2.3. Emotional Science

René Descartes is largely considered a villain in the field of critical animal studies. His most central contribution "to the animal question is his distinction between humans and other animals based on the possession of a mind and a capacity for conscious thought" (Fitzgerald and Kalof 59). In his letters to Montaigne and Pythagoras between the years of 1646 and 1649, Descartes

discusses what he considers to be the prejudicial belief ... that animals are thinking beings. He cites lack of speech by animals as evidence of his claim that animals do not think, reasoning that since animals have the organs necessary for speech their lack thereof must be the result of a paucity of the thoughts necessary to motivate speech. He therefore concludes that animal

²⁴ Although I reference Jennifer Mason in this section, the idea of animals becoming important in American literature during the time when America was becoming more urban and industrialized is also discussed in John Berger's essay "Why Look at Animals?" in *About Looking* (New York: Vintage, 1992).

actions are not inspired by thought, but instead are instinctual or mechanical, and as mechanical entities animals lack souls.²⁵ (Fitzgerald and Kalof 59)

Thinking such as this has obviously had very negative consequences on animal populations throughout the world.²⁶ And, unfortunately, Descartes's scientific influence did not end with animal psychology (or lack thereof).

The philosophical form of human psychology was also influenced by Descartes's work.²⁷ The modern study of human psychology (as a social science instead of a branch of philosophy) began during the late 1800s, when “[i]n American literary and cultural studies, [the same time period] is universally understood to be a period of intense interest in animals and their relationship to people” (Mason 1). I regard this as somewhat ironic because the contemporary study of human psychology led to our current understanding of human emotions. Using the model of evolutionary psychology, emotions are described as “adaptations that have arisen [through evolution] in response to the adaptive problem of mechanism orchestration” (Cosmides and Tooby np).²⁸ Now, science assumes, humans are “mechanical entities” as well.

Though we are still using the same language, the science of psychology, both in humans and animals, has become quite a bit more sophisticated. Human psychologists such as Robert Plutchik, Paul Ekman, Wallace Friesen, Carrol Izard and Silvan Tomkins “believe

²⁵ This information is based on *Descartes: Philosophical Letters*, translated and edited by Anthony Kenny, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970).

²⁶ Consequences include using animals as objects of spectacle and sport, as scientific objects, as well as mass-produced food items. All of these topics are covered in Linda Kalof and Amy Fitzgerald's edited collection, *The Animals Reader: The Essential Classic and Contemporary Writings* (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2007).

²⁷ Specifically, “Meditations on First Philosophy” from René Descartes, *Descartes: Selected Philosophical Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986); and Stephen Voss, trans., *The Passions of the Soul*. (Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1989).

²⁸ For a more in-depth discussion of evolutionary psychology, see Michael Lewis, Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones, and Lisa F. Barrett, *Handbook of Emotions* (Third ed.), (New York: Guilford Press, 2008).

that certain emotions are basic or primary [and] the basic emotions are: sadness, happiness, anger, fear, disgust, and surprise. These emotions combine in different ways to form other [secondary] emotions, including compassion, boredom, embarrassment, rage, hunger, and more” (“List of Human Emotions” np). Animal psychologists, or cognitive ethologists such as Marc Bekoff, have also identified a list of basic animal emotions.²⁹ One may or may not be surprised to know that many cognitive ethnologists believe animals experience all of the same basic emotions humans do, plus many secondary emotions (Bekoff 10). In essence, animals also experience sadness, happiness, anger, fear, disgust, and surprise, as well as many complex combinations of these emotions.

I have laid out this information in order to proceed with a foundation of scientific backing. In the remainder of this chapter, the analysis of literature is divided among those basic, or primary, emotions which all animals (human and nonhuman) share. Furthermore, in an effort to keep novels and stories together, discussions of human emotions and animal emotions take place under the same section and are additionally divided among the species of animal being represented.

2.4. Literary Animals

2.4.1. The Cow

Wilma Dykeman’s classic 1962 novel, *The Tall Woman*, begins in a fictional place called Thickety Creek, in the North Carolina Mountains, on the eve of the American Civil War. It tells the life story of protagonist Lydia McQueen from early adulthood until death.

²⁹ Other than Marc Bekoff, Jane Goodall, Colin Allen, Peter Singer and E. O. Wilson have also made substantial contributions to the field of cognitive ethology.

There are several nonhuman animals in this work that play an important role in Lydia's life, but the cow, Pearly, may be the most significant one.

Mark McQueen, Lydia's newlywed husband, acquires Pearly in the beginning of the story by trading a neighbor an unknown item or service for her. On the day Lydia and Mark set out to move into their first home together, Mark reveals the cow to Lydia and tells her that the cow is all hers (Dykeman 20). Lydia is astonished by this gift and becomes filled with "the pleasure of ownership" (Dykeman 20). She says to Mark, in reference to the cow, "She's the daintiest beast I ever did set eyes on" (Dykeman 20). Then, addressing the cow, Lydia says, "You bring us milk and cream for rich yellow butter and we'll see you get all the grass and fodder you can hold and a snug place to sleep nights when winter comes. You'll be a valuable to us" (Dykeman 20). Lydia feels "proud for the cow walking slowly behind" their wagon and believes the cow allows the couple to be "beginners of substance" (Dykeman 20). She sees the cow as the "beginning of their farm, the plenty and promise that they would make for themselves ... and their children" (Dykeman 20). Lydia's attitude toward Pearly is one of happiness, gratification and security. She believes this cow will be valuable to her and Mark as they begin their family together.

Soon after Lydia and Mark move into their house, Mark goes off to fight in the war. He leaves Lydia with the responsibility of tending their fields and the cow (Dykeman 24). A short while later, Lydia's mother, Sarah Moore, is brutally attacked by a gang of outliers (men avoiding regular service in the war). Lydia's younger sister, Kate, pleads with her, saying, "Lydia, you've got to stay with us now ... You're all we've got" (Dykeman 34). Realizing that she must move back to her homeplace to help care for her family until her

mother is well again, Lydia goes back to her and Mark's home to get her only possession, Pearly.

The first use Lydia found for Pearly was to plow the Moore family's field. This was not easy at first. Pearly, wearing "ill-fitting gear ... pulled and kicked a few times [and] backed and balked as the weight of the plow became heavy in the field" (Dykeman 48). Nevertheless, "[w]ith Lydia leading her by the halter she made it down the length of one row and back again" (Dykeman 48). Lydia was "[s]even months, or better, along" in her first pregnancy by this time and she had "done a good man-sized job" leading Pearly through the field (Dykeman 48). Her Aunt Tildy and mother forbade her from doing it anymore that day, so Lydia turned the job over to Kate, saying, "Pull Pearly easy but steady ... and talk to her" (Dykeman 48). When Kate replied, "I've nothing to say to a cow" (Dykeman 48), Lydia snapped back at her, saying, "[t]hen say the alphabet" (Dykeman 48). Lydia tried to make Kate realize the value of the cow, saying, "[i]t's the sound of your voice gentles her. Don't you understand, Kate, she's all we've got? We've got to make her do or do without" (Dykeman 48). Perhaps no one recognized Pearly's value to the family as much as Lydia, and she made sure Pearly knew how she felt. Later that evening, "[w]hen Lydia went to milk [the cow], she slipped out a lick of salt for Pearly [and] she gave the little cow an extra nubbin of precious corn, too" (Dykeman 49). Giving Pearly salt, a treasured item for which "[t]here was no substitute" (Dykeman 33), was a sign of care and thankfulness.

After Mark returns from the war and decides to build himself and his wife a new house, Lydia continues her care for the cow by suggesting a barn-raising before the temperature drops, without telling Mark why she wants this. The reason is that she "[c]ould not bear to think of the cow shivering in a make-shift lean-to during the winter to come"

(Dykeman 84) and “[s]he wondered if Pearly was frightened [and if she] would be safe from wild animals” (Dykeman 88) in their new home. Lydia thinks “[i]t would be good for [Pearly] to have her a tight, warm place” (Dykeman 88). Lydia’s plan for the barn-raising is for her “Aunt Tildy and the girls [to] fix food for all, and when the tight stalls for Pearly and her feed were finished, the men could come and join their wives in a big dinner set under the trees” (Dykeman 84). Lydia’s father, Jesse Moore, butchers his hogs early so that the McQueen family can provide their neighbors with some meat at this dinner, along with the corn pudding and stack pies Lydia plans to make on her own (Dykeman 87).

Though Lydia feels “triumphant” about the idea of the two hams her father has provided for them, Mark feels embarrassed. He feels as though his neighbors think they were a needy family, remarking, “everybody up and down the valley will be saying your pa had to butcher his hogs early this year to furnish the table for them that come to furnish us a barn” (Dykeman 87). With those parting words, Mark disappears into the night and does not return until nearly morning.

The following morning, Mark tells Lydia he has butchered the cow. He announces the butchering of the cow with pride and a sense of accomplishment, telling Lydia, “there’ll be no call for you to be ashamed of the food we have to offer” (Dykeman 89). Further separating himself from the cow, Mark consistently refers to Pearly as “our beef” (Dykeman 89). Mark sees fit to use Pearly one last time as a status symbol. He had given Lydia the cow, which they considered their “finest possession,” and walked her slowly behind their wagon so that “their friends at the infare³⁰ could see that they might be a beginning couple, but they

³⁰ A party or other celebration held to mark someone entering a new home, especially the arrival of a bride at her new home.

were beginners of substance” (Dykeman 20). The new house Mark builds is a way for them to start over, and again, Mark uses Pearly to “roast in style and plenty” and boast a bit of affluence for their friends (Dykeman 88). For a second and final time, Lydia is astonished.

As Mark unknowingly breaks the bad news to Lydia, she “gave one cry and clasped her hands to her mouth” (Dykeman 89). She leaves the house and “at the edge of the field ... swinging from a heavy beech limb, hung her cow, hung Pearly” (Dykeman 89). Lydia can not emotionally handle what she sees; “[s]he could not look at the carcass. What had happened was beyond belief” (Dykeman 89). The image of Pearly hanging from the tree causes

a dozen memories [to flood Lydia’s] mind: of mornings when the milk foamed into the bucket and promised them nourishment for one more day; of Robert guiding a plow behind the strangely harnessed creature as Kate coaxed her along; and the sound of dainty hoofs as Lydia led Pearly down a long hard road on a bleak late-winter day before David was born. (Dykeman 89)

Lydia had seen the cow as more than just an animal. Pearly had been a symbol of “high confidence” (Dykeman 89), of hope and as “a gentle beast that had fed them, nourished Lydia’s baby when food was scarce, and had been ready to do so again” (Dykeman 90), had she been given the chance.

In her short life, Pearly was able to fulfill many roles for the Moore and McQueen families. Among other things, Pearly had been a commodity that was exchanged between men, a gift, a possession, a working animal, a source of nourishment, a cause for confidence, hope, motivation and an uplifted spirit, a pet, in a way, and eventually, a meal. Pearly is a

good example of the ways in which an Appalachian woman recognized a deeper worth in an animal than its simple financial value.

Lydia and her family members displayed a variety of emotions toward and over Pearly. However, Pearly was not described as displaying any emotions herself. The closest readers come to getting an idea of Pearly's personality is the effort she exerts while trying to pull the plow across the field (Dykeman 48). This scene represents Pearly as willing to do what needed to be done and being compliant under the domination of her human owners. There are no scenes throughout Pearly's short-lived appearance in *The Tall Woman* that allude to any emotions Pearly may have experienced, truly making Pearly one of Fudge's absent-present animals (Fudge, *Perceiving* 2).

Another absent-present cow can be found in Appalachian author James Still's novel, *River of Earth*. First published in 1940, *River of Earth* exposes ways cows were still important to Appalachian families even toward the end of the period of industrialization, when Appalachia's agricultural economy was in the latter stages of reduction. *River of Earth* narrates three years of the life of Brack and Alpha Baldrige and their young family as they try to make ends meet during Great Depression-era Appalachia, both outside and inside mining towns suffering from a boom and bust economy in the mountains of Eastern Kentucky. The story begins with the Baldrige family living on the outskirts of a mining camp called Blackjack, which has been closed, leaving its workers, including Brack Baldrige, to fend for themselves.

The Baldriged, devoid of livestock other than a few guineas, had been surviving for about a year off a small amount of pork, what wildlife they could find, and a garden they had planted. Alpha, the mother in the family, though having just given birth, "ate little more now

than the rest [of the family], for the baby's sake, eating as though for shame while [they] were not there to see, fearing [they] might not understand" (Still 13). Even then, Alpha thinks her baby is puny. She tells Brack, "'I'm uneasy. He needs cow's milk, and plenty'" (Still 48) and gets no response. Alpha does not let go of this need, however; standing over a patch of "lush growth" (Still 50), she says, "[t]his would make the finest hayfeed ever was ... Just going wasting ... If we had us a cow her udders would be tick-tight ... It would be a sight the milk and butter we'd get'" (Still 49). Brack has his heart set on moving back down to Blackjack though, when the mine opens back up. He tells her that the family "won't have use for a cow at Blackjack" (Still 49), where they would be able to buy what they need from the company store.

Soon after this conversation, a neighbor seeking help brings a calf that has a corn cob lodged in her throat up to the Baldrige's homeplace. In a very emotional scene, several of the family members try to reach their hand down the calf's throat to dislodge the cob, but none are successful. Seeing this, the neighbor decides to leave the choking calf with the Baldriges. Immediately after he leaves, Alpha voices her desire again. She says, "[i]f we could raise her ... there would be milk for the baby'" (Still 63). With nothing left to do, Brack cuts the calf's neck, takes out the cob and sews her neck back up with a needle and thread.

With the baby "mighty nigh starved" (Still 68), Alpha longs "for the heifer to start giving milk" (Still 69), but that time never comes. The baby dies of croup about a year later, but before he does, the neighbor who had left the young cow with the Baldrige family "heard the calf was alive and sent a man to fotch it. He was ashamed to come a-claiming himself" (Still 170). Alpha blames this neighbor and the subsequent lack of having a milk-

producing cow for the death of their child, saying, “[i]f Saul Hignight hadn’t laid claim to the heifer, we’d had milk and butter too. The baby might o’ lived” (Still 170).

Alpha’s reliance on a nonhuman mammal’s reproductive system to take the place of her own again shows one way a cow is instrumentalized. Though Alpha’s strong desire for the heifer to grow and eventually be able to produce milk represents her deep faith in the ability of the animal, the true reason Alpha longs for ownership of a cow is not because she wants to take care of the animal, but because she wants the animal to take care of her and her family. The only family members who are interested in saving the cow’s life for the sake of the cow and not of the family, are the unnamed protagonist and narrator, and his sister, Euly. Ironically, neither of these characters do anything to help dislodge the corn cob. Instead, they both cry. Euly cries “softly, and then angrily” (Still 64) and her brother cries shamefully (Still 65). Euly and her brother’s tears show more than the emotion they feel over the calf. Their juxtaposition to their unemotional family members, draws specific attention to the lack of emotion on the rest of their family’s behalf.

During the time the calf spends with the Baldridges before she is taken back, she seems to form a close attachment with the children, but in an absent-present fashion. There are no emotions to suggest this idea. There are a few scenes where the children are in the fields or are walking somewhere and the heifer calls out to them or follows them. In each of these scenes, the calf is described very plainly and directly. In one scene “[t]he heifer ran after” (Still 79) the children, and in another, “[t]he heifer bawled dolesomely after” (Still 71) the family. It is obvious that the calf is present in the novel, but the calf’s role in the novel is very limited and her personality is never truly developed.

Though to a lesser extent, there is a sentiment similar to Alpha's toward a family cow in Lee Smith's 1988 critically acclaimed novel *Fair and Tender Ladies*. *Fair and Tender Ladies* is a mono-epistolary novel that tells the life story of Ivy Rowe Fox, beginning around the turn of the twentieth century, in a fictional area in southwestern Virginia. The setting begins in a rural area, transitions to a town, then to a coal camp, and finally moves back to a rural area, as it follows Ivy through her life's ups and downs.

Ivy comes from a family that grows "nearabout all [they] eat" (Smith, *Fair* 16) and it is clear that their cow provides sustenance for the family as well. Ivy writes to her pen-pal and explains that the family's cow, Bessie, is "close to give out" (Smith, *Fair* 16). She further states that this is causing their mother, Maude, quite a bit of grief. Ivy writes, "Bess is sick... [T]his is fidgeting Momma to death what to do, for the twins is so little yet, we need milk for Danny is always weak" (Smith, *Fair* 16). This again echoes a mother's reliance on a cow's reproductive system to meet the needs of her family.

Though the section of *Fair and Tender Ladies* where Bessie is written about is very brief, there is still enough information to declare her an absent-presence. It is clear that Bessie is an important resource for the family, because Maude is worried "to death" (Smith, *Fair* 16) and it is apparently causing Ivy to worry as well. This worry represents the presence of the cow. The absence of the cow is reflected in the fact that Ivy never mentions anything in her letter about the actual cow, other than that she is "close to give out" (Smith, *Fair* 16). Readers never come to understand why she is ill, or if anyone is sad or upset that she may die. Furthermore, nothing is told about Bessie's personality. She is just a force which causes Ivy's family concern for their health.

Alpha and Maude place great stock in having a cow. Alpha believes that the cow would be able provide so much for her family, that it would make the difference between life and death. The Baldrige's neighbor, Saul Hignight, apparently places stock in the cow as well, first saying that he could not "afford to lose this one" (Still 62), then sending someone to reclaim the calf, in spite of knowing how badly the starving family needs to have it and the fact that he has another cow of his own. The emotions regarding the Baldrige family and their cow are not quite as intimate as those between Lydia and Pearly, but they are somewhat similar. Though Alpha's interest in the cow seems to be instrumental, and Saul Hignights's is financial, the Baldrige children express an interest in, or at least a sympathy for the calf. The relationship between Maude and Bess is very similar to the one between Alpha and her nameless calf, though the section is much shorter. Both women place a lot of faith in the cows, but only because they rely on the cows for the lives of their children.

Although these three works of Appalachian literature present cows as very important to Appalachian families, both instrumentally and sentimentally, none of the three cows are represented as being thinking creatures. As Fudge discusses in *Perceiving Animals*, the cows are "there, but not speaking" (2) and not feeling. Even as nearly every member of the Baldrige family is shoving their entire arm down a calf's neck, the animal is still not written about using terms of emotions. One would assume that a living, breathing creature in this situation would exhibit signs of fear, horror or terror, but the word Still chooses to describe the animal with is simply "lifeless" (64).

2.4.2. The Dog

Dogs have been described as "man's best friend." There is an abundance of reasoning behind this, which is often uncovered in the literature of Appalachia. While canines may not bring as much financial value to the home as a cow or horse, they are able to provide for

families that keep them in many ways. For example, dogs frequently served as companions for family members; protection for the house; children and livestock; and they aided in hunting endeavors.

In *Fair and Tender Ladies*, there is a bond between a man and his dog that makes a noteworthy impression on the young protagonist. Revel Rowe is Ivy Rowe's paternal uncle. He comes to visit in the beginning of the novel on Christmas day, as his brother and Ivy's father, John Arthur, lay on his deathbed. Before Ivy begins to explain who Revel is, she talks about his "big black dog" who had been "wagging hisself all over the house and licking at people and jumping up" (Smith, *Fair* 29). Ivy learns that the dog is named "Charly" and remarks that he "minds the best and is the smartest dog [she] ever seed" (Smith, *Fair* 30). The dog "goes everywhere with uncle Revel" as he travels around with "whisky to drink and his banjer to play" (Smith, *Fair* 30). It is apparent that Ivy is very captivated by her uncle and his dog.

The bond between Revel and "Charly" is one that mirrors the bond between Chad and his dog, Jack, in the novel *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*. Written by John Fox, Jr. and published in 1903, *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come* is a classic work of Appalachian local-color writing. The book landed on the *New York Times*' list of bestselling novels during 1903 as well as 1904. Fox, a native of non-Appalachian Bourbon County, Kentucky, was a Harvard educated journalist and war correspondent for the majority of his life.³¹ He began to publish fiction during the 1890s, with his primary subject matter being life

³¹ More can be found on John Fox, Jr.'s biography in Bill York, *John Fox, Jr.: Appalachian Author* (Jefferson: McFarland & Co, 2003).

in the rural Kentucky hill and mountain regions, places with which Fox had only some familiarity.

The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come is set in the Cumberland Mountains, in southeastern Kentucky, during the latter parts of the nineteenth century. It tells the story of a young, twice-orphaned “wandering waiif” (Fox 6) named Chad, and Jack, Chad’s “dog with a belly to feed and [who] went for less than nothing with everybody but his little master and the chance mountaineer who had sheep to guard” (Fox 4). In the beginning of Chad and Jack’s story, the inseparable two had been living with, guarding cattle and driving sheep for, a family of four who were all taken by a “plague that passed [through the valley], taking with it the breath of the unlucky and the unfit” (Fox 1). On the morning of the funeral for the last family member, it had been decided that Chad was to be taken in by a neighbor named “old Nathan” whom the foster family owed a debt. However, Chad had been told that this neighbor hated dogs and he “did not mean to be bound out, nor to have Jack mistreated” (Fox 5). Therefore, after the funeral, while Jack sat waiting “with perfect faith and patience, for the boy to make up his mind” (Fox 6), Chad decides that rather than be bound to the neighbor, he and Jack would go out in search for a new place to call home.

Prior to this decision, Chad and Jack had moved around quite a bit. Chad had left places many times before, “usually because somebody, like old Nathan, had wanted to have him bound out, or had misused Jack, or would not let the two stray off into the woods together, when there was nothing else to be done” (Fox 6). He had stopped to stay with the now deceased “Uncle Jim” and “Aunt Jane” because “the old man and his son and his girl had all taken a great fancy to Jack” and did not mind if the two “stayed out in the woods over night” (Fox 6). Although the initial encounter (a “dog-fight and [a] boy-fight with the family

in the next cove” [Fox 27]) would not suggest it, Chad and Jack did not spend too much time on their own before they were taken in by the Turner family, a new family who took a liking to Jack.

The first morning Chad and Jack awakened in the home of the Turners, old Joel, the family patriarch, tells Chad his dog has “a heap o’ sense” (Fox 28). This compliment prompts Chad to tell old Joel all about his acquisition of Jack; “how Chad had nursed [the dog] and how the two had always been together ever since” (Fox 29). Already impressed by Jack’s intelligence, Chad soon gives old Joel even more reason to appreciate the two newcomers when he rises from his sleep and announces that he can milk the cow. This initiative allowed old Joel to see that “it was plain that the little stranger was not going to be a drone in the household” (Fox 29).

Just a short while later, the Turners’ sheep get loose from their pen and begin to follow a runaway ram across the river and into the woods. At Chad’s command, Jack swims across the river and “flashing like a ball of gray light through the weeds and up into the woods,” Jack begins to round the “evidently much scattered” (Fox 33) sheep up. Until old Joel realized that “[p]lainly, Jack was no sheep-killer” (Fox 33) he had sent one of his sons into the house to get his gun, so that he could shoot Jack before the dog was able to get ahold of any of his sheep. As Jack makes his way back to Chad, old Joel, with astonishment and happiness, remarks to Chad, “‘I *do* be damned. I’ll just take that dawg to help drive them sheep down to town”” (Fox 34). Though it had taken a moment of panic, Chad and Jack had officially made themselves a lasting part of the Turner family.

Chad’s love for Jack and unwillingness to stick around anywhere his dog is not welcome is a display of affection by a human to a non-human animal. Jack and Chad had

grown up together, and were equals in a partnership that helped both of them survive. Although a deep, loving feeling from human family members to nonhuman animals, especially dogs, is a common theme in Appalachian literature, often the dog has to “earn” his or her place in the family through service, much like the way Jack had to prove himself a good fighter and herder before the Turner family fully placed their trust in him. In many works of Appalachian fiction, the dog earns his or her rank in the family through a display of hunting ability. *Hunter’s Horn*, written by Appalachian author Harriette Simpson Arnow, displays this idea very well.

Hunter’s Horn, published in 1949, is set in the southeastern Kentucky mountains, beginning in the fall of 1939.³² The book tells the story of Nunn and Milly Ballew and their young family. Throughout the novel, the Ballews interact with many others who live in their rural community called Little Smokey Creek. One of the most identifiably Appalachian themes carried out in *Hunter’s Horn* is the deep connection to place. The setting of Little Smokey Creek has been described as an “isolated place, where many of [Arnow’s] characters’ richest experiences concern their connections to the land” (Ballard xi). In this case, the idea of “place” and “land” can be extended to include the wildlife that exists naturally with, or alongside, the land.

Nunn Ballew, the patriarch in the Ballew family, becomes “obsessed with” hunting and killing an elusive red fox that has been dubbed “King Devil” by the Little Smokey Creek community (Baer 118). This fox, who turns out to be a female, is charged with “stalking the neighborhood, killing farm animals and luring hounds to their deaths” and although “[e]veryone else in the area has given up chasing the devilish animal” (Baer 118), Nunn

³² See the Introduction to *Hunter’s Horn*, written by Sandra L. Ballard.

continues until he is able to kill her. Though this synopsis may seem to say a bit more about a man's lust for the death of a wild animal than it does a literary dog, it explains why Nunn takes better-than-usual care of his fox hunting hound, Zing. In parts of *Hunter's Horn*, Nunn even "neglects his land and his family" (Baer 118) in order to keep his hound in good enough shape to be able to hunt King Devil.

The first instance of such happens in the beginning of the novel, where readers stand at the counter of a country store with Nunn as he shops for necessities the Ballew family cannot make on their own: "overalls and dress goods and small shoes," sugar, lard, flour and a few cans of dog food for an "old hound when his teeth ain't so good" (Arnow 1). Against the clerk's advice to try a few cans and come back to buy more if the dog likes it, Nunn decides to go ahead and buy two dozen cans of dog food (but before leaving, gets five more), which is worth two dollars, citing that he "need[s] it right away. It'll soon be fine fox-hunten weather" (Arnow 1). Nunn spends twelve dollars at the store, which buys enough to hopefully get his family, including the dog, through the winter and into spring.

When Nunn gets home later that evening, he is met at the gate by Zing, his "big black and tan hound ... a great gaunt ugly beast with a ribby chest and knotted legs and a sad scarred face framed by long hanging tattered ears" (Arnow 3). Zing's outward appearance does not match his personality, however. He meets Nunn by "frisking like a pup, licking Nunn's wrists and his hands, sniffing his shoes, then leaping away and running madly around him" (Arnow 3-4). Before Nunn had left the store, the clerk wrapped up a few "nice fresh beef bones," and gave them to Nunn for Zing free of charge (Arnow 2). Zing could smell the bones down in Nunn's grass sack, and began "sniffing with eager eyes and a watery mouth" (Arnow 4). Zing, now apparently an older dog, had not had beef since he "wasn't hardly a

full grown pup” (Arnow 4). Knowing this, Milly, Nunn’s wife, giggles as she remarks that she “ain’t seen Zing so lively in a long time” (Arnow 5). Zing’s giddiness brings happiness to each member of the family that evening, so much so, in fact, that the children begin to beg their father to give Zing the bones right away instead of making the dog wait until the family has finished eating.

When Nunn concedes to his eager children, Zing takes his raw beef bones beneath the table. The children sit on the ground around the dog and admire his great pleasure, remarking that their parents “ought to see him ... [h]e’s lickin it ... an his mouth’s a drippen water” (Arnow 7). Eventually, though, Zing stops licking the bones, much to the children’s disappointment. Zing then “slunk from under the table and went and lay down behind the stove, head down on his outstretched paws. His tail lay land and sad and his ears drooped at the reproach and disappointment in the children’s voices” (Arnow 7). Milly quickly quiets the children, telling them that “Zing can’t help it if he’s old an not able to chew, an he never was much of a hand fer raw meat anyhow” (Arnow 7). She then assures the dog by telling him “[w]e’ll cook em Zing, an it’ll be fine” (Arnow 7).

Unsatisfied with Zing’s inability to eat the special dinner he had been given, the children again begin to beg their father on Zing’s behalf, so that the dog may have some of the canned food Nunn bought. Milly chimes in, too, telling Nunn, ““They’s a little coal oil left ... It’ll burn long enough fer you to see to feed him. They’ve hurt [Zing’s] feelens so, an I guess he’s hurt his teeth so a tryen to chew that bone that he’ll never eat that plain corn pone” (Arnow 8). Nunn again gives into his family’s wishes and opens the can of store-bought dog food. After putting some into Zing’s bowl, the family all stands around the dog, anxiously waiting to see whether or not he will approve of his new food. After looking

“questioningly at Nunn,” Zing “began a silent, wolfish gulping of the food” (Arnow 8). Milly sighs with relief at this sight, then begins to wash the evening dishes as Zing keeps “licking his long-since-empty pan, pushing it around Milly’s feet” as she continues to wash dishes and the other members of the family go on with their evening activities (Arnow 9).

Though Nunn’s love for Zing was sparked by his great skill in hunting foxes, the other members of the Ballew family love him for his personality and the happiness he brings to their lives. Zing does have instrumental use for the family, but he is also loved sentimentally. The Ballew family members keep Zing in their thoughts and reflect on his puppyhood, much like they do with the childhood of their children. Nunn’s love for Zing even prompts the store clerk to donate beef bones to the dog, thereby bringing together the two men more so than a simple business transaction would have.

Narrating a sentimental love for nonhuman animals separates John Fox, Jr. and Harriette Simpson Arnow into a category different from Wilma Dykeman, James Still and Lee Smith. Although they all write Appalachian stories containing many nonhuman animals, Fox and Arnow represent the animals as emotive. Zing expresses many emotions throughout *Hunter’s Horn*, including happiness and shame. Fox describes Jack as being “in wonder” (10) and “joyful” (10), which are secondary and primary emotions, respectively. Furthermore, Jack and Zing both seem to have characters that are just as well developed as the human animals in their corresponding novels.

At this point, one may be thinking that Dykeman and the others did not attach any emotional quotient to the animals they wrote about because of the specific species of the animal. After all, dogs often live in the house with humans, travel with humans, and work with humans. Dogs form attachments to humans differently than cows do. However, this is

not the case. There are many dogs that Lydia encounters throughout *The Tall Woman* to whom Dykeman accords little to no emotional description.

One of the first canines is a “black-and-tan pup from a litter of one of Morgan’s [Bludsoe] dogs” (Dykeman 107) that Mark brings home. Probably still reeling from the memory of the last animal Mark brought home, Pearly, Lydia tries not to grow “attached to the awkward, flop-eared hound,” but she does “in spite of herself” (Dykeman 107). She thinks of its “deep, distinctive bark that led Mark to name it Big Bass” and “wondered if she had remembered to tell Mark where she kept the cornbread for” (Dykeman 107) the dog. Though Lydia tries not to become close to Big Bass, his personality (which readers never really get to know) draws her in, so much so that she cooks and saves food for the dog.

Later, Lydia and Mark take a trip up the mountain to visit with Big Matt Bludsoe. When they get there, Lydia hears a “low whining sound, a mixture of pain and weakness” (Dykeman 248). She asks Big Matt if it is one of his dogs, and when Matt’s wife Callie says that it is, in fact, “Old Thunder, Morgan’s best bear dog [and that] [h]e was in a fight last week [and] got part of his belly ripped open” (Dykeman 248), Lydia asked if she could look at him. After asking Morgan, who is Big Matt and Callie’s son, to hold onto his dog, Lydia “bathed the wound as well as she could ... with her own clean handkerchief” (Dykeman 249) and some hot water. She then told Morgan that she had “medicine at home [and] you send somebody down to get it and I’ll make you up a salve to put on that gash” (Dykeman 249) in the dog’s side. For this act of kindness, Callie Bludsoe smiles at Lydia. Lydia “had seen no one smile since she had come to this place” (Dykeman 250). Then Callie tells Lydia that her boys had “named [Lydia] to [her] before this ... [and that] they spoke the truth” (Dykeman 250), meaning Lydia was a good-hearted woman.

Although Lydia “had no idea why she had asked” if she could see Old Thunder, the dog brings the two families together, and allows Lydia the courage to ask a question she has been wanting to ask Big Matt for many, many years (Dykeman 248), which is whether or not the Bludsoe family was responsible for the violent attack on Sarah Moore during the war. She is relieved to find out that they were not to blame, and this leads to a lasting friendship between the two families. Even later in life, as Lydia lay on her deathbed, Callie comes to be by her side, saying, “I’m a stranger to you’uns, but I be no stranger to her that’s laying in yonder. She saved a dog for my boy, Morgan, once” (Dykeman 312) and it created an unbroken tie between the two women.

What these Appalachian stories of dogs all have in common is the idea that dogs and their human animal counterparts share a reciprocal love and relationship. Beginning with rambling Uncle Revel and his dog, Charly, from *Fair and Tender Ladies*, and roaming Chad and Jack from *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*, readers sense a feeling of companionship between the dogs and their masters. The dogs go everywhere with their human animals; if either is not welcome, neither shall stay. When the relationship expands from a duo (as in, a man or boy and his dog), to a larger family, it seems as though the dog has more pressure put upon it to perform in order to belong with the human animals. The dog needs to prove its usefulness to the family so that the relationship stays balanced and reciprocal. The most common (and seemingly appreciated) way dogs are able to display their worth to the family is through their hunting ability. The dogs become providers for the family in such a way that they are, arguably, almost as valuable as the patriarch himself.

The differences in these stories, though, are in the descriptions of the dogs themselves. Whereas Arnow and Fox write about the animals as characters in and of

themselves, Smith and Dykeman typically use the animals in their stories only as “absent-presences” to provide their readers with more information about their human characters. For example, Lydia appears compassionate and helpful through the episode with Old Thunder. Old Thunder, much like many of the other dogs in *The Tall Woman*, does not get to be his own entity. He has a flat character and is simply a literary tool.

2.4.3. The Horse

As discussed in the previous chapter, during the periods of Appalachian settlement and industrialization, horses had already become a status symbol in the United States and other industrialized countries, and were only affordable for people who were wealthy. Many of the families who are chronicled in the Appalachian fiction being discussed here do not fall into the category of wealthy; therefore, horses are not often represented in the literature. Owning horses was a rare and special thing for typical Appalachian people, and the literature of the region reflects this idea. The sentiment is expressed in James Still’s *River of Earth* when Brack Baldrige’s unnamed oldest son, the narrator of the novel, has a moment when he discovers that he might be the proud owner of a newborn colt at just seven years of age.

Clabe Brannon, a neighbor, comes to visit the Baldriged on their eldest boy’s seventh birthday. Clabe was in need of Brack to come to his farm to help him deliver a colt. As father and son ride to the Brannon farm on a nag Clabe had brought along for them, Brack asks his son how he would like to ““have a leettle side-pacing filly growing up to ride on”” (Still 25). His son responds by saying he’d ““give nigh everything”” (Still 25). The thought of having a “colt, living and breathing, was more than being seven years old; it was more than anything” to the boy (Still 25). It made his heart pound, “knowing suddenly there was nothing [he] wanted more than” having his own horse (Still 25).

After the birth of the colt, Clabe suggests to Brack that he ought to take the colt once he's been weaned, adding that "he ought to make a fine stud-horse" (Still 28). As Brack discusses this with Clabe, Clabe's son, Oates, stands quietly, listening. His "hope seemed a bloated grain of corn on a diseased ear, large and expectant, yet having no soundness beneath" (Still 28). Just after Brack consents to taking the horse "some far day when he's weaned and hain't bridle-scared" (Still 29), Oates approaches Brack's son with "anger in his face, sitting dark as a thunderhead in his eyes" (Still 29). Oates was angry about the possibility of losing the colt, and after insulting the Baldrige family and this young member of it, particularly, Oates "struck [Brack's boy] in the face" (Still 31). After the two boys exchange a few blows, Oates tells Brack's boy, "Hain't no yellow-dog coward Baldrige going to get my colt ... That there one's belonging to me, and I'd break his neck before I'd let him be tuck off" (Still 31).

This scene is one that reveals very strong emotions regarding how these two young boys feel about having a colt of their own. For one boy, excitement and a racing heart are the symptoms felt. The other experiences anger, jealousy, and resentment. It seems that Oates has a strong desire to feel the pride associated with ownership and dominion over another living thing. For the Baldrige boy, the sense is that he would like to have the colt for companionship and to have someone whom he could grow up with and love.

Although this horse causes strife, another horse serves as a sort of comic relief throughout *River of Earth*. In the beginning of the same scene discussed above, Brack's wife observes him as he situates himself upon the nag to ride away. Brack's "legs stuck out like broomsticks" because the "stirrups were too short" (Still 23). She laughs at him and tells him the "biggest load's on top [and that he'd] better give that nag a resting spell before long"

(Still 23). Placing confidence in the nag's ability, Brack says back to her, "Size don't allus speak for strength ... This here nag could carry me twice over and never sap her nerve" (Still 23).

Later on in the novel, a similar scene occurs. Alpha's brother, Uncle Jolly, comes to visit the Baldrige family and to spend the night. He rides a horse named Old Poppet up the mountain to visit them; however, before he could get all the way to the house, Old Poppet "became so winded climbing the last steep of [the] hill, [Uncle Jolly] got out of the saddle, walking behind and pushing her rump" (Still 33). Laughing at the situation, Brack says, "Yonder comes a fool ... He hain't no blood kin to me" (Still 33).

Much like the representation of the calf Brack Baldrige saves, the horses in Still's stories do not get any emotional description. Their physical bodies and actions are described, but the descriptions are often just literary tools used to provide more details about the human characters in the novel, which echoes Fudge's idea that "the treatment of animals in written material has always been similarly bound up with animals as absent-presences: there, but not speaking" (Fudge, *Perceiving* 2).

2.5. When We Started Minding Animals

Returning to an idea expressed earlier in this chapter, there are differences and similarities between the broader category of American literature and the specific category of Appalachian. In her introduction to *Civilized Creatures*, Mason remarks that the "second half of the nineteenth century is universally understood to be a period of intense interest in animals and their relationship to people" (1) and "that animals became important to the American literary imagination precisely at the point they became absent from most people's

everyday lives” (3). Mason goes on to assert “that writing about nonhuman nature required the writer’s at least temporary location at or beyond the periphery of civilization” (Mason 3).

Applying these two arguments to the study of Appalachian literature is enlightening. After all, Appalachia was described by writers during the latter half of the nineteenth century as “a strange land and peculiar people”³³ who were “living to all intents and purposes in the conditions of the colonial times” (Frost np). Appalachia was considered by many to be on the periphery of American civilization. Shapiro argues that the popularity of Appalachian travel writing³⁴ and local color writing during this time led to America’s “discovery” of the region and all of its peculiarities.³⁵

I suggest that one of the main attractions Northern urbanites and other readers of nineteenth century middle-brow magazines may have had to Appalachian travel writing and local color was the abundance of nonhuman animal life. If indeed, the “second half of the nineteenth century is universally understood to be a period of intense interest in animals and their relationship to people” (Mason 3), Appalachia was able to provide stories to satisfy that desire. Although domesticated and wild animals did, in fact, “[become] absent from most people’s everyday lives” (Mason 3) during the period of industrialization and urbanization in the northeast, as Mason suggests, Appalachia was, arguably, slower to separate from its animals. Animals were, as the literature and history suggests, very present. The same aspect of Appalachia that drew attention to its culture through travel writing and local color, which

³³ See Will Wallace Harney, “A Strange Land and Peculiar People” *Lippincott’s Magazine* (October ed.) (New York, 1873).

³⁴ For an anthology of Appalachian travel writing during this time period, see Kevin E O'Donnell, *Seekers of Scenery: Travel Writing from Southern Appalachia, 1840-1900* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004).

³⁵ See Henry D. Shapiro, “The Local-Color Movement and Appalachia” *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978).

is its “otherness” (Shapiro), could also be responsible for stories such as *Hunter’s Horn* and *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come* not reaching the wild popularity and success of books such as Anna Sewell’s 1877 novel, *Black Beauty*. Unfortunately, although cultures on the periphery of civilization may have been interesting to some during this period, the literature they produced has largely been considered “regional” and therefore has not been as highly regarded as some other works of fiction with which it is comparable.

2.6. Conclusion

Rather than tracing a linear change over time, with movements of literature representing animals as purely functional, then as sentimentalized, Appalachian authors have differed on an individual basis throughout the past two centuries. As we have seen in this thesis, the degree to which Appalachian writers represent animals in their stories varies greatly. There are some authors, such as John Fox, Jr. and Harriette Arnow, whose work is filled with animals, and who endow the nonhuman animals of Appalachia with feelings and emotions much like the human characters. Others, like Lee Smith, James Still, and Wilma Dykeman, allow their animal characters to fall into Fudge’s abyss of absent-present animals. They are certainly there, moving the story along, but they do not speak; they are not really represented as characters or agents with their own lives.

As a whole, Appalachian literature provides more intimate details of the relationships found between Appalachian residents and their nonhuman animal counterparts than does the history. In some cases, Appalachian literature reveals just how important the nonhuman animal members of the family were to the survival of the family. The Appalachian fiction also draws out the complex system of reliance and co-dependence between humans and nonhuman animals. Furthermore, the literature is able to show more of the human attitudes

and feelings toward the nonhuman animals during these periods of great change than the history is able to show.

CHAPTER 3: THE “WOMEN-ANIMALS-NATURE ASSOCIATION”: APPALACHIAN
LITERATURE THROUGH AN ECOFEMINIST LENS

3.1. The “Women-Animals-Nature Association”

Those of us who have been trained in the field of Appalachian studies know that Appalachia cannot be lumped into any one category. There is no single thing all Appalachian people solidly agree on, believe, practice or consume. However, there is something more than just geographic location that unites those who live in the many parts of Appalachia, as well as with the rest of the United States. This omnipresent tie is that the people of Appalachia, like the rest of the people of the United States, are living in a patriarchal society. Many Appalachian studies scholars have studied patriarchal systems in the region. Among these are Robert Weise,³⁶ Dwight Billings and Kathleen Blee,³⁷ and Patricia Beaver.³⁸ Each of these scholars employs traditional definitions of patriarchy in their studies, which define patriarchy as “a form of social organization in which the father or oldest male is the head of the family, and descent and relationship are reckoned through the male line; government or rule by a man or men” (“Patriarchy, n.” np) or as “the predominance of men in positions of power and influence in society, with cultural values and norms being seen as favoring men. Freq. with pejorative connotation” (“Patriarchy, n.” np). In these definitions, patriarchy is

³⁶ See *Grasping at Independence: Debt, Male Authority, and Mineral Rights in Appalachian Kentucky, 1850-1915* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2001).

³⁷ See *The Road to Poverty: The Making of Wealth and Hardship in Appalachia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

³⁸ See *Rural Community in the Appalachian South* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986).

either “generally about a male in a prominent familial or governmental role” (Ganguly np) or men having a “privileged position that excludes others (women) from participating or from having power in society” (Ganguly np). Regardless of which definition is used, patriarchy is essentially “a hierarchy in which the man is typically in charge” (Ganguly np).

Since the Colonial Period, manifestations of patriarchy in Appalachia have been multi-faceted. Male domination has taken place in the home with individual families, in the workplace by way of industrial/corporate paternalism³⁹ and in the government, which has, at times, been “under the sway of the companies through the cooperation of local business leaders and simple corruption of local officials” (Edwards, Asbury and Cox 71). Furthermore, complacency with patriarchy and paternalism has been perpetuated by Appalachian Christian churches that largely maintain Calvinistic⁴⁰ ideas of total depravity and irresistible grace.⁴¹

As ecofeminist theory⁴² points out, patriarchy is not limited to human relationships with other humans. Male dominance can be expanded from dominion over “‘human Others,’ such as women, people of color, children, and the poor [to dominion over] ‘earth Others,’

³⁹ For a more detailed discussion of this concept, see Ronald Garay, *U.S. Steel and Gary, West Virginia: Corporate Paternalism in Appalachia* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011).

⁴⁰ In his book, *Faith and Meaning in the Southern Uplands* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), Loyal Jones argues that “mountain people have persisted in their Calvinism” (4).

⁴¹ The doctrine of irresistible grace holds that God’s Holy Spirit “graciously causes the elect sinner to cooperate, to believe, to repent, to come freely and willingly to Christ” (Steele and Thomas 19).

⁴² Ecological feminism, or ecofeminism, as it is abbreviated, sees “the patriarchal dominations of women and other social groups as parallel to man’s exploitation of ‘nonhuman nature’” (Warren and Wells-Howe np). It further seeks to capture “a variety of multicultural perspectives on the nature of the connections within social systems of domination” (Warren, “Introduction” 1).

such as animals, forests, the land” (Warren, *Ecofeminist* xiv).⁴³ Ecofeminist Greta Gaard explains that

[f]or the past two thousand years, women, animals, nature and people of color have become conceptually associated with Western patriarchal thought, and it is their culturally constructed “closeness to nature” as well as their supposed lack of reason that authorizes and reinforces their subordination. (126)

By contrast, men are able to associate themselves with culture, reason, closeness to God and a mastery over nature, with nature expanding beyond the natural elements to women, children, animals, and non-whites.⁴⁴

It is no secret that women have been and continue to be oppressed by man-centered cultures. This is not just an occurrence in Appalachia; the oppression of women is “one of the true universals, a pan-cultural fact” (Ortner 1). It may be more difficult, however, to begin this study with the assumption that the theories of children being oppressed and animals being oppressed are equally as accepted as the theory regarding women’s oppression. In order to address that issue, I offer a set of value dualisms or dichotomies that help illustrate how oppressions related to patriarchy, such as those regarding women, children and animals, are linked in Appalachian literature.

⁴³ It is important to note here that although I am discussing the oppression of groups within Appalachia, Appalachia itself has been seen as an “other” by the larger United States. There is a large body of work on this subject, but good places to begin are Allen Batteau’s *The Invention of Appalachia* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990), Henry D. Shapiro’s *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978) and Rodger Cunningham’s *Apples on the Flood: The Southern Mountain Experience* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987).

⁴⁴ Warren and Gaard are not the only two scholars to make the connection Gaard calls the “women-animals-nature association” (126). Gaard traces the critical work on the association over the past three or so decades in her essay “Vegetarian Ecofeminism: A Review Essay.” In this essay, Gaard explains the history of the “women-animals-nature association” while simultaneously revealing the history of ecofeminism, radical ecofeminism and vegetarian ecofeminism.

The list begins with the mind/body distinction, where “mental activities are more valuable than bodily ones” (Spelman 122). Subsequent dualisms follow the same pattern and include reason/emotion, human/animal, production/reproduction and masculine/feminine. In each set, women, slaves, free laborers, children and animals are identified with the latter subject and men with the first. This set of dichotomies provides a strong foundation for the logic of domination, which is another significant feature of an ecofeminist framework (Tong 237).

Logic of domination is “a structure of argumentation that leads to a justification of subordination” (Tong 237). The way these dichotomies follow the logic of domination is by employing “value-hierarchical thinking ... which places higher value, status, or prestige on what is ‘up’ rather than on what is ‘down’” (Tong 237). In this system, the group of rational, mindful, and intellectual individuals (men) dominate or control groups that are seen, through cultural constructs, as irrational (women, children, animals and non-whites, or human/earth “Others”). The irrational are associated with the body, which is connected with emotion, reproduction and sexuality, and animal instinct.

3.2. Applying Ecofeminism in Appalachian Literature

Ecofeminists see this list of androcentric dichotomies as troubling. Though there are many different followers of ecofeminism (Warren, *Ecological Feminist* x), ecofeminists generally agree on the negativity of “value dualisms ... and the historical sex-gendered association of women with emotion, body, and nature” (Warren, *Ecological Feminist* xvii). Ecofeminists further believe that in order for the male gender bias to be eliminated, it must first be recognized and there must be a “development of practices, policies, and theories which are not male-gender biased” (Warren, “Introduction” 1). Feminist Marian Scholtmeijer

explains that one way the gender bias can be recognized is through the study of literature. She says that “[t]he responsibility for seeing and honoring otherness resides with the source of the trouble: resides, that is with culture” (234). She continues by saying, “[w]ith fiction, we are in the domain of culture. Fiction can expose and dismantle the unexamined belief systems that authorize” (234) the oppression of groups of individuals.

This study follows along those lines to seek out instances where these dualisms appear and to analyze the ways Appalachian authors have commented on, contributed to or broken through the idea of the linked oppressions of women, children and animals. While there has been discussion of gender and sexism in studies of Appalachia,⁴⁵ the primary structure of oppression researched in Appalachia is that of classism.⁴⁶ This study will open a new discourse in the study of Appalachia that will contribute to understanding the roles of women, children and animals within Appalachian culture.

3.3. Identifying with Animals

The gender divide between the characters in Harriette Arnow’s *Hunter’s Horn*⁴⁷ is generally very clear, except in the case of the fox named King Devil. From the very beginning of the novel, each member of the Ballew family, including the dog Zing, fits

⁴⁵ Theda Perdue discusses gender issues in Cherokee society in her book, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998). In addition, for a good introduction to women’s issues in Appalachia, other than the Cherokee case, see Elizabeth Engelhardt’s *Beyond Hill and Hollow: Original Readings in Appalachian Women’s Studies* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2005); Barbara Ellen Smith’s *Neither Separate Nor Equal: Women in the Political Economy* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1999); and Patricia D. Beaver’s “Hillbilly Women, Hillbilly Men: Sex Roles in Rural Agriculturally-Based Appalachia,” in *Appalachian Educational Module: The Appalachian Woman* (Newton: Educational Development Corporation, WEEA Project, 1979).

⁴⁶ A subject search in the Western North Carolina Library Catalog reveals thirteen resources for “Women – Appalachian Region,” a single result for “Gender Identity – Appalachian Region” and 159 resources for “Appalachian Region -- Social Conditions.”

⁴⁷ For my introduction to the study of *Hunter’s Horn*, see “Chapter One: A Brief History and Literary Analysis of the Effects of Settlement and Industrialization on the Appalachian Nonhuman Animal” under the heading “1.3. Matching History and Literature.”

directly into a gender role. For example, the story begins with Nunn in the town, handling the family's finances and needs for the upcoming winter. Zing has spent his day acting as a stand-in for Nunn while Nunn was away from the house, protecting and bringing home dinner for his family.

Milly Ballew is at home in the realm of domesticity among the children, cooking dinner. In fact, Milly may as well be one of the children herself. As readers begin to learn more about Milly, her voice is described as being "light and breathless and touched with the same gaiety that filled the children's" voices (Arnold 4). Her forehead presents "little wispy curls" and she has a "thin child's body" (Arnold 4). Furthermore, Milly does not laugh or chuckle; she "giggles" like her children (Arnold 5).

Milly is very closely associated with her children, and her children are very closely linked with the family's dog, Zing. Tom, one of Milly's two dead children, "had loved Zing like a brother" (Arnold 7). All of her living children feel the same way. They "follow" (Arnold 7) Zing, and advocate for him. They do not only love Zing, they are Zing or Zing is one of them, in a way. The "children and Zing [come] on Nunn together" (Arnold 8), begging for the dog to receive his canned food. The children also "looked eagerly and often toward the bones" (Arnold 7) Zing was supposed to have for dinner, as if they want them just as badly as the dog does. Milly is linked to Zing by association through her children.

The women-animals-nature association in *Hunter's Horn* appears not in connection to Zing, but in Milly's connection with the fox, King Devil. She sees King Devil for the first time while she is out with her youngest child, Deb, trying to draw a particular kind of sap from a tree that she is hoping will help Deb with his breathing problems. When Milly sees King Devil, the fox is standing on a ledge with her fur brightened by the sun (remember,

though, that it is not until the fox is killed that we realize she is actually a female). Milly seeing the fox is likened to Moses seeing the burning bush; it is a divine experience (Arnow 19). Milly believes the fox is “eager for her to see him” (Arnow 19). King Devil is described as standing “still among the red leaves, head turned toward her, fiery-tipped brush lifted, mouth open, happily, pleasantly, like a dog” (Arnow 19). The two look at each other. King Devil “was so close [Milly] could see the hairs in his eye-brows, the teeth shining in his half-open mouth, and the green fire in his coolly appraising eyes” (Arnow 19). Milly realizes the fox is King Devil when she notices a “nicked left ear” (Arnow 19). This is “the fox Nunn had chased in hatred and in anger for the last five years” (Arnow 19), the same fox that “every hunter was sworn to kill” (Arnow 19). Milly shares an experience with the fox that no one else ever has. Though “many had seen him long enough to learn his mark ... never had he stood so still and close as” (Arnow 19) he did with Milly. Not even Deb was able to see King Devil, despite Milly’s desire for him to.

Milly kept this experience a secret from her husband. She told no one where she had seen the fox, though the men all gathered that night to hunt for her. Milly was keeping King Devil safe, in a way, while all of the men and many of the women in her neighborhood wanted King Devil dead. By doing this, Arnow utilizes the women-animals-nature association. Because Milly does not participate in helping her husband find and kill King Devil, and she in fact keeps the fox’s location a secret, Milly joins the side of nature. She does not aid her husband in his conquest over the fox, though killing the fox may seem reasonable because the fox has stolen people’s livestock for years. King Devil actually had a dead chicken when Milly saw her. The need for the fox to be eradicated in order to save livestock, and therefore money, does not matter to Milly. She recognizes the fox’s simple

need for food. Milly had an emotional experience with King Devil as well as an understanding of the fox that no one else was able to have.

Milly and Nunn both fit into many of Spelman's dichotomies. Milly is more emotional than reasonable, closer to nature than her husband, who wishes to dominate nature, and perhaps more animal than human because of her closeness to King Devil. Arnow may have consciously written this connection between Milly and nature in *Hunter's Horn*, though ecofeminism did not emerge until about twenty years after *Hunter's Horn* was published. Critics argue that *Hunter's Horn* is about "how nature repays man for violating it" (Baer 118), with the "man" violating it being humankind and specifically Nunn, as well as other men. "Nature" also takes shape in many forms, including King Devil and the women in Nunn's family.

Nunn does get repaid for violating nature. Those worldly things he cares about so much, such as his reputation, are ruined when he "neglects his land and his family to pursue" (Baer 118) King Devil. When he finally catches King Devil, Nunn realizes the fox is a pregnant female. Baer argues that "[p]art of Nunn has died with his victory over nature's tormentor, the fox" (118) but she does not elaborate on this idea. There could be a strong case made for the idea that "part of Nunn" dies because he finally realizes how disconnected he has become from the rest of his family, and by extension, nature, when he kills King Devil. He did not wish to kill a pregnant fox, though that is what he had done. He wanted to exercise some control over the natural world around him, including the fox and his family.

Nunn's mistake is revealed through the similarities between the anger and embarrassment King Devil and his daughter, Suse, cause him. King Devil causes Nunn these feelings by proving to be too elusive for the hunter and his dogs. The promise Nunn had

made to kill King Devil many years ago only adds to his obsession with killing the fox and, in turn, saving his pride. Suse, “who also wanted to be free” (Baer 118), like King Devil, reveals to her family that she, like the fox, is pregnant. Nunn is furious over the damage her pregnancy does to his reputation and “insists that Suse salvage his reputation by marrying her seducer and entering into nearly feudal servitude to another family” (Baer 118). Similar to the way Nunn desires to kill the fox for his reputation’s sake, he wishes to kill his daughter’s spirit and happiness for the same reason.

Reputation-saving seems to be a common theme in Appalachian literature. The idea also appears in Wilma Dykeman’s *The Tall Woman*.⁴⁸ Similar to Nunn Ballew, Mark McQueen tries to bypass embarrassment by killing an animal⁴⁹ that is closely associated with his wife, Lydia McQueen. Pearly and Lydia’s emotional connection is explained in chapter two of this thesis, but their metaphorical women-animals-nature association is not. The clearest section of *The Tall Woman* where Lydia is associated with Pearly is when Lydia’s brother, Robert, having come to her home, tells her that their mother has been attacked and that she must come back with him.

Lydia is the eldest of her siblings and is looked up to by each of them. When Lydia returns to her family’s home, she immediately assumes her mother’s role as caretaker. Later in the evening, when things have settled down, Lydia finally takes a minute to collect her thoughts outside. Her sister, Kate, follows her outside and pleads with her, saying, “Lydia, you’ve got to stay with us now ... You’re all we’ve got” (Dykeman 34). Immediately after

⁴⁸ The introduction to this work can be found in “Chapter One: A Brief History and Literary Analysis of the Effects of Settlement and Industrialization on the Appalachian Nonhuman Animal,” under the heading, “1.3. Connecting History and Literature.”

⁴⁹ A complete description of this scene can be found in “Chapter Two: Literary Animals: Representations of the Nonhuman Animal in Appalachian Literature,” under the heading, “2.4.1. The Cow.”

this, “a picture of the little brindle cow flash[es] across Lydia’s mind” (Dykeman 34). Pearly, the little brindle cow, is all Lydia has. This sentiment is repeated when Lydia brings Pearly to her family’s home and tries to reason with her sister by using Kate’s own words. She asks, ““Don’t you understand, Kate, she’s all we’ve got?”” (Dykeman 48). Essentially, Lydia and Pearly both become caretakers for their family. Lydia’s family depends on her to keep them going and Lydia depends on Pearly, which puts the cow in a vital position to maintain the entire family’s livelihood.

While Mark is away fighting in the war, it is clear to all of Lydia’s family members how important Pearly is to Lydia. However, when Mark returns from the war, he neglects to realize their connection. In his attempt to remove his family from the neighborhood and society in which they live, Mark moves them far up the mountain and deep into the woods behind the Moore family’s farm into a desolate, uninhabited area. While Mark was away at war, he became disillusioned with humanity by his stay in a prisoner of war camp. Once he returns and learns about the attack on Sarah Moore by outliers, who he presumes were neighbors, his disenchantment is complete and he wishes to fully separate himself (including his wife and child) from the community. In a final attempt to distance himself from his father-in-law’s rule and home, he refuses the pigs his father-in-law butchers. Mark believes his separation from the community must be both successful and complete. He does not want anyone to be able to claim that he is dependent on another being. He believes he is in control of himself and his reputation, his family, and his environment. Because of these reasons, Mark drags his family into the woods against everyone’s wishes and needlessly slaughters Pearly during the night.

Mark is a patriarch whose rule over nature is shown through the area he moves into and the destruction he must cause to build his home there. Mark's rule over his wife is shown through forcing her to move to this place and by killing her beloved cow, which links the oppression of his wife, to that of animals. Though Nunn does not display a mastery over nature like Mark's, they each kill the animal that is most closely associated with their wives.

The short-story, "Bob, A Dog" displays a similar idea of people wishing to have control over nature, with nature being manifested through women, children, and animals. "Bob, A Dog" is a short-story written by Lee Smith in her collection titled *Mrs. Darcy and the Blue-Eyed Stranger*. It is contemporary, both in setting and in publication date, unlike *Hunter's Horn* and *The Tall Woman*, but reflects many of the same ideas.

There are no dates to suggest when "Bob, A Dog" is set, but as an estimate, it could be sometime during the 1980s. Similarly, the story is presumably set somewhere in North Carolina. I gather these two ideas from references to contemporary movies and TV shows, like *Rambo* (1982, 1985 and 1988) and *Dynasty* (on air 1981-1991), and the mention of locations in North Carolina, such as the University of North Carolina (Smith, "Bob" 20), the Greensboro highway (Smith, "Bob" 5), Morehead City (Smith, "Bob" 8) and Raleigh (Smith, "Bob" 7 and 27).

The story begins in the month of May with David telling Cheryl that he is going to leave her "forever" (Smith, "Bob" 1). Cheryl is holding a stack of towels in her hands as he tells her this and as he begins walking out of the door. Cheryl is left in the house, with "the bedrooms upstairs behind her so full of all the children of their shared life" (Smith, "Bob" 4), much like Milly, placing Cheryl in the realm of domesticity. David is free to go wherever he sees fit, leaving his wife and children behind.

Cheryl's four children are out of her control. Her eldest, Angela is "too grown up for her age, too big breasted and smart mouth, smoking" (Smith, "Bob" 9). Louis "was shooting everything these days" (Smith, "Bob" 8) with his BB gun and "getting in fights at school" (Smith, "Bob" 9). Mary Duke, who is "only six, and whiny ... didn't really understand" (Smith, "Bob" 9) what was going on between her parents. Finally, Sandy "had run away for four or five hours, and when Purcell finally found him down by the river he said he was sorry he was so bad, he knew his daddy had left because he was so bad" (Smith, "Bob" 9). So when Sandy brings home a puppy in a box he had found, Cheryl lets him keep it.

The puppy rapidly becomes a dog, and a source of trouble for Cheryl, though she closely identifies with him. The children name their new dog Bob, and Bob quickly becomes hated by every adult in Cheryl's life. One problem with Bob is that he "refused to stay outside ... and when they put him outside, he sank against the wall of the house and wailed, the longest wail, the most pitiful thing you ever heard" (Smith, "Bob" 10). This does not bother Cheryl as much as it bothers everyone else, though, because Cheryl believes "[h]e sounded like [she] felt" (Smith, "Bob" 10) and that he had a way of "anticipating you, of knowing just how you felt" (Smith, "Bob" 16). The howl Bob howled was "low at first like a howl in [Cheryl's] own head" (Smith, "Bob" 16). Though no one else can, Cheryl identifies with the dog.

Almost everyone has a suggestion as to what Cheryl should do with Bob. Cheryl's sister Lisa suggests that Cheryl take Bob "straight to the pound before [the children] got too attached to him" (Smith, "Bob" 10). Her friend Marie tells her, "'I think you need to get rid of him'" (Smith, "Bob" 12). Cheryl cannot do this, though, so she decides that she will have someone build a pen for Bob outside. When the pen does not completely work out, Jerry

Jarvis, the hardware store owner, tells Cheryl that he can “have a boy over here tomorrow to run [her] a little old electric wire right around the bottom of [Bob’s] fence and then [she] won’t have no more trouble” (Smith, “Bob” 23). He assures Cheryl that “[i]t won’t hurt him a bit. Just a little jolt is all, he won’t hardly feel it” (Smith, “Bob” 23). Cheryl cannot do this though. She thanks Jerry, but tells him ““I think that’s awful. Shocking him” (Smith, “Bob” 23).

Jerry is completely sure the “jolt” “wouldn’t hurt him a bit” (Smith, “Bob” 23), but “guarantee[s] he’ll stay in [his] pen” (Smith, “Bob” 23). Jerry knows how to use tools to his advantage, and he would use the electric wire to keep Bob in his place. It comes as no surprise that Jerry is married, but “he kissed Cheryl slow and hard, a kiss that left her breathless, leaning against Bob’s pen. Jerry rubbed her cheek and smiled into her eyes, it was clear he didn’t even care who might be looking” (Smith, “Bob” 24). It is clear that Jerry does not care about the feelings of Cheryl, his wife or Bob.

Though Jerry is not trying to kill an animal like Nunn had been and Mark did, the three men are still comparable. Nunn neglects his family. Mark alienates his family. In “Bob, A Dog,” David leaves his family, and Jerry disregards his family in his romantic pursuit of Cheryl. Furthermore, Jerry is willing to hurt both his wife emotionally and Cheryl’s dog physically to get what he wants. Cheryl is willing to do neither. Cheryl refuses using the wire on Bob’s pen, and tells Jerry to ““[l]et go of [her] this minute”” (Smith, “Bob” 24) when he attempts to kiss her. Presently going through a divorce herself, Cheryl reminds him that he is married (Smith, “Bob” 14), and aligns herself with other women in her situation by doing so.

Cheryl’s relationship with Bob is unique because she is the only person in the story who advocates for Bob. Her children even begin to lose interest in the poor dog after a while.

Cheryl does this because she understands why Bob acts the way he does. She has a spiritual connection with Bob that no one else has. Bob knows how Cheryl feels and Cheryl knows how Bob feels. They both suffer together.

Like Milly and King Devil, and Pearly and Lydia, Cheryl and Bob are manifestations of Spelman's dichotomies. Cheryl aligns herself with nature (Bob) and with other women. She positions herself against Jerry, who is representative of "human" in the human/nature dualism. Furthermore, Cheryl chooses emotion over reason when the idea of installing an electric wire on Bob's pen is presented to her. Cheryl is more compassionate than Jerry (and others in the story). She understands that the electric wire would keep Bob in his pen, but she believes that using electricity on the dog is morally wrong.⁵⁰ In terms of the dichotomy, Cheryl is nature, Bob is nature; Cheryl is emotional, Bob is emotional; Bob is animal, and Cheryl is animal. Jerry is the opposite; he is human and he is reason.

"Lying Doggo" by Bobbie Ann Mason is a story similar to the three analyzed above, but "Lying Doggo" inverts the dichotomies reinforced by *Hunter's Horn*, *The Tall Woman* and "Bob, A Dog." "Lying Doggo" is set in Philadelphia in the early 1980s. The story is centered on Grover Cleveland, who is an old, dying dog, dearly loved by his human family. In the beginning of "Lying Doggo," we learn that "Grover Cleveland is growing feeble" (Mason 191). He has arthritis which "stiffens his legs so that on some days he cannot get up" (Mason 191). Jack, who has been with Grover since puppyhood, "has been talking of having Grover put to sleep" (Mason 191) and this is something the Cleveland-Culpepper family is in conflict over. Jack and Nancy's son, Robert, tells his parents, "[d]on't you dare take him to

⁵⁰ Carol J. Adams discusses the connection between males abusing women and animals in her essay, "Women Battering and Harm to Animals" which appears in Carol J. Adams and Josephine Donovan ed. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

the vet unless you let me go along. I don't want any funny stuff behind my back'" (Mason 192). Robert wants to be there when Grover passes away, and he knows the time is coming, whether it is induced by the family or not.

Jack's primary concern is that Grover is in pain. Jack metaphorically puts himself in Grover's place, and says, "[i]f I were in Grover's shape, I'd just want to be put out of my misery" (Mason 197). Nancy does not understand this. Nancy, unlike Milly and Cheryl, is not able to identify with her dog. Instead, she identifies Grover with her husband, Jack. Her issue with Grover dying is that "[t]he dog is forcing Nancy to think of how Jack has changed" (Mason 195). She is worried because she "has been feeling that the dying of Grover marks a milestone in her marriage to Jack" (Mason 193). Nancy wants to keep Grover alive. She has never known Jack without Grover and she is afraid that if Grover leaves, Jack will be a different person.

Nancy wants to keep Grover alive for a selfish reason. Jack wants to euthanize him to keep him from suffering. In this way, it is Jack who is more closely associated with the animal, though it is Nancy who seems to be more emotional about the subject of Grover passing. This predicament perverts Spelman's set of dualisms because the same being that is associated with the animal is also supposed to be associated with being emotional instead of rational or reasonable. Jack, however, is able to remove his emotion from Grover's death. Jack wants to be compassionate, and despite how much he loves his dog, he believes it would be best for Grover if he were euthanized. Nancy, though she is the character who is more closely associated with the "human" in the human/animal dichotomy, is being irrational over this matter. She only takes into account her own feelings, and wants to keep Grover alive, though he is certainly suffering.

3.4. The Author's Model

Compassion and dominance are yet another set of dichotomies that can be used to categorize these characters. In *Hunter's Horn*, Nunn wants to dominate King Devil, his daughter, and nature, by extension. Milly, on the other hand, is compassionate and shares an understanding with King Devil, as well as her daughter. Similarly, in *The Tall Woman*, Mark wishes to remove himself from any kind of societal organization, and have domain over his family and his environment in an area deep in the woods. Lydia, however, is more compassionate. She does not carry blame in her heart like Mark does. She is able to forgive the outliers, and she is even able to forgive Mark for killing Pearly. In "Bob, A Dog," Jerry wants to dominate Bob for Cheryl, so that he could in turn, have Cheryl for himself. Cheryl is compassionate and refuses Jerry's advice and advances.

"Lying Doggo" flips the categories and dichotomies around. It is Jack who is compassionate and has no desire to dominate anything. However, Jack is not the only character who can be seen as an inverse of Spelman's dichotomies. His wife, Nancy, is difficult to place into any one of these categories. She is not associated with nature or animals, yet she closely associates her husband with an animal. She is not dispassionate, nor is she compassionate toward Grover. She acts unreasonably in regard to Jack's desire to have Grover put to sleep. Though she eventually comes around to the idea of putting Grover to sleep, it is not until she and Jack are able to address the deeper problems in their changing marriage that she makes this decision.

Nancy is differentiated from Milly, Lydia and Cheryl furthermore by having an education, by keeping her maiden name, and by leaving her Appalachian home and family. Though we are not sure, it is safe to assume that Lydia and Milly have had little formal

education. Cheryl, we know, is a high school graduate who did not attend college. Additionally, Milly, Lydia and Cheryl took their husbands' last names, and wish to live near their extended families. Perhaps the reason Nancy cannot be placed into the set of dichotomies is because she is somewhat gender-neutral.⁵¹ She has traits and experiences that are frequently associated with men (education, leaving home), as well as those associated with women (motherhood). Nancy is a modern woman who breaks through the traditional gender roles and offers readers a unique and refreshing perspective on Appalachian women.

Three out of the four authors discussed in this chapter reinforce Spelman's dichotomies. In each story, the male is a patriarch and his rule over his family, animals, and nature can all easily be linked. It is not until we encounter characters that do not follow traditional gender-roles that we find a man who has no desire to have dominion over his family, his animal, or nature. In fact, it is Jack's willingness to become somewhat gender-neutral, that allows his marriage to improve. Throughout "Lying Doggo," Jack performs tasks which are usually associated with the female gender, such as preparing dinner (Mason 197), trying not to cry (Mason 200), and worrying about Nancy's (Mason 195) and Grover's health (Mason 192).

Perhaps the message to take away from this idea of gender-neutrality is that once one is able to remove gender-roles from a relationship, or by extension, a society, the other dichotomies which separate men from women, animals, and nature will then begin to disappear as well. Nancy is proof that this shift in social structure is very difficult. She spends the majority of "Lying Doggo" being detached from her family and being afraid that

⁵¹ Gender-neutral (conforming to neither gender role) is not to be confused with androgynous (conforming to neither sex).

Grover's death will dramatically throw off the balance of her relationship with her husband. In this case, Grover can be viewed as a symbol of the idea of gender-roles. He has been in place for the entirety of their relationship, much like how people grow up learning about and understanding gender-roles. The death of Grover, or destruction of gender-roles, therefore, is a frightening idea to face because it has become the norm. However, it is not until Nancy is able to let Grover die, or accept being gender-neutral, that her relationship is able to continue to grow and develop in a healthy way.

CHAPTER 4: THE MOUNTAINEER AND HIS MUTT: EXPANDING KINSHIP TIES TO ANIMALS IN APPALACHIAN LITERATURE

4.1. Kinship in Appalachia

I once saw a plaque that read “No Outfit Is Complete without Cat Hair.” I could not agree more. I come from a family of animal lovers who go multiple generations back. Most members of my family, including me, grew up with several animals living in and outside of the home. There have been dogs, cats, a ferret, fish, cows, horses, and chickens. Animals have always been present in my family’s lives. Their lives are chronicled alongside the people in our family in photos and anecdotes. Our animals are a constant presence. They are in the bed with us at night, on the sofa with us watching the television in the evening, and sitting beside us at breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Being in those places is not something that only the animals enjoy. We want them there just as much as they want to be there, if not more.

Speaking on behalf of my family (though I am sure there are others out there who are similar to us), we care about nonhumans the same way we care about humans in the family. We are equally concerned about the nonhuman family’s health and happiness as we are about the human. We provide care for our nonhuman animals, and they provide care for us. We include items they need on grocery lists, plan our days around being able to spend some time with them, take them to the doctor when they are not well, and grieve when they pass away. I have always considered them to be members of the family, if only a little furrer.

In the field of anthropology, the concept of people caring and working for each other in these ways is known as “kinship.” Though kinship studies usually focus on human populations (hence the prefix “anthro”), this chapter explores works of Appalachian literature for instances of humans including nonhuman animals in the web of kinship ties. While still maintaining traditional anthropological definitions of kinship, I investigate the specific ways in which these kinship ties have been expanded to the nonhuman animals who have been kept by Appalachian families. Questions addressed throughout this chapter include whether or not the reliance on and exchange between the human and the nonhuman animal is an equal one and what becomes of the relationship if and when the nonhuman animal is no longer seen as useful to the family.

4.2. What is Kinship?

“Kinship” is a term used in many different disciplines and therefore has many different meanings. Charles Darwin has already theorized the biological kinship between humans and animals,⁵² but for the purposes of this study, the more contemporary anthropological definitions of kinship are the most useful. Under this discipline, the broadest sense of kinship is “all the relationships that people are born [consanguinal] into or create later in life and that are considered binding in the eyes of their society [affinal]” (“Kinship” np).⁵³ In the anthropological sense, the term “affinal” refers to being related by marriage (“Consanguinity” np). Affinal excludes some other types of relationships which could be considered binding by society, such as legal adoption and having or being godparents.

⁵² See Charles Darwin and Morse Peckham, *The Origin of Species: A Variorum Text* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

⁵³ For more on kinship, see Thomas Trautmann, *Lewis Henry Morgan and the Invention of Kinship* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987) and Jack Goody and Meyer Fortes, *The Character of Kinship* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973).

Instead, these “kinlike” types of relationships are categorized under the term “fictive kinship.”⁵⁴

Although in contemporary society, pets and other animals may be considered fictive kin because they are “adopted” from shelters, it is necessary to add another type of kinship for animals which are acquired through barter, through simply being found, or through other non-legal (but not illegal) methods. The type of kinship that would relate nonhuman animals to humans in this situation is termed “nurture kinship.”⁵⁵ The idea of nurture kinship expands on fictive kinship to include those who provide “care, assistance, protection, and sustenance, as well as share food and other items of subsistence” (Witherspoon 21-22). For this study, I purpose that pets and some other nonhuman animals fit into the kinship network by way of nurture kinship.

4.3. Studying Kinship through Literature

Kinship ties have often been cited as an important aspect of life in both pre- and post-industrialized Appalachia. Two of the most influential anthropological studies which include the importance of kinship in Appalachia are Patricia D. Beaver’s *Rural Community in the Appalachian South* (1986) and Rhoda H. Halperin’s *The Livelihood of Kin: Making Ends Meet “the Kentucky Way”* (1990).⁵⁶ Although animals are visible in these two studies, their presence primarily exists to help display characterizations of how Appalachian families live.

⁵⁴ For more information on fictive kinship, see Janet Carsten, *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) and David M. Schneider, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984).

⁵⁵ For more information on nurture kinship see David M. Schneider, *A Critique of the Study of Kinship* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984).

⁵⁶ Additionally, Carol B. Stack did a groundbreaking anthropological study titled, *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), in which she presented the idea of people including non-biological family members in their kinship network and the idea of making the network “flexible.” This study, however, was not done on an Appalachian community.

For example, Halperin describes a couple's home by saying, "[a]djacent to the house is a small garden and a pumpkin patch from which Ruth and Bob feed their single milk cow. Their well-trained collie guards the cow and the garden areas" (60). This quotation tells readers that Ruth and Bob have a collie that serves as a guard dog, and that they have a cow which gives them milk. Ruth and Bob are clearly benefitting from their animals. What the quotation does not reveal, however, is if their animals are benefitting from them, other than being trained and fed. The information ethnographies such as this provide is anthropocentric, leaving those who are curious about the lives of the animals to wonder.

This chapter exists to try to fill in those gaps. I aim to note the ways in which Appalachian literature reflects the complexities of the human-animal interaction in regard to kinship. Literature is a great place to look for these intricacies because it allows readers to understand a story from "many different angles" (Perry 2), including that of the nonhuman animals. Literature provides "the insights about how the conception of" (Perry 1) kinship has been expanded to nonhuman animals throughout the past two centuries. Ethnographies and histories provide the "causal or correlative explanations for the social and psychological phenomena that literature reveals" (Perry 1).

4.4. Expanding Kinship Ties to Animals in Appalachian Literature

In addition to pointing out instances of nurture kinship, which is marked by providing care, assistance, protection, and sustenance, as well as sharing food and other items of subsistence in the literature discussed (Witherspoon 21-22), I further plan to employ the use of an anthropological model that was used by Hester A. Davis in her 1957 study of social

interaction and kinship in Cherokee, North Carolina.⁵⁷ Though her study is based on human communities, her model can be utilized in this chapter to understand how animals can be perceived as part of the human kin group. Doing this will ultimately suggest that including animals in the kinship network opens up a new way of thinking about the definitions of extended family and support network.

In her model, Davis assumes specifically that “living patterns indicate the importance of kinship ties” (63). Furthermore, Davis and her researchers

Expect[ed] to find ... more ... [e]xpanded families: families in which kin other than the nuclear family live within a single household unit ... than ... [n]on-expanded families: families in which only the husband, wife and children live within a single household unit. (63)

Davis believes that the presence of so many expanded families denotes the importance of kinship and kinship ties in the Cherokee community she studied. While still assuming that living patterns indicate the importance of kinship ties, I can modify Davis’s idea to suit my study with just one slight adaptation; I can expect to find more families in which animals live within a single household unit than families in which no animals live within a single household unit. The only thing that changes from Davis’s model to mine is that relatives other than the husband, wife and children have now become “animals” instead of “kin.”

Along with slightly modifying Davis’s idea to suit my own needs, I plan to use Appalachian literature and critical animal studies to complicate the traditional model of an anthropological study with the hope that this new use will allow for a fuller understanding of

⁵⁷ See Hester A. Davis, *Social Interaction and Kinship in Big Cove Community, Cherokee, North Carolina* (University of North Carolina, 1957).

the depth of human-animal relationships. This study will take place within fictional lives and neighborhoods found in the pages of Dykeman's *The Tall Woman*, Bobbie Ann Mason's "Lying Doggo," Arnow's *Hunter's Horn*, Fox's *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*, and Smith's "Bob, A Dog." It will be divided between five families, or five "case studies," headed by the primary animal character from that piece of literature.

4.4.1. Pearly

Wilma Dykeman's *The Tall Woman* is centered on two families, the Moores and the McQueens. Lydia Moore McQueen's cow, Pearly, has a fairly well-developed character and is a good starting point for this study of expanding kinship.⁵⁸ In Pearly, readers see displays of each of Witherspoon's markers for nurture kinship. Throughout Pearly's life, she was able to provide her families with a variety of things, including strength, milk and emotional comfort. There is no doubt that Pearly holds up her end of the kinship agreement,⁵⁹ but not all the human characters in Pearly's life reciprocate her love and care. All through *The Tall Woman*, Lydia is the person who recognizes the value of her cow more than any other human character. The value Lydia sees in Pearly is also different than the value others see in her. Because of her value, Lydia treats Pearly much like she would the human members of the family, wanting her to have the best Lydia is able to offer.

After being forbidden from guiding Pearly as she plows the Moore family's field, Lydia turns the job over to her sister, Kate, and says, "Pull Pearly easy but steady ... and talk

⁵⁸ For my introduction to the study of *The Tall Woman*, see "Chapter One: A Brief History and Literary Analysis of the Effects of Settlement and Industrialization on the Appalachian Nonhuman Animal" under the heading "1.3. Matching History and Literature."

⁵⁹ A more detailed discussion of Pearly's contributions to the Moore and McQueen families can be found in "Chapter Two: Literary Animals: Representations of the Nonhuman Animal in Appalachian Literature" under the heading "2.4.1. The Cow."

to her” (Dykeman 48). When Kate replies, “I’ve nothing to say to a cow,” Lydia snaps back at her, saying, “Then say the alphabet” (Dykeman 48). Lydia tries to make Kate treat Pearly as Lydia does. She tells Kate, “It’s the sound of your voice gentles her” (Dykeman 48). Presumably in an effort to apologize for the ignorance of her sister, Lydia goes to check on Pearly later that evening. Upon greeting Pearly, Lydia “slipped out a lick of salt for Pearly [and] she gave the little cow an extra nubbin of precious corn, too” (Dykeman 49), in a sincere display of nurture kinship through sharing food and providing sustenance and care.

Food sharing is not the only example of nurture kinship we see between Lydia and Pearly. After Mark, Lydia’s husband, returns from the Civil War and decides to build a new house for himself and his wife, Lydia continues her care for the cow by suggesting a barn-raising before the temperature drops and Pearly is left outside. Lydia “could not bear to think of the cow shivering in a make-shift lean-to during the winter to come” (Dykeman 84) and “[s]he wondered if Pearly was frightened, if she would be safe from wild animals” (Dykeman 88) in their new home. Lydia thought “It would be good for [Pearly] to have her a tight, warm place” (Dykeman 88) instead of being left outdoors, exposed in the cold at night, thereby displaying the acts of providing care and protection, as well as subsistence.

Pearly’s death is another point in the novel where Lydia displays emotions over the cow that she also displays over her human family members.⁶⁰ When Mark tells Lydia Pearly is dead, Lydia goes into hysterics over the cow. Her reaction to Pearly’s death is comparable with her reaction over the guerrilla attack on her mother during the war. Though all the

⁶⁰ For the summary of Pearly’s death, see “Chapter Two: Literary Animals: Representations of the Nonhuman Animal in Appalachian Literature” under the heading, “2.4.1. The Cow.”

human characters certainly did not share Lydia's sentiment, she had seen Pearly as more than just an animal. She had seen Pearly as her kin.

4.4.2. Jack

*The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*⁶¹ is set in roughly the same time period as *The Tall Woman*, yet there are remarkable differences in the animal characters in these two stories. One aspect these two novels have in common, however, is a deep, familial connection between a human character and a nonhuman animal character. *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come* tells the story of a young, twice-orphaned "wandering waif" (Fox 6) named Chad, and Jack, Chad's "dog with a belly to feed and [who] went for less than nothing with everybody but his little master and the chance mountaineer who had sheep to guard" (Fox 4). In regard to the idea of kinship, Chad and Jack are the same; neither of them have parents and both of them need someone to take care of them. Their primary problem in the beginning of the novel is finding a home that will extend kinship status to human and nonhuman animals alike. The two eventually find this at the home of old Joel Turner.

Jack wins himself kinship status with his heroic shepherding efforts.⁶² After this incident, old Joel places his trust in Jack's good nature and ability, and has the dog aid him in getting the sheep into town. While Jack was literally shepherding a flock of sheep to town, Chad was shepherding a metaphorical, singular sheep to town. After the incident with the sheep running away, old Joel volunteered Chad to take his daughter, Melissa, to school, telling him, "Take good keer o' that gal, boy" (Fox 35). Chad was "curiously touched all at

⁶¹ For my introduction to the study of *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*, see "Chapter Two: Literary Animals: Representations of the Nonhuman Animal in Appalachian Literature" under the heading "1.4.2. The Dog."

⁶² For a description of the scene referenced here, see "Chapter Two: Literary Animals: Representations of the Nonhuman Animal in Appalachian Literature" under the heading "1.4.2. The Dog."

once by the trust shown him” (Fox 35). Though it had taken a moment of panic and doubt, Chad and Jack had officially made themselves a part of the Turner family. They were going to provide care and assistance, and in turn be provided care, protection and sustenance by the Turners.

Though Chad eventually fell out of the good graces of the Turners, Jack remained with them, presumably, until his death. When Chad is finally able to begin taking care of Jack again, after returning from war, Jack is “half-blind and aged” (Fox 312) and spends his time dozing at Mrs. Turner’s feet (Fox 312) and resting his head in Melissa’s lap (Fox 293). Knowing the old dog can roam with him no longer, Chad leaves Jack with old Mother Turner as he heads off to the West. By this time, old Mother Turner had grown accustomed to the faithful little dog at her feet and she “wanted him” (Fox 335) to remain in her care.

Jack’s story differs from Pearly’s primarily because Jack was able to become a member of several different kinship networks and Pearly was not. Jack had been Chad’s companion all along, then became a member of at least one other family before the Turners. Jack was able to gain status in these families in a way which Pearly was not, though both were generous to their respective human families and served them in a variety of ways. There are a multitude of possible theories which could be debated as to why Jack fits in everywhere he goes and Pearly does not. Some characters, such as Mark McQueen, only see the animal for its instrumental worth. To Mark, Pearly was milk, milk products, and beef, though she meant something quite different to Lydia. Dogs, though, are different. There is certain

universality to dogs. Besides the cultural taboo on killing and eating dogs in western society, there is simply something about a dog that almost demands love, care and affection.⁶³

4.4.3. Zing

Zing is most certainly one of these demanding dogs. In the beginning of *Hunter's Horn*,⁶⁴ readers stand at the counter of a country store with Nunn as he shops for necessities the Ballew family cannot make on their own: "overalls and dress goods and small shoes," sugar, lard, flour and a few cans of dog food for an "old hound when his teeth ain't so good" (Arnow 1). Against the clerk's advice to try a few cans and come back to buy more if the dog likes it, Nunn decides to go ahead and buy two dozen cans of dog food (but before leaving, gets five more), which is worth two dollars, citing that he "need[s] it right away. It'll soon be fine fox-hunten weather" (Arnow 1). Nunn spends twelve dollars at the store, which buys enough to hopefully get his family, including the dog, through the winter and into spring. This demonstration shows more than just providing sustenance for Zing; it also shows providing care. Nunn could have spent that money on his children or himself, the human members of the family, but he chose to spend it on Zing instead.

Before Nunn had left the store, the clerk wrapped up a few "nice fresh beef bones," and gave them to Nunn for Zing free of charge (Arnow 2). When Nunn arrives back at home, Zing smells the bones down in Nunn's grass sack, and begins "sniffing with eager eyes and a watery mouth" (Arnow 4). Zing, now apparently an older dog, had not had beef since he "wasn't hardly a full grown pup" (Arnow 4). Knowing this, Milly, Nunn's wife, giggles as

⁶³ Donna Haraway further discusses these ideas in *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).

⁶⁴ For my introduction to the study of *Hunter's Horn*, see "Chapter One: A Brief History and Literary Analysis of the Effects of Settlement and Industrialization on the Appalachian Nonhuman Animal" under the heading "1.3. Matching History and Literature."

she remarked that she “ain’t seen Zing so lively in a long time” (Arnow 5). Despite his wife’s remark, Nunn tells Milly, “Thet grocery clerk said these bones—they got a sight of meat on em—was clean an good enough to bile fer soup. Whyn’t you cook em first, make you some soup with dumplens, an then give em to Zing” (Arnow 4-5). Milly politely refuses, citing “I’ve already got a God’s plenty fer supper with th possum an all, an the bones would maybe ruin fore mornen, an anyhow they’d be better fer Zing raw” (Arnow 5).

Milly obviously cares a great deal for Zing. This feeling is echoed by the entire family, and reciprocated by Zing. He had been the one to kill the possum the Ballew family was going to dine on for dinner. Zing had “come walken in with it right at daylight ... an laid it in th kitchen door” (Arnow 4), though Zing himself had not “eat nothen all day” (Arnow 5). Zing could have easily eaten the possum for himself, but he decided to bring it home to his family, instead.

Zing is not quite seen as an equal in Nunn’s eyes, though. His children have to beg their father to give Zing the bones right away instead of making the dog wait until the family had finished eating. When Nunn concedes to his eager children, Zing takes his raw beef bones beneath the table. The children sit on the ground around the dog and admire his great pleasure, remarking that their parents “ought to see him ... [h]e’s lickin it ... an his mouth’s a drippen water” (Arnow 7). Eventually, though, Zing stops licking the bones, much to the children’s disappointment. Zing then “slunk from under the table and went and lay down behind the stove, head down on his outstretched paws. His tail lay land and sad and his ears drooped at the reproach and disappointment in the children’s voices” (Arnow 7). Milly quickly quiets the children, telling them that “Zing can’t help it if he’s old an not able to

chew, an he never was much of a hand fer raw meat anyhow” (Arnow 7). She then assures the dog by telling him “[w]e’ll cook em Zing, an it’ll be fine” (Arnow 7).

Unsatisfied with Zing’s inability to eat the special dinner he had been given, the children again begin to beg their father on Zing’s behalf, so that the dog may have some of the canned food Nunn bought. Milly chimes in, too, telling Nunn,

They’s a little coal oil left ... It’ll burn long enough fer you to see to feed him.

They’ve hurt [Zing’s] feelens so, an I guess he’s hurt his teeth so a tryen to
chew that bone that he’ll never eat that plain corn pone (Arnow 8)

that had been made for the dog. Nunn again gives into his family’s wishes and opens the can of store-bought dog food. After putting some into Zing’s bowl, the family all stands around the dog, anxiously waiting to see whether or not he will approve of his new food. After looking “questioningly at Nunn,” as a child might look at their father, Zing “began a silent, wolfish gulping of the food” (Arnow 8).

Although Milly and the human children may include him a little more than Nunn, Zing is definitely a significant part of the Ballew family. They keep Zing in their thoughts and reflect on his puppyhood, much like they do with the childhood of their children. When he dies, the entire family is grief-stricken. Milly had already experienced the deaths of two of her human children, but “[t]rouble was a funny thing; no matter how much of it a body had, new trouble never lessened the old” (Arnow 44). Even though she tried to fight the feeling, thinking it was “silly for a woman with two children dead to feel such a hard choking hurt over a dead dog” (Arnow 44), she had to give in to her sadness because “Zing had been so kind” (Arnow 44).

In the human family's relationships with Zing, there is almost complete equality. This is obvious with Milly and the children, however, not so much so with Nunn. It may seem as though Nunn does not love or care for Zing emotionally, at least not as much as the rest of the family, but his care and nurture kinship is expressed in different ways throughout the novel. Zing's death is, arguably, what ultimately forces Nunn into an obsession with killing King Devil. He demands justice for the death of his beloved dog. Though Nunn does not kneel and weep over the dead dog's body, he does grieve for the loss of Zing.

4.4.4. Grover

Bobbie Ann Mason tells a similar story of the loss of a family's dog in "Lying Doggo."⁶⁵ Though "Lying Doggo" is set roughly forty years later than *Hunter's Horn*, the emotional pain experienced by the families over the death of their respective dogs is unchanging. The grieving process over Grover, who is the Culpepper-Cleveland family's dog, begins before his death, which is a stark contrast to the sudden death of Zing.

Readers are first introduced to Grover and his family in the short-story, "Nancy Culpepper," which immediately precedes "Lying Doggo" in the collection titled *Shiloh and Other Stories* (2001). Here we learn only that Grover belongs to Nancy's husband, Jack, and that he was present at the wedding ceremony, whereas Nancy's parents were not (Mason 176). Fast-forward into "Lying Doggo," in which Grover is one of the main characters, and we learn that it has been several years since their wedding day and "Grover Cleveland is growing feeble. His eyes are cloudy, and his muzzle is specked with white hairs" (Mason 191). Nancy believes "that the dying of Grover marks a milestone in her marriage to Jack"

⁶⁵ The introduction to "Lying Doggo" can be found in "Chapter 3: Women, Children and Animals: Appalachian Literature through an Ecofeminist Lens" under the heading, "3.3. Women Identifying with Animals."

(Mason 193) and the thought of Grover dying “seize[s Nancy] with an irrational dread—that when the dog is gone, Jack will be gone too” (Mason 193). Nancy’s investment in Grover is only for Jack’s sake. After all, we were told that Grover is Jack’s dog.

Jack’s relationship with Grover is complicated and heart-wrenching. Nancy said that back when she married Jack, “she felt, in a way, that she was marrying a divorced man with a child” (Mason 191) and once married, “Nancy felt that she had an instant family” (Mason 193) because of the inclusion of Grover. Indeed, Jack does take care of Grover as though the dog is his child. Wherever Jack goes, Grover remains with him, and as Grover’s health deteriorates, Jack begins to buy “special foods for the dog—pork chops and liver, vitamin supplements” (Mason 192). Furthermore, Jack researches the dog’s ailments, though “[a]ll the arthritis literature [Jack] has been able to find concerns people, [however] he says the same rules must apply to all mammals” (Mason 192). Jack indeed includes Grover in his kinship network, by way of nurture kinship. This is a fact that cannot be disputed, though there is one caveat—“Jack has been talking of having Grover put to sleep” (Mason 190).

The problem of whether or not to euthanize Grover is the primary conflict in “Lying Doggo.” Jack says, “If I were in Grover’s shape, I’d just want to be put out of my misery” (Mason 197). Nancy disagrees. She believes that since Grover is still conscious and can use his mind (Mason 197), that putting him down “shouldn’t be a matter of [their] convenience. If Grover needs assistance, then it’s [their] problem. [They’re] responsible” (Mason 197). Neither Jack nor Nancy, though “never really knew anybody who died” (Mason 192) and the problem looms over them throughout the duration of the story.

Herein lay two unique and complicated conflicts. One is the ethical aspect of euthanizing one of your kin. This is a problem that is debated in our current society, where

some believe that it is acceptable for humans to be euthanized and others do not.⁶⁶

Euthanizing dogs, however, does not stir up the same sort of conflict. The question here is, does Jack's expressed desire to euthanize Grover mean that he does not value the life of the dog as much as he does the lives of his other, human, family members? Furthermore, if Jack does decide to euthanize Grover, does it mean that he does not actually see Grover as a member of his family, as his kin?

The answer to these questions lies in Jack's and Nancy's discussion about whether or not they, themselves, would want to be euthanized. Jack believes that he would, if he were suffering. Nancy does not. She tells Jack that she "couldn't pull the plug" (Mason 197) on him, and that he would "have to be screaming in agony" (Mason 197). Jack is taken aback, and asks her if she would "really be like that" (Mason 197) and then reiterates that he would "want to be put out of [his] misery" (Mason 197). Jack's wish for himself to be "put out of his misery," if the conditions were all right, suggests that euthanizing Grover does not mean that Jack does not value Grover's life. It, in fact, means the opposite: Jack loves Grover so much that he does not want the dog to have to suffer. He wants to do the same thing for Grover as he would want done for himself.

In order to try to solve the problem of whether or not to put Grover to sleep, Jack and Nancy both put themselves in his situation. Though they continue to disagree, the act alone suggests that they both see Grover as their equal. The pair is faced with a dog's problem, yet they are able to discuss it freely as though it were a human problem. The two categories,

⁶⁶ Dr. Jack Kevorkian is among the most well-known human euthanasia advocates. For more information on his life and the arguments about euthanasia, see Neal Nicol and Harry Wylie, *Between the Dying and the Dead: Dr. Jack Kevorkian's Life and the Battle to Legalize Euthanasia* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press/Terrace Books, 2006).

human and animal, are interchangeable in Jack and Nancy's minds. Because of this, the answer to the question as to whether or not Jack still sees Grover as a member of his family, though he essentially plans to kill him, is yes. Grover is still a member of the family, and Jack only plans to do what is right by him.

4.4.5. Bob

So far, this study has focused somewhat on death. Pearly was killed, Jack is left by Chad and presumably dies, Zing dies unexpectedly, and Grover grows old and sick and needs to be euthanized. Lee Smith's short story, "Bob, A Dog,"⁶⁷ is a relief from the ongoing theme of beloved animals dying. In a skillful way, Smith brings great comedy into the trials and tribulations associated with raising a dog.

Bob is, in fact, a dog. He is a dog who Sandy brought home as a puppy in a box. Sandy had found the puppy "in the weeds along the interstate, near the overpass" (Smith, "Bob" 10) and named him "Bob" somewhere along the road home. Cheryl, Sandy's mother, lets him keep the puppy, thinking Bob will help the children cope with the divorce their parents are going through.

Bob does not make a very good impression on all of Cheryl's family, though "Sandy just loved Bob to death" (Smith, "Bob" 10) and her other children soon become attached as well. Cheryl's live-in mother, Netta, and children think Bob "had been abused" (Smith, "Bob" 10) before he was abandoned because he "refused to stay outside ... and wailed, the longest wail, the most pitiful thing you ever heard" (Smith, "Bob" 10). The thought of abuse does not sway Netta's nor Cheryl's sister, Lisa's, opinion of the dog, however. Lisa claims

⁶⁷ The introduction to "Bob, A Dog" can be found in "Chapter 3: Women, Children and Animals: Appalachian Literature through an Ecofeminist Lens" under the heading, "3.3. Women Identifying with Animals."

the only reason why Bob will not go outside is “because he [is] stupid” (Smith, “Bob” 10), and Netta later decides Bob “smells awful” and declares “It’s him or me” (Smith, “Bob” 11). Angela, one of Cheryl’s older children, promptly answers her grandmother by saying, “It’s him, then” (Smith, “Bob” 11).

As Bob’s newness begins to fade and he starts growing, Cheryl’s children begin to lose interest in him. Cheryl eventually gets “a stakeout chain so the kids could put Bob out in the yard in the afternoon, so they could get in the den [where Bob hangs out all day, between “the sofa and the wall, hiding” (Smith, “Bob” 10)] to watch TV” (Smith, “Bob” 11). Bob primarily spends his time outdoors howling and “tangling himself in his stakeout chain” (Smith, “Bob” 11). Cheryl’s neighbors begin to complain. Her friend, Marie, tells her she “need[s] to get rid of him” (Smith, “Bob” 12). The children become completely ambivalent and Cheryl ultimately finds herself solely responsible for caring for Bob, though he was supposed to be the children’s pet and responsibility.

All the while, Bob continues his antics. He gets kicked out of his obedience training class and has a warrant “swore out” on him which “call[s] Bob a pernicious nuisance ... and enjoin[s] him from howling” (Smith, “Bob” 17). Bob “refuse[s] to be enjoined” (Smith, “Bob” 17), though, and continues to howl “if he stay[s] outside on the chain too long” (Smith, “Bob” 17). Cheryl decides her last resort is to ask Gary Majors “to build her a dog pen” (Smith, “Bob” 17). Unfortunately, Cheryl’s last resort does not work very well. Bob continues to grow and is eventually able to escape and wreak havoc on the neighborhood: stealing an Oriental rug and knocking over an old man with a pacemaker (Smith, “Bob” 23).

Even through all of this, Cheryl could not bear the idea of getting rid of the poor dog, like so many people had suggested, though “she couldn’t have told you why” (Smith, “Bob”

23). Additionally, when an electric fence is suggested to Cheryl, she politely refuses, saying, “I know you think it’s stupid, but I won’t do that. I’ll just keep on doing what I’m doing. We’ll just put more stuff around until he can’t get out, that’s all” (Smith, “Bob” 23-24). But there never comes a time when Bob does not get out. He would “move a cinder block, tunnel out, and run wild until somebody called the police, who came and got him and put him in the pound” (Smith, “Bob” 25). There is no doubt that Bob was a hassle, but he “had become Cheryl’s dog, finally, totally, after all” (Smith, “Bob” 25), and she loved Bob despite his bad behavior.

The relationship between Bob and Cheryl is one that takes a while to build. By the end of the story, Bob tries to run away from his pen, but only to the house where Cheryl sits inside, alone. Mistaking this possible display of affection on the part of the challenging pup, Cheryl resolves to fix his pen one last time and put him back inside, only to have him run away again just a few minutes later. During the process of this great escape, however, Bob “lurche[s] over to stand for a minute there by [Cheryl’s] chair before he [takes] off running free across the darkened yard” (Smith, “Bob” 32). What can Cheryl do but wait for the police to be called and go get him in the morning?

Out of all the animals in this study, Bob is probably the least deserving of kinship status, and he never totally gets it.⁶⁸ It could be argued that some human members of his

⁶⁸ I would like to caveat the idea that Bob is least deserving of kinship by referencing Dr. John Bradshaw, a renowned anthrozoologist who posits that dogs today are treated as pack-following wolves or furry humans in his book, *Dog Sense: How the New Science of Dog Behavior can make You a Better Friend to Your Pet* (New York: Basic Books, 2011). Bradshaw suggests essentially, that dogs were bred over hundreds and thousands of years for specific working purposes, and now humans expect them to be pets with no jobs and no responsibilities. He believes that this leads to what pet-owners see as misbehaviors from their dogs. Bob is a perfect example of such a dog. Bob is a young hound (a dog bred to hunt and aid in hunting) whose natural instinct is to run and trail other animals, but who is instead put in a house or his pen and expected to be a well-behaved, quiet, and still member of the family.

family even neglect him. Some of the characters actively dislike Bob and some do not care either way. It is Cheryl alone who repeatedly shows care and affection, characteristics of nurture kinship, to Bob. In his way, he tries to reciprocate the love. It may be useless, but it leaves one to wonder if Bob could ever nudge his way into the rest of the family's hearts as he grows older.

4.5. Conclusion

In this study, each animal is included in their family's kinship system by way of nurture kinship, even if the nurturing is only provided by one human family member. Ultimately, each animal is taken care of, in multiple ways, by their respective family. Bob may be capable of providing companionship, but his age and antics, or the disconnection in communication between him and his human family, serves as a barrier to the full development of his kinship status. Grover mainly provides an emotional outlet for Jack (Cleveland) and a reason for Jack and Nancy to renew their marriage. Zing and Jack (the dog) provide tangible goods for their families, such as meals, protection, and shepherding, in addition to love and affection. Finally, Pearly gives everything she possibly can to support her family, but then a member of her family takes her life. By doing this, Mark proves that the exchange of nurture kinship is not always equal between human and nonhuman animal. Pearly's case is a morose display of how it is possible for someone to hate, dislike, and/or kill an animal who has only done good.

Cheryl and Lydia are the only two characters whose families do not appreciate their animals as much as they do, though their animals are at opposite ends of the reciprocating-kinship spectrum. What this shows is that to some personalities (Cheryl and Lydia), it makes no difference what the animal provides or does not provide for the family; they are going to

take care of the animal regardless. Inversely, those with other types of personalities are going to use the animal for everything it has and only take care of it for that purpose (Mark), or they are going to completely disregard the animal no matter what (Netta, Lisa and Marie).

Although I had suggested earlier that there is some sort of universality dogs particularly have that demands a person's care, this study suggests that idea only registers with the Lydia/Cheryl-type personality. It is not universal. After all, it is suspected that Bob had been abused, and then abandoned alongside the interstate. Lydia's sister, Kate, does not even know how to begin to relate to a cow, as if the creature does not have eyes and ears with which to see and hear, and is not at all comparable to a human. Finally, Mark takes the proverbial prize for not caring about animals when he murders Pearly during the night.

Beginning this study, I had hoped that I would find something exceptional about how Appalachian people relate to their animals. I naively thought that the literature would suggest that in Appalachia, in a place where people have lived and continue to live so closely with nonhuman animals, that there would be a more equalized and respectful relationship between the two. What this study shows, however, is that human-animal relationships in Appalachia vary from person to person, which proves yet again, that Appalachia cannot be considered a homogenized region. Though this idea undoubtedly disappoints this particular researcher, I can still take comfort knowing that there are other Lydias and Cheryls and Leighs living amongst the animals in Appalachia.

CONCLUSION

History tells us that there was a time when the nonhuman animals of Appalachia of all shapes and sizes were valuable for their flesh, fur, and ability. Largely as a result of the American way of commercial agriculture, animals in Appalachia had to begin to take on different roles. Appalachian people do not keep the same types and numbers of animals as they once did, and these animals no longer serve the same purpose as they did two hundred years ago. Animals that were once relied on to sustain the life of the family, like dairy cows and sheep, are now kept simply for the joy of it. Today in Appalachia, farmers raise some beef cattle, but it is primarily in relatively small cow/calf operations, which consist of keeping a breeding herd of beef cattle and caring for cows and their offspring until the calves are weaned and can be sold. Likewise, hobby farms are now popular in many rural Appalachian regions. Hobby farmers often keep some sheep or llamas and other types of boutique animals, and allow tourists to visit and buy souvenirs.

Horses, once a vehicle for the men and women of Appalachia, are now prized commodities. Small horse stables in the Appalachian countryside charge tourists up to sixty dollars per person, per hour to ride and look at scenery on horseback. People who are able to afford the substructure, show their horses at shows and entertain people with old world horse tricks and rodeos, or race them and allow others to place bets on them. Though all of these avenues exist for horse owners, there is no working use for horses in Appalachia anymore. In addition to performances that display social status, horses are now often kept in small, restraining fences as pets, lacking the space and the will to run.

Perhaps with the exception of a few animals, including dogs and cats, and other nonhuman animals that are kept out of love and companionship, it seems that many domesticated animals, no matter what kind, are simply a way for people to make money. This is as true today as it was two hundred years ago when Euro-Americans began moving onto Appalachian soil. The wildlife that once ran free through the Appalachian wilderness now reside in zoos or wildlife preserves, where people can pay money to look at them from forty feet away and twenty feet above. To look at the way relations have progressed over the course of time, it seems like the most important relationship between Appalachia people and the nonhuman Appalachian animal has been and continues to be the financial one.

A look at the literature tells us something different, however. Literature opens up avenues to examine the intricacies of relationships between humans and animals. In literature, we can analyze individual relationships; relationships between ordinary people and their animals. Looking at relationships from this angle is much more rewarding than looking at the history for that reason. The history of animals in Appalachia has been primarily concerned with the economic aspects of keeping animals. The literature, as I have shown in this thesis, shows us much more.

In the second chapter of this study, I took a close look at the emotional side of the human-animal relationship as represented through Appalachian literature. I discussed human emotions, as well as animal emotions. I examined the way different individuals viewed and felt about animals, in addition to how Appalachian authors have written about animals. What I ultimately discovered in this chapter is that Appalachian literature reveals just how important the nonhuman animal members of the family were to the human members, as well as the complex systems of reliance and co-dependence between humans and nonhuman

animals. Another idea that came out of this chapter is that Appalachian authors have differed on an individual basis on how they represent animal characters. There are some authors whose work is filled with animals, and who represent the nonhuman animals of Appalachia with feelings and emotions much like the human characters. Others allow their animal characters to be there, moving the story along, but do not allow them to speak.

In chapter three, I continued to focus on the individual relationships between humans and animals. I specifically used ecofeminist theory to explore the link between animals, women, and nature in Appalachian literature. While I certainly found these links, I was surprised to also find a sort of model for how to circumvent systems of patriarchy buried within Bobbie Ann Mason's short story, "Lying Doggo."

My findings in chapter four also came as somewhat of a surprise to me. In this chapter, I took an anthropological model and applied it to the study of literature. The result of the five "case studies" I did in chapter four was that each animal is included in their family's kinship system by way of nurture kinship. Each animal is taken care of by their respective family and it makes no difference what the animal provides or does not provide for the family; they are going to be taken care of regardless. Ultimately, chapter four showed that human-animal relationships in Appalachia vary from person to person. This is not something history could have told us.

In closing, there are many areas of Appalachian and Critical animal studies left to explore. I hope to be able to continue my work on the history of animals in Appalachia, as well as work with animal themes in Appalachian and other types of rural literature. For others who are not inclined to study history and/or literature, there is work to be done on

almost anything. The possibilities are too numerous for me to mention here, but I can give a few suggestions.

One thing I did not discuss at all in this thesis is the idea of vegetarianism in Appalachia. I touched on the idea of hobby farms, and this is an area I believe is worthy of critical attention. Hunting in Appalachia was another idea I touched on, but this subject, I am sure, is not for the faint of heart. A more in-depth study of the links between sexism, classism, speciesism, and other systems of oppression in Appalachia could be done, and would be very welcomed by Appalachian scholars as well as Critical Animal scholars. The intersection of animal rights' activists and environmentalists in Appalachia would be also be interesting. As you can see, the directions to turn in the combination of these two fields of study are endless, and I might add, very rewarding.

WORKS CITED

- “About ICAS.” *Institute for Critical Animal Studies*. ICAS. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.
- “Journal for CAS.” *Institute for Critical Animal Studies*. ICAS. Web. 9 Mar. 2012.
- Adams, Carol J., and Josephine Donovan, eds. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995. Print.
- Arnow, Harriette L. S. *Hunter’s Horn*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1997. Print.
- Baer, Barbara L. “Harriette Arnow’s Chronicles of Destruction.” *Nation* 222.4 (1976): 117-120. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 10 Mar. 2012.
- Ballard, Sandra L. “Introduction.” *Hunter’s Horn*. By Harriette Arnow. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1997. Print.
- Bartram, William. *Travels Through North & South Carolina, Georgia, East & West Florida, the Cherokee Country, the Extensive Territories of the Muscogulges, or Creek Confederacy, and the Country of the Chactaws; Containing An Account of the Soil and Natural Productions of Those Regions, Together with Observations on the Manners of the Indians. Documenting the American South*. University of North Carolina, 11 Dec. 2011. Web. 11 Dec. 2011.
- Batteau, Allen W. *The Invention of Appalachia*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1990. Print.
- Beaver, Patricia D. “Hillbilly Women, Hillbilly Men: Sex Roles in Rural Agriculturally-Based Appalachia.” *Appalachian Educational Module: The Appalachian Woman*. Ed.

- Sharon Lord and Carolyn Patton-Crowder. Newton: Educational Development Corporation, WEEA Project, 1979. Print.
- . *Rural Community in the Appalachian South*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1986. Print.
- Bekoff, Marc. *The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Leading Scientist Explores Animal Joy, Sorrow, and Empathy and Why They Matter*. Novato: New World Library, 2007. Print.
- Berger, John. "Why Look at Animals?" *About Looking*. New York: Vintage, 1992. Print.
- Billings, Dwight B., and Kathleen M. Blee. *The Road to Poverty: The Making of Wealth and Hardship in Appalachia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.
- Blethen, H. Tyler. "Pioneer Settlement." *High Mountains Rising: Appalachia in Time and Place*. Ed. Richard A. Straw and H. Tyler Blethen. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004. Print.
- Bolgiano, Chris. *Mountain Lion: An Unnatural History of Pumas and People*. Mechanicsburg: Stackpole Books, 1995. Print.
- Bradshaw, John. *Dog Sense: How the New Science of Dog Behavior can make You a Better Friend to Your Pet*. New York: Basic Books, 2011. Print.
- Calloway, Colin G. *The Scratch of a Pen: 1763 and the Transformation of North America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. Print.
- Carpenter, Frank O. *The Great Smoky Mountains and Thunderhead Peak*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1890. Print.
- Carsten, Janet, ed. *Cultures of Relatedness: New Approaches to the Study of Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. Print.

- “Consanguinity.” *Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. Web. 20 Mar. 2012.
- Constantz, George. *Hollows, Peepers, and Highlanders: An Appalachian Mountain Ecology*. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2004. Print.
- Cornell, Joseph D. “Slash and Burn.” *Encyclopedia of Earth*. Eds. Cutler J. Cleveland. Washington, D.C.: Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment, 27 Oct. 2011. Web. 11 Dec. 2011.
- Cosmides, Leda, and John Tooby. “Evolutionary Psychology and the Emotions.” *Center for Evolutionary Psychology*: University of California at Santa Barbara, 2000. Web. 16 Mar. 2012.
- Cottingham, John ed. *Meditations on First Philosophy with Selections from the Objections and Replies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. Print.
- Cunningham, Rodger. *Apples on the Flood: The Southern Mountain Experience*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1987. Print.
- Darwin, Charles, and Morse Peckham. *The Origin of Species: A Variorum Text*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006. Print.
- Davis, Donald E. *Homeplace Geography: Essays for Appalachia*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 2006. Print.
- . *Where There Are Mountains: An Environmental History of the Southern Appalachians*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2000. Print.
- Davis, Hester A. *Social Interaction and Kinship in Big Cove Community, Cherokee, North Carolina*. MA Thesis. University of North Carolina, 1957. Print.

Descartes, René, and Anthony Kenny. *Descartes: Philosophical Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970. Print.

---. *The Passions of the Soul*. Trans. Stephen Voss. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub. Co., 1989. Print.

---. *Descartes: Selected Philosophical Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Print.

Dunaway, Wilma A. *The First American Frontier: Transition to Capitalism in Southern Appalachia, 1700-1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996. Print.

Dykeman, Wilma. *The Tall Woman*. Newport: Wakestone Books, 1962. Print.

Edwards, Grace T., JoAnn A. Asbury, and Ricky L. Cox. *A Handbook to Appalachia: An Introduction to the Region*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2006. Print.

Eller, Ronald D. *Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers: Industrialization of the Appalachian South, 1880-1930*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1982. Print.

Engelhardt, Elizabeth S. D. *Beyond Hill and Hollow: Original Readings in Appalachian Women's Studies*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2005. Print.

Fitzgerald, Amy, and Linda Kalof. *The Animals Reader: The Essential Classic and Contemporary Writings*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2007. Print.

Fox, Jr., John. *The Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1931. Print.

Frost, William Goodell. "Our Contemporary Ancestors in the Southern Mountains." *Atlantic Monthly* March (1899): 1-9. Print.

Fudge, Erica. *Animal*. London: Reaktion, 2002. Print.

- . *Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality, and Humanity in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006. Print.
- . *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture*. Houndmills: Macmillan Press, 2000. Print.
- . *Renaissance Beasts: Of Animals, Humans, and Other Wonderful Creatures*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004. Print.
- Gaard, Greta Claire. "Vegetarian Ecofeminism: A Review Essay." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 23.3 (2002): 117-146. *Project Muse*. Web. 25 Feb. 2012.
- Ganguly, Shona. "Patriarchy." *Keywords for American Cultural Studies*, 2009. NYU Press. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.
- Garay, Ronald. *U.S. Steel and Gary, West Virginia: Corporate Paternalism in Appalachia*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2011. Print.
- Gaventa, John. *Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980. Print.
- Goody, Jack, and Meyer Fortes. *The Character of Kinship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973. Print.
- Griffin, Susan. *Woman and Nature: The Roaring Inside Her*. New York: Harper & Row, 1980. Print.
- Grossman, Henryk. *Law of Accumulation and the Breakdown of the Capitalist System*. London: Pluto Press, 1992. Print.
- Halperin, Rhoda H. *The Livelihood of Kin: Making Ends Meet "the Kentucky Way"*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990. Print.

- Haraway, Donna J. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.
- Harney, Will Wallace. "A Strange Land and a Peculiar People." *Lippincott's Magazine* October (1873): 430-432. Print.
- Howell, Benita J. *Culture, Environment, and Conservation in the Appalachian South*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2002. Print.
- Hyde, John. *Report on the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States at the Eleventh Census*. USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.
- Jarrell, Tracy T. *The Cultural History and Future of Sheep Farming in the High Country*. MA Thesis. Appalachian State University, 2011. Print.
- Jones, Loyal. *Appalachian Values*. Berea: Berea College Appalachian Center, 1984. Print.
- . *Faith and Meaning in the Southern Uplands*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999. Print.
- Kephart, Horace. *Our Southern Highlanders*. New York: Outing Pub. Co., 1913. Print.
- "Kinship." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012. Web. 20 Mar. 2012.
- Krech, Shepard. *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1999. Print.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. *Totemism*. Trans. Rodney Needham. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971. Print.
- Lewis, Michael, Jeannette M. Haviland-Jones, and Lisa F. Barrett. *Handbook of Emotions*. New York: Guilford Press, 2008. Print.
- "List of Human Emotions." *List of Human Emotions*, 2012. Web. 16 Mar. 2012.

Mandel, Ernest. *Marxist Economic Theory*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1969. Print.

Martin, Joel W., and Mark A. Nicholas. *Native Americans, Christianity, and the Reshaping of the American Religious Landscape*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010. Print.

Mason, Bobbie A. "Lying Doggo." *Shiloh and Other Stories*. New York: Modern Library, 2001. Print.

Mason, Jennifer. *Civilized Creatures: Urban Animals, Sentimental Culture, and American Literature, 1850-1900*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005. Print

Merchant, Carolyn. *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Harper One, 1980. Print.

"Mission, Policies and Bylaws." *Appalachian Studies Association*. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.

Murfree, Mary Noailles. "A Mountain Storm." *ReadBookOnline.net*, 2011. Web. 13 Mar. 2012.

Nicol, Neal, and Harry Wylie. *Between the Dying and the Dead: Dr. Jack Kevorkian's Life and the Battle to Legalize Euthanasia*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press/Terrace Books, 2006. Print.

O'Donnell, Kevin E., and Helen Hollingsworth. *Seekers of Scenery: Travel Writing from Southern Appalachia, 1840-1900*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2004. Print.

Ortner, Sherry B. "Is Female to Male as Nature is to Culture?" *Feminist Studies* 1:2 (Autumn, 1972): 5-31. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Jan. 2012.

"Patriarchy, n." OED Online. Oxford University Press, 2009. Web. 26 Apr. 2012.

- Perdue, Theda. *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998. Print.
- Perry, Ruth. *Novel Relations: The Transformation of Kinship in English Literature and Culture, 1748-1818*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
- “Relation of the Statistics of Agriculture to Those of Population.” *Agriculture Part I Farms, Livestock and Animal Products, Twelfth Census of the United States – 1900*. USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.
- “Relations of Cereal Growing to Live-stock Growing.” *Cereal Production, Report upon the Statistics of Agriculture Compiled from Returns Received at the Tenth Census*. USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf, 1993. Print.
- . *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979. Print.
- Salstrom, Paul. *Appalachia ’ s Path to Dependency: Rethinking a Region ’ s Economic History, 1730-1940*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1994. Print.
- Schneider, David M. *A Critique of the Study of Kinship*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1984. Print.
- Scholtmeijer, Marian. “The Power of Otherness: Animals in Women’s Fiction.” *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Ed. Carol J. Adams and Josephine Donovan. Durham: Duke University Press, 1995. 231-262. Print.
- Shapiro, Henry D. *Appalachia on Our Mind: The Southern Mountains and Mountaineers in the American Consciousness, 1870-1920*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1978. Print.

- Sharpe, J. E. *The Cherokees: Past and Present: An Authentic Guide to the Cherokee People*. Cherokee: Cherokee Publications, 1970. Print.
- Smith, Justin E. H. "Our Animals, Ourselves." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 58.15 (2011): B6-B10. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.
- Smith, Lee. "Bob, A Dog." *Mrs. Darcy and the Blue-Eyed Stranger: New and Selected Stories*. Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 2010. Print.
- . *Fair and Tender Ladies*. New York: Putnam, 1988. Print.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. "Woman as Body: Ancient and Contemporary Views." *Feminist Studies* 8.1 (Spring, 1982): 109-131. *JStor*. Web. 31 Mar. 2012.
- Stack, Carol B. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. Print.
- Steele, David N., and Curtis C. Thomas. *The Five Points of Calvinism: Defined, Defended, Documented*. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1963. Print.
- Still, James. *River of Earth*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1978. Print.
- Stone, Linda. *Kinship and Gender: An Introduction*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2010. Print.
- Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction*. Boulder: Westview Press, 2009. Print.
- Trautmann, Thomas R. *Lewis Henry Morgan and the Invention of Kinship*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987. Print.
- United States. *1840 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1850 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1860 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1870 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1880 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1890 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1900 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

---. *1920 Census of Agriculture*. United States Department of Agriculture. Web. 12 Dec. 2011.

Veblen, Thorstein. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Viking Press, 1967. Print.

Warren, Karen, and Barbara Wells-Howe ed. *Ecological Feminism*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Warren, Karen. *Ecofeminist Philosophy: A Western Perspective on What It Is and Why It Matters*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000. Print.

---. "Introduction." *Ecological Feminism*. Ed. Karren Warren and Barbara Wells-Howe. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Weidensaul, Scott. *Mountains of the Heart: A Natural History of the Appalachians*. Golden: Fulcrum Pub, 1994. Print.

- Weinstein, Cindy. *Family, Kinship, and Sympathy in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
- Weise, Robert S. *Grasping at Independence: Debt, Male Authority, and Mineral Rights in Appalachian Kentucky, 1850-1915*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 2001. Print.
- Williams, Cratis D. *The Southern Mountaineer in Fact and Fiction*. Diss. New York University, 1961. New York: New York University, 1961. Print.
- Williams, John Alexander. *Appalachia: A History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002. Print.
- Witherspoon, Gary. *Navajo Kinship and Marriage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1975. Print.
- Woolson, Constance Fenimore. "Up in the Blue Ridge." *Rodman the Keeper*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1880. 276-339. Print.
- Yarnell, Susan L. *The Southern Appalachians: A History of the Landscape*. Asheville: U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, 1998. Print.
- York, Bill. *John Fox, Jr: Appalachian Author*. Jefferson: McFarland & Co, 2003. Print.

VITA

April Leigh Walters was born in 1987 to Christine Mundy and Timothy Walters at Stonewall Jackson Hospital in Lexington, VA. With little exception, she lived in surrounding Rockbridge County her entire childhood and adolescence, surrounded by extended family. Leigh graduated from Rockbridge County High School in 2005 and shortly thereafter began her undergraduate career at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond. Knowing she was interested in writing, Leigh decided to major in Mass Communications in the beginning, but eventually changed her major to English, with a concentration in American literature and a minor in American Studies. Her interest for Appalachian literature was sparked after taking a class on Southern literature, where she was introduced to the short-story, "Drawing Names," by Bobbie Ann Mason. It was a story that reminded her of home. Leigh graduated from VCU in December of 2009 with a Bachelor of Arts in English. Appalachian State University's Master of Arts in the Appalachian Studies Program was the only one she had applied to, being positive that the program was the right fit for her. She entered into the program in the fall semester of 2010, and dove right away into Appalachian literature and literary criticism. Leigh worked as a graduate teaching assistant for the first two semesters she was in the Appalachian Studies Program, then she was offered a chance to teach AS 2410, *Appalachia: An Introduction*, with a humanities focus, on her own the following two semesters. Teaching was something Leigh enjoyed very much and she was delighted to receive the 2011-2012 award for Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant, which commended her on her in-classroom teaching efforts. Upon graduation from Appalachian

State University in May 2012, Leigh plans to seek out an appropriate Ph.D. program that will allow her to continue her work melding Critical animal studies with Rural literature. She hopes to eventually be able to work as a professor at an advanced degree granting institution where she can share her love for animals and literature with similar thinkers.