Recently, it took the individual actions of a Scottish-born, 48-year-old Australian to once again question the legitimacy of the traditional gender dichotomies generally subscribed to by state legislatures and the wider public they are elected to represent. Norrie May-Welby of Sydney—born a man, before undergoing a sex change operation and eventually opting to become a “neuter”—“made headlines after […] receiving an official designation of gender neutrality in Australia” but was in next to no time confronted with the withdrawal of this document “over questions of whether the New South Wales registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages had the power to issue such a designation.”

The case of May-Welby resonates with a dramatic development in the contemporary relevance and problematic nature—*nature* of course being the operative word—of a number of issues raised during the international interdisciplinary conference “Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present,” an event hosted by Prof. Dr. Stefan Horlacher at the Technical University of Dresden in June, 2009. Organized with
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the support of the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung für Wissenschaft, this conference was, as the title suggests, primarily devoted to a series of literary-historical case studies within the scope of surveying and comparing the conception, construction, and representation of masculinity in different historical periods. Beyond exercising the scholarly minds of presenters and participants from a wide range of academic fields in Europe and the U.S., it also attracted the attention of the media, with Germany’s preeminent tabloid newspaper Bild as well as television channel MDR losing no time in reporting on the event. Media and public interest stems from the perception of contemporary masculinity as being in an (oxymoronic) state of perpetual crisis, the typical manifestations of which are the increasing gender divide in academic performance, male perpetrated violence in the home or workplace, and most dramatically the copycat massacres in schools and colleges.

It was thus fitting that, given the flurry of media interest in matters masculine, the conference opened with four papers that emphasized the growing cultural, social, and political significance of masculinity studies as an academic discipline. STEFAN HORLACHER’s introductory paper addressed from a theoretical perspective the key questions of “Why Masculinities?” and “Why Literature?,” thereby establishing the latter as the preeminent discursive resource for epistemological insights into the historical development and contemporary relevance of masculinities. By addressing key texts situated at the intersection of literature, literary studies, sociology, psychoanalysis, and other fields of research, Horlacher provided the necessary framework for examining the interplay of fictional constructions and of what is commonly perceived non-fictional, that is, “real-life” enactments of masculinities, emphasizing literature’s potential to provide alternatives and offer solutions. Horlacher argued that while bearing a clear historical imprint, literary texts nevertheless transcend any narrow notion of mimesis that would reduce them to a mirror or straightforward representation of reality as “given.” If one takes into account literature’s ability (a) to constitute a discursive field in which even marginalized, aberrant voices can articulate themselves, (b) to give voice to something that could be called “the collective unconscious,” and (c) to transcend its time of origin, literature (and literary studies), according to Horlacher, can be viewed as an extraordinarily privileged medium for the conception, reception, and analysis of historically changing phenomena linked to the construction and deconstruction of (not just) British masculinities (compare Horlacher, 2004, 2010).

In his keynote address, HARRY BROD (Northern Iowa), one of the founders of masculinity studies in the U.S., traced the emergence of this field of enquiry into a fully-fledged discipline with its own key theoretical texts, debates, and concepts, identifying the desideratum of establishing a nexus between Eve Sedgwick’s concept of homosociality and Raewyn Connell’s research into hegemonic masculinity. In the course of his conceptual overview of the field, Brod also stressed the problematic status of a distinctive methodology as well as the
diverse relations between men’s studies and feminism, women’s studies, queer studies, and critical race theory. Despite the field’s notable achievements so far (such as its impact in critiquing the popular notion that gender studies mainly address issues related to femininity), Brod finished on a relatively ambivalent note, and stressed two quite diverse aspects which were to prove relevant for the subsequent papers: on the one hand, some degree of saturation has been reached in the field of theory and publications (which may be read as a justifiably positive appraisal of the discipline and the way it has gradually established itself over the last few years), on the other hand, more satisfactory answers to the most burning issues within the field remain to be sought out.

Quite a different perspective was offered by the second keynote speaker, RICHARD COLLIER (Newcastle). Drawing on the field of legal studies, Collier’s argument made it clear that one has to consider the role the law plays in the shaping of masculinity, serving not only as a focal point for political (or, indeed, public) disputes, but as an officially sanctioned discourse of its own that challenges the roles of men and their rights in various areas of social policy in the UK. Having been affected by the groundbreaking work of legal feminism (which focuses on women’s representation within juridical practices and institutions), a “masculinities” perspective or position has been established as a burgeoning segment of legal discourse since the middle of the 1990s, with the problems of embodiment, autonomy, and legal policy providing the dominant recurring themes. In addition, Collier explored the changing public perceptions of male violence arising from the high-profile media interventions of paternity rights groups such as Fathers4Justice, who have polarized UK public opinion through a number of high-profile publicity stunts, including, for instance, protest occupations of Westminster by men dressed up as Batman and Spiderman—superhero personae with problematic and fragile identity issues—the implications of which deserve a thorough reading. It remains open to discussion whether public outrage has been indicative of a continued domination of established role model allocations in parenting cultures, or whether it is indicative of a developing awareness of and sympathy for fathers’ rights activism. Clearly, the idea of “men who love and care” still has the potential to provoke unease among viewers who stick to notions of reckless hyper-masculinity.

The question of the field’s current state of development and its future prospects in critical discourse raised earlier by Brod, was readdressed by KEVIN FLOYD (Kent State), who concluded the opening theoretical and interdisciplinary part of the conference with his paper on “Masculinity Studies and Queer Studies.” Drawing on Judith Butler’s analysis of heterosexual normativity, Floyd questioned the normalization of heterosexuality that has been a key issue ever since Butler’s performative approach to gender, and her view of sex as culturally constructed. Although Butler’s work has evidently become part of the canon of gender studies, masculinity is still discussed without critical reflection on the heterosexual norm. Here, the relatively recent fields of queer
and transgender studies may offer new perspectives on pre-twentieth century contexts, however deriving from a contemporary theoretical framework. By addressing the explanatory capacity as well as limitations of their key terms and paradigms, Floyd argued that transgender studies in particular have shown the potential to question both a number of entrenched academic assumptions about masculinity, as well as the outmoded divide between exclusively theoretical and historical approaches, and literary studies.

The main thematic section of the conference was devoted to analyses of exemplary, representative primary texts and the concomitant changes in the representation and construction of masculinity from the Middle Ages to the present. Two contributions on the medieval Romance genre opened this section, both offering readings “against the grain” of genre-specific masculinity formations.

Andrew James Johnston (FU Berlin), in “Robin, Gamelyn and Medieval Masculine Escapism,” did away with the popular association of the purely violent ideal of masculinity with the Middle Ages, by pointing out the broad range of masculine identities that co-exist in many medieval texts. If the surface structure of the pseudo-Chaucerian romance *Gamelyn* seems to favor violence as a legitimate form of rebellious self-expression, with the aim of establishing “order” within homosocial contexts of adolescent males, Johnston elicited the transgressive potential of the *Gamelyn* text by drawing on popular cultural intertexts such as the *Robin Hood* narratives of that time, in order to show the complex web of contradictory ideological positions that question the role of violence depicted in *Gamelyn*: its eponymous hero is by no means flawless, but rather shows elements of clownish naiveté in addition to scenes that exhibit his brutish strength. Thus, there is a considerable residue of subversion beneath the conservative treatment of social pressures as depicted in *Gamelyn*, and Johnston’s close reading both of the manifestations of the male body in *Gamelyn* as well as of the textual representation of a social order in transition, was able to discern contradictory images of masculine identity formation.

Christoph Houswitschka (Bamberg), in “Masculinity and Chivalric Prowess,” showed how in Thomas Malory’s *Morte Darthur*, one of the best-known and most influential Arthurian tales, it is once more the body which serves as a focal point for asserting and maintaining masculinity: the knight’s physical and spiritual integrity comes under constant threat of physical violence and “fleshly lusts.” In the course of the narrative, subtle traces of anxiety are often marginalized by scenes of demonstrative, hegemonic masculinity exhibiting male power: here Lancelot’s impossible strength ultimately marks an exaggerated chivalric ideal and shows no hints of his downfall that usually features in the source material in Malory’s time, as the author tellingly avoids the question whether Lancelot slept with the Queen, favoring instead the idealized extreme of his protagonist, as opposed to the moderate character of Gareth.

Early modern representations of masculinity were examined by Thomas Kühn (Dresden) and Gabriele Rippl (Bern). The former turned his attention to
John Milton’s epic poem *Paradise Lost* (1667) and examined its stock of characters with regard to different forms of masculinity. Whilst Milton’s settings—consisting of the discrete realms of hell, heaven, the earthly paradise as well as the spaces in between—feature inhabitants as diverse as Adam, the Father and the Son, the angels, and Satan and his followers, the creation of woman is rendered a side-issue that merely produced a “companion-piece” to man. Consequently, Eve appears as one of very few females in the text. However, Milton’s world is by no means masculine in the traditional sense of the word. Focusing on Book VI of *Paradise Lost* (Raphael’s account of the battle between Satan and the angels), Kühn demonstrated not only that virile masculinity is portrayed almost exclusively as the province of the fallen angels, but that “heaven’s lack of masculinities” is only really overcome in battle situations, where even the archangel appears “[n]ot in his shape Celestial, but as Man / Clad to meet Man; over his lucid Armes / A militarie Vest of purple flowd” (*PL* XI, 238ff.).

Gabriele Rippl, on the other hand, offered an entirely different perspective in her paper “Images of Masculinity in Texts of Early Modern Women: Cavendish, Fanshawe and Bradstreet.” As Rippl demonstrated, early modern autobiographical texts written by women are not only an excellent source of information for seventeenth-century notions of femininity, but also show the interrelatedness of gender roles and the functioning of gendered behavior codes.

It became evident, how cultural, social, philosophical, and religious prescripts and traditions, that is, Renaissance ideas of ideal manhood, influenced the notion of masculinity and the self-fashioning of men in seventeenth-century England as well as in its New England colonies. As the chosen primary material made clear, early modern masculinity among the aristocracy and the gentry naturally implied amongst other things being a learned scholar, a talented horseman, an experienced soldier, and possibly also an art lover. Since the autobiographical material of the upper classes often served public goals, the literary presentation of masculinity is based on patterns that serve this purpose. Thus glimpses of the “real” men can only be caught by looking at the ironies, rifts, and gaps the texts produce. Obviously the outwardly-directed, or other-directed, “shame” culture of the court produced different masculinities than did the inwardly-directed “guilt” culture of the Puritans. Since our ideas of early modern masculinities always derive from discourses and representations of masculinity, it was the aim of Rippl’s contribution to investigate different notions of masculinity as presented in Cavendish’s, Fanshawe’s, and Bradstreet’s autobiographical texts which were critically read against the backdrop of religious, cultural, and literary prescripts and scrutinized for possible deviations from them.

Three contributions dealing with texts from the 18th century marked the transition from Renaissance and Augustan conceptions of masculinity to the modern era. Isabel Karremann (Munich) compared the repression of the abject in the masculine ideals propagated by the 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury with their satirical reprise in Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726). As Augustan masculinity is
clearly modeled on the heroes of Greek mythology and the Roman civitas under Augustus, the literary representations of the new Augustan age designate a masculine ideal based on rationality, absolute self-control, and emancipation from the desires and frailties of the body, as well as moral virtue (a word, as is worth pointing out, deriving from Lat. *vir* = man). The subsequent exclusion of irrationality, immorality, and any openly expressed sexuality—and their projection and abjection onto women, children, or dumb beasts—provided a discursive framework entirely conducive to the patriarchal order, yet, as various genre narratives of that era show, still produced its own anxieties. Karremann focused on Swift’s renowned and exemplary novel and was able to show the way it subverts the key ideas of one of the era’s most influential philosophers in Gulliver’s voyage to Lilliput: the Herculean ideal of strength is subverted as the protagonist becomes subject to laughter, as his bizarre appearance is ridiculed by the locals. In addition, Gulliver’s narrative ridicules the twelve labors of Hercules by reenacting them in a satirical form.

In “The Male Gaze vs. Sexual Ventriloquism,” LAURENZ VOLKMANN (Jena) examined the elusive nature of Daniel Defoe’s fiction with regard to its gender politics. Focusing on the example of Robinson Crusoe, Volkmann discussed both the popular image of the protagonist as well as the significant amount of recent critical readings that emphasize homoerotic and colonial aspects. Defoe, argued Volkmann, largely modeled his eponymous hero on the ideal of muscular Christianity, though also including attributes from other gender concepts at the time. Consequently, Crusoe’s sexuality has been subject to heated debate among several generations of academics, with many readings stressing the character’s closeted homophilia as well as the aspect of the White, male colonizer who subjugates the savage islanders by virtue of his “male gaze,” and who conquers nature in order to exploit it as a “perfect prostitute to industry.” Similarly, quite a number of protagonists in Defoe’s lesser books correspond to the image of the adventurous renegade whose personal relationships are dominated by comradeship and scenarios of male bonding, and who allows himself to cherish visions of idyllic all-male utopias. Often these turn out to be escapist fantasies emanating from the hardships of early capitalism. At the same time, Crusoe’s character exhibits a number of male phobias (e.g., his refusal to go out naked) hinting at sublimation.

RAINER EMIG (Hanover) considered the problematic issue of “Sentimental Masculinity,” where the sentimental is traditionally viewed as an exclusively feminized form of narrative, as the famous examples of Samuel Richardson’s heroines show (cf. Pamela or Clarissa). Against this popular notion, Emig addressed the effects of the Age of Sentimentality on new conceptualizations of masculinity, employing the example of Henry Mackenzie’s Man of Feeling (1771). Mackenzie’s protagonist, Harley, cannot reconcile contradictory expectations as he is torn between privilege and individual virtue, rationality and feeling, strength and weakness. The episodic structure of the book highlights Harley’s failure to achieve worldly success, and by consequence eventually
sees his downfall. Thus, Mackenzie’s short novel is not only indicative of the transition from Neoclassical via Romantic to bourgeois masculinity, which points in the direction of the 19th century, but even qualifies the protagonist as an early example of masculinity in crisis, which remains the preferred diagnosis throughout the following centuries.

Popular fiction of the 19th century was the focus of the next two presentations. RALF SCHNEIDER (Bielefeld) modeled his typology of Victorian masculinities on the basis of contemporary gender binaries that did not allow for a questioning of the masculine norm, though, paradoxically, the Victorians never explicitly formulated standard concepts of masculinity—unlike their emphasis on representing the feminine ideal, which was often reduced to the private sector, the public being an exclusively male affair. Still, Schneider argued that within these patriarchal, paternalist structures, there were ways of expressing anxieties and ambivalences about masculinity, especially in popular literary genres like the Gothic novel or early detective fiction, which both specialize in providing unsettling reading experiences. Schneider’s typology classified the various forms of Victorian masculinity as either trivialized (as one can see in the hypochondriac uncle of the protagonist Laura in Collins’ Woman in White), demonized (where, of course, Bram Stoker’s Dracula or Stevenson’s Mr. Hyde spring to mind), or utterly eccentric (such as Dickens’ minor characters or Conan Doyle’s celebrated Sherlock Holmes). Given that the majority of male protagonists are far from serving as flawless role models, a proper definition of the hegemonic, masculine ideal may only be found ex negativo in Victorian fiction, since not even a reliable pater familias tends to populate these books. Thus, the issue of masculinity appears in line with the general articulation of unease that often threatens domestic scenarios: in Dracula, for example, it is the polluted earth which is brought to England onboard the ship Demeter.

In their joint paper “The Props of Masculinity,” SUSANNE SCHOLZ (Frankfurt/Main) and NICOLA DROPMANN (Kiel) examined the latent inferiority complex underpinning dominant male roles in the adventure novels of Henry Rider Haggard. To some degree providing the masculine ideal that Victorian genre fiction (as examined by Schneider) usually lacks, late Victorian adventure narratives present an all-male world of extremely exaggerated role modeling, that is, reckless ruffians fighting for the empire in swashbuckling scenarios. In the course of these narratives, imperial enterprises provide a potential playground for asserting virile, duty-bound, Christian manhood, and Haggard’s famous hero, Allan Quatermain, not only regularly succeeds on his missions throughout Africa (he represents the great White hero who perceives his African servants as child-like creatures who must be educated), but also provides a model of masculine virility for adolescent readers of the time. Addressing the issue of the various phallic props (e.g. the rifle, which serves as a constant reminder of the protagonist’s gun fetish) that usually accompany the hero on his mission (as exhibited in King Solomon’s Mines), Scholz and Dropmann revealed the masculine ideal represented in this genre to be of a rather fragile nature. Against
this background of male anxiety in the contact zone between warriors and sages, British men and African women, fears about cultural degeneracy and contagion become apparent. By mapping the territory of Africa like the female body, the exploration of the “Dark Continent” is akin to the taking of a virgin site, allowing the hunter-hero to reassert his male identity. At the same time, this issue is also indicative of the imperialist mindset of the time: the crisis at home is acted out abroad in archaic trials of courage.

Opening the final section of the conference—the sessions on 20th and 21st century fiction—Silvia Mergenthal (Constance) examined the long shadow cast by the Great War and the way the experiences in the trenches led to a dramatic reconfiguration of gender relationships. Mergenthal referred to Pat Barker’s Regeneration trilogy (Regeneration, 1991; The Eye in the Door, 1993; The Ghost Road, 1995) as well as to historical novels that include fictionalized renderings of the lives of the war poets Siegfried Sassoon and Wilfred Owen. With women at the home front steadily adjusting to jobs previously unavailable to them, it was the traumatized soldier who, having fostered emotional, sometimes latently homoerotic bonds during the war, suffered from the “nervous condition” of shell shock and thus showed behavior habitually associated with femininity: “The war that had promised so much in the way of ‘manly’ activity had actually delivered ‘feminine’ passivity,” as Barker states in Regeneration. In the light of renewed discussions surrounding these texts, Mergenthal added a close reading of Robert Graves’s autobiography, which stressed both the problem of homosexuality (since British military law prohibited “any act of gross indecency with another male person”) as well as the traumatic implications of the war experience, a theme which also dominated the story of Sassoon’s life.

Claudia Lainka (Mannheim/Dresden) introduced the now almost forgotten British author John Cowper Powys into the discussion. In his fourth novel, Wolf Solent (1929)—a bestseller at the time of publication, a success the author was never able to replicate—Cowper Powys developed a fluid construction of the notion of gender, which Lainka analyzed in a psychoanalytical reading of the text indebted to Jacques Lacan. Putting particular emphasis on the protagonist’s conscious as well as unconscious thought-processes, Lainka demonstrated that Solent’s masculine self-conception proves both highly idiosyncratic and rather unstable, thus doing away with the notion of a monolithic and predetermined conception of gender identity.

As far as post-war masculinities are concerned, Sebastian Müller (Mannheim) provided a starting point by presenting his research results on the problematic side of virile masculinity as portrayed in the Angry Young Man “movement” beyond its immediate 1950s context. While the character disposition of Jimmy Porter (the protagonist in John Osborne’s Look Back in Anger) or Joe Lampton (in John Braine’s Room at the Top) has usually been reduced to a class conflict brought about by the tension between upward mobility and the protagonists’ respective working-class backgrounds, Müller emphasized the
inherent gender conflict: both Joe and Jimmy face challenges to their pride and masculinity and turn to alternate means of compensation, such as status symbols and rebellious gestures. The influence of these Angry Young Men and their tendency to idealize absent fathers can not only be traced in narratives of that era (like Sillitoe’s *Saturday Night and Sunday Morning*), but even in contemporary popular films of the post-modern age, such as David Fincher’s adaption of Chuck Palahniuk’s *Fight Club* (1999), or Martin Campbell’s reboot of the James Bond franchise in *Casino Royale* (2006). Evidently, the working-class hero remains a simple but effectively reaffirming mode of male identity-formation, who still casts a long shadow in mass media representations of the 21st century.

The nexus of subversion, legalization and assimilation in the construction of gay masculinities was discussed in detail by Berthold Schoene (Manchester), who referred to three English novels of the post-war period. Like Richard Collier before him, Schoene introduced legal aspects and their implications for male self-conception into the discussion. Having stressed the significance of the ideological split within the gay community between mainstream-cultural assimilationism and strategic cultivation of subversive estrangeness that reached extreme heights in the aftermath of the 1980s AIDS crisis, Schoene explored three different literary examples of homosexuals. Whereas Alan Hollinghurst’s *The Spell* (1998) features fantasies of promiscuous sex which hint at a subliminal “fear of domestication,” Tom Wakefield’s novel *Mates* (1983) portrays the domestic life of a gay couple and insists on ordinary forms of love, beyond mere mimicry of the heterosexual norm. Since all of the books in question—including even E.M. Forster’s *Maurice* (1971; completed in 1914)—add to the debate of relationships among gay men, Schoene provocatively asked whether, despite their apparent differences and their apparent irreconcilability, both gay and queer ideologies do not in fact share at least some common denominators even when it comes to the alleged (il)legitimacy of promiscuity and sexual experimentalism on the one hand, and monogamous “coupledom” and the hotly contested desirability of gay marriage, on the other.

Fatemeh Hosseini (Dresden) charted the shift from patriarchal to “filiar-chal” structures in the early novels of Ian McEwan, whose work has often raised controversy among feminists. The ambivalent quality of McEwan’s prose becomes not only apparent if one considers its reception (whereas his early texts were denounced as misogynist, his third novel, *The Child in Time*, was suddenly embraced as a feminist text), but even more so if it is subjected to a close reading. Hosseini’s argument focused both on man-woman as well as child-parent relationships in McEwan’s novels, and noted a growing sophistication in the author’s treatment of masculinities, culminating in the question raised in a recent oratory penned by the author of *Enduring Love*: “shall there be womanly times, or shall we die?” Novels like *The Innocent* or *The Cement Garden* (featuring the imitation and acquisition of a late father’s phallic insignia) inevitably tie the perception of masculinity to death and violent sce-
narios, where both matriarchy and patriarchy have to be overcome by the figure of the son. Thus, the narratives point towards a post-patriarchal era of the son, for which Hosseini proposes the concept of *filiarchy*, a term originally derived from socioeconomic studies.

**Andrea Ochsner** (Basel) examined the comparatively recent phenomenon of British “Lad Lit.” Now often identified with the publication of Nick Hornby’s bestselling account of a football supporter, *Fever Pitch* (1992), and Hornby’s subsequent novel *High Fidelity* (1995), the phenomenon of Laddism was addressed throughout the 1990s in self-help books and magazines, and came to evoke its own brand of literature. Lad lit turned into a publishing phenomenon, despite the feminist backlash against the kind of behavior advertised in these books. Ochsner rejected such superficial readings by proposing to read these narratives as a modern variant on the classic *Bildungsroman*, highlighting the problematic dispositions of masculinity that haunt the protagonists. They usually are urban men in their thirties who refuse to grow up, delay decisions, and overindulge their obsessions with personal possessions: Rob, the protagonist in *High Fidelity*, prefers sorting his record collection (in autobiographical order) over addressing personal problems; John O’Farrell’s protagonist Michael (*The Best a Man Can Get*, 2000) is afraid of commitment in his relationship and favors prolonged adolescence, establishing for himself a persona as a daring bachelor; Tim Lott’s *White City Blue* (1999) sees the collapse of a network of friends when one of them decides to tie the knot, the ongoing dedication among the latter’s male friends also hinting at a homoerotic subtext. The central protagonists not only face a series of personal crises, but these are also very much viewed as coinciding with postmodern identity issues. The New Lad (as the quintessential 1990s Everyman) is simply overburdened with the sheer amount of male (media) scripts that he recognizes as potential role models.

The concluding panel discussion focused on two main aspects, emphasizing firstly—with reference to the opening theoretical contributions by Horlacher, Brod, Collier and Floyd—the centrality of divergent diachronic processes in constructions of the body as well as the importance of Butler’s theory of performativity in any general definition of masculinity, especially with a view to how male (sexual/textual) identity is accorded a different meaning within different epochs and across different genres. The diachronic dimension of all literary works discussed during the conference also demonstrated how identity issues are negotiated on the levels of the psyche, of social practices, and of desire. A second major issue raised during the discussion was whether the perceived crisis of masculinity is largely a contemporary phenomenon or an inherent feature of male identity formation, as many of the textual analyses seemed to imply. In order to analyze the results of detailed literary interpretations on a more abstract level, explanatory models stemming from psychoanalytic object relations theories, which focus on psychosexual development during infancy and its impact on the “male script,” may prove invaluable.
Plotting a literary history of British masculinities in terms of an ongoing succession of crises proved a controversial turning point in the discussion, suggesting the necessity of further research and a follow-up conference, which will take place at Dresden University of Technology in June 2010. The projected publication date of a research anthology based on the contributions presented above but also including additional articles on Shakespeare (Mark Bracher), on the “crisis” of masculinity in seventeenth-century England (Michael S. Kimmel) and on Black British masculinity is 2011.
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