CULTURE, SOCIETY & MASCULINITIES

PERFORMING THE INVISIBLE

Guest Editors:

**RAPHAEL COSTAMBEYS-KEMPCZYNSKI
MARIE MOREAU
EMILIE PIAT**

Instructions to Authors

Manuscript preparation. *Culture, Society & Masculinities* publishes regular articles (around 7,500 to 8,500 words) and brief reports (2,500 to 3,000 words). Authors should prepare manuscripts according to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed., 2009). Formatting instructions and instructions on the preparation of abstracts, text with designated headers (A-level through C-level), references, tables, and figures appear in the *Manual*. All copy must be double-spaced. **Abstract and keywords**. All manuscripts must include an abstract containing a maximum of 120 words typed on a separate page. After the abstract, supply up to five keywords or brief phrases. **References**. References should be listed in alphabetic order (also double-spaced). Each listed reference should be cited in the text and each text citation should be listed in the References. Basic formats are as follows:

Journal article:
Forth, C.E. (2009). Surviving our paradoxes? Masculinity, modernity, and the body. *Culture, Society & Masculinities, 1*(1), 6-32.

Book:
Janssen, D.F. (2008). *International guide to literature on masculinity: A bibliography*. MSP Bibliography Series No. 1. Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Edited book:
Armengol, J.M., & Carabí, À. (Eds.). (2009). *Debating masculinity*. Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Chapter in a book:
Gilmore, D. (2009). Cultures of masculinity. In J.M. Armengol & À. Carabí (Eds.), *Debating masculinity* (pp. 31-41). Harriman, TN: Men's Studies Press.

Article in an Internet-only journal:
Gordon, R. (2004, June 15). The men among us. Library Journal.com. Retrieved October 15, 2006, from http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA423789.html

Figures. High-quality printouts are needed for *all* figures. The minimum line weight for line art is 0.5 point for optimal printing.

Review Procedure. *Culture, Society & Masculinities* uses a masked review process. Authors are asked to include all identifying information in the cover letter, including the manuscript title, the authors' names, institutional affiliations, and e-mail addresses. The first page of the manuscript should include only the article's title, abstract, and keywords. Footnotes containing information that would reveal the authors' identity and/or affiliation should be removed. Every effort should be made to see that the manuscript itself contains no clues to the author's identity.

Permissions. When an article has been accepted, authors are required to obtain and provide to the editor all necessary permissions to reproduce in print and electronic form any copyrighted work, including, for example, photographs of people.

Publication Policy. Our policy prohibits an author from submitting the same manuscript for concurrent consideration by two or more publications. Our policy also prohibits publication of a manuscript that has already been published in whole or substantial part elsewhere. Authors of manuscripts describing research using human participants are required to comply with APA ethical standards in the treatment of human participants. Upon acceptance of a manuscript authors must sign and return a copyright agreement.

Submission. Submit manuscripts *only* as electronic files (.rtf or .doc file), via the editor's email: diederikjanssen@gmail.com

Raphael Costambeys-Kempczynski*, Marie Moreau* and Emilie Piat*

Performing the Invisible

This special issue follows on from the international conference *Performing the Invisible: Masculinities in the English-Speaking World*, organized at the Université Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris 3 on September 25-26, 2010 (http://www.men.univ-paris3.fr) and sponsored by the university's research groups *CREW* and *PRISMES*, its postgraduate school *EDEAGE-Etudes Anglophones, Germanophones et Européennes*, its research council and its division for international relations. The conference was part of the two-year interdisciplinary research project *Performing Straight White Masculinities*, sponsored by the Sorbonne Nouvelle's research council. The editors of this special issue wish to thank the conference's organizing committee, namely Ariane Blayac, Sophie Chapuis, Claire Conilleau, Claire Delahaye, Claire Hélie, Marianne Kac-Vergne, Pierre-Antoine Pellerin and Hélène Quanquin.

From the Invisible to the Observable

On the subject of photography, Slavoj Žižek identifies what he understands to be a "negative link between visibility and movement."[1] Žižek reminds us that "photography, the medium of immobilization, was first perceived as the *mortification* of the living body"[2] and argues that "in terms of its original phenomenological status, movement equals blindness, it blurs the contours of what we perceive: in order for us to perceive the object clearly, it must be frozen, immobilized—immobility makes a thing visible."[3] It follows, then, that to make a subject visible it must be immobilized but this must necessarily lead to its disappearance. Similarly, through its act of performance the living body is rendered invisible.

In his 1993 seminal article "Invisible Masculinity," Michael S. Kimmel suggests that failure to question the normative practices of hegemonic masculinity had rendered non-existent the experiences of men living their lives as men. History books, in the main, may be written by men and may be about men, but Kimmel states quite succinctly: "American men have no history."[4] Indeed, history books do not

* Université Sorbonne Nouvelle—Paris 3.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Raphael Costambeys-Kempczynski, MCF - Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3, 13 rue Santeuil 75231 Paris Cedex 5, France. Email: raphael.costambeys@univ-paris3. fr.

deal with the practice of being a man and therefore the experience of men as gendered selves has remained unobserved. This invisible history is gradually being traced thanks to the work of feminist scholars over the past four decades. It is, therefore, only relatively recently that such academic fields as Men's Studies have been able to develop and, as Stephen M. Whitehead reminds us, "turn attention to men in a way that renders them and their practices visible, apparent and subject to question."[5]

Even within this framework, the title of this issue of *Culture, Society & Masculinities* may still remain somewhat enigmatic: how is it possible to identify the actions of something which cannot be seen? And yet the need to break free from the study of masculinity as a visible but static entity is, today, one of the central tenets of Men's Studies. As R.W. Connell insists:

> Rather than attempting to define masculinity as an object (natural character type, a behavioural average, a norm), we need to focus on the processes and relationships through which men and women conduct gendered lives. 'Masculinity', to the extent the term can be briefly defined at all, is simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture.[6]

It is, therefore, the practice of masculinity that must retain our attention—the way masculinity, or rather, the ways masculinities, are performed and executed.

There is, however, a double dialectic that is necessarily at work when dealing with the notion of performance in the context of any study into gender identities and it is perhaps worth mapping out the connotations and denotations of the same "performance." Primarily defined as "the accomplishment or carrying out of something commanded or undertaken,"[7] the use of the term within the context of Men's Studies refers us to the notion of gender scripts where received expectations based on perceived biological sex are imposed by a society continually in need of stabilizing contingency. If we articulate this with the idea that a performance is also "the quality of execution of such an action, operation, or process; the competence or effectiveness of a person or thing in performing an action,"[8] then we must necessarily evoke the concept of hegemonic masculinity where such notions as quality of execution, competence and effectiveness play a fundamental part in the construction of a normative performance of masculinity where, as Connell puts it, "one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted."[9] We could, perhaps, call the carrying out of such gender scripts as hegemonic masculinity "command performances." Of course, the criteria used to evaluate quality, competence, effectiveness, evolve over time. Thus, the reception of performances is continually in flux, the norms that contribute to the definition of hegemonic masculinity also. This leads Connell to conclude: "Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the *currently accepted* answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women"[10] (our italics).

Connell's analysis of the masculinity power complex leads us in a most tangible way to the other prevalent definition of performance, that of the interpretation of an artistic work. "The most visible bearers of masculinity," writes Connell, "may be exemplars, such as film actors, or even fantasy figures, such as film characters."[11]

Such representations may serve to reinforce the gender scripts of hegemonic masculinity but they can also serve to shift the consensus.

Three of the articles collected here focus directly on theatre and film (Ronan Ludot-Vlasak, Frédérique Fouassier, Yann Roblou) and through their analyses demonstrate to what extent the performance of masculinity is contingent over time. Ultimately this is what leads to a sense of crisis, not the hackneyed media use of the expression "masculinity in crisis," but the identification of a period in time where the new performance of masculinity has yet to stabilize, for example through the establishment of a new consensus on hegemonic masculinity as we move from one generation of men to the next or through male subjects' response to the prevailing consensus as they move through a period of biological transformation from boyhood to manhood.

Needless to say, the use of the term "performing" in the title to this special issue aims to articulate the notions of performance as we have so far discussed with Judith Butler's idea of gender performativity. The distinction between performance and performativity is, of course, fundamental in understanding Butler's definition of gender where:

> […] gender proves to be performative—that is constituting the identity it is purported to be. In this sense, gender is always a doing, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to pre-exist the deed.[12]

Performances, whether we understand them as commanded or not, are undertaken. Even if the performance is subject to evaluation, the masculine or feminine subject remains free to choose the performance of their gender. For Butler, however, this freedom of choice is a misnomer because gender is "a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame."[13] The subject, therefore, only exists within performative gender acts.

The regulatory frames are multiple, from the home to the workplace, from church to the film screen. Some regulatory frames, such as pubs and clubs, offer strategies of resistance. Valérie Capdeville (*this issue*) shows how the emergence of gentlemen's clubs in eighteenth-century London helped define a new masculinity within the context of a developing urban culture. Other such frames can be imposed with such violence that traditional power hierarchies are radically altered as Patrick Farges (*this issue*) demonstrates when discussing internment camps in Canada during the Second World War. Both of these articles, through a deep association of performance and performativity, show how regulatory frames can be subverted and transformed, no matter how apparently inflexible. Anne-Valérie Dulac (*this issue*) reminds us that the 1563 *Homily Against Excess of Apparel* offers through a pragmatically orientated sermon a regulatory framework to enforce the execution of gender performance. In this context, reading from the right script, indeed, from the right scripture, will lead to salvation.

COMMUNICATING INVISIBILITY

Femininity and masculinity function as an exclusion procedure, a binary system aligned with conventional notions of biological divide. Through its pervasiveness, the hegemonic masculinity of its time is rendered invisible whereas subordinate masculinities, seen by the system as a potential threat, will traditionally react by

identifying these performances as "non-masculine" and render them visible through negatively connoted categorization. Non-masculine behaviour is thus seen to be pathological or deviant, a violent expression of individualism working against collective social stability that the system must protect. As Donald E. Hall points out: "[t]he prevailing gender and sexual paradigms of an era regulate everyone's lives, working to curtail possibilities and relentlessly push sexual/erotic relationships into socially acceptable channels."[14]

As we have already argued, however, the rules that regulate paradigms fluctuate. Censorship by the system, as one example of prohibition for not respecting the rules, may be used to contain and limit semantics, but it is based on the fallacious assumption that reality and communication can be subject to stabilisation in the first place. In fact, there is no pre-ontological or rational need for a given rule—it simply reflects functional needs for complexity and risk reduction (a heightened example of this in the context of war is analysed by Farges, *this issue*). In the words of the American historian E. Anthony Rotundo:

> Manhood is not a social edict determined on high and enforced by law. As a human invention, manhood is learned, used, reinforced, and reshaped by individuals in the course of life.[15]

Thus, masculinity and femininity are political fictions and, as Hall suggests, if gender paradigms aim for social acceptance so must the social system also tolerate non-masculine behaviour and gradually integrate it into hegemonic masculinity (Capdeville, *this issue*).

If this is the case, it is because the act of communication itself is porous being dependent upon context, agent and medium. Colin B. Grant explains that "[t]he theory of porous communication integrates higher levels of complexity: as the metaphor of the "pore" suggests, communications are complex entities of structures and spaces where spaces of various kinds introduce contingency and uncertainty"[16] and continues:

> In view of these spaces, theories in the shadow of the 'semantic of interaction' such as intersubjectivity, understanding or consensus can be reconceptualised together with the epistemological foundations on which they are built. In pragmatic interactions, communicative uncertainties are bridged by contingent constructions such as assumptions, imputations and presuppositions between cognitively unique agents.[17]

If non-masculine behaviour by men is meant as a mark of individualism (Dulac, *this issue*), like autonomy it is not to be equated with solipsism since uncertainties are bridged and constructs communalised by means of operative fictions of collective knowledge such as politics (which governs freedom), religion (which governs salvation), science (which governs truth), or philosophy (which governs ethics, morals, virtue). All of these categories move towards defining our sense of masculinity. But if masculine and non-masculine behaviours are not to be seen as solipsistic (as solely existing in my mind), they are to be understood as subjective (as perceived by my mind).

Society depends on fictions of commonality such as ethics, religion and culture which, as codifications, may be seen as simulating the transcendence of a poten-

tially isolated subject. In the words of Kant, as explicated by Hans Vaihinger, these are heuristic fictions.[18] One such heuristic fiction is masculinity, in other words the need to project onto the male subject the quality of masculinity in order to understand men (and often masculinity itself), but this feature should not be considered as constitutive of the real. These fictions, heuristic, conceptual or philosophical fictions, do not serve to illuminate some kind of reality, but, in Vaihinger's words, they are instruments "for finding our way about more easily in the world."[19]

If, as individuals, however, we chose to function as if the world was a fiction, our situation would quickly become untenable. And yet is there not an implicit conception of masculinity which recalls Vaihinger's reading of Kant: have we not all at some point confused gender and sex, the cultural and the biological, "as if" men are masculine, or should be masculine, "as if" the quality of masculinity is relative to the quality of what is to be a man, a real man? Masculinity then is the thing-in-itself of what it is to be a man or the *Ding an sich* to use the Kantian term. Eva Schaper writes:

> Things-in-themselves can consistently be seen as heuristic fictions, as devices enabling us to account for a given situation in terms of a theory. Things-in-themselves as heuristic fictions permit us to derive and exhibit a complicated set of consequences if we proceed as if they were real.[20]

Masculinity must, therefore, be more than a noumenon: masculinity is more than something conceived by thought, it is something that must be perceived, rendered visible, in experience. Along with the question "What is it to be masculine?" comes its phenomenal bedfellow: "What is it to be perceived as masculine?" In other words, masculinity as a cognitive fiction participates in the construction of reality at the self-referential and the hetero-referential levels. Masculinity is no different from any other such construction. Its function lies in the communication of socially useful codifications, whether it be on the stage or on film, in the pub or, indeed, in internment camps.

MATRIX STRUCTURES: PUBLIC/INVISIBLE/PRIVATE/VISIBLE

When dealing with the construction of gender performance it is important to address the context within which gender scripts are mediated and how these scripts are produced and reproduced. Habitually, the contexts addressed tend to be classified as either belonging to the public or private spheres, and many studies have concentrated on the associations and disassociations of the performance of masculinity between the workplace and the home.[21]

In her book *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*, Lynne Segal argues that since the 1950s the way in which men engage with the home and family life has undergone an "irreversible transformation."[22] The increasing porosity between the home and the workplace has, in turn, seen a shift in the way men engage with their masculinity, however, leading to what Chris Haywood and Máirtín Mac an Ghail call "a domestic refusal, an active disassociation from the private sphere."[23] Haywood and Mac an Ghail remind us of Willott and Griffin's 1997 study "'Wham Bam, Am I a Man?': Unemployed Men Talk About Masculinities" and how men who are out of employment feel an increased need for this disasso-

ciation. For these unemployed men, "[t]he pub became an important resource within which to maintain a spatial division of public and domestic spheres."[24]

Of course, the expression of this need of escape is not a phenomenon true only for the second half of the twentieth century. Capdeville (*this issue*) explores how the rise of gentlemen's clubs in the eighteenth century impacted on the development of the performance of masculinities. Capdeville's approach renders more complex the conventional binary division between public and private spheres, where the gentlemen's clubs in question hold quite a hybrid status affording men a male-only private space in which to construct a new public performance of masculinity.

If gentlemen's clubs offer their members the choice of partaking in homosocial relations as a way of performing their masculinity, the male internment camps set up in Canada during the Second World War impose upon the detainees an artificially enclosed space with a new set of rules for the public performance of masculinity. Farges's study of life in these camps (*this issue*), rendered invisible by other historical events of the time, focuses on the narratives of the former prisoners affording us public insight through private memories into how they constructed themselves as men confined amongst men.

Dulac's study (*this issue*) of Sir Philip Sydney's *Arcadia* (1590) explores how Pyrocles must disguise himself as an Amazonian lady to be able to approach his beloved Philoclea hidden away in a pastoral lodge by her father. Pyrocles must thus abandon the public performance of his heroic manhood as only through the adoption of non-masculine behaviour can he gain access to Philoclea's private sphere and fulfil his "manly" romantic ambition.

Notions of public and private performance of masculine identities are inherent in all of the articles collected here but each study also serves to demonstrate how relations between the public and private spheres need to be understood in terms of a matrix structure of performance rather than distinct discrete arenas. Matrix structures are to be understood here as environments requiring the subject to respond to two or more constructs quasi-simultaneously and where both function and product of the subject are combined.

Within the framework of matrix structures, the example of stage and film actors and characters, as explored by Ludot-Vlasak and Roblou (both *this issue*), is an intriguing one. Engaged in playing the part of a superhero, for instance, actors on a film set may well be performing their masculinity according to received gender scripts of public representations of identity in the workplace but, as Roblou demonstrates, they are also engaged in conveying a representation of masculinity that will feed into that gender script and see it evolve. In this way, beyond the film set as work place, the notion of public sphere takes on a whole new dimension with regards to the performance of masculinity when the superhero role is projected onto the screen and consumed by millions of viewers. In the case of the films discussed by Roblou, this double performance, whereby the actor performs his masculinity as a man in the workplace where his employment is to construct a received notion of the ultimate masculine man, may then find itself post-produced through special effects that transform the character into an idealized form of the hypermasculine, thus pushing the notion of gender roles as cultural fictions to the extreme.

The characterization of such hypermasculinity does not solely need to be constructed through hi-tech know-how as Fouassier reveals in her study of Shakespeare's characters Coriolanus and Antony (*this issue*). Both Roblou and Fouassier's articles, however, expose how the portrayal of such outwardly hypermasculine

characters as superheroes and "super-soldiers" serves to reveal the very private conflicts of performing one's masculine identities.

Gender scripts also function as political tools as Ludot-Vlasak (*this issue*) shows in his analysis of the career of nineteenth-century American actor Edwin Forrest whose choice of roles was fuelled by partisan ideology. In this particular instance, the role of the actor takes on a deliberate propaganda dimension where the feeding of private political belief into the performance of a character on the theatre stage becomes an ideal way to manipulate gender scripts and thus help set the norms of the hegemonic masculinity of the time.

Beyond the porous nature of the public/private sphere complex, the notion of matrix structures helps us to articulate more clearly the notion that "masculinity is not something one is born with or an inherent possession, but rather an active process of achievement, performance and enactment"[25] with Butler's notion of gender performativity. In the former, the product of the performance helps construct the way in which masculinities function; in the latter, it is in the very act of functioning that one is to find the production of masculinity.

Performing the Invisible: The Articles

In 1940, the British government took the decision to intern in male-only camps in Canada German and Austrian male immigrants who had originally settled in the United Kingdom after escaping Nazism. This experience was to greatly affect the way these boys and men constructed and lived their masculinity. Patrick Farges (*this issue*) explores through R.W. Connell's notion of "hegemonic masculinity" how the identity narrative of the "Camp Boys," as they were known, was affected by feelings of confinement, powerlessness and impotence. Through a study of the self-narratives produced by those interned, Farges examines the performative construction of the masculinities of the Camp Boys.

Central to the stage performances of the American actor Edwin Forrest (1806-1872) was his political ideology. A fervent supporter of the Democratic Party, the parts Forrest embodied were meant to be vehicles for an unambiguous muscular style of acting that would applaud the masculine values upheld during President Andrew Jackson's term of office. If Jackson himself appeared to embody such prototypes of manliness as the frontiersman, the Indian fighter or the mountain man, earning him the nickname "Old Hickory," Ronan Ludot-Vlasak demonstrates in his article (*this issue*) that the performance of the roles that Forrest portrayed, notably in Robert Montgomery Bird's *The Gladiator* and Robert Conrad's *Jake Cade*, helped render visible how the ideological content of the plays staged contradictory gender constructs.

If in Bird's *The Gladiator* Spartacus is buried as a free man it is because the rebellious slave is understood to correspond to such Roman values of masculinity as honor and bravery. It is this notion of *virtus*, the Roman virtue of manliness, valor and honor, and how it is constructed and performed that is central to Frédérique Fouassier's study of Shakespeare's last two Roman plays *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* (*this issue*). Fouassier understands the characterization of both Coriolanus and Antony as "hypervisible hypermasculinity"—they are both men of war. Fouassier, however, explores how the stage portrayal of these two characters comes to perform the dissolution of their initial masculine identity. The appeasement negotiated by his mother between Coriolanus and Rome leads to his destruction;

Antony's neglect of his duties as a soldier after his encounter with the beautiful Egyptian queen will also ultimately lead to his death.

Gentlemen's clubs are constructed as exclusive male-only circles where the social performance of certain masculinities is kept behind closed doors, and indeed remains invisible. With the rise of a new urban culture during the first half of the eighteenth century gentlemen's clubs began to develop in England, perhaps both influenced by and as a reaction to French salon culture. Valérie Capdeville (*this issue*) explores how the English clubs responded to a wish to shape a new masculinity through purely homosocial bonds by trying to reconcile a sense of gentlemanly politeness with a sense of virility. There equally appears to be a sense of national identity at stake here with an English model of masculine sociability trying to define itself against a perceived French feminine model of masculinity.

Yann Roblou's study of Hollywood superhero movies of the first decade of the twenty first century (*this issue*) returns us to the complex performances of the fictions of masculinity. In what way do new representations of the super-man uphold or question hegemonic masculinity as understood by Connell? Roblou focuses on the physical tangibility of these characters and addresses the notion of body technologies. It is the need to explore the transformation of the body as the protagonist passes from birth through boyhood to manhood that sees superhero movies dedicate large parts of the film to depicting the source of origins of the superhero. Roblou reminds us of Lee Clarke Mitchell's statement that masculinity is, after all, "a cultural fiction that must be created."[26] But beyond a simple representation of the development of aggressive physical masculine traits, Roblou demonstrates that this also serves to show the limitations of the character. If the development of over-enlarged muscles is an external symbol of masculine power, the superhero also experiences his mutated form as an internal trauma.

Outwardly visible signs of gender performance, such as clothing and facial hair, serve as theatrical props that represent an adherence to or subversion of gender scripts of masculinity. Published in the Second Book of Homilies in 1571, Dulac (*this issue*) discusses the sermon "Against excess of Apparel" which aimed to promote Elizabethan hegemonic masculinity by identifying the threat that "effeminate men"—understood as men with a desirous interest in fashion—posed to the stability of the social system. Through close analysis of Sir Philip Sydney's Arcadia (1590), Dulac examines how "gender disguise" allows space for the construction of a masculinity that sets itself against the normative gender script of the Elizabethan era. Dulac demonstrates that the tensions between concealment and exhibition performed, for example, through Pyrocles's cross-dressing, serve in fact to delay the action of his manhood in his romantic quest. Through its act of performance the living body is rendered invisible.

Notes

[1] Slavoj Žižek, *The Plague of Fantasies* (London: Verso, 2008), 108.
[2] Žižek, *Plague*, 108.
[3] Žižek, *Plague*, 108-109.
[4] Michael S. Kimmel, "Invisible Masculinity," *Society* 30, no. 6 (1993): 28.
[5] Stephen M. Whitehead, "Men," in *International Encyclopedia of Men and Masculinities*, ed. Michael Flood, Judith Keegan Gardiner, Bob Pease and Keith Pringle (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 402.

[6] R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), 71.

[7] OED Online, September 2012, s.v. "performance, n.," http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/140783?redirectedFrom=performance (accessed October 25, 2012).

[8] Cf. n.7.

[9] Connell, *Masculinities*, 77.

[10] Cf. n.9.

[11] Cf. n.9.

[12] Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990), 25.

[13] Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 33.

[14] Donald E. Hall, "Gender and Queer Theory," in *The Routledge Companion to Critical Theory*, ed. Simon Malpas and Paul Wake (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), 103.

[15] Anthony E. Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), 7.

[16] Colin B. Grant, "Uncertain Communications: Uncertain Social Systems," *Soziale Systeme* 10, Heft 2 (2004): 224.

[17] Cf. n.16.

[18] Hans Vaihinger, *The Philosophy of "As-If,"* trans. C.K. Ogden (London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1911 (1924).

[19] Vaihinger, *Philosophy*, 15.

[20] Eva Schaper, "The Kantian Thing-in-Itself as a Philosophical Fiction," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 16, no. 64, *History of Philosophy Number* (July 1966): 236.

[21] For further reading see Bradley (1999), Cockburn (1983, 1985), Collinson (1992), Roper (1994), Willis (1977), Willott and Grffin (1997), etc.

[22] Lynne Segal, *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men* (London: Virago, 1990), xi.

[23] Chris Haywood and Máirtín Mac an Ghail, *Men and Masculinities* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003), 37.

[24] Haywood, *Men*, 38.

[25] Haywood, *Men*, 138.

[26] Lee Clark Mitchell, *Westerns: Making the Man in Fiction and Film*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 155.

REFERENCES

Bradley, Harriet. *Gender and Power in the Workplace: Analyzing the impact of Industrial Change*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge, 1990.

Cixous, Hélène and Catherine B. Clement. *La Jeune Née*. Paris: Union Générale d'Editions, 1975.

Clare, Anthony. *On Men: Masculinity in Crisis.* London: Random House, 2000.

Cockburn, Cynthia. *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto, 1983.

Cockburn, Cynthia. *Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men and Technical Know-how*. London: Pluto, 1985.

Collinson, David L. *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity, and Workplace Culture*. New York: W. de Gruyter, 1992.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.

De Lauretis, Teresa. *The Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

Dudink, Stefan. "The Trouble with Men: Problems in the History of 'Masculinity'." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1 (1998): 419-31.

Edgar, Andrew. *Habermas: Key Concepts*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Featherstone, Mike. *Undoing Culture.* London: Sage, 1995.

Grant, Colin B. "Probleme des Öffentlichkeits-Begriffes im Verorten von Literatur." LUMIS-Schriften University of Siegen 45 (1996): 20pp.

Grant, Colin B. *Literary Communication from Consensus to Rupture. Theory and Practice in Honecker's GDR*. Amsterdam/Atlanta (GA): Rodopi, 1995.

Grant, Colin B. "Uncertain Communications: Uncertain Social Systems." *Soziale Systeme* 10, Heft 2 (2004): 217-232.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Legitimation Crisis*, Thomas McCarthy (trans.). London: Heinemann, 1976 (1973).

Habermas, Jürgen. *Theory and Practice*, John Viertel (trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1976 (1971).

Halberstam, Judith. *Female Masculinity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Hall, Donald E. "Gender and Queer Theory." In *The Routledge Companion to Critical Theory*, edited by Simon Malpas and Paul Wake, 102-114. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Haywood, Chris and Máirtín Mac an Ghail. *Men and Masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003.

Kimmel, Michel S. "Invisible Masculinity." *Society* 30, no. 6 (1993): 28-35.

Michell, Lee Clark. *Westerns: Making the Man in Fiction and Film*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Pease, Bob. *Recreating Men: Postmodern Masculinity Politics*. London: Sage, 2000.

Roper, Michael. *Masculinity and the British Organization Man since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Rotundo, E. Anthony. *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era*. New York: Basic Books, 1993.

Schaper, Eva. "The Kantian Thing-in-Itself as a Philosophical Fiction." *The Philosophical Quarterly* 16, no. 64, *History of Philosophy Number* (July 1966): 233-43.

Segal, Lynne. *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago, 1990.

Simon, William. *Postmodern Sexualities*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Solomon-Godeau, Abigail. *Male Trouble: A Crisis in Representation*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1999.

Vaihinger, Hans. *The Philosophy of "As-If."* C.K. Ogden (trans.). London: Keegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1911 (1924).

Whitehead, Stephen M. "Men." In *International Encyclopedia of Men and Masculinities* edited by Michael Flood, Judith Keegan Gardiner, Bob Pease and Keith Pringle, 401-05. Abingdon: Routledge.

Willis, Paul. *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs*. Farnborough: Saxon House, 1977.

Willott, Sara and Griffin, Christine. "'Wham Bam, Am I a Man'?: Unemployed Men Talk About Masculinities. *Feminism and Psychology* 7, no.1 (1997): 107-28.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Plague of Fantasies*. London: Verso, 2008.

VALÉRIE CAPDEVILLE*

GENDER AT STAKE:
THE ROLE OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY LONDON CLUBS IN SHAPING A NEW MODEL OF ENGLISH MASCULINITY

The English club, as an arena of exclusive male sociability, contributed to the re-fashioning of a new model of politeness, which did not posit refinement and masculinity as opposites. Some of the main aims of clubs were to preserve their members' masculine identity and to reinforce their cohesion by developing a strong male affiliation network. The success of clubs in England enabled to establish a unique model of male sociability, proving that being an Englishman did not imply being unsociable and rough. The club was an exclusive social space, where a man can perform his masculinity through his activities, his conversations and his behaviour. The visibility of gender and social performance induced the respect and support of his fellow clubmen and could determine a man's future social and political success. The eighteenth-century club thus played a crucial role in the process of gender identification and of social recognition. This article shows that masculinity was a social construction as well as a social performance. Being a man obeyed gendered norms, which corresponded to gendered social manners and practices. During the first half of the eighteenth century, the ideal of the gentleman served as a means to shape the Englishman's masculine identity, but it revealed the limits and the paradoxes of politeness, thus questioning the French model.

Keywords: eighteenth-century London clubs, masculinity, male sociability

Sociologist Scott Coltrane defined gender as "the socially constructed ideal of what it means to be a woman or man," stating that our everyday activities provided "opportunities for expressing, and perhaps transforming, the meaning of gender."[1] Therefore, masculinity is considered as a social construction, but also as a social performance that is expressed through the manners and behaviour of men themselves.

* Université Paris 13.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Valérie Capdeville, University of Paris 13, 99 avenue J-B Clement, 93430 Villetaneuse, Paris, France. Email: valerie.capdeville@iutv. univ-paris13.fr.

Since the beginning of the eighteenth century, masculinity has been confronted to challenging cultural influences. Indeed, the concept of masculinity has matured through its conflictual relationship with politeness. The dynamics of attraction-repulsion for the French model helped redefine English masculinity. Moreover, in the first half of the eighteenth century, the influence of a new 'urban culture' with the flourishing of sociability in England influenced its very definition.[2] The ideal of the *gentleman* through politeness and refined conversation, which prevailed among the exclusive circles of London society, corresponded to a desire to shape a new model of masculinity.[3] Yet, a paradox existed between a normative refined and "feminine" sociable model, as performed in French salon culture, and that of the gentleman's club.[4] This tension highlighted the danger of excessive refinement and effeminacy, epitomised by the *fop* figure.[5] This may be a reason for the exclusion of women from those private institutions, added to the fact that club sociability and conversation were simply thought inappropriate for the female sex. In a society highly preoccupied with social visibility, gender representation and performance through gender-specific pastimes and manners were crucial. What then, in a gentleman's reactions or attributes, should be displayed and what should remain invisible?

Homosociality seemed to be the best way for men to preserve their virility and identity.[6] Thus, club sociability provided the perfect medium for redefining male sociability and offering a new model of English masculinity. To what extent did London clubs question and replace a model inspired from French 'feminine' sociability with a model of English sociability, reconciling politeness and refinement with masculinity?

GENDER AT STAKE: MASCULINITIES AND THE IDEAL OF THE GENTLEMAN

A definition of 'masculinities' which perfectly applies to club sociability in eighteenth-century London is to be found in *The Masculinities Reader*, edited by Stephen Whitehead and Frank Barrett in 2001: "Masculinities are those behaviours, languages and practices, existing in specific cultural and organizational locations, which are commonly associated with males and thus culturally defined as not feminine."[7] Indeed, men's social manners and practices are a decisive tool in the identification and fashioning of their masculinity. As Judith Butler affirmed, "gender is a construction," and "without those acts; there would be no gender at all."[8]

The club is an institution that appeared at the end of the seventeenth century and mainly grew out from the coffee-house. It flourished in the eighteenth century as an increasingly private and exclusive space. Indeed, the definition of the word *club* changed progressively, following the evolution of the form of sociability to which it referred.[9] In the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the noun *club* was first defined as a social gathering held in a tavern or in a coffee-house, during which the expenses were split among the members present. In the first half of the eighteenth century, the term became more precise: a *club* meant any association or society in which people gathered with a common aim and met on a regular basis in a precise location according to certain rules, in order to maintain social relationships and a spirit of cooperation. The 1730s saw the creation of the *Royal Society Club* (originally called *Club of Royal Philosophers*), *White's Club*, the *Dilettanti Society* or the *Sublime Society of Beefsteaks*, to name but the main ones. It is not before the 1760s that the word *club* reached its full maturity, by then defined as an association of persons, meeting

under specific rules, whose admission was guaranteed by a selective vote. A club then had its own premises (the *club-house*) reserved for the exclusive use of its members as a space for social intercourse and entertainment (for example *Boodle's*, or *Brooks's* located in St. James's Street).

If most London clubs were socially exclusive, they were all gender exclusive. As a male universe, the club can be considered as a pure expression of masculinity. Men's clubs represent the perfect model of exclusive male sociability: by strictly selecting their members, by expecting that they conform to club rules and by providing them with a male-only assembly, they contribute to shape and assert their members' masculinity. Through the process of masculine affiliation and through specifically male behaviours, the construction of masculinity is at stake. The importance of peer recognition within the club and within society at large shows that masculinity is not only a social construction but also a social performance. Gender structures social relationships; it advocates and reproduces rules and patterns of expectation. As Frank Barrett suggests, "individuals act out gender norms; they are constructing gendered systems of dominance and power."[10] The visibility of gender is then confirmed through the way clubmen try to reach a normative ideal of male behaviour in conformity with gendered social expectations.

As a matter of fact, the concept of "hegemonic masculinity" is particularly relevant to our subject. Introduced in 1983 by Raewyn Connell, it mainly refers to the dominant position of men in society and to the subsequent subordination of women.[11] At the end of the seventeenth century, the status of woman in English society still followed a patriarchal model. What is even more interesting is that this concept can apply not only to "the structural relationship between men's power over women," as Michèle Cohen puts it, but also to the unequal power relations between different categories of men.[12] For Cohen, it is the polite and refined gentleman that represents hegemonic masculinity. However, Connell has recently added some refinement to her theory and defined a more complex model of gender hierarchy, emphasizing the agency of women.[13]

To better understand the construction of English masculinity, the club will reveal itself a very useful tool. Indeed, it is a privileged space where male bonding takes place and where male social practices are performed. In the eighteenth century, polite and refined masculinity was supported by conduct manuals, moral literature, and popular periodical essays. Born in the coffee-houses of Queen Anne's reign, periodicals such as the *Spectator* and the *Tatler* endeavoured to promote the ideal of the gentleman. Through this successful medium, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele aimed at diffusing "gentlemanly values" to their readers and encouraged what the historian David Solkin called a "well mannered masculinity."[14]

The first step of the gentleman's formation was education of course, "learning" to be more precise. Then, politeness and conversation were necessary to the fashioning of the gentleman.[15] Philip Carter considers conversation "as the crucial means for uniting and engaging friends, professional associates or strangers" and "a key requirement of the modern gentleman."[16] Politeness was an inclusive notion comprising the behaviour to adopt in public, the instruction, as well as the moral virtues of an individual. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the French were still the best models of polite conversation. So as to fashion himself as a "man of conversation," the gentleman had to imitate the French. The Grand Tour provided an opportunity for young aristocrats to form their tastes and to put a finishing touch to their education. On their way to Italy, they spent some time in

France in order to acquire French polish, manners and language. However, "though by going abroad young men were expected to be polished out of their 'rusticity' and return accomplished gentlemen, they could equally well develop, 'an effeminate and unmanly foppery'."[17] This tension raised by several contemporaries will be analysed in the following section of this study.

Also part of acquired polite experience was sociability: "being sociable to man," as James Miller defined politeness in 1738.[18] In that respect, the club was a decisive step for the young gentleman eager to gain a cultural varnish and social recognition. Belonging to a club often proved a helpful passport for the young aristocrat to enter the polite political and literary circles of the capital. Meeting distinguished, accomplished and influential men enabled him to acquire this so much desired social credit. The average age of the founding members of the *Society of Dilettanti*[19] or of *Almack's*[20] (future *Brooks's*), was twenty-five. The initiative of those young men could also be seen as a means to organise their own social integration into a selective network of male affiliation, thus making recognition by their older peers much easier.

Making a figure in the world is a social performance.[21] John Brewer affirmed that "politeness and refinement had to be shared; put on display."[22] Gentlemanliness, then, is highly visible through manners, practices, dress code, etc. But is being a gentleman equivalent to being masculine? Masculinity, as established earlier, expresses itself through expected gendered behaviours and practices. The ideal of the gentleman, in trying to shape and to embody English masculinity, has highlighted some paradoxes inherent to the English nation.[23]

Club Sociability: A Gendered Tradition

Before the extraordinary development of London clubs in the first part of the eighteenth century, coffee-houses were already strongly identified with male sociability. The only feminine presence was limited to the coffee-house owner or to the waitress. When small assemblies of men started to meet in a separate room, the exclusion of women became even more obvious. Most of the various activities of London clubs were definitely male pastimes, not considered suitable for women. Clubmen gathered around food and wine, cards and conversation, sharing their political, scientific or artistic interests. They loved to spend time with friends to exchange their opinions, compare their experiences and define the limits of a gender-exclusive social space. Gambling, for example, was a behaviour which, like sport or hunting, enabled men to create bonds and to become an integral part of the male affiliation network.[24] In some clubs, the election of a new member by the famous process of blackballing was followed by an initiation ritual, which reinforced male bonding. It was a means to introduce the new clubman to the fellow members of the club and also to create a feeling of belonging to a selective community.

Furthermore, we can easily draw a parallel between the rites and codes that a club member had to follow and the rites performed by freemasons' lodges. Both forms of sociability were for men only, and as far as rites were concerned, the obligation of secrecy too was a characteristic that some clubs and freemasonry had in common.[25] The *Sublime Society of Beefsteaks*,[26] for instance, required its members to keep the words pronounced during their initiation ritual secret. As for the *Hell-Fire Clubs*, secrecy was coextensive with identity. The nature of those societies implied that names of members remained undisclosed. Rituals with masks and specific cos-

tumes were used during pagan ceremonies held in secret locations, hidden from the public.[27]

For a long period, men have shown that they were not ready to accept women into the public sphere, and especially into their clubs. The segregation of the sexes remained a dominant feature of English society and sociability. At the end of the seventeenth century, some social practices of separation had already developed. For example, English women had taken the habit of leaving the table after dessert, allowing men to be free to dwell on some more "masculine" topics and to indulge into pastimes reputed as not suitable for ladies, among which drinking and gambling.[28] Several foreign travellers were surprised at this unusual practice. César de Saussure mentioned it as an established custom in 1727;[29] as well as Abbé Le Blanc, who made a long description of such a ritual in his *Lettres d'un François* in 1745.[30]

The practice of meeting and dining among men exclusively not only echoes this tradition, but also seems to prolong, at their club, those privileged moments when men could drink and discuss together without restraint. Women were nonetheless part of clubmen's preoccupations as they were often the object of toasts and bets. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, the most famous toasts were those performed by the *Kit-Cat Club*. Specific glasses had been engraved with a few poetic phrases written by Lord Halifax in 1703, in honour of some of the most beautiful ladies of the time.[31] Bets were also often dedicated to women, to their life expectancy or their fertility, as revealed by numerous entries in the betting books of *White's* or *Brooks's*.[32]

Therefore, the role of women in English society appears crucial for understanding the specificity of club sociability in England and the apparent contrast with France, the paradise of "salonnières." Traditional masculine and feminine role expectations are not enough to explain the exclusion of women from clubs. It is true that women had their own activities: they met at concerts, in neighbourhood circles, and around the famous ritual of tea-table conversation. Their exclusion from the sociability of clubs could, in part, be explained by their prescribed status in English society and their confinement to the domestic sphere. However, the first history of women, published by William Alexander in 1779, though providing a historical justification of female domestication in the private sphere, underlined, not without irony, the following paradox:

> We allow a woman to sway our sceptre, but by law and custom we debar her from every other government but that of her own family as if there were not a public employment between that of superintending the kingdom, and the affairs of her own kitchen, which could be managed by the genius and capacity of women.[33]

Between the highest affairs of the kingdom and those, not less essential, of the home, woman was not allowed intermediary responsibilities. Between State and family, the public sphere was not easily open to women.

Although *The Spectator* and *The Tatler* granted them an unprecedented and significant position in the "literary public sphere," Addison and Steele constantly reminded their readers of woman's specificity and of the importance for each sex to remain in their reserved domains and to conform to their respective social roles: "The utmost of a Woman's Character is contained in Domestick Life […] All she has to do in this World, is contained within the Duties of a Daughter, a Sister, a Wife,

and a Mother;"[34] "Men and Women ought to busie themselves in their proper Spheres, and on such Matters only as are suitable to their respective Sex."[35] Besides, in a letter that an uncle wrote to his nieces, who had developed a passion for Latin and Physics, Steele clearly criticized women who desired to acquire any kind of knowledge considered useless to their domestic tasks: "What I have to beg of you now, is, […] to tell us the difference between a Gentleman that should make Cheesecakes, and raise Paste, and a Lady that reads *Lock*, and understands Mathematicks."[36]

The eighteenth century was marked by an increasingly polarizing separation between the two spheres: public, social and masculine versus private, intimate and feminine.[37] The ideology that prevailed at the time understood masculine qualities as particularly adapted to the public world, and those attributed to women as better suited the domestic world. Even if those gender affinities were essentially theoretical, they represented a precept that eighteenth-century women were aware of and to which most women, as well as men, seemed to resign themselves. For Margaret Hunt, the main impact of all this symbolic baggage on the lives of actual women was certainly negative.[38]

Nevertheless, even if they remained aware of the tensions existing between their behaviour and the domestic feminine ideal, some women could have a non-negligible political influence.[39] Indeed, as Ingrid Tague affirmed, "[women of quality] participated in a huge network of influence that was a characteristic feature of British political life in the eighteenth century."[40] The Duchess of Devonshire provides the best example of the aristocratic power and political influence of a woman in a society that favoured men.[41] Her talent for public relations, her strong power of persuasion and her unique personality allowed her to become a successful patroness and an effective politician who was able to disseminate Whig propaganda and to contribute to decisive political victories. Unsurprisingly, the visibility generated by such an influential social role was a source of anxiety among men. As a matter of fact, the intention to exclude women from the public sphere, and thus from clubs, was expressed through a strategy of distancing from political power. Men considered politics as their reserved domain—except for queens—even if one must distinguish government from political curiosity. Some discussion topics, termed as "masculine," such as politics, law, and all that is related to public affairs, should not be touched on by women, not even in their presence.

However, the French traveller Pierre-Jean Grosley offered the following account in 1774: "[si] les femmes n'ont point d'entrée dans toutes ces coteries: elles s'en indemnisent par des coteries entr'elles, où, dit-on, elles traitent aussi les affaires d'Etat,"[42] implying that women had their own sociability space, in which they could freely discuss politics as well as literature.

An example of feminine initiative was the creation of *The Female Coterie*, also called the *Ladies' Club*. This "first public female club ever known," as Horace Walpole's words suggested, was established in 1769-70.[43] It admitted men and first met at *Almack's* Assembly Rooms (different from *Almack's*, the club of St James's Street and future *Brooks's*) then in Albermarle Street, and from 1775 in the splendid residence of George Colebrook in Arlington Street.[44] *The Female Coterie* stands as an exception, as it is the only mixed club to function like a gentleman's club. It held regular meetings, had strict but specific election procedures: the vote for each new candidate was reserved to the members of the opposite sex. The social activities of the club were varied: dining, gambling, concerts, balls ... and the participation of

both sexes was rather balanced: 269 women for 295 men.[45] However, sex equality remained a mere illusion. Not only did men dominate at the club dinners, but above all, the election procedures were unequally performed: when a married woman was elected, her husband automatically became a member, whereas the reverse was not the case. Moreover, the management of the club was a man's business: in 1775, the names of 53 women appeared on the subscription list against 178 men.[46] The adventure of *The Female Coterie* ended in the winter 1777-78 because of financial difficulties. Yet, this short-lived experience remained a rare incursion of femininity into the male homosocial domain of the club.

Another though earlier instance was the famous *Blue-Stocking Club* mentioned for the first time in Elizabeth Montagu's correspondence in 1757, but it was more a *salon* than a real club.[47] The *Blue-Stockings* "circle," to use Sylvia Myers's phrase, was not a formal society: contrary to a *club*, it had no regular meeting day, no admission procedures, no rules. It is even almost impossible to draw an exact list of its members as they varied depending on the occasions and on the affinities of the persons invited. From the start, Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu's aim was to promote literary conversation as the main pleasure of social life. As the founder and dominant figure of this mixed assembly, "la Belle Présidente" gathered in her own house in Hill Street—then, from 1779, in Portman Square—the most remarkable figures of London society.[48]

The existence of this "literary salon" seemed to answer a social need of the time: the most learned women expressing the desire to have some intellectual exchange with men. Moreover, the success and longevity (almost fifty years) of this assembly testifies to the ambition of a group of educated ladies to put an end to the monopoly of men on intellectual and aristocratic sociability and more generally, to the separation of the sexes within the public sphere.

Women were not only thought to be unfit for positions of intellectual eminence, more especially public affairs or political matters, but they were also seen as an obstacle to masculine sociability and liberty. The Italian traveller Ferri de Saint-Constant asked an Englishman one day: "To the question, but why do you exclude women who would take part in the conversation in a pleasant manner?," the Englishman answered: "Oh, their presence would be a source of trouble and restraint for us: we wouldn't be able to express ourselves freely, nor give our toasts;" the Italian added: "You mean that you wouldn't be able to indulge in scandalous excess, destroy your constitution and your principles, abandon yourselves to intemperance and obscenity."[49]

POLITENESS AND ENGLISH MASCULINITY: A PARADOX?

The English club prescribed a form of refined sociability which excluded women, whereas the latter were considered crucial to the perfection of taste and politeness in France. A double tension can be pointed out. There is a first paradox between women's polishing influence and the threat of effeminacy and a second one between the taciturn and unsociable reputation of the Englishman and the success of male sociability in clubs. So, in other words, how could conversation, so closely associated with women in France, the true queens of Parisian salons, become one of the dominant features of the male universe of the London club? How could the Englishman, reputed as taciturn in the accounts of numerous contemporary travellers, transcend his nature and make of the club the temple of conversation and

masculine sociability *par excellence?*

As expressed through the title of Jeffrey Merrick's article on Morellet and women, "Society needs Women 'Like Coffee Needs Sugar',"[50] just like sugar sweetens a dish, women's function is to refine society. While some considered women as necessary to public sociability, politeness, and the refinement of manners, others perceived them as a threat to man's essential character, putting his masculinity in question. Addison encouraged contact with women as very essential to politeness:

> It is to the Fair Sex we owe the most shining qualities of which our's is master…. Men of True Taste feel a natural complaisance for women when they converse with them, and fall, without knowing it, upon every art of pleasing…. An intimate acquaintance with the other Sex, fixes this complaisance into a Habit, and that Habit is the very Essence of Politeness.[51]

On the one hand, the presence of women was seen as beneficial and civilizing. It favoured social interaction between two distinct but complementary sexes: "Men and Women were made as Counterparts to one another."[52] Thus, conversation between men and women appeared to be the best means to perfect their politeness, their contact having a positive influence on each other:

> [it is] the Male that gives Charms to Womankind, that produces an Air in their Faces, a Grace in their Motions, a Softness in their Voices, and a Delicacy in their Complections. […] [without women], Men would be quite different Creatures from what they are at present ; their Endeavours to please the opposite Sex, polishes and refines them out of those Manners most natural to them […] Man would not only be unhappy, but a rude unfinished Creature, were he conversant with none but those of his own Make.[53]

David Hume insisted on the benefits of mixed company: "both sexes meet in an easy and sociable manner; and the tempers of men, as well as their behaviour, refine apace."[54] Conversation between the sexes would also help rub off, at least soften, the coarseness so much reproached to the English. James Fordyce also belonged to those who praised its virtuous effect: "nothing formed the manners of men so much as the turn of the women with whom they converse […] Such society, beyond anything else, rubs off the corners that give many of our sex an ungracious roughness."[55] To counter this lack of refinement attributed to the Englishman, the presence of women in society would be salutary: Swift remains convinced that the presence of ladies would "lay a Restraint upon those odious Topicks of Immodesty and Indecencies into which the Rudeness of our Northern Genius is so apt to fall."[56]

For those who aspired to refinement and politeness, there was a necessity to find a happy middle ground, as Joseph Spence warned his readers: "some conversation with the ladies is necessary to smooth and sweeten the temper as well as the manners of men, but too much of it is apt to effeminate or debilitate both."[57] The suspicion of the English towards the fair sex was expressed by a lot of contemporary writers. Those who denounced conversation between men and women accused it of encouraging the confusion of sexual identities by effeminizing the masculine character. Furthermore, behind the danger represented by women hid the shadow of the French model. The relation with the French was thus sexualized, constructed as a relation of seduction, positioning the English as male and the French as female.

Michèle Cohen explains that as "desire and seduction were held to be effeminizing, this relation threatened the manliness of the English tongue."[58] The English Language is a strong and masculine tongue, but it has some drawbacks: "Silence and difficulty of speaking and fewness of words are a kind of national Character," noted Thomas Wilson in 1729.[59] He added that conversation, though enjoyed, was "less pleasant to us; and in solitude, silence and spleen gain[ed] ground." This accounted for the taciturn character of the English.[60] This lack of sociability and politeness that is reproached to the Englishman, even if it has become a stereotype, will develop into an emblematic characteristic of the English nation and more particularly of English masculinity.

Blurring Gender Boundaries, or, the Threat of Effeminacy

At the beginning of the eighteenth century, masculinity seemed to have suffered a crisis in England. Even women were concerned that men were abandoning masculinity itself, becoming soft, urbanized, and weak. The success of the coffee-houses at the end of the seventeenth century gave rise to a debate at the centre of which gender prevailed: the resistance to the coffee-houses as male preserves opposed women to coffee. A pamphlet entitled *The Women's Petition against Coffee* (1674) revealed the opposition between the sexes through women's hostility towards coffee—the drink as well as the institution—which, according to them, was harmful to man, as it would alienate his judgment and weaken his virility.[61] Tim Hitchcock justly explains that "the concept of effeminacy highlights the crucial ways in which the 'other' to manliness in the eighteenth century was not simply the feminine, but also the effeminate."[62] In truth, men were not really threatened by femininity itself, even if they feared female power, but by effeminacy.

The figure of the fop was the object of numerous satires and embodied the shortcomings of femininity and politeness: by adopting too feminine attitudes, the fop sacrificed his virility.[63] It is interesting to note that a masculine woman was as much criticized and mocked as an effeminate man. Addison and Steele were not the only ones to denounce such characters; in the second half of the century, James Fordyce achieved to warn young women against the confusion of genders: "A masculine woman must be naturally an unamiable creature. I confess myself shocked whenever I see the sexes confounded. An effeminate fellow […] is an object of contempt and aversion at once […] the transformation on either side must ever be monstrous."[64] All this contributed to blur genders, which John Brown condemned in 1757 in his *Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times*: "The Sexes have now little other apparent Distinction, beyond that of Person and Dress: Their peculiar and characteristic Manners are confounded and lost: The one Sex having advanced into *Boldness*, as the other has sunk into *Effeminacy*."[65]

An interesting example of this danger of gender blurring is the *masquerade*.[66] This fashionable amusement was one of the few entertainments organised by London clubs where both sexes could meet. Significantly enough, it took place outside the clubs' premises, unlike all other club activities.[67] Following Terry Castle's ideas, the cultural historian Dror Wahrman more recently insisted on the play of gender identities in the masquerades, stating that "masquerades famously undermined distinctions of gender, confounding again playful disguise with the potentialities of actual cross-gender passing."[68] Indeed, the mask performed a double role. As a clothing accessory, it served as a social artifice, which hid one's identity, removing

social boundaries and liberating individuals from any form of pressure. Worn by men and women alike, as a fashion item, it also concealed one's sexual identity, blurring and even questioning gender distinction.[69] The ambivalence of the mask echoed the double function of the gaze—to see and to be seen, thus reinforcing the theatricality of such entertainments, which nonetheless remained associated with potential subversion and transgression.

Therefore, mixing with women was perceived as a danger, since man might alter his masculine identity and what is more, his national character. Contrary to his French contemporary, the Englishman preferred to stay apart and privileged the company of his male companions. Abbé Le Blanc did not fail to notice what he considered as a national specificity: "The French enjoy the company of women as much as the English are afraid of it, unless they are in love."[70] We find in Ned Ward's *Secret History of London Clubs*, the *Beau's Club* and the *Mollies' Club* ridiculing two masculine figures typical of the time: the *beau*, a character at the top of London fashion, with affected manners and obsessed with his appearances, and the *molly*, a homosexual character, effeminate in demeanour as well as dress code.[71]

The fop was effeminate because he spent so much time in the company of women that he tended to behave like them. Thus, he had become "Frenchified" in manners and language.[72] As such, he had forfeited his identity both as Englishman and as a man. Through the voice of Mr. Locke in Richard Hurd's *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel*, the Grand Tour and the accomplishments it promised were questioned and considered as alien to the manly English character.[73] "No need to go out of our own country to learn politeness and manners. Many judicious foreigners prefer ours to the French, as more manly and becoming."[74] Travel to other countries, especially to France, was to be avoided; of course, this idea provided the occasion for an anti-French sentiment to surface. Feminization became linked to treason and masculinity to patriotism, as denounced in *The Fifteen Comforts of a Wanton Life* (1706-1707):

> 'This to that Fopish Nation that we owe
> Those antick Dresses that equip a Beau.
> […]
> So strangely does Parisian air Change
> English Youth, that half a year
> Makes em forget all Native Custome
> To bring French modes, and Gallic Lust home;[75]

The fop stood both as a caricature and a warning against the pursuit of an excessive model of politeness. To avoid becoming a fop, a young man had to exercise self-control and behave according to the expectations and norms of his social status and his sex. This was at the heart of Chesterfield's advice to his son. As Michèle Cohen justly remarked, "politeness may have been about ease and sociability, but it required constant vigilance and discipline of body and tongue."[76] What mattered then was only his visible performance and the way a gentleman was able to control his attitude and perform in society. It was part of the gentleman's training to learn what should be displayed, but also what should be concealed. By either hiding his lack of education or roughness of manners, or by masking his excessive delicacy or eccentricity, he aimed at finding the right balance to make all undesired traits of character or behaviour invisible.

THE ROLE OF CLUBS IN REDEFINING MALE SOCIABILITY AND
OFFERING A NEW MODEL OF ENGLISH MASCULINITY

The paradoxes that have been identified should have made it very difficult for an Englishman to be polite and masculine at the same time. However, club sociability succeeded in reconciling politeness and refinement with manliness. To Lord Chesterfield, France was a model to be followed,[77] to David Fordyce, on the contrary, this model was to be questioned. "Conversing with men 'rub[bed] off that awkward Air and Pedantry of Manners' inevitably acquired during an academic education." This is how Cohen understands Fordyce's idea that English politeness was serious and produced free men, men of civic virtue.[78] Homosociality thus favoured social cohesion among the polite circles of English society. The exclusion of women from clubs provided the necessary condition for the redefinition of English male sociability.

Beyond the polarisation of gender mentioned above, one can question whether the club was a public or a truly private space. Where does it stand in the private/public sphere dialectics? The club, as a social institution, is the fruit of the parallel development of the press and the coffee-house. Born from the free association of private persons in a public place, it seems to belong to the public sphere, as defined by Habermas.[79] Moreover, as a forum of discussion where a public opinion is formed, and as a place where social practices are performed, it fully follows this dynamics of publicity. However, we can consider that the club occupies an ambiguous position within the Habermasian model. Located at the heart of the public sphere, it progressively became, throughout the eighteenth century, a more and more private institution. The public character of the first clubs of the end of the seventeenth century, those informal gatherings, tended to disappear in the first half of the eighteenth century. Indeed, clubs not only deserted the coffee-houses and taverns to dwell in their own private buildings, but they also adopted stricter rules and more exclusive admission procedures and tended to recreate a quasi-domestic universe. Thus, the club can be seen as a "social space," an intermediary space, following Michèle Cohen's idea that "social spaces were neither fully public nor private but rather a space-between, created in part by the nature of the activities that took place there, and comprising all the spaces for 'society' both inside or outside the home."[80]

As long as politeness was located in social spaces where women were also present, it would endanger men's masculinity. To retain their masculine character, men had to remove themselves from women's company and conversation. They needed to create and preserve a private space in which they could protect their sexual and social identity. The "public" school has sometimes been referred to as one of those private spaces; so is the club. The exclusion of women from clubs, whose sociability and conversation were considered inappropriate for the feminine character, also reflected the will of men to remove women from this world of male affiliation. Homosociality was seen as an efficient means to preserve men's threatened masculinity: "to retain the firmness and constancy of the male, [men must spend time] in the company of our own sex."[81]

In the second half of the eighteenth century an awareness grew that politeness, as it was defined—and in conformity with the French model—was incompatible with virility, so precious a notion to the English national character. As French conversation and sociability were associated with femininity, the only way to safeguard

the man's masculine identity in England was to create new norms of politeness, which would perform a model of sociability *à l'anglaise*. Philip Carter considers that "the emerging attractions of refined sociability stimulated a need for conduct writers to develop existing notions of acceptable masculinity—to create, in effect, a model of refined masculine conduct—that would allow urban males to display a capacity for refinement while maintaining their masculine identity."[82] It is true that clubs had an influence on the art of conversation, on politeness and on society in general, replacing a French "feminine" model of sociability with an English model, in which men reigned.

The lack of sociability and refinement often reproached to the Englishman was corrected by the success of such male institutions as London clubs, whose members represented the best examples of highly sociable masculinity. Samuel Johnson, a reputed clubman himself and the founder of the *Literary Club*, invented an alternative word to "sociable:" in 1783, he coined the word "clubable," which perfectly corresponded to the English character. It remained a synonym of *sociable* but better suited English sociability.[83]

The first impressions that many might have on the English at the time could be deceitful, as the Swiss Muralt observed: "It is usual for them to be reserved at first, easing only once they are better acquainted with the persons they are dealing with."[84] Thus, association and life in society enabled them to surpass their initial inhibitions. Once the ice had been broken and the environment tamed, Englishmen could adhere to a real spirit of community. The private, exclusive, even intimate atmosphere of the club, as well as its male-only character, seemed to suit the English better and to enable them to forget their reserve or their clumsiness and to shine as sociable individuals in a chosen assembly of restrained size, composed by their peers.

The frankness that the English showed in their discourse, as well as their taciturnity and the roughness of their manners, neither altered the refinement of their nation, nor their sociable character. Once seen as real deficiencies, those traits of the national character have become positive identifying values throughout the eighteenth century: they have taken part in the redefinition of English masculinity. Free from the French model, politeness and masculinity have been reconciled: Englishmen could be both polite and manly. According to Shaftesbury, politeness resulted in conversation between distinguished and learned men rather than an exchange between the sexes, which would represent a potential threat to their masculinity: "Language and style, as well as our voice and person, should have something of that male-feature and natural roughness by which our sex is distinguished. And whatever politeness we may pretend to, 'tis more a disfigurement than any real refinement of discourse to render it thus delicate."[85]

Notes

[1] Scott Coltrane, "Theorizing Masculinities in Contemporary Social Science," in *Theorizing Masculinities*, eds. Harry Brod and Michael Kaufman (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994) 1.

[2] On the role of clubs in the development of urban sociability, see Peter Clark, *Sociability and Urbanity: Clubs and Societies in the 18th Century City* (Leicester: U of Leicester P, Victoria Studies Centre, 1986). By the same author, but covering more than two centuries, see *British Clubs and Societies, 1580-1800: The Origins of an Associational World.* (Ox-

ford: Clarendon P, 2000).

[3] According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the term *gentleman* has evolved along the economic and social changes of the time. It is "a man of superior position in society, or having the habits of life indicative of this; often, one whose means enable him to live in easy circumstances, a man of money and leisure." On the concept of the *gentleman* and its evolution in the eighteenth century, see an article by Jacques Carré, "Gentleman," in *Dictionnaire Raisonné de la Politesse et du Savoir-Vivre du Moyen-Âge à Nos Jours*, dir. Alain Montandon (Paris: Seuil, 1995) 425-438.

[4] On the origins, evolution, characteristics and functions of gentlemen's clubs in eighteenth-century London, see Valérie Capdeville, *L'Age d'Or des Clubs Londoniens (1730-1784)* (Paris: H. Champion, 2008).

[5] According to the *OED*, the word *fop* was first recorded in 1440 and, for several centuries, just meant a fool of any kind. In 1672, for the first time, it was used to mean: "one who is foolishly attentive to and vain of his appearance, dress, or manners; a dandy, an exquisite."

[6] As John Tosh observed, homosociality revealed "the central role of peer approval in confirming masculine status," Michael Roper & John Tosh, "Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender," in *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, eds. S. Dudink, K. Hagemann & John Tosh (Manchester, 2004) 70.

[7] Stephen M. Whitehead & Frank J. Barrett, eds., *The Masculinities Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001) 15.

[8] Judith Butler, "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory," in *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*, ed. Sue-Ellen Case (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990) 273.

[9] See Capdeville, *L'Age d'Or des Clubs Londoniens (1730-1784)* 8-9.

[10] Frank J. Barrett, "The Organizational Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity: The Case of the US Navy," in Whitehead & Barrett, *The Masculinities Reader*, 79.

[11] In their newly released book, Henry French and Mark Rothery explain Connell's intention "to emphasize both the contingent, historical nature of gender relations, *and* their evolution through an on-going struggle between powerful and subordinate groups in society." *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900* (Oxford: OUP, 2012) 5.

[12] Michèle Cohen, "'Manners' Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830," *Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005): 312-313.

[13] See R.W. Connell & James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept," *Gender & Society* 19 (2005): 829-59.

[14] David H. Solkin, *Painting for Money. The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven, London: Yale UP, 1993) 60.

[15] According to the *OED*, *politeness* is a synonym for "polish, refinement, elegance, good taste".

[16] Philip Carter, *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800* (London: Longman, 2001) 62.

[17] Michèle Cohen, ed., *Masculinity: Men Defining Men and Gentlemen, 1660-1918, Part 1: 1660-1800, Sources from the Bodleian Library*, Oxford, 2000. Editorial Introduction.

[18] James Miller, *Of Politeness. An Epistle to the Honourable William Stanhope, Lord Harrington* (London: L. Gilliver & J. Clark, 1738) 4.

[19] The *Society of Dilettanti* was founded in 1734 by a group of young men just returned from their *Grand Tour* in Italy. They wished to promote, in their own country, the taste for the same objects that contributed to their intellectual enrichment there.

[20] *Almack's* was created by twenty-seven young men of rank in 1764, as a gambling institution, located in St James's Street. It soon became extremely fashionable and marked the end of *White's* monopoly in the universe of private gambling clubs. In 1778, William Brooks, the second owner of the club, gave his name to *Brooks's*.

Among the illustrious members of the club, Charles James Fox stands as its main symbol. See an article by Richard Ollard "The Brooks's of C.J. Fox," in Philip Ziegler and

Desmond Seward (eds.), *Brooks's, A Social History* (London: Constable, 1991) 33-43.

[21] Carter referred to the "gentlemanly social performance," in *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society*, 209.

[22] John Brewer, *The Pleasures of the Imagination* (London: Harper Collins, 1997) 107.

[23] Those paradoxes are underlined and analysed in Capdeville, *L'Age d'Or des Clubs Londoniens (1730-1784)*, 275-80.

[24] Lionel Tiger, *Men in Groups* (London: Nelson, 1969) 123.

[25] This tradition of secrecy comes from the freemasons' ancient rites performed in the Middle-Ages. At the time, they used to recognize themselves by specific words, signs and secret gestures.

[26] The *Sublime Society of Beefsteaks* was founded in 1735 by Henry Rich, the machinist of *Covent Garden Theatre*. It gathered men of talent every Saturday around a piece of *steak* prepared by Rich himself. "[the society is] composed of the most ingenious artists in the Kingdom […] [who never suffered] any diet except Beef-steaks to appear." *The Connoisseur*, n° 19 (6 June 1754). Its emblem was the *gridiron*, on which the first steak was grilled, and its motto: "Beef and Liberty!"

[27] In the 1720s, several *Hell-Fire Clubs* appeared in London. They were dedicated to atheism and blasphemy, but also seemed to be a pretext for drunkenness and debauchery. The first one was founded in 1719 by Philip, Duke of Wharton and other high society rakes. A royal edict tried to suppress them in 1721. But in 1740, the most famous of all "Hell-Fire clubs" was created by Sir Francis Dashwood with twelve other members. This secret fraternity was called *The Order of the Knights of St. Francis of Wycombe,* or sometimes *The Friars of St. Francis* or *The Monks of Medmendham*. See Daniel P. Mannix, *The Hell-Fire Club* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1959) or a more recent study by Evelyn Lord, *The Hell-Fire Clubs: Sex, Satanism, and Secret Societies* (Yale University Press, 2008).

[28] "It is customary, after the cloth and dessert are removed and two or three glasses of wine are gone round, for the ladies to retire and leave the men to themselves," John Trusler, *The Honours of the Table, or Rules for Behaviour during Meals* [1788], (Dublin: W. Sleater, 1791) 8.

[29] César de Saussure, letter 8, *Lettres et Voyages de Monsieur César de Saussure en Allemagne, en Hollande et en Angleterre: 1725-1729* (Lausanne, Paris: Fishbacher, 1903) 229.

[30] Jean-Bernard Le Blanc (Abbé), *Lettres d'un François* [1745], 3 vols. (Amsterdam, 1751) 2: 110-116. It would be interesting to try and establish a link between the appearance of this segregation of the sexes at the end of the meal and the development of institutions of masculine sociability at the end of the seventeenth century.

[31] For precisions on the ritual of toasting, see Capdeville, *L'Âge d'or des clubs londoniens*, 139-143.

[32] Here is one example reported in *White's* betting book:

March 21st 1746/47.

Mr John Jeffries bets Mr Dayrolle five guineas, that Lady Kildare has a
child born alive before Lady Caroline Petersham.

N.B. Miscarriages go for nothing.

The entirety of *White's* betting-book is reproduced in Henry Algernon Bourke, *The History of White's*, 2 vols. (London: Waterloo & sons Ltd., 1892) 2: 1.

For *Brooks's* betting book, see "Betts Book–1778", LMA, Mss. Acc/2371/BC.

[33] William Alexander, *The History of Women, from the Earliest Antiquity to the Present Time, Giving Some Account of Almost Every Interesting Particular concerning that Sex among All Nations*, 2 vols. (London: W. Strahan & T. Cadell, 1779) 2: 336.

[34] *Spectator*, n° 342 (2 Apr. 1712).

[35] *Spectator*, n° 57.

[36] *Spectator*, n° 242 (7 Dec. 1711).

[37] The concept of the separation of spheres was theorized and developed for the first time by Martha Vicinus, *Separate Spheres* (Bloomington, 1974).

[38] Margaret Hunt, *Women in 18th-Century Europe* (NY: Pearson Longman, 2010).

[39] See Sarah Richardson & Kathryn Gleadle (eds.), *Women in British Politics , 1760-1860: the Power of the Petticoat* (Basingstoke, 2000); Amanda Vickery (ed.), *Women, Privilege and Power: British Politics 1750 to the Present* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001); Rosemary Sweet & Penelope Lane (eds.), *Women and Urban Life in Eighteenth-Century England: "On the Town"* (London: Ashgate, 2003). See also two interesting articles by Elaine Chalus, "'My Minerva at My Elbow': The Political Roles of Women in Eighteenth-Century England," in Stephen Taylor et al. (eds.), *Hanoverian Britain and Empire* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 1998) 210-20, or "Elite Women, Social Politics, and the Political World of Late Eighteenth-century England," *Historical Journal* 43 (2000) 669-97.

[40] Ingrid H. Tague, *Women of Quality: Accepting and Contesting Ideals of Femininity in England, 1690-1760* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002) 217.

[41] See Amanda Foreman, *Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire* (London: Harper Collins, 1998).

[42] Pierre-Jean Grosley, *Londres: Ouvrage d'un Français*, 3 vols. (Neuchâtel: aux dépens de la Société Typographique, 1774) 1: 219

[43] Letter to Lady Ossory (14 Dec. 1771) Horace Walpole, *Correspondence*, 32: 67.

[44] In his correspondence, Horace Walpole, himself a member of *The Female Coterie*, listed the names of the women who founded this 'atypical' club:

> There is a new institution that begins to make and, if proceeds, will make considerable noise. It is a club of both sexes to be erected at Almack's, on the model of that of the men at White's. Mrs. Fitzroy, Lady Pembroke, Mrs. Meynell, Lady Molyneux, Miss Pelham et Miss Lloyd are the foundresses. I am ashamed to say I am of so young and fashionable a society; but as they are people I live with, I choose to be idle either than morose.

Letter to Montagu (6 May 1770), Horace Walpole, *Correspondence*, 10: 305.

[45] Chiffres donnés par Peter Clark, *Clubs and Societies*, 198.

[46] Peter Clark, *Clubs and Societies*, 199.

[47] Sylvia Harcstack Myers, *The Bluestocking Circle: Women, Friendship and the Life of the Mind in Eighteenth-Century England* (Oxford: Clarendon P) 1990.

[48] "La Belle Présidente" is an expression used by Lord Lyttleton in 1765 and reported in C.B. Tinker, *The Salon and English Letters: Chapters on the Interrelation of Literature and Society in the Age of Johnson* (NY: Macmillan, 1915) 124. Elizabeth Vesey, Mrs. Boscawen, Elizabeth Carter, Catherine Talbot, Hester Chapone, Hannah More attended regularly, as well as eminent gentlemen from London high society such as Lord Lyttleton, Lord Pulteney, the Earl of Bath. Among the circle's *habitués* were also Horace Walpole, David Garrick, Dr. Johnson or Edmund Burke

[49] "'À la question, mais pourquoi excluez-vous les femmes qui prendraient part à la conversation d'une manière agréable?' L'Anglais de lui répondre: 'Oh! c'est que leur présence serait pour nous un sujet de gêne et de contrainte: nous ne pourrions pas dire ce que nous voudrions, ni pousser nos toasts', et l'Italien d'ajouter: 'C'est-à-dire, que vous ne pourriez pas vous livrer à des excès scandaleux, détruire votre constitution et vos principes, vous abandonner à l'intempérance et à l'obscénité'," Jean-Louis Ferri de Saint-Constant, *Londres et les Anglais* (Paris: Fain Jeune, 1804) 1: 198.

[50] Jeffrey Merrick, "Society needs Women 'Like Coffee Needs Sugar:' André Morellet and the Female Sex," in *André Morellet (1727-1819) in the Republic of Letters and the French Revolution*, ed. J. Merrick & D. Medlin (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1995) 95-113.

[51] James Forrester, "The Polite Philosopher" [1734], *A Present for a Son* (London: J. Dixwell, 1775) 67-68. Forrester defined conversation with ladies as "the Shorter, Pleasanter and more Effectual Method of arriving at the summit of genteel behavior" (62).

[52] *Spectator*, n° 128 (27 July 1711).

[53] *Spectator*, n° 433 (17 July 1712).

[54] David Hume, 'Of Refinement in the Arts', *Selected Essays* (Oxford: OUP, 1993) 169.

[55] James Fordyce, *Sermons to Young Women* [1766] 2 vols. (London, 1786) 1: 17.

[56] Swift, "Hints towards an Essay on Conversation" (1763), in *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. H. David (Oxford, 1973) 4: 95.

[57] Joseph Spence, *Letters from the Grand Tour 1730-1741*, ed. S. Kilma (London: Mc Gill, Queen's UP, 1975) 9-10.

[58] Michèle Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century* (London, New York: Routledge, 1996) 39.

[59] Thomas Wilson, *The Many Advantages of a Good Language to any Nation, with an Examination of the present State of our own* (1724), quoted in Tim Hitchcock & Michèle Cohen, eds., *English Masculinities 1660-1800* (London & NY: Longman, 1999) 48. See also *Spectator*, n° 135 (Aug. 4, 1711): "Our Discourse is not kept up in Conversation but falls into more Pauses and Intervals than in our Neighbouring Countries."

[60] See Paul Langford, *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850.* (Oxford: OUP, 2000) 188, 194.

[61] *Women's Petition against Coffee representing to Publick Consideration the Grand Inconveniences accruing to their Sex from the Excessive Use of that Drying, Enfeebling Liquor*, Presented to the Right Honourable the Keepers of the Liberty of Venus (London, 1674).

[62] Tim Hitchcock & Michèle Cohen, *English Masculinities*, 6.

[63] On the fop figure, see Philip Carter's study: 'Mollies, Fops and Men of Feeling: Aspects of Male Effeminacy And Masculinity in Britain, c.1700-1780' (unpub. D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford, 1995). Also see pamphlet: *Mundus Foppensis: or, The Fop Displayed* (1691).

[64] J. Fordyce, *Sermons to Young Women*, 1: 104.

[65] John Brown, *An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times* (London: L. Davis & C. Reymers, 1757) 30.

[66] Terry Castle, *Masquerade and Civilization*: *Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction* (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford UP, 1986).

[67] In May 1774, *Boodle's*, one of the main clubs of St James' Street, organised a great masquerade at the *Pantheon*, a building designed by James Wyatt and inaugurated in 1772.

[68] Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (Yale UP, 2004) 160.

[69] "Plus qu'un artifice supplémentaire dans les accessoires de la fête, c'est un instrument de liberté qui manifeste au plus haut point la fonction représentative des apparences et du vêtement," in Daniel Roche, *La Culture des Apparences. Une Histoire du Vêtement, XVIIe-XVIIIe Siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 1989) 384.

[70] "Autant les Français se plaisent dans la compagnie des femmes, autant les Anglais la craignent, à moins qu'ils ne soient amoureux," Jean-Bernard, Le Blanc (Abbé), lettre 7, *Lettres d'un François,* 1: 45.

[71] See Edward Ward, *The Secret History of Clubs* (London: J. Phillips, 1710). The term *Macaroni* was also used to refer to those young wealthy aristocrats and famous founding members of *Brooks's* club, who were characterized by their eccentric dress and hair style, inspired by Italian fashion. Their eccentric behaviour and delicate manners reminded of the figure of the *beau* or *fop*.

[72] Tim Hitchcock & Michèle Cohen, *English Masculinities*, 51.

[73] Richard Hurd, *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel, Considered as Part of an Englishman's Education: Between Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Locke* (London: A. Millar, 1764) 156.

[74] John Andrews, *Letters to a Young Gentleman on his Setting out for France* (London, 1784) 4.

[75] *The Fifteen Comforts of a Wanton Life* (1706-1707) 6, quoted in Michael S. Kimmel, *The History of men. Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005) 139.

[76] Michèle Cohen, ed., *Masculinity: Men Defining Men and Gentlemen*, Intro. The interesting pamphlet *Mundus Foppensis: or, The Fop Displayed* (1691) outlines several indications of the "feminization" of late 17th-century men.

[77] Letter 33 (29 Oct. 1739), Philip Dormer Stanhope, Lord Chesterfield, *Letters written by the late Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, to his Son*, 2 vols. (London: J. Dodsley, 1774) 1: 93.

[78] David Fordyce, *Dialogues concerning Education*, 2 vols. [1745, 1748] (London: Routledge, Thoemmes P, 1992) 56. Cohen, *Fashioning Masculinity*, 49.

[79] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Bourgeois Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society.* Trans. Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Polity P, 1989). Questioning Habermas's model, Nancy Fraser denounced the hegemonic dominance of this male "bourgeois public sphere," in "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to a Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1992) 109-142.

[80] This idea is developed in Michèle Cohen & Tim Hitchcock, *English Masculinities, 1660-1800* (London & NY: Longman, 1999) 47.

[81] William Alexander, *History of Women*, 1: 314.

[82] Philip Carter, "Men about Town: Representations of Foppery and Masculinity in Early Eighteenth-Century Urban Society," in Hannah Barker & Elaine Chalus, eds., *Gender in Eighteenth-Century England. Roles, Representations and Responsibilities* (London & NY: Longman, 1997) 49.

[83] James Boswell recorded on November 29th, 1783: "I was in Scotland when this Club was founded during all the winter. Johnson, however, declared I should be a member, and invented a word upon the occasion: 'Boswell (said he) is a very *clubable* man'. When I came to town I was proposed to Mr Barrington, and chosen." James Boswell, *Life of Johnson*, ed. R.W. Chapman, 1953 (Oxford: World's Classics, OUP, 1998) 1260.

[84] "Il leur est ordinaire d'être d'abord réservez, & de ne s'ouvrir qu'à mesure qu'ils connaissent les personnes à qui ils ont à faire," Béat-Louis de Muralt, *Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et les Voiages* [1728], ed. Charles Gould (Paris: Champion, 1933) 143.

[85] Anthony Ashley-Cooper (Earl of Shaftesbury), "The Moralists, a Philosophical Rhapsody," *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* [1711], ed. J.M. Robertson, 3 vols. (London, 1723) 2: 6.

REFERENCES

Primary Works

Addison, Joseph & Richard Steele. *The Spectator*. 1711-14. Ed. D.F. Bond. 5 vols. 1965. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Alexander, William. *The History of Women, from the Earliest Antiquity to the Present Time, Giving Some Account of Almost Every Interesting Particular concerning that Sex among All Nations*, 2 vols. London: W. Strahan & T. Cadell, 1779.

Andrews, John. *Letters to a Young Gentleman on his Setting out for France*. London, 1784.

Ashley-Cooper, Anthony (Earl of Shaftesbury). *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*. 1711. Ed. J.M. Robertson. 3 vols. London, 1723.

Boswell, James. *Life of Johnson*. Ed. R.W. Chapman. 1953. Oxford: World's Classics, OUP, 1998.

Brooks's betting book: "Betts Book–1778," LMA, Mss. Acc/2371/BC.

Brown, John. *An Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times*. 2nd ed. London: L. Davis & C. Reymers, 1757.

Chalmers, Alexander. *The British Essayists: The Connoisseur*. London: R. Lyman, 1827. Vols 18-19.

Ferri de Saint-Constant, Jean-Louis. *Londres et les Anglais.* Paris: Fain Jeune, 1804.

Fordyce, David. *Dialogues concerning Education*, Facsim. 1757. 3rd ed. 2 vols. London: Routlege, Thoemmes P, 1992.

Fordyce, James. *Sermons to Young Women*. 1766. 10th ed. 2 vols. London, 1786.

Forrester, James. "The Polite Philosopher." 1734. *A Present for a Son*. London: J. Dixwell, 1775.

Grosley, Pierre-Jean. *Londres: Ouvrage d'un Français*. 3 vols. Neuchâtel: aux dépens de la Société Typographique, 1774.

Hume, David. "Of Refinement in the Arts." *Selected Essays*. Oxford: OUP, 1993.

Hurd, Richard. *Dialogues on the Uses of Foreign Travel, considered as part of an Englishman's education: between Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Locke*. London: A. Millar, 1764.

Le Blanc, Jean-Bernard (Abbé). *Lettres d'un François*. 1745. 3 vols. Amsterdam, 1751.

Miller, James. *Of Politeness. An Epistle to the Honourable William Stanhope, Lord Harrington.* London: L. Gilliver & J. Clark, 1738.

Mundus Foppensis: or, The Fop Displayed. 1691.

Muralt, Béat-Louis (de). *Lettres sur les Anglois et les François et les Voiages*. 1728. Ed. Charles Gould. Paris: Champion, 1933.

Saussure, César (de). *Lettres et Voyages de Monsieur César de Saussure en Allemagne, en Hollande et en Angleterre: 1725-1729.* Lausanne, Paris: Fishbacher, 1903.

Spence, Joseph. *Letters from the Grand Tour 1730-1741*. Ed. S. Kilma. London: Mc Gill, Queen's UP, 1975.

Stanhope, Philip Dormer (Lord Chesterfield). *Letters written by the late Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield, to his Son*, 2 vols. London: J. Dodsley, 1774.

Swift, Jonathan. "Hints towards an Essay on Conversation." 1763. *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift.* Ed. H. David. Oxford, 1973.

Trusler, John. *The Honours of the Table, or Rules for Behaviour during Meals.* 1788. Dublin: W. Sleater, 1791.

Walpole, Horace. *The Yale Edition of Horace Walpole's Correspondence*. Ed. W.S. Lewis. 48 vols. New Haven: Yale UP, 1960.

Ward, Ned. *The History of the London Clubs: or, the Citizens Pastimes.* London, 1709.

Ward, Ned. *The Secret History of Clubs*. London: J. Phillips, 1710.

Wilson, Thomas. *The Many Advantages of a Good Language to any Nation, with an Examination of the present State of our own*. London: J. Knapton, 1724.

Women's Petition against Coffee representing to Publick Consideration the Grand Inconveniences Accruing to their Sex from the Excessive Use of that Drying, Enfeebling Liquor, Presented to the Right Honourable the Keepers of the Liberty of Venus. London, 1674.

Secondary Works

Barker, Hannah & Elaine Chalus, Eds. *Gender in Eighteenth-century England: Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*. London, NY: Longman, 1997.

Barrett, Frank J. "The Organizational Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity: The Case of the US Navy." Eds. Stephen M. Whitehead & Frank J. Barrett, *The Masculinities Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.

Bourke, Algernon H. *The History of White's*. 2 vols. London: Waterloo & Sons ltd., 1892.

Brewer, John. *The Pleasures of the Imagination*. London: Harper Collins, 1997.

Butler, Judith. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory." Ed. Sue-Ellen Case. *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1990: 270-82.

Capdeville, Valérie. *L'Age d'Or des Clubs Londoniens (1730-1784).* Paris: Honoré Champion, 2008.

Carré, Jacques. "Gentleman," *Dictionnaire Raisonné de la Politesse et du Savoir-Vivre du Moyen-Âge à Nos Jours*. Dir. Alain Montandon. Paris: Seuil, 1995: 425-438.

Carter, Philip. *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society, Britain 1660-1800*. London: Longman, 2001.

Carter, Philip. 'Mollies, Fops and Men of Feeling: Aspects of Male Effeminacy and Masculinity in Britain, c.1700-1780'. Unpub. D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford, 1995.

Carter, Philip. "Men about town: representations of foppery and masculinity in early eighteenth-century urban society". Eds. Hannah Barker & Elaine Chalus. *Gender in Eighteenth-century England. Roles, Representations and Responsibilities*. London & NY: Longman, 1997: 31-57.

Castle, Terry. *Masquerade and Civilization*: *Carnivalesque in Eighteenth-Century English Culture and Fiction*. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford UP, 1986.

Clark, Peter. *Sociability and Urbanity: Clubs and Societies in the Eighteenth-Century City*. Leicester: U of Leicester P, Victoria Studies Centre, 1986.

Clark, Peter. *British Clubs and Societies, 1580-1800: The Origins of an Associational World*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 2000.

Cohen, Michèle & Tim Hitchcock, Eds. *English Masculinities 1660-1800*. London & NY: Longman, 1999.

Cohen, Michèle. *Fashioning Masculinity: National Identity and Language in the Eighteenth Century*. London, New York: Routledge, 1996.

Cohen, Michèle. "Manliness, Effeminacy and the French: Gender and the Construction of National Character in Eighteenth-Century England." Eds. Michèle Cohen & Tim Hitchcock. *English Masculinities. 1660-1800*. London & NY: Longman, 1999: 44-61.

Cohen, Michèle. *Masculinity: Men Defining Men and Gentlemen, 1660-1918, Part 1: 1660-1800, Sources from the Bodleian Library*, Oxford, 2000.

Cohen, Michèle. "'Manners' Make the Man: Politeness, Chivalry, and the Construction of Masculinity, 1750-1830." *Journal of British Studies*, April 2005, Vol. 44, Iss. 2, 312-313.

Coltrane, Scott. "Theorizing Masculinities in Contemporary Social Science". Ed. Harry Brod & Michael Kaufman. *Theorizing Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1994: 39-60.

Connell, R.W. & James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society*, 19 (2005): 829-59.

Foreman, Amanda. *Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire*. London: Harper Collins, 1998.

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to a Critique of Actually Existing democracy." Ed. Craig Calhoun. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT P, 1992: 109-142.

French, Henry & Mark Rothery. *Man's Estate: Landed Gentry Masculinities, 1660-1900*. Oxford: OUP, 2012.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Bourgeois Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Trans. Thomas Burger. Cambridge: Polity P, 1989.

Hunt, Margaret. *Women in 18th-Century Europe*. NY: Pearson Longman, 2010.

Kimmel, Michael S. *The History of Men. Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities*. Albany: State University of NY Press, 2005.

Langford, Paul. *Englishness Identified: Manners and Character, 1650-1850*. Oxford: OUP, 2000.

Lord, Evelyn. *The Hell-Fire Clubs: Sex, Satanism, and Secret Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Mannix, Daniel P. *The Hell-Fire Club*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1959.

Merrick, Jeffrey. "Society needs Women 'Like Coffee Needs Sugar': Andre Morellet and the Female Sex". Eds. Jeffrey Merrick & Dorothy Medlin, *André Morellet in the Republic of Letters and the French Revolution*. New York: Peter Lang, 1995: 95-113.

Ollard, Richard. "The Brooks's of C.J. Fox". Eds. Philip Ziegler & Desmond Seward, *Brooks's, A Social History*. London: Constable, 1991: 33-43.

Roper, Michael & John Tosh. "Hegemonic Masculinity and the History of Gender". Eds. Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann & John Tosh. *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*. Manchester: MUP, 2004: 41-58.

Solkin, David H. *Painting for Money*. *The Visual Arts and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven, London: Yale UP, 1993.

Tague, Ingrid H. *Women of Quality: Accepting and Contesting Ideals of Femininity in England, 1690-1760*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002.

Tiger, Lionel. *Men in Groups.* London: Nelson, 1969.

Vicinus, Martha. *Separate Spheres*. Bloomington, 1974.

Wahrman, Dror. *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2004.

Patrick Farges*

Masculinity and Confinement: German-Speaking Refugees in Canadian Internment Camps (1940-1943)

The forced migration of German-speaking refugees fleeing Nazism brought to Canada a group of "accidental" immigrants—the "Camp Boys." The group consisted of German and Austrian nationals, Jewish and non-Jewish, who had previously migrated to the United Kingdom. In 1940, the British government decided to register all "enemy aliens" and to intern some of them. A few weeks later, approximately 2,000 male internees (aged from 16-65 years) were sent overseas to Canadian internment camps. They spent several months in a confined, all-male, but sociologically extremely diverse, environment. The internment camps thus became a vividly remembered matrix of masculinity, especially for the younger "Boys." From the Camp Boys' retrospective self-narratives, it appears that their self-representation and self-construction as "men" was deeply affected by the feelings of confinement, powerlessness, and impotence they experienced in the camps. By looking at the way power circulated in the camps, and the way hierarchies were constructed (intersecting class, religion, and sexuality), the author addresses and reframes the notion of subordinated vs. "hegemonic masculinity" (R.W. Connell). By looking at the retrospective self-narratives produced by these men, he also addresses the narrative and performative construction of masculine identities.

Keywords: masculinity, German-speaking, refugees, internment camps, WWII

The present paper stems from a research project conducted between 1999 and 2006 in Canada and Germany. The project focused on the long-term acculturation of German-speaking[1] refugees in Canada after Hitler's "rise to power" (*Machtübernahme*) in January 1933. The sources used were mainly self-narratives, i.e. stories that people use to construct and reconstruct meaning out of the events of their lives: memoirs, autobiographies, correspondences, as well as thirty oral history interviews (Farges, 2008). The main focus of the present paper is to study the constructions of masculinity within the Canadian internment camps where German-speaking refugees were interned between 1940 and 1943.

---

* Sorbonne Nouvelle—Paris 3.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Patrick Farges, Département d'études germaniques, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle—Paris 3, 13 rue Santeuil, 75005 Paris, France. Email: patrick.farges@univ-paris3.fr

---

Research in the field of women's migrations has been intensely pursued in the last ten years (e.g., Gabaccia & Iacovetta, 2002), offering important new insights on gendered aspects of migration, identity issues, as well as transnational lives. It has also brought to the fore important methodological issues, such as the choice of self-narratives as primary sources. In my view, it is now time to shed new light on the migrations of men with regard to the theoretical findings of women's migration studies. A history of detention in Canada exists, particularly concerning the various Canadian internment practices during the World Wars (Auger, 2005; Draper, 1983; Iacovetta, Perin & Principe, 2000,). However, despite elaborate research done in the past twenty years on shifting gender boundaries on the "home front," and despite insightful work published on camaraderie in a military context, the question of the gendered aspects of all-male internment and the question of the reshaping of masculinity in detention have received little attention so far.[2]

In addition, over the past thirty years, a first generation of men's studies has offered insights into the construction and representations of masculinities. One important contribution in this field is R.W. Connell's definition of (and fieldwork on) "hegemonic masculinities" (Connell, 1995), referring to dynamic forms of the negotiating of masculine power in given societal frames. First understood as men's practices guaranteeing their domination over women, the concept of hegemonic masculinity now also encompasses men's practices ensuring domination over alternative or subordinate forms of masculinity. According to Judith Halberstam, hegemonic masculinity "depends absolutely on the subordination of alternative masculinities" (1998, p. 1). Socially and historically constructed, masculinity is contingent and fluid, because multiple discourses intersect in any man's life. Adult masculinity is produced through a complex process of development involving negotiation in multiple social relationships, cultural settings, and specific historical circumstances. Connell point out that

> to the extent the term can be briefly defined at all, [masculinity] is simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture. (2005, p. 71)

Different forms of masculinity exist in definite relation with each other, but often in relations of hierarchy and exclusion, thus relying on power structures and forms of domination. Hegemonic masculinity as the historically and culturally stable and legitimised form of masculinity is essentially dynamic, contextual (i.e. historically situated), and hence contestable. It thus maintains a dialectic link with other regimes, systems, or forms of masculinity. Recently, Connell and Messerschmidt have insisted that hegemonic masculinity be understood as a "pattern of practice (i.e. things done, not just as a set of role expectations or an identity)" (2005, p. 832). Masculinities are being practically performed, they refer to ways of "doing" (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Furthermore, Connell and Messerschmidt plead for an explicit research focus on the spaces and territories in which masculinities are unfolded: they evoke "geographies of masculinity" as well as "intersectionality" (class, religion) among men.

The microcosm of the internment camp offers, I shall argue, a particularly pertinent space to study such performative interactions between men through which masculinities are being constituted and subordination is being produced. In the

case of the internment of "enemy aliens" during World War II, masculinity constituted a dimension present in both the rationale for interning solely men and the everyday practices within the internment camps. Far from being non-visible, unmarked and disembodied, the internees' masculinity in the margins of war was marked through practices that ranged from the wearing of uniforms to repetitive constraints and routines affecting the men's bodies. In this paper, I shall demonstrate that deconstructing norms of hegemonic vs. non-hegemonic masculinities, and studying male hierarchies (according to class, religion, age, or sexual domination) within an all-male environment in which no feminine presence could help affirm masculine identities, are a way of studying gender relations. By looking at the way power circulated within the camps, and at the way hierarchies were constructed through multiple micro-acts intersecting class, religion, and sexuality, I aim to address and reframe the notion of subordinate vs. "hegemonic masculinities." By looking at the retrospective self-narratives produced by the interned men, I also wish to address the narrative-performative construction of masculine identities through retrospective written and oral narration. "Becoming a *real* man" in an adverse war environment was a complex process. Internment was thus a dense and intense period of social and gendered interactions in these men's lives. The social, religious, as well as sexual relations the Camp Boys were confronted with in the "men's kitchen" (*Männerküche*) became part of their masculine identity toolkit.

"His Majesty's Most Loyal Internees," or, How to Become a "Camp Boy"

The forced migration of German-speaking refugees fleeing the Nazi regime brought to Canada a strange group of migrants: the "Camp Boys" as they labelled themselves. According to Puckhaber (2002), approximately 5,000-6,000 German-speaking refugees (Jews and non-Jews) managed to enter Canada in the 1930s and 1940s despite Canada's restrictive (and largely anti-Semitic) immigration policy (Abella & Troper, 2000). Their story is that of an absurd episode of World War II, and yet it is "one of the few Second World War stories with a happy ending" (Koch, 1980, p. XIV). In his autobiography, Erwin Schild qualifies this episode as "a bizarre Jewish schlemiel joke. (…) Kafka could not have dreamt up a more grotesque absurdity" (2001, p. 236). The Camp Boys consisted for the most part of—Jewish and non-Jewish—German and Austrian citizens who had previously found refuge in the United Kingdom. In view of Nazi Germany's growing military successes, the fear of a "Fifth Column" of saboteurs spread over the United Kingdom, reaching a peak in the Spring of 1940. In reaction, Prime Minister Churchill decided to register and categorise all "enemy aliens," and to intern some of them, in accordance with the widespread practice of wartime internment (Cesarani & Kushner, 1993). Among the interned, some 2,000 male internees aged from 16 to 65 were sent overseas to Canadian internment camps (others were sent to Australia; Dümling, 2000). There, they spent months (or even years) in a confined, all-male, but sociologically extremely diverse environment that became their matrix of masculinity. The internment camps thus became a vividly recalled structuring event in the Camp Boys' lives, especially the younger ones. After their release, about half of the Camp Boys permanently settled in Canada,[3] becoming the country's "accidental immigrants" (Draper, 1983).

The "internment story" began abruptly but had been preceded by several other episodes of rupture and displacement, including the violent exclusion from the

community of German nationals organised by the Nazi regime. These ruptures serve as crucial pivot points of the self-narrative, differentiating biographical time in "then" and "now," and spatial orientation in "there" and "here." Especially, the moment of capture, often related in considerable detail, opened up a liminal phase of "no longer"/"not yet." In his memoirs, Alfred Bader (born 1924 in a Viennese Jewish upper middle-class family) vividly recalls the day he was arrested by British "Bobbies" as an "enemy alien:"

> Sunday, May 12 [1940], exactly two weeks after my birthday, was memorable for two events. At 11 a.m., during the break in Hebrew school at the Middle Street synagogue, I asked a girl for the first date in my life and she accepted. Ten minutes later, two detectives picked me up, drove me home to collect some clothes and a toothbrush and took me to a detention centre on the Brighton racecourse. (Bader, 1995, p. 25)

Bader's distanced irony, particularly when he emphasizes that the day of his arrest coincided with his first manly date with a girl, can be interpreted as a retrospective narrative strategy in order to cope with the feeling of treason and loss of virility he, as other refugees, felt in Spring 1940. The capture in a war context was experienced as a precipitous loss of status in the social and gender hierarchy: as a form of symbolic emasculation. Great Britain, considered a safe haven by numerous refugees, and the very country that had organised the *Kindertransporte* in order to evacuate Jewish children from German and Austrian cities—had now suddenly turned against the refugees. It was like falling into an unsuspected enemy's hands. Eric Koch writes: "To be arrested by people considered to be friends was a traumatic experience for the thousands of those who had suffered cruelty at the hands of the Nazis" (1980, p. 3). The poem "His Majesty's Most Loyal Internees," written in the first weeks of internment (possibly by Oswald Volkmann), renders this bitter feeling towards Great Britain (quoted in Seyfert, 1984, pp. 177-178):

> We left in search of liberty
> The country of our birth,
> We thought to live in Britain was
> The finest thing on earth,
> You gave us hospitality
> When we gave guarantees.
> And now we are His Majesty's
> Most loyal Internees.
> (…)
> When Hitler's troops in Rotterdam
> Came down by parachute
> And everybody panicking
> The thing became acute,
> We were with wives and families
> Arrested by police,
> So we became His Majesty's
> Most loyal Internees.
>
> They told us not to be afraid
> We might be back at night,
> We were not prisoners at all
> And would be soon all right.

> But after weeks of promising
> They sent us overseas,
> Although we were His Majesty's
> Most loyal Internees.
>
> And here we are, without the means
> Of proving our case,
> Behind a strongly guarded fence
> In a forgotten place.
> We wait while the authorities
> Consider the release,
> Because we are His Majesty's
> Most loyal Internees.

The recurrent bittersweet formula—"His Majesty's Most Loyal Internees"—insistently points at Great Britain's disloyalty. Soon after their internment on British soil, some 2,000 men were sent overseas to the Dominions Canada and Australia for "security reasons."[4]

The fact that only men were sent overseas reflects the fundamental gender imbalance that characterised the State and the authorities. Male images dominated, and still dominate, the public representation of war. Women and children, as well as the old and sick, belonged to the feminised "home-front," the one which had to be protected and for whom the men were supposed to fight. Against the male bodies, however, the government exaggerated and inflated an aggressive stance. The British and Canadian states regarded the male German-speaking refugees as significant threats to their war strategy. The Camp Boys were coerced into migration and internment. They were allowed no agency whatsoever and were at the mercy of authorities. In Edgar Lion's own words:

> And there are two ships and it was just a question of: "you go this way, you end up in Australia, you go that way, you end up in Canada." I ended up in Canada. It was just a question of luck, just coincidence. There was no rhyme, reason or anything.[5]

The Camp Boys felt as "accidental deportees" who then became "accidental immigrants" to Canada. All along, they experienced an acute sense of masculine disempowerment. Their self-representation and self-construction as "men" were profoundly affected by the process of forced migration and confinement. Their passive role in the war did not correspond to the dominant representation of male soldiers defending their family and country. The helplessness and enforced passivity of forced migration and internment were antithetical to traditional representations of a male role in society. In the gendered spatial dichotomy of wartime, captivity and internment seemed to float freely between the gender poles. For the interned refugees, there was a near complete loss of control over the workings of their life that unsettled the cultural assumptions linking masculinity with dominance. Everything these men knew and understood about their selves was being questioned. In exile and internment, the men's incapacity to assume their traditional protective role for their families was experienced as a symbolic form of emasculation. This explains why they referred to themselves as *Boys* and not as *men*.

INTERNMENT AS "MEN'S KITCHEN"

The refugees were detained in eight internment camps: one in New Brunswick, five in Quebec, and two in Ontario. Contacts with the outside world were almost non-existent. Internment, detention and the uncertainty about the whereabouts of family members in Europe soon launched a process that transformed these men, aged from 16 to 65, into "Camp Boys." They had left the past behind and their future was hazy and uncertain. The majority was young: half of them were less than 25 years old and most had never been married or financially independent. Camp life thus represented a transitional phase that happened during their formative years. Whilst interned, they felt utterly insecure. They had entered a legal and psychic no-man's-land, disconnected from the "normal" world of individual respect and recognition. The camp experience was situated somewhere between being "in limbo" (Seyfert, 1984, p. 173) and being in "Hell's Kitchen." The first autobiographical study on the topic of internment was Eric Koch's *Deemed Suspect. A Wartime Blunder*, published in 1980. It was soon nicknamed *Kochbuch* (cookbook) by the Camp Boys. And indeed, the kitchens played a great part in the internees' everyday life and memories.

Camp was like a microcosm: "It was like living in a small town" (Koch, 1980, p. 169). Gerry Waldston speaks of a "mini-city," others of a "mini-world" (Rasky, 1981). Though the refugees had fled Nazi Europe and though German was their common language, the Boys' social backgrounds differed tremendously. In a confidential report, Alexander Paterson, the British emissary in charge of controlling the camps, noted in July 1943:

> It is not easy to discern any principle underlying their selection. They ranged in age from sixteen to seventy, in health from the robust to the moribund, in occupation from a university professor to a pedlar who was mentally deficient. Brothers and fathers and friends appear to have been separated with remarkable frequency. Some of the younger ones alleged that they were never told where they were going, others say they knew they were bound for Canada. (quoted in Puckhaber 2002, pp. 197-198)

Camp was characterised by a vast social as well as religious mix. Ernest Poser remembers the day when the camp commander, following orders that were probably meant to break the internees' routine and morale, had decided to separate Jews from non-Jews:

> As we came out of the service, there stood camp commander with his stick and he said: "OK, I have orders to separate the Jews from the non Jews in this camp." And to us that was like a stab: this is exactly what we had left behind in Germany. "This is Northern Ontario, they want to separate Jews from non Jews!" And we stood in total silence. He said: "Would all the Jews now please step over here." And nobody moved. So he said: "All right. Who went to the service tonight?" So a bunch of people moved over, you see, to one side. "OK, so you're Jews." I said: "And what about the rest of us?"—"You're non Jews." I mean he did in ten minutes what Hitler couldn't do in all the years since *Mein Kampf*. Unbelievable! This guy was a genius![6]

The most incongruous social and religious interactions happened in internment. The camps were places of intersectionality in which gendered masculine power and social hierarchies were negotiated on a daily basis. Under "normal" circum-

stances, these men would probably never have met. Here was for instance a man who called himself "Count Lingen" and who was actually the grandson of the last German *Kaiser*. He mingled un-problematically with Orthodox Jews and soon became camp leader. Eric Koch recalls the following anecdote:

> No doubt it was flattering that when he encountered any of us during our endless promenades through the camp, he would bow slightly and say *Guten Tag, Guten Tag, Guten Abend Herr Rosenzweig, Herr Levinsohn, Herr Cohen*, etc. Based on our recent experience we were no longer accustomed to being treated with such civility by German gentiles. (Koch, 1980, p. 81)

Camp life made unusual socio-cultural face-to-face interactions possible and it led to the un-breaking of social hierarchies. Camp was like a small, men-only, version of the outside world.

On the other hand, camp was also the site of "bio-politics." In his analysis of the emergence of bio-politics, Foucault (2003) shows how modern governance is dependent on forms of management of the body. The body is the site for "rights" and, at the same time, for a system of punishment linked to the deprivation of those same rights. Foucault's work suggests that the mechanisms of disciplinary power that ensure the system of rights are the nodal points of analysis. Power is not possessed, but rather exercised (Foucault, 1977). Power mechanisms can be reverted and Foucault suggests that the very power that excludes can also empower. In the camps, power hierarchies and violence from men against men soon appeared and they were used as micro-social regulators. In this context, the demonstration of (sometimes violent) power in a "hypermasculine" context (Toch, 1998) was a means of installing a complex hierarchical system within an all-male environment. The seemingly egalitarian condition of being an internee could not supersede the workings of power within the camps.

It appears that one of the main dimensions of bio-political negotiation were forms of masculinity. Sociologists and anthropologists have shown the ways in which, in traditional as well as contemporary societies, "boys" and "little men" are socialized into "becoming *real* (or great) men" by other men, in what the French anthropologist Maurice Godelier has defined as the "House of Men," i.e. the intergenerational social interactions constantly producing hegemonic representations of masculinity (Godelier, 1986; Welzer-Lang, 2000, pp. 14-17). In the internment camps, which functioned as "House of Men," older internees became intellectual, physical, and sometimes sexual initiators/predators/dominators vis-à-vis younger ones. Camp became a quintessential site of production of a masculinity that, according to Michael Kimmel (2008), importantly entails homosocial experience, performed for, and judged by, other men. This reframing of camp life in terms of a process of "becoming men" sheds new light on the numerous debates, quarrels, fights and sexual domination that took place within the camp microcosm, within the "men's kitchen."

Eric Koch states that:

> The absence of women had a very predictable influence on the lives of many inmates. The only way in which we could have heterosexual love affairs was in our fantasies. But no fantasy at all was required to have affairs with men: we were surrounded by potential male love-objects who were all too real. (1980, p. 157)

In the absence of markers of feminine otherness in the homosocial camps, homosexual practices, fantasies or mere rumours became symbolic weapons and were easily instrumentalized. The Boys walked a fine line between facing threat and losing more of their virility through passivity. For instance, the pride the Boys of the "kitchen squad" took in the public display of *providing* for the other internees helped them to reaffirm themselves as *breadwinners*. In Gregory Baum's recollection, the kitchens served as highly strategic sites in which various power games took place:

> We had the black kitchen. Those were the priests, and so this was the black kitchen. Then we had the red kitchen. Those were the communists. And then we had the warm kitchen and those were the homosexuals that had also fled Germany. And in Austria, "*warm*" means "homosexual"—"*ein Warmer*," "*ein warmer Bruder*" (a warm brother). And so that was the "warm kitchen." So we had three crews.[7]

Any problem related to the kitchens—or to food—led to particularly irrational and violent reactions. One day however, a camp leader had to deal with a serious problem: one of his cooks had been discovered having sexual intercourse with an internee in the kitchen area. This soon led to the wildest rumours about food. He recalls:

> I was surprised by the vehemence of the response, because somehow people began to associate homosexual practices in the kitchen with food. It became an explosive issue, and the demand was made for the cook to be removed from the kitchen. This was one of those situations where it was difficult to restore reason through objectively orientated discussion. (quoted in Koch, 1980, p. 158)

On another similar occasion, communist internees held a spectacular phoney trial that ended in the condemnation of two boys. As punishment, they were ordered to fight each other "until there was a bloody mess," in order to prove their virility.

Such (hard to find) testimonies attest to the fact that there existed forms of domination of men over other men, as well as an economy of—at times sexualised—power within the camps. Domination could be played out as sexual domination in the attempt to impose one pattern of hegemonic masculinity. But within the camps' hierarchical system, the Boys had access to *alternative* forms of social and gendered interactions, such as the nurturing role, which became also part of their identity construction. The historian is, however, struck by the fact that most self-narratives, testimonies, and autobiographies silence these crucial episodes of camp life. This does not contradict the assumption that there indeed existed forms of performative social mechanisms in order to impose hegemonic masculinity over other, alternative and subordinate, masculinities. On the contrary: in retrospect, most Camp Boys tried to recreate in their self-narratives a "normal" masculine identity through erasure, cautious re-membering and, at times, textual acrobatics.

While all types of camp work were undoubtedly essential for the camps' functioning, work also played an important psychological role. Work structured the men's lives and gave them a sense of achievement. The varied chores in the camps gave the Boys the opportunity to be innovative and competitive, and to publicly demonstrate their ingenuity and skills. Chores created opportunities for "manly" competition—toughness, muscle, and sweat were put to the fore[8]—and this fed

into traditional images of virility and manliness. Through the various physical as well as intellectual activities in the camps, the men re-established various masculine identities: they could be productive, providers, or professionals again. In this way, they became "someone" again, thereby regaining some self-respect and dignity. These factors bolstered the collective morale and made everyday life easier. At a group level, social activities were an important safety valve bringing some change in the dull internment routine. For the camp guards, they served as a micro-social instrument of domination over the interned men. At the same time, activities could be empowering. Entertainment and cultural activities were opportunities for the internees to explore their, at times latent, musical, theatrical, or political ambitions. They also served as a safe outlet for conflicts and subversive ideas. Through their social activities, the Boys performed their cultural, social, and gendered identities and re-enacted their pre-exile, "normal" selves, thus re-creating a pre-war sense of comfort, power, and self-worth.

"BACK TO NORMAL" AFTER MONTHS OF IMPOTENCE?

Camp certainly was not a vacuum or a "no man's land" (Henry Kreisel[9]), though the camp experience is often referred to in those very terms. Nor was it a blind spot in the Camp Boys' biographies. On the contrary, the experience of internment was a dense and intense period of socialisation and re-socialisation. Through their common experience, the "Camp Boys" were cemented into a masculine peer group sharing a collective memory. The social, religious, and sexual interactions related to the "men's kitchen" became part of their collective narration and identity.

Internment had begun in the late spring of 1940 in England and was prolonged in Canada. From 1941 onwards, liberations started. Some internees chose to remain in Canada while others asked to be transferred to the USA or back to the United Kingdom. Some internees were freed as late as 1943, i.e. after two years in captivity! By then, all remaining Camp Boys had been transferred to the Île-aux-Noix Camp in Quebec. It was nicknamed "Isle of Nuts" by those who desperately waited to be freed (Schild, 2001, p. 229). In October 1945, all internees released on Canadian soil were given the status of "landed immigrants" by decree. This was the first step towards Canadian citizenship and marked the end of a period of five years of in-between-ness. For most Camp Boys however, life was far from being back to normal. Most former internees indicate that shame, anger, fear and distrust were heightened components of their post-internment identity.

First of all, internment had profoundly affected the Boys' perception of time. Inside the camp, the passing of time had become an abstraction, a routine (Farges, 2007), whereas "outside," a gruesome war was taking place. Julius Pfeiffer recalls that

> [a] number of men were emotionally affected by the camp experience. They withdrew into themselves, pushed over the edge by the imprisonment and knowledge of the terrible events in Europe. All of them suffered traumatic family losses while they sat out the war, overwhelmed by pangs of guilt at their inability to communicate with the outside, or contribute something significant to the war effort. (1989, p. 219)

Pfeiffer's memories are an expression of the Boys' general feeling of impotence and de-virilisation. They had no contact with the outside world and felt anxiety about

the situation of their families and friends in Europe. Cases of "neurasthenia" and depression, or, to use the camp jargon, "internitis" (Koch, 1980, p. 143), are also reported. Yet at the same time, the internees could not but feel gratitude for having escaped Nazism and, in the case of Jewish internees, for having survived the Holocaust. Their feeling thus oscillated between despair, impotence, and thankfulness.

In more than a way, camp had been a "compression chamber" (Koch, 1980, p. 168) interposed between worlds: between "here" and "there," between Germany and Canada, between "then" and "now," and between hegemonic and alternative masculinities. The experience of internment thus served as a laboratory in which the Boys learned that "being a man" was, in fact, an extremely complex and hierarchical matter. They felt the huge discrepancy between the role they thought they ought to play (that of the traditional "provider" or "breadwinner") and the symbolic emasculation they had to come to terms with. After liberation, some internees never found the way back to normalcy. For some, this ended up in suicide attempts while others forever changed their mental representations of gender and society. One of them particularly underlines how internment affected his understanding of sociality:

> You can never become a bourgeois after that. When you're separated from the bourgeois customs and you suddenly find yourself dressed the same way as other people, you really see through the kind of superficiality of public life. We all said this. (quoted in Draper, 1978, p. 102)

In retrospect, the Boys' feeling of powerlessness and impotence was counterbalanced by the narrative strategies they adopted in their self-narratives. The work of memory thus became a crucial focus of the Boys' lives, as their very existence had been profoundly affected by past ruptures.

"We the Camp Boys:" Confiscated vs. Reclaimed Memory

The specific sources used in this project—self-narratives—highlight the Boys' strategies of self-assertion through memory and narration. The self-narratives they produced do not read like traditional historical sources, because they use narrative techniques of fiction in order to "tell the story." Accuracy is not always the issue here. However, the narratives generally "seek to meet (…) criteria of coherence, verisimilitude, and interest" (Richardson, 1994, p. 521). The Boys' autobiographies and life-stories often construct a master narrative in which they embody migrant "success stories" in post-war Canada. The official group memory is that of the "happy accident" by which successful (male) immigrants "became some of the liveliest immigrants Canada ever had," according to a *Maclean's* magazine article published in the early 1960s (Moon, 1962). In his self-narrative, Julius Pfeiffer offers a similar appraisal:

> This group of less than a thousand men supplied Canada with a contingent of architects, artists, businessmen, chemists, dentists, engineers, economists, filmmakers, historians, journalists, lawyers, mathematicians, novelists, philosophers, professors, psychiatrists, researchers, religious leaders, sociologists, electronic media executives and even an impresario. (1989, 220)

But this collective master narrative notwithstanding, a general feeling of uneasiness remained tangible, readable between the lines. For a long time, it was practically impossible for the Boys to "tell the[ir] story," because the story could not be told in a post-Holocaust world. The internment experience was in no way comparable with the horrors others had been through in Nazi Europe. To be more specific: it was not comparable to surviving a Nazi concentration and extermination camp. Some ex-internees knew that, especially those who had witnessed German concentration camps (like Dachau and Sachsenhausen[10]) before leaving Germany, or those whose family members had survived a Nazi extermination camp.[11] In a post-Holocaust world, the Camp Boys' memories of wartime internment were hence confiscated, obliterated. The Canadian internment was not "worth telling" with regard to stories of Holocaust survival.

The Boys, one can argue, were actually Holocaust survivors of a different kind. Far from being heroic, their story was merely "accidental." They certainly could not identify with the 20,000 Holocaust survivors Canada let in in the late 1940s and 1950s (Torczyner, 2001, pp. 245-247). As a consequence, the Jewish Camp Boys felt somewhat marginalised within the Jewish-Canadian community. Irving Abella, a historian of Canadian Jewry, shows that a unilateral process of collective memory was imposed onto post-Holocaust Canada. He writes:

> The world had become too dangerous a place for Jews to allow themselves the luxury of internal dissent and divisiveness. The radicalism and class struggles of the 1920s and 1930s seemed sadly out of place in the changed circumstances of the 1950s and 1960s. Jewish energies were now totally devoted to protecting the State of Israel, to welcoming the influx of Holocaust survivors and to breaking down the barriers in Canadian society. One Yiddish pundit labelled the postwar Jewry the "sha-shtill generation," literally, the silent generation, afraid to rock the boat for fear of sinking with it. (Abella, 1990, p. 226)

Erwin Schild, who became the Rabbi of the Toronto Adath Israel Congregation in September 1947, is most certainly one of the ex-Camp Boys who most deeply reflected on the issue of confiscated memory. In his autobiography published in 2001, he clearly distances himself from claiming the status of a "Holocaust survivor" (though having left Nazi Germany after the *Reichskristallnacht* and having spent five weeks in the Dachau concentration camp): "What I have written was never intended as a Holocaust memoir; I do not claim the title of Holocaust survivor" (Schild, 2001, p. 300). It is interesting to follow the evolution of Schild's discourse in the span of the 25 years in which he produced several self-narratives. In a review—published in 1981—of Eric Koch's book, Schild frames the internment in terms of impotence and de-virilisation. He speaks of a "dwarfed" and "minor" memory: "Our internment was a minor event, dwarfed by the Holocaust" (Schild, 1981, p. 40). The review's title is also extremely evocative: The Camp Boys' experience is labelled a mere "Canadian Footnote to the Holocaust," and thus becomes an *infra-paginal* co-text in the history of World War II. Twenty years later, in his autobiography, Schild follows up on the idea. This time, however, he posits that there is a link between the "footnote" and the greater historical master narrative:

> It was but a footnote because it was dwarfed by the Holocaust, and yet related to it as a footnote to a text. It could only have happened at that time, and only in

a world that allowed the Holocaust to happen. It could have happened only be-
cause anti-Semitism was widespread. (Schild, 2001, p. 235)

Half a century after the end of internment, the Camp Boys' traumatic months as
detainees are thus reclaimed and given a new status. When I interviewed Erwin
Schild in 2004, he came back to the notion of a "footnote," calling it a "significant
footnote:"

> [Our story] is not part of the Holocaust and yet it couldn't have happened with-
> out the war and without the Holocaust, so I figured that it's a significant footnote,
> an interesting footnote, but no more than that, except for the people who went
> through it. It shaped their lives, so it's no longer a footnote.[12]

On an individual basis, the Boys were able, so it seems, to find a non-hegemonic
place in History by endorsing the paradoxical identity of male victims *and* sur-
vivors.[13]

Other private forms of memory reclaiming also existed among the Camp Boys, in
which "veteran" and traditional "male-bonding" undertones can be detected. In
spite of their scepticism toward "Old Boys' Clubs,"[14] they did maintain private con-
tacts and organised discrete commemorating practices, gathering and reunions, es-
pecially since the 1990s, that is, after they had retired. Helmut Kallmann published
several issues of an Ex-Internees' Newsletter. In addition, several autobiographies
were published in Canada, the United Kingdom, and Germany. The prevalent tone
is that of the "good old days" in which the—now old—men were young, thus re-
versing the boy-to-man polarisation process. Excluded from the memories of the
front line or heroic moment of survival, the only wartime *lieu de mémoire* where
masculine vigour could indisputably be reaffirmed were veteran stories and com-
memoration practices.

In this context, Freddy Grant's (Friedrich Grundland's) song "You'll Get Used to
It" (whose claim to fame was that it was part of the soundtrack of a Hollywood
war movie) became a central reference for the Boys. Its content reflects traditional
representations of masculinity (and race):

> You'll get used to it, you'll get used to it
> The first year is the worst year, but you'll get used to it
> You can scream and you can shout, they'll never let you out
> You will never see your wife, for they locked you in for life
> It serves you right, you So and So, why weren't you naturalized Eskimo
> Just tell yourself, it's marvellous, you'll get to like it more and more
> You've got to get used to it, and when you got used to it
> You feel just as lousy as you felt before.

The lyrics are a poignant rendition of the Camp Boys' absurd years behind barbed
wire, when they were deprived of their manly powerless and felt impotent in a war
context. This song and various other commemoration practices were a way for the
Boys to reclaim a group memory and to perform an acceptable masculine identity
after years of invisibility and silence.

NOTES

[1] The designation "German-speaking" refers solely to the language used by the "Camp Boys." Many of them were German or Austrian; others were Polish or Czechoslovak.

[2] Angelika Sauer concurs on this point in her review of Martin Auger's book, *Prisoners on the Home Front*, published in 2005 (Sauer, 2007). A few studies do focus on the gendered dynamics of confined men, notwithstanding (e.g., Archer, 2004; Browning, 2007; Rachamimov, 2006; Reiss, 2005; Vance, 1995).

[3] In the 1970s, Eric Koch, a former Camp Boy himself, was able to trace 972 of his former co-internees. Most had settled in Canada (Koch, 1980).

[4] The official reasons given to the Canadian government read as follows: "The wishes of the British government are these: In the matter of preference they are anxious that we should take first of all interned aliens (…). The reasons they give in this connection are that the interned aliens in Great Britain may be in a position to help to direct parachutists in the event of a bombardment of the British Isles, which they are expecting hourly. They also feel that the German prisoners they have there require a great deal by way of protection, and that the men protecting them should be available for the protection of the British Isles themselves. (…) We have agreed to receive here interned aliens from the United Kingdom, and for some time past we have been making arrangements to see that they will be properly concentrated and controlled, when they are brought to Canada." (Canadian House of Commons Debates, 19th June 1940).

[5] Interview Edgar Lion, Montreal, 4th August 2003.

[6] Interview with Ernest Poser, Vancouver, 1st July 2004.

[7] Interview with Gregory Baum, Montreal, 25th March 2003.

[8] In Carl Weiselberger's short story, *Der Rabbi mit der Axt* (The Rabbi with an Axe), a Rabbi regains some sense of manliness by cutting wood on Sabbath, disregarding the commandment not to do any bodily work on that day (Weiselberger, 1973).

[9] University of Manitoba Archives (Winnipeg), MSS 59 "Henry Kreisel," Box 1, Folder 1.

[10] The number of people who were sent to concentration camps rose brutally after the *Reichskristallnacht* pogrom in November 1938.

[11] This was the case of Julius Pfeiffer, whose wife and son survived Bergen-Belsen. The Pfeiffer family was reunited in Canada long after the end of the war (Farges, 2008, pp. 270-275).

[12] Interview with Erwin Schild, Toronto, 10th May 2004.

[13] In the case of the Jewish ex-internees, this identity is closely linked to that of dominated men in a racialised anti-Semitic world that let the Holocaust happen. On dominated masculinity and the writing of history, see Jenkins and Hine (eds., 1999-2001).

[14] Eric Koch writes: "We have no group feeling—we do not belong to Old Boys' Clubs, nor do we have associations, or annual camp reunions where we all get together to drink beer (…), telling each other stories about the sergeant-major. A few friendships have endured, but once we were released most of us did not feel the need to keep in touch. Although we may now say that the years behind barbed wire were invaluable to our development or that internment was a key event in our lives, and although we may even enjoy exchanging reminiscences once in a while, we tried in the years that followed our release to forget camp as quickly as possible" (Koch, 1980, p. 256).

References

Abella, Irving. 1990. *A Coat of Many Colours. Two Centuries of Jewish Life in Canada*. Toronto: Lester & Orpen Dennys.

Abella, Irving and Harold Troper. [1983] 2000. *None Is Too Many. Canada and the Jews of Europe, 1933-1948*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.

Archer, Bernice. 2004. *The Internment of Western Civilians under the Japanese 1941-1945. A Patchwork of Internment*. London and New York: Routledge.

Auger, Martin. 2005. *Prisoners on the Home Front: German POWs and "Enemy Aliens" in Southern Quebec, 1940-1946*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Bader, Alfred. 1995. *Adventures of a Chemist Collector*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Browning, Julie. 2007. "'The Only Thing They Have to Bargain With Is Their Own Self:' Masculinity and Protesting Immigration Detention." *Transforming Cultures eJournal* 2.1. Accessed March 1, 2011. http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/TfC/article/download/597/544.

Cesarani, David, and Tony Kushner. 1993. *The Internment of Aliens in Twentieth Century Britain*. London: Frank Cass.

Connell, R.W. 2005. *Masculinities*, 2nd ed. Crows Nest: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R.W. and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity. Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society* 19.6: 829-59.

Draper, Paula Jean. 1978. "The Accidental Immigrants: Canada and the Interned Refugees," parts I and II. *Canadian Jewish Historical Society Journal* 2-3: 1-38; 80-112.

Draper, Paula Jean. 1983. "The Accidental Immigrants: Canada and the Interned Refugees." PhD diss., University of Toronto.

Dümling, Albrecht, ed. 2000. *Zu den Antipoden Vertrieben. Das Australien-Exil Deutschsprachiger Musiker*. Saarbrücken: Pfau.

Farges, Patrick. 2007. "'In this compression chamber between Europe and North America' (E. Koch). Construction de la temporalité dans les récits des 'réfugiés-internés' au Canada." Proceedings of the International Conference "Temporalités de l'exil, University of Montreal. http://www.poexil.umontreal.ca/events/colloquetemp/actes/farges.pdf

Farges, Patrick. 2008. *Le Trait d'Union ou l'Intégration sans l'Oubli. Itinéraires d'Exilés Germanophones au Canada après 1933*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. A. Sheridan. Middlesex: New York Peregrine.

Foucault, Michel. 2003. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-1976*. Eds. M. Bertani and A. Fontana. Trans. D. Macey. London: Penguin.

Gabaccia, Donna R. and Franca Iacovetta, eds. 2002. *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives: Italian Workers of the World*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Godelier, Maurice. 1986. *The Making of Great Men: Male Domination and Power Among the New Guinea Baruya* [1982]. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press; Paris: Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Iacovetta, Franca, Roberto Perin and Angelo Principe, eds. 2000. *Enemies Within: Italian and Other Internees in Canada and Abroad*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Jenkins, Earnestine and Darlene Clark Hine, eds. 1999, 2001. *A Question of Manhood: A Reader in U.S. Black Men's History and Masculinity*. Vols. 1 and 2. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kimmel, Michael. 2008. *Guyland: The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men. Under-*

standing the Critical Years Between 16 and 26. New York: Harper Collins.

Koch, Eric. 1980. *Deemed Suspect. A Wartime Blunder*. Toronto: Methuen.

Moon, Barbara. 1962. "The Welcome Enemies. The Story of the Happy Accident by Which 972 Interned Aliens Became Some of the Liveliest Immigrants Canada Ever Had." *Maclean's*, 10th February, 14-15; 36-39.

Pfeiffer, Julius. 1989. "Enemy Alien." In *New Immigrant Voices*, edited by Milly Charon. Dunvegan: Cormorant Books, 206-226.

Puckhaber, Annette. 2002. *Ein Privileg für wenige. Die deutschsprachige Migration nach Kanada im Schatten des Nationalsozialismus*. Münster: Lit Verlag.

Rachamimov, Alon. 2006. "The Disruptive Comforts of Drag: (Trans)Gender Performances among Prisoners of War in Russia, 1914-1920." *The American Historical Review* 111.2, 362-82.

Rasky, Harry. 1981. *The Spies That Never Were*, Documentary in two parts. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), Montreal, 11th-12th October.

Reiss, Matthias. 2005. "Bronzed Bodies behind Barbed Wire: Masculinity and Treatment of German Prisoners of War in the United States during World War II." *Journal of Military History* 69, 475-504.

Richardson, Laurel. 1994. "Writing: A Method of Inquiry." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. London: Sage, 516-529.

Sauer, Angelika E. 2007. Review of Auger, Martin, *Prisoners on the Home Front: German POWs and "Enemy Aliens" in Southern Quebec, 1940-1946*. H-Canada, H-Net Reviews. Accessed March 1, 2011. http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=12796.

Schild, Erwin. 1981. "A Canadian Footnote to the Holocaust. A Review Essay of *Deemed Suspect. A Wartime Blunder*, by Erich [sic] Koch." *Canadian Jewish Historical Society Journal* 5.1, 31-44.

Schild, Erwin. 2001. *The Very Narrow Bridge. A Memoir of an Uncertain Passage*. Toronto: Malcolm Lester.

Seyfert, Michael. 1984. *Im Niemandsland: Deutsche Exilliteratur in britischer Internierung. Ein unbekanntes Kapitel der Kulturgeschichte des Zweiten Weltkrieges*. Berlin: Das Arsenal.

Toch, Hans. 1998. "Hypermasculinity and Prison Violence." In *Masculinities and Violence*, edited by Lee Bowker. London: Sage, 168-78.

Torczyner, James. 2001. "A Community Snapshot: The Socio-Economic Dimensions." In *From Immigration to Integration. The Canadian Jewish Experience: A Millenium Edition*, edited by Ruth Klein and Frank Dimant. Toronto: Malcolm Lester, 242-66.

Vance, Jonathan F. 1995. "Men in Manacles: The Shackling of Prisoners of War, 1942-1943." *Journal of Military History* 59.3, 483-504.

Weiselberger, Carl. 1973. *Der Rabbi mit der Axt. Dreißig Geschichten*. Edited by Hertha Hartmanshenn and Frederick Kriegel, Victoria: Morris Printing.

Welzer-Lang, Daniel. 2000. *Nouvelles Approches des Hommes et du Masculin*. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

West, Candace and Don Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1.2, 125-51.

Frédérique Fouassier*

"Thou Art My Warrior / I Holp To Frame Thee": The Construction of Masculine Identity in Shakespeare's *Antony* and *Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*

In Shakespeare's Roman plays, *Antony and Cleopatra* (1608) and *Coriolanus* (1609), the hero is constructed as a kind of superhuman, supervirile warrior, sometimes verging on caricature. Yet, in both plays, Rome is criticized, and the constructed manliness of the Roman hero is exposed in all its fragility. The warrior's identity undergoes dissolution and symbolical emasculation. Antony and Coriolanus share the stage with two very powerful female figures, Cleopatra and Volumnia, and their contact proves fatal to them: Cleopatra holds a type of power traditionally seen as male, and Coriolanus is but the extension of his mother Volumnia, who is even more masculine than him.

Keywords: masculine identity, Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus,* warrior

Shakespeare's Roman plays show Rome as an intensely patriarchal world governed by the notion of *virtus*, a strict, military code of personal honour and duty to the state. It is a world of military prowess and pompous rhetoric in which politics is a matter of performance. The *Encyclopaedia Universalis* defines *virtus* in its first sense as what characterizes the *vir*, i.e. man, that is to say the physical bravery and strength a soldier must show on the battlefield. The first meaning of the word never disappeared from Latin and kept on applying to the figure of the great warrior. But the term gradually became more complex and acquired a broader sense under the influence of Greek philosophy: it referred to the moral courage man needs to reach wisdom. The word finally evolved to mean what we call "virtue" today, i.e. moral rectitude and the conformity with moral laws. In his last two Roman plays *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606-1607) and *Coriolanus* (1607-1608), Shakespeare explores Roman values and the notion of masculinity by, among other things, exposing the figure of the Roman warrior-hero as an artefact.

* Centre d'Etudes Supérieures de la Renaissance, Université de Tours.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Frédérique Fouassier, Centre d'Etudes Supérieures de la Renaissance, Université de Tours, 59 rue Néricault-Destouches, BP 11328, 37013 Tours Cedex 1, France. Email: frederique.fouassier@univ-tours.fr

Of course, the Roman vision of masculinity as conveyed in Shakespeare's sources such as Plutarch greatly differs from the approach the Bard's contemporaries had of this matter, all the more so when taking into account the heated context of the resurgence of old, chivalric martial values in early modern England, a vision which in turn differs from our own. Because no one can step beyond time and since we can only see the past through the eyes of the present, I will adopt a dominantly presentist approach and focus on the way we perceive the problem of the construction of masculinity in *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra* with a hindsight of four hundred years of historical events and critical theory, for, as Bruce R. Smith argues, presentism makes it possible to address not just one past moment but multiple pasts, all at the same time. This type of approach makes all the more sense when gender issues are concerned: presentism can take the long view and entertain models of gender and sexuality that existed before Shakespeare's time as well as after, and not be especially worried about the currency of those models in Shakespeare's time.[1] As Evelyn Gajowski argues, adopting a presentist approach means that responding to a Shakespeare text means entering a dialogue not only with Shakespeare and his contemporaries but also with a whole tradition of theatrical critical responses to Shakespeare's text that has accumulated over the course of four centuries, these responses themselves constituting not merely passive responses but also active constructions of meaning in their own right.[2]

This type of presentist approach is also all the more relevant when dealing with drama, for gender is, both in society and on stage, profoundly a matter of performance. Indeed, if "sex" refers to biological differences between man and woman, "gender" denotes the attitudes and behaviour thought (stereo)typically masculine or feminine. And when it comes to representing on stage what was thought typically feminine or masculine, the *performant* aspect of gender is all the more blatant, especially on Renaissance England's all-male stage, where all parts were played by men. As Terence Hawkes explains in *Shakespeare in the Present*, presentism considers precisely what the play does, here and now in the theatre, in addition to what it says in the world to which its written text refers.[3] Hawkes insists on the fact that meaning is made and not found,[4] and stresses the importance of what he calls the "performant function" (as opposed to the "referential function") of theatrical events: our tendency to reduce a play to what it refers to, to what it has to say about the world outside itself, beyond the walls of the playhouse, leaves aside a number of features that, reinforced by the largely oral nature of early modern society, "typically surface in a play's permanent self-referring sense of performance."[5]

Both Coriolanus and Antony embody *virtus* in its most restricted meaning of soldierly courage and physical strength, but both undergo a dissolution of their virility and of their identity as these are revealed as constructions and matters of performance. Coriolanus represents *virtus* at its most extreme: Shakespeare caricatures him as a new Hercules, a war machine, a man of pure action who distrusts words. But he is above all his mother's thing and he ultimately represents *virtus* as an artificial conception of manhood which is doomed to failure and which can only lead to the destruction of the hero. Antony too is defined as an all-powerful soldier drinking blood on the battlefield. This again constitutes a hypervisible, staged conception of masculinity which is exposed in its dimension of pure construct. But this Antony is entirely constructed through speech and the audience –be it the other characters, Shakespeare's contemporaries or twenty-first-century spectators– never sees this version of him. Instead, we are shown a man forsaking his masculinity

under the influence of Egypt and its voluptuous queen. Yet, the dissolution of Antony's Roman virility does not lead to total destruction, as in Coriolanus's case.

Coriolanus and *Antony and Cleopatra* seem at first sight to propose an equation according to which Romanness equals *virtus* which in turn equals virility. To be Roman thus means to be a man, and a courageous man. If one refers to Plutarch (Shakespeare's main source for his Roman plays), *virtus* comes down to valour, which is itself an all-inclusive virtue. In the opening sentences of his *Life of Martius Coriolanus*, Plutarch writes that "in those days, valiantness was honoured in Rome above all other virtues: which they called *virtus*, by the name of virtue itself, as including in that general name all other special virtues besides".[6] This is repeated almost word for word in *Coriolanus* by Cominius, who states that "valour is the chiefest virtue" (II.2.82). According to this definition, the courageous soldier is the epitome of the noblest sort of man. As Robin Headlam Wells specifies in *Shakespeare's Politics*, war and formal combat are some of the most rigidly gendered of all human activities.[7] If one follows this perspective, Coriolanus appears as the very essence of masculinity, and this definition of masculinity supposes the complete negation of qualities identified as female and labelled as weak, such as compassion, tenderness or nurturing.

Coriolanus is *virtus* incarnate, the "flower of warriors" (I.8.33). He appears from the start as a man of action, at home on the battlefield. He has acquired his virility at war at a very young age, and his very identity too: he derives his name from the city of Corioles, from whose gates he emerged covered in blood, in an image evoking a second birth. The other characters recurrently praise his valour and military feats, and the stage directions repeatedly mention him appearing in full military gear. The loudness of his voice is insisted on, just as his "grim looks" (I.5.31), and the spectators often see him fight on stage. His mother Volumnia portrays him as a war machine: "Before him / He carries noise, and behind him he leaves tears. / Death, that dark spirit, in's nervy arm doth lie" (II.1.154-156). In this hyperbolical description, Coriolanus appears as more than human: he is a machine, a titan. He seems to be a new version of Hercules. As Wells argues in "An Orpheus for a Hercules: Virtue Redefined in *The Tempest*," though there are only two allusions to Hercules in *Coriolanus*, the latter is the supreme Herculean hero, for not only was Hercules the archetypal warrior, but he was famed for his terrible vengeance too. And Coriolanus, Shakespeare's most egregious example of warrior-hero, is truly Herculean not only in his manly courage but also in his vindictive rage.[8] The most accessible version of the story of Hercules to Jacobean readers was that of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, in which he does not appear as a very complicated character. He is mainly defined by his belief that courage lies in deeds and not in words, and that tactics, subterfuges and the like should be replaced by prowess. He is truly heroic in his capacity to endure suffering, but this resistance is by its very excess almost beyond human comprehension.[9] All these characteristics also define Coriolanus. The speeches in which Seneca's Hercules in *Hercules Furens* says he wants to tame nature and destroy everything are strongly reminiscent of Coriolanus' speeches of revenge against Rome. To reinforce this dimension of virile warrior, Roman male characters recurrently refer to Mars, the God of war, the deity presiding over them, and with whom they are even sometimes identified by the other characters.

The battle sequences are all the more impressive because of Coriolanus' bloody appearance. Coriolanus is not just lightly smeared, he is literally soaked in his enemies' (and his own) blood.[10] When Cominius lists Coriolanus's feats, he insists:

"From face to foot / He was a thing of blood, whose every motion / Was timed with dying cries" (II.2.106-108). His dedication to Rome prompts his bravery: "Killing our enemies, the blood he hath lost— / Which I dare vouch is more than he hath / By many an ounce—he dropped it for his country," Menenius declares when trying to defend Coriolanus in front of the plebs (III.1.301-304). Hyperbole so dominates these descriptions that they verge on bathos.[11] Coriolanus himself calls the blood covering his face a "mask" (I.9.10) and contrasts it to "blushing," which he despises as a juvenile weakness (I.10.68-70). *Virtus* is inscribed on the hero's body through his numerous wounds, which are the proof of his dedication to the city, of his courage and of his virility—in a word, of *virtus*. We have a very precise topography of Coriolanus's wounds thanks to Volumnia, who gloats over them in Act II. Hearing that her son was injured on the battlefield, she exclaims: "O, he is wounded, I thank the Gods for it" (II.1.118). To her, "[blood] more becomes a man / Than gilt his trophy" (I.3.40-41). She makes the list of Coriolanus's wounds and she is happy that they will leave big scars. Yet, the image of the wound is ambiguous and double-edged: at the same time as it proves the hero's worth, it reveals his vulnerability. As Coppélia Kahn remarks in *Roman Shakespeare*, the Latin word for "wound" is *vulnus*, the root of "vulnerability," and she argues that wounds mark a kind of vulnerability easily associated with women, as they show the flesh to be penetrable, prove it can bleed and make apertures in the body. But she insists that through the discursive operations of *virtus*, wounds become central to the signification of masculine virtue, and thus to the construction of the Roman hero.[12] The ambiguity of the image of the wound is one of the reasons why Coriolanus cannot stand the idea of showing his wounds to the citizens, as any man who wants to be elected a consul has to do: it means showing the signs of his vulnerability and acknowledging his dependence on these people he despises for their cowardice and obsession with money.[13]

Coriolanus loses his humanity in these descriptions. He is repeatedly alluded to as "a thing," and even as "a thing / Made by some other deity than Nature" (IV.6.91-92). More than a person, he is the personification of the type of brave soldier praised in Rome. In the same perspective, he is repeatedly identified with his sword, the soldier's ultimate phallic prop.[14] Dehumanization reaches a climax at the end of the play, when Coriolanus wants to exact revenge against ungrateful Rome. "This Martius is grown from man to dragon. He has wings, he's more than a creeping thing," Menenius comments (V.4.12-14). And he goes on:

> When he walks, he moves like an engine, and the ground shrinks before his treading. He is able to pierce a corslet with his eye, talks like a knell, and his hum is a battery. He sits in his state as a thing made for Alexander. What he bids be done is finished with his bidding. He wants nothing of a god but eternity and a heaven to throne in. (V.4.18-24)

Here is what happens when *virtus* is not subordinated to politics: it runs the risk of turning into unbridled violence, destructive both for the city and the hero. Coriolanus's hyper-masculinity is so visible, so blatant that it becomes self-destructive. In this perspective, excess of masculinity means the end of masculinity. This seems to come down to a paradox, according to which excess of masculinity leads to the loss of control both for the man embodying this principle and for those around him. Yet, control is precisely one of the chiefest masculine virtues, so that when it

becomes excessive, masculinity negates itself, and therefore cannot exist anymore.

As Wells explains in *Shakespeare's Politics*, the question of heroic masculinity and the military values it signified was of paramount importance in the context of Elizabethan and Jacobean politics, as it was an issue causing deep divisions in Parliament, the Privy Council and even the royal family.[15] *Coriolanus* portrays a disunited military society at a time when English foreign policy was the subject of a heated argument between militarists and moderates at Court.[16] One of the main questions at the centre of the debate was whether those masculine characteristics traditionally associated with the military profession (such as chivalry, physical assertiveness or prowess in battle) were valuable qualities in a political leader or whether they were a threat to social stability.[17] Wells explains that chivalry is a self-consciously masculine culture, celebrating values like courage, manliness and strength. It was this medieval code of values that Robert Devereux, second Earl of Essex hoped to revive. Essex was the central figure of the aristocratic faction wanting to restore military values to an age they saw as degenerate and meek. Essex opposed the unheroic present to the time of Henry V, the symbol of England's heroic past. Essex was executed as the leader of the last attempt to depose Elizabeth I.[18] With his disgrace, the war party and the heroic ideal it espoused lost much of their credibility. When James I succeeded to Elizabeth I in 1603, the old ideal of heroic masculinity seemed to have withered. James was moved by strong anti-militarist beliefs; he was a tireless worker for peace, and he dreamt of a Europe united by the arts of civilization and not of military conquest. Yet, his son Prince Henry had a very different political vision: he had been hailed by militant Protestants as a future warrior-hero and was regularly portrayed as the embodiment of heroic masculinity. The descriptions of Prince Henry aged fifteen made by George Marcelline in his *Triumphs of King James the First* (1609) are remarkably similar to those of young Coriolanus in the eponymous play. Of course, as Wells insists, such blatant militarism was at odds with James I's pacifist ideals. The latter commissioned the parliamentarian Sir Robert Cotton to write a document warning of the dangers of the new culture of military assertiveness associated with Prince Henry. So that the heroic ideal was once more the subject of political interest. In this respect, *Coriolanus* appears as one of Shakespeare's most political plays, since its concern is the controversial issue of martial values.[19] According to Wells, *Coriolanus* shows that, far from uniting people against a common enemy, the heroic ideal proves instead to be inherently divisive, setting citizen against citizen,[20] and that the neo-medieval culture of violence had no place in the new world of civic humanism.[21] Wells thus states that Shakespeare suggests that there is something inherently dangerous in this heroic ideal. *Coriolanus* shows that when the heroic ideal takes the form of the idealisation of martial glory, its capacity for destruction is limitless.[22] This questioning is also due to the change in the Roman context itself. As John W. Velz remarks in "Cracking Strong Curbs Asunder," *Coriolanus* is set between the first and second ages of Rome, that is between the heroic age of personal achievement and the age of the city-state, in which the ideal of the all-powerful virile soldier can no longer hold.[23] This change of context is in great part responsible for Coriolanus's tragic end.

When it turns out that *virtus* is not Coriolanus' essence but a construct which must be bent to the necessities of political life, the warrior-hero experiences this discovery as emasculation. To his mother who urges him to accept to show his wounds to the plebs, he answers: "Would you have me / False to my nature? Rather

say I play / The man I am" (III.2.14-16), to which Volumnia answers: "You might have been enough the man you are / With striving less to be so" (19-20). Masculinity is not Coriolanus' essence: it is a costume he wears, a part he plays. The acting metaphor is present in the play whenever Coriolanus is confronted to the realities of political life, and it is associated to images of prostitution and emasculation:

> Away, my disposition; and possess me
> Some harlot's spirit! My throat of war be turned,
> Which choired with my drum, into a pipe
> Small as an eunuch or the virgin voice
> That babies lull asleep! The smile of knaves
> Tent in my cheeks, and schoolboys' tears take up
> The glasses of my sight! A beggar's tongue
> Make motion through my lips, and my armed knees,
> Who bowed but in my stirrup, bend like his
> That hath received an alms!—I will not do't,
> Lest I surcease to honour mine own truth,
> And by my body's action teach my mind
> A most inherent baseness. (III.2.113-125)

Once the all-powerful soldier has left the battlefield and must adapt to the contingencies of political life, *virtus* appears as an artefact and Coriolanus' identity and virility crumble. The identification of valour, virility and action on the one hand, and of femininity, words and dissembling on the other hand, is recurrently stated by Coriolanus throughout the play.

Another element which contributes to the idea of emasculation is the ambiguity of the male bonds one finds in the plays. As Smith insists in *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England*, anthropologists have observed two conflicting traits among human males in cultures all over the world: the tendency to be aggressive with one another while at the same time forming strong bonds. When reading Plutarch's accounts of Greek soldiers' friendship, one sees that the courage that made them rivals on the battlefield is the very thing that makes them friends.[24] Smith insists on the fact that the Rome described in *Coriolanus* is a fiercely masculine world and that war and politics, i.e. two manifestations of male aggression, are the whole subject of the play.[25] From the very first act, the rhetoric of sexual consummation is used by Martius to describe combat:

> O let me clip ye
> In arms as sound as when I wooed, in heart
> As merry as when our nuptial day was done,
> And tapers burnt to bedward! (I.7.29-33)

This announces the encounter between Coriolanus and Aufidius in act IV:

> Thou hast beat me out
> Twelve several times, and I have nightly since
> Dreamt of encounters 'twixt thyself and me –
> We have been down together in my sleep,
> Unbuckling helms, fisting each other's throat –
> And walked half dead with nothing

Aufidius declares on meeting Coriolanus (122-127). The use of sexual metaphors is not found in Plutarch: it is an addition by Shakespeare, who connects male aggression and male sexual desire. Smith tries to make sense of these metaphors and argues that they can be explained in different ways: to the traditional academic line, Aufidius' rhetoric is a sheer metaphor, chosen by the playwright for its powerfulness. If one then takes a Freudian approach, one either has a heterosexual man consciously deploying a figure of speech or a homosexual man unconsciously revealing his repressed desire, which leaves no room for ambiguity. But to Smith, instead of demarcating two separate categories of desire, distinguished according to gender, we have only one: in the same way as for Plato, male friendship and sexual attraction are not opposites but two aspects of the same bond, for the space of the metaphor, Shakespeare invites us to see a continuum of erotic desire embracing both male and female objects, both arch rival and new bride. The rhetorical focus is on the speaker, on Aufidius as desiring subject, and not on the body he desires. If gender figures here at all, Smith goes on, it booms out in the male swagger Aufidius assumes when speaking about sexual desire. So that according to Smith, Aufidius' metaphor says that male bonding and erotic desire are *like* each other[26], which makes Aufidius' servants declare: "Our general himself makes a mistress of him," (IV.5.199-200). Smith adds that whatever power Aufidius' metaphor had for Shakespeare's audience was generated by the way it fuses two highly charged feelings into one.[27] He also reminds us that early modern English society was rigidly segregated by gender and radically patriarchal in its disposition of power despite its being ruled by women for half a century.[28] And in the all-male power structure of the sixteenth century, society fostered male bonds above all other emotional ties. So that Plutarch's *Lives* offered Renaissance male readers a model for male bonding closely matching the ways in which men related to men in their own society. Plutarch thus supplied Shakespeare not only with the biographic facts he needed for his Roman plays, but with a dramatic universe in which male protagonists find their identity in their relationships with each other.[29] Smith calls this particular way of putting sex into discourse the "myth of Combatants and Comrades," the most public and pervasive myth of homosexual desire in Renaissance England according to him. This myth expresses in specifically sexual terms the ambivalences of feelings involved in male bonding generally.[30] To Smith, the two conflicting imperatives governing the actions of paired heroes like Coriolanus and Aufidius are "fight this man" on the one hand and "love this man" on the other hand, and this conflict of impulses helps explain why the violent and the erotic so often coincide in his plays about soldiering.[31] So that behaviour that *we* would label homosexual, and hence which to us would amount to the rejection of manliness, was for them a very aspect of manliness. In this perspective, such oxymoronic images suggest that homoerotic desire served to fuel the patriarchal enterprise and strengthen the male bonds that kept patriarchy in place.[32]

Smith notices that Coriolanus always remains silent to Aufidius' declarations. To the critic, it seems that in Shakespeare's plays, a man can say without shame that he desires another man's body, but he cannot say that he wants to be desired.[33] Smith also recalls that the word "boy" was used for the object of homo-erotic desire. This fact reminds us of Aufidius and Coriolanus' final combat, when Aufidius calls Coriolanus "boy of tears" (V.6.101): with this expression, Aufidius symbolically emasculates Coriolanus, turning subject into object, man into woman.[34]

The fragility of the warrior-hero's virility is reinforced by the fact that it is Vo-

lumnia who made Coriolanus a super warrior, as she herself is very much aware: "My praises made thee first a soldier" she says (III.2.110), and she adds: "Thou art my warrior, / I holp to frame thee" (V.3.62-63). "Made," "frame:" these verbs evoke a voluntary construction and show *virtus* as something entirely cultural, and by no means natural. Volumnia herself sent her son to war at a very early age and she would have preferred him dead than a coward on the battlefield (I.3.23-25). If someone in the play is naturally endowed with the qualities constituting *virtus* in the broader sense of the term, i.e. not only bravery but also political wisdom, it is Volumnia, not Coriolanus, which may lead one to assert that she uses her son as a substitute to accomplish the political ambitions her female condition prevents her from fulfilling. She asserts that Coriolanus derives his warrior qualities from her: "Thy valiantness was mine, thou suck'st from me" (III.2.131). The image of the baby sucking his manly aggressiveness from his mother is expressed in a few powerful lines which have repeatedly struck critics: "The breasts of Hecuba / When she did suckle Hector, look'd not lovelier / Than Hector's forehead when it spit forth blood / At Grecian sword contemning" (I.3.41-44). These lines lend themselves to psychoanalytical interpretations such as Janet Adelman's in her article "'Anger's My Meat': Feeding, Dependency and Aggression in *Coriolanus*:"

> In this imagistic transformation, to feed is to be wounded; the mouth becomes the wound, the breast the sword. The metaphoric process suggests the psychological fact that is, I think, at the centre of the play: the taking in of food is the primary acknowledgement of one's dependence on the world, and as such, it is the primary token of one's vulnerability. But at the same time as Volumnia's image suggests the vulnerability inherent in feeding, it also suggests a way to fend off that vulnerability. In her image, feeding, incorporating, is transformed into spitting out, an aggressive expelling. […] The wound spitting blood thus becomes not a sign of vulnerability but an instrument of attack.[35]

Adelman insists that this image is central to the play because it constructs feeding and nurture as marks of dependence, which explains Coriolanus's scorn for the plebs (he needs their voices to be elected a consul) and his obsession with self-sufficiency. What he longs for is standing "As if a man were author of himself / And knew no other kin" (V.3.35-37). But autonomy is an illusion and cannot be sustained. When the woman who has modelled him as the incarnation of *virtus* asks him to acknowledge his dependency and do what the citizens expect from him, he is symbolically emasculated and his sense of identity falls into pieces. Although he has decided to take his revenge on Rome and be self-sufficient, when he finds himself in front of his wife's eyes, Coriolanus acknowledges that he is not "Of stronger earth than others" and he "melt[s]" (V.3.28-29) before being killed by conspirators, after asking his enemies to tear him into pieces.

In *Coriolanus*, one sees that *virtus* understood in an absolute, primitive way, as a construct disconnected from the realities of political life, cannot hold and can only lead to the destruction of the man rigidly incarnating these qualities. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, *virtus* is also doomed to failure, but the process is radically different.

In *Antony and Cleopatra*, we have two contradictory portraits of Antony: the Roman Antony is opposed in Manichean fashion to the Egyptian Antony, but both appear as purely linguistic constructions of the Roman camp. The tone is set from the exposition scene, in which Antony's soldiers deplore that the once-courageous warrior now indulges in Egyptian languidness:

> Those his godly eyes,
> That o'er the files and musters of the war
> Have glowed like plated Mars, now bend, now turn
> The office and devotion of their view
> Upon a tawny front. His captain's heart,
> Which in the scuffles of great fights hath burst
> The buckles on his breast, reneges all temper
> And is become the bellows and the fan
> To cool a gipsy's lust. (I.1.2-9)

As in Coriolanus's case, we have an allusion to Mars. References to the God of war recur in the play and are usually combined to assimilations of Cleopatra to Venus. Like Coriolanus, Antony had a superhuman stature: his eyes were "godly," he "glowed," and his heart was so full of courage that it made his armour "burst."[36]

> To Caesar, Antony used to be *virtus* incarnate:
> When thou once
> Was beaten from Modena, where thou slew'st
> Hirtius and Pansa, consuls, at thy heels
> Did famine follow, whom thou fought'st against,
> Though daintily brought up, with patience more
> Than savages could suffer. Thou didst drink
> The stale of horses and the gilded puddle
> Which beasts would cough at. Thy palate then did deign
> The roughest berry on the rudest hedge.
> Yea, like the stag when snow the pasture sheets,
> The barks of trees thou browsèd. On the Alps
> It is reported thou didst eat strange flesh,
> Which some did die to look on. And all this—
> It wounds thine honour that I speak it now—
> Was borne so like a soldier that thy cheek
> So much as lanked not. (I.4.57-72)

Caesar's description of the former Antony stoically surpassing the wildest creatures in what he can endure, drinking urine and feeding on the bark of trees is very close to those we hear of Coriolanus. The vision of Antony as the embodiment of *virtus* is not restricted to the Roman camp: Cleopatra also hyperbolically refers to him as the "Lord of lords" and "infinite virtue" (IV.8.16-17). But the audience does not get to see this version of Antony: the ideal soldier is entirely created with words and refers to his past deeds, not to his present self. What we see is rather a man indulging in the pleasures of the flesh in Egypt ("I' th' East my pleasure lies," as he himself declares (II.3.40)) and losing battles because of erroneous strategic choices.

According to the Roman camp, Antony loses his virility at the contact of Egypt, and "is not more manlike / Than Cleopatra," as Caesar declares (I.4.5-6). In Egypt, sexual roles reverse, and Antony's soldiers weep like women, to Enobarbus's despair: "Look, they weep; / And I, an ass, am onion-ey'd. For shame! / Transform us not to women" (IV.2.35-7). As for Canidius, he laments during the battle of Actium: "So our leader's led, / And we are women's men" (III.7.69-70). The inversion climaxes in the exchange of clothes Cleopatra makes while Antony is asleep: "I drunk him to his bed, / Then put my tires and mantles on him, whilst / I wore his sword Philippan" (II.5.21-3). Cleopatra does not only dress Antony as a woman: she ap-

propriates his sword, the warrior's phallic symbol. After Actium, Antony exclaims: "She has robbed me of my sword!" (IV.14.23): he himself feels emasculated in Egypt. To Kahn, the idea of emasculation is reinforced by Antony's constant thematic association with Mardian, Cleopatra's eunuch servant, throughout the play.[37] As Wells recalls, the argument of the loss of martial values which turns the nation into women is precisely that used by radical Protestants like Essex.[38] For instance, the Puritan Stephen Gosson complained about the decline of England's military culture in his pamphlet *The School of Abuse* (1579) in terms strongly recalling Enobarbus': "Our wrestling at arms, is turned to wallowing in ladies' laps, our courage to cowardice, our running to riot, our bows into bowls, and our darts to dishes."[39] To Gosson, the loss of soldierly spirit in England comes down to men being turned into women, and to the attributes of war and the warrior being left aside for those of the kitchen.

As Smith reminds us, in the Renaissance, giving oneself up to lechery as Antony does in Egypt amounts to be an "effeminate" man, a fact which has dramatic consequences. Indulging in carnal pleasures means upsetting the rational order of cosmos, not only by placing the body above the spirit: it also entails the turning upside down of gender and class distinctions, because, as Smith argues, sexual behaviour functions as a sign, a metaphor for other kinds of concern.[40] An "effeminate" man is one who desires women too much (or rather, who experiences sexual desire just in the same way as women supposedly do).[41] Just as effeminate lust is debilitating, masculine love inspires virtuous action.[42]

Antony desperately tries to cling to his former heroic self. The more power escapes him, the more fights he loses, the more he becomes obsessed with reasserting his sense of himself and of his "former fortunes" as "the greatest prince o' th' world, / The noblest" (IV.15.55-57) in front of Caesar and Cleopatra. For instance, during the battle scenes of Acts III and IV, he keeps reminding Cleopatra of his prowess, and expresses it in a way intermingling war and sexuality: "If I lose mine honour, / I lose myself" (III.4.22-23) he declares, and he goes on: "If from the field I shall return once more / To kiss these lips, I will appear in blood" (III.13.177-178). He wants to appear as the eager soldier he used to be: "There's sap in't yet! The next time I do fight, / I'll make death love me" (III.13.196-197). Like in *Coriolanus*, sexuality and war are closely linked and the soldier's bravery on the battlefield is assimilated to sexual ardour. In a very symbolical way, Cleopatra and Antony's aptly-named soldier Eros help him don his armour: being a lover and being a soldier may not be that contradictory after all. Again, love-making and war-making are alike: the two activities are fused into one.

But Antony's heroic self seems lost forever. Although he acknowledges: "Authority melts from me" (III.13.92), he goes on: "I am / Antony yet" (94-5), the broken line only mirroring the fragility of his sense of identity. The same verb "melt" is used by Coriolanus, and is used again by Cleopatra to allude to Antony's death: "The crown o' th' earth doth melt" (IV.15.65). Antony's self literally dissolves: he is "indistinct / As water is in water," and "cannot hold this visible shape" (IV.14.10-11 and 14): he cannot maintain his public identity and image of great conqueror after his defeat by Caesar and Cleopatra's supposed betrayal. Just before Antony dies, the lovers greet each other in a way representing Antony as a victorious warrior (IV.15.14-18). To Kahn, the discrepancy between the stage action and the rhetoric used exposes Antony's ringing assertions of triumph over Caesar as purely ideological constructions; although these words refer to the qualities constituting

virtus in a very powerful way, at the same time they render them ironic as signs to be manipulated for various purposes.[43]

If Antony needs to reassert his sense of himself as the incarnation of *virtus* he used to be, it is because he is very much aware that this part of himself is escaping him, and he experiences this loss as the loss of his very identity. He reproaches Caesar with "harping on what [he is], / Not what he knew [he] was" (III.13.146-147). He states his loss of identity in an obsessive way: "I / Have lost my way forever," "I have fled myself," "I have lost command," he declares in the space of a very few lines (III.11.3-4, 9 and 23). He lays the blame on Cleopatra for his defeat at the battle of Actium: "You did know / How much you were my conqueror, and that / My sword, made weak by my affection, would / Obey it on all cause" (III.11.64-67). Again, we have the assimilation between war and sexual love, as the word "conqueror" and the phallic image of the sword show, and Egypt as the cause of Antony's loss of self and of his *virtus*. This fact is stated by Antony's soldiers as well, who say that because of Cleopatra's bad influence, "Experience, manhood, honour, ne'er before / Did violate so itself" (III.10.22-23). Here is what happens when *virtus* is confronted to a strong female influence: it dissolves. Contrary to Volumnia, Cleopatra *has* political power, which makes her all the more dangerous and castrating. The comparison of war to sexual love here is not the realm of male bonding anymore. War being a highly gendered activity, Cleopatra's taking part in it and her overmastering Antony amounts to a gender reversal: Antony loses his virility in the process, while Cleopatra becomes all the less feminine by encroaching on male soldierly prerogatives. Besides, she is an Egyptian, an Other whose culture and values go against Roman ones and threaten to contaminate them. So that according to Kahn, Antony tries to reconstitute his *virtus* through his emulating bond of rivalry with Caesar (which is of the same kind as Coriolanus's bond with Aufidius), because even though it brings defeat, it does not produce the loss of gender identity his relationship with Cleopatra generates.[44]

But in the same way as Coriolanus feels emasculated and prostituted when told to submit to the citizens' desires, Antony feels emasculated and prostituted by Caesar's dominating him. He imagines himself

> with pleached arms, bending down
> His corrigible neck, his face subdued
> To penetrative shame, whilst the wheeled seat
> Of fortunate Caesar, drawn before him, branded
> His baseness that ensued (IV.14.74-77)

The image of submission is expressed in highly sexual terms, as seems to be the norm in the case of soldierly relationships, and pictures Antony as humiliatingly subdued by Caesar in an image evoking rape. As Smith reminds us, Plutarch's heroes move in a world defined totally in terms of political bonds. In this intensely masculine world, emotional ties function as political ties. Only Antony dares to be different: he defies his male peers, and for this daring, he pays the tragic price of ostracism and death.

When Antony decides to commit suicide, he abandons his warrior self: he wants to be "no more a soldier"(IV.14.42). He asks his soldier Eros to help him take his armour off. Eros's name invites allegorical reading. To Kahn, it does not only figure the uneasy coexistence of soldier and lover within Antony: it is also an allegorical

representation of *eros* that, fused with honour, would symbolically reconcile Egypt and Rome.[45] To Peter Erickson in *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama*, "in renouncing his soldier identity, Antony also rejects the definition of masculinity that it entails. In psychological terms, the armor symbolizes emotional defenses, which Antony willingly gives up. His allusion to Dido and "her Aeneas" indicates the positive self-definition initiated by disarming; Antony refuses the epic masculinity that requires the abandonment of love in favor of empire."[46] Yet, when dying, Antony insists on the nobility and on the "Romanness" of his act: "[I] do now not basely die, / [...] a Roman by a Roman / Valiantly vainquished" (IV.15.57-59). Paradoxically enough, Antony is never more a manly, Roman hero than when he decides to give up the external, visible signs of virile Romanness. From this moment on, masculinity ceases to be a role one has to perform to the eyes of the world; it becomes a subtler, heart-felt, intrinsic quality. At the moment of his death, he manages to make the two seemingly contradictory aspects of his personality coexist, and even fuse. It is a reconciliation of this kind that Cleopatra enacts when doing her portrait of Antony: she brings together the apparently irreconcilable aspects of her lover. Antony's death leaves room for the construction of a new Antony in her words, which recreate him as legend:

> His face was as the heav'ns [...]
> His legs bestrid the ocean; his reared arm
> Crested the world; his voice was propertied
> As all the tunèd spheres, and that to friends;
> But when he meant to quail and shake the orb,
> He was as rattling thunder. For his bounty,
> There was no winter in't; an autumn 'twas
> That grew the more by reaping. [...]
> In his livery
> Walked crowns and crownets; realms and islands were
> As plates dropped from his pocket. (V.2.78-91)

In Cleopatra's narration of her dream, Antony acquires colossal stature; he is a giant warrior of infinite strength and power. Although Cleopatra draws Antony from his Roman self, it is also she who recreates him in godlike dimensions. But this Antony is a pure creation of the mind, just as much as Caesar's portrait of the warlike Antony. Kahn insists on this: she remarks that Antony is always someone else's version of Antony, and never himself. She also insists that Antony never returns to the heroic Roman image of fixed and stable identity from which he has departed.[47] Besides, this colossal Antony can only exist after death. There is no space for him in the world of the living.

In *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, Shakespeare foregrounds *virtus* in order to reveal it as an artificial construct. In both plays, masculinity understood in an absolute and limiting way fails. Despite its strength and apparent invulnerability, the super warrior meets a tragic death. The question one thus asks oneself is whether another type of masculinity is possible. Robin Headlam Wells may very well provide an answer in her analysis of the Hercules motif. She remarks indeed that along with Hercules, another figure of ruler is often evoked in Renaissance texts: that of Orpheus. She explains that if the heroes of Shakespeare's martial tragedies are variations on the Herculean theme, the central mythological figure dominating Shakespeare's late tragicomedies is that of Orpheus, Hercules' symbolic antithesis.[48]

Renaissance mythographers interpreted the Orpheus story as an allegory of the civilizing power of liberal arts. Interestingly enough, Wells notices that James I was often compared to Orpheus: with this comparison, Renaissance thinkers were acknowledging the ambition of the monarch to be recognized as the peaceful protector of civilized values in a violent world.[49] Wells goes on saying that Hercules and Orpheus were traditionally compared with each other. But though both were renowned as peacemakers, one achieves his ends by violent conquest, while the other does so through the arts of peace. They thus represent antithetical views of manhood and civilization.[50] To Wells, Shakespeare's version of the new ruler, built on the Orphic model, is Prospero in *The Tempest*: although like Hercules, Prospero has in the past used his powers violently to subdue nature, he then resolves to abjure the "rough magic" of destructive vengeance. Like Coriolanus, Prospero has been exiled from his own state and wants to take revenge on those who have wronged him. But at Ariel's prompting, he resolves to suppress Herculean fury and to espouse a rarer kind of virtue: he plans to unite Milan and Naples through a dynastic marriage, and hopes his daughter will fall in love with the very antithesis of the Herculean hero.[51] So that Prospero may very well be the possibility of a new, more positive type of masculinity one does not find in Coriolanus and Antony.

Notes

[1] Bruce R. Smith, "Resexing Lady Macbeth's Gender—and Ours", in *Presentism, Gender and Sexuality in Shakespeare*, ed. Evelyn Gajowski (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 25-48, 29.

[2] Evelyn Gajowski (ed.), *Presentism, Gender and Sexuality in Shakespeare* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 6.

[3] Terence Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present* (New York and London: Routledge, 2002), 5.

[4] Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present*, 102.

[5] Hawkes, *Shakespeare in the Present*, 111-112.

[6] T.J.B. Spencer (ed.), *Shakespeare's Plutarch, The Lives of Julius Caesar, Brutus, Marcus Antonius and Coriolanus in the Translation of Sir Thomas North* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964), 297.

[7] Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics. A Contextual Introduction*. Second edition (London and New York: Continuum, 2009), 56.

[8] Robin Headlam Wells, "An Orpheus for a Hercules: Virtue Redefined in *The Tempest*", in *Neo-Historicism: Studies in Renaissance Literature, History and Politics*, ed. Robin Headlam Wells, Glenn Burgess and Rowland Wymer (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2000), 240-262, 240.

[9] Wells, "An Orpheus for a Hercules", 241.

[10] See I.7.21-22.

[11] See I.1.238; I.3.35-36, 43; I.7.29, 69-70; I.9.9-10; I.10.47-48, 68-70, 93.

[12] Coppélia Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare. Warriors, Wounds and Women* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), 17.

[13] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, 158.

[14] See I.4.53-54 and I.6.76.

[15] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 62.

[16] Robin Headlam Wells, *Shakespeare's Humanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 28.

[17] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 42.

[18] In the official sermon preached at Paul's Cross after his execution, Essex was com-

pared to Coriolanus.

[19] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 56-58.

[20] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 59.

[21] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 62.

[22] Wells, *Shakespeare's Humanism*, 130-131.

[23] John W. Velz, "Cracking Strong Curbs Asunder: Roman Destiny and the Roman Hero in *Coriolanus*", *English Literary Renaissance* 13 (1983), 58-69, 62.

[24] Bruce R. Smith, *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England. A Cultural Poetics* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991), 33.

[25] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 33.

[26] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 54-55.

[27] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 56.

[28] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 22.

[29] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 56-57.

[30] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 58.

[31] Smith, *Homosexual Desire*, 59.

[32] Bruce R. Smith, "L[o]cating the Sexual Subject", in *Alternative Shakespeares. Volume 2*, ed. Terence Hawkes (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 95-121, 99.

[33] Smith, "L[o]cating the Subject", 101.

[34] Smith, "L[o]cating the Subject", 101.

[35] Janet Adelman,"'Anger's My Meat': Feeding, Dependency and Aggression in *Coriolanus*", in *Shakespeare, Pattern of Excelling Nature*, ed. David Bevington and Jay Halio (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1978), 108-124, 110.

[36] The same image is strikingly used again at the moment of Antony's suicide.

[37] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, 119.

[38] Wells, *Shakespeare's Humanism,* 32.

[39] Stephen Gosson, *The School of Abuse* (1579), ed. Edward Arber (London: English Reprints, 1869), 34.

[40] Smith, "L[o]cating the Subject", 97.

[41] Smith, "L[o]cating the Subject", 101.

[42] Yet, one never actually sees Antony and Cleopatra's "lust in action". The play begins with the couple's passion as an accomplished fact. As Smith argues, what the audience sees and hears hereafter is an extended series of variations of scenes of parting. Smith, "L[o]cating the Subject", 114.

[43] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, 134-135.

[44] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, 119.

[45] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare*, 130.

[46] Peter Erickson, *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1988), 140.

[47] Kahn, *Roman Shakespeare,* 116.

[48] Wells, "An Orpheus for a Hercules", 240.

[49] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 59.

[50] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 60.

[51] Wells, *Shakespeare's Politics*, 60-61.

REFERENCES

Adelman, Janet. "'Anger's My Meat': Feeding, Dependency and Aggression in *Coriolanus.*" In *Shakespeare, Pattern of Excelling Nature*, ed. David Bevington and Jay Halio. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1978, 108-124.

Adelman, Janet. *Suffocating Mothers. Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, Hamlet to The Tempest*. New York and London: Routledge, 1992.

Erickson, Peter. *Patriarchal Structures in Shakespeare's Drama*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1988.

Gajowski, Evelyn, ed. *Presentism, Gender and Sexuality in Shakespeare*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Gosson, Stephen. *The School of Abuse* (1579). Edited by Edward Arber. London: English Reprints, 1869.

Hawkes, Terence. *Shakespeare in the Present*. New York and London: Routledge, 2002.

Kahn, Coppélia. *Roman Shakespeare: Warriors, Wounds and Women*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by David Bevington. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Shakespeare, William. *Coriolanus*. Edited by R.B. Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Smith, Bruce R. "L[o]cating the Sexual Subject," in *Alternative Shakespeares. Volume 2*, ed. Terence Hawkes. London and New York: Routledge, 1996, 95-121.

Smith, Bruce R. "Resexing Lady Macbeth's Gender—and Ours." In *Presentism, Gender and Sexuality in Shakespeare*, ed. Evelyn Gajowski. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009, 25-48.

Smith, Bruce R. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England. A Cultural Poetics*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Spencer, T.J.B., ed. *Shakespeare's Plutarch, The Lives of Julius Caesar, Brutus, Marcus Antonius and Coriolanus in the Translation of Sir Thomas North*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964.

Velz, John W. "Cracking Strong Curbs Asunder: Roman Destiny and the Roman Hero in *Coriolanus*." *English Literary Renaissance* 13 (1983): 58-69.

Wells, Robin Headlam. "An Orpheus for a Hercules: Virtue Redefined in *The Tempest*," in *Neo-Historicism: Studies in Renaissance Literature, History and Politics*, ed. Robin Headlam Wells, Glenn Burgess and Rowland Wymer. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000, 240-262.

Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare's Humanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Wells, Robin Headlam. *Shakespeare's Politics. A Contextual Introduction*. Second edition. London and New York: Continuum, 2009.

Ronan Ludot-Vlasak*

Too Much to Perform: Masculinity in Robert Montgomery Bird's *The Gladiator* and Robert Conrad's *Jack Cade*

This article explores the paradoxes of masculinity in two Forrest-Prize plays and aims at making visible socially constructed heteronormative gender relations in both works. Whereas they respectively dramatized a slave rebellion and a medieval revolt, they were self-conscious vehicles of Jacksonian ideology, and for a largely male and working-class audience, Forrest's Cade and Spartacus came to symbolize the very essence of the nation's masculine values and democratic ethos. Yet not only does Jacksonian masculinity partly undermine the revolutionary and democratic ideals it was to promote, but it also suggests that masculinity in these two plays manifests itself as an elusive and heterogeneous realm of experience involving different forms of performance which prove incompatible.

Keywords: American drama; nineteenth-century America; pastoral; patriarchy; *The Gladiator* (Robert Montgomery Bird); *Jack Cade* (Robert Conrad)

Actor Edwin Forrest (1806-1872) may be regarded as one of America's first icons. A man of the people born to a family of immigrants, he fervently supported the Democratic Party—he even delivered a speech on the occasion of the 62nd anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, a celebration held under the auspices of the Democratic Party in 1838 (Alger 1877, 339). It is therefore no surprise that this self-taught man became extremely popular among the working-class and small craftsmen, to whom he held up an idealized image of the American citizen through his "muscular acting style" (Kimmel 2006, 28) and the values he was meant to embody. In order to be offered parts that would suit his ego and promote his democratic political ideals, he created the Edwin Forrest Prize, which rewarded nine plays written for him between 1828 and 1847. *The Gladiator* (1831) and *Jack Cade* (1841) were awarded the prize and both plays were first performed in New York at

* Université du Havre.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ronan Ludot-Vlasak, Université du Havre 25, Rue Philippe Lebon 76600, Le Havre, France. Email: ronan.ludotvlasak@gmail.com

the Park Theatre. They became his most successful parts in American plays—along with *Metamora*.

The plots of both plays show undeniable similarities. Robert Montgomery Bird's *The Gladiator* relates the rebellion led by Spartacus at the end of the Roman Republic. After being captured by the Roman Army, the Thracian shepherd accepts to serve Bracchius and to become a gladiator only if his new master also buys his son and wife. During his first fight in the arena, he is asked to confront his own brother, Phasarius. They refuse to fight and start a rebellion. Spartacus and his followers win the first battles against the Romans, but his army is soon plagued by inner divisions and the hero is deserted by some of his men. His wife and son are murdered after being freed from a Roman camp and Phasarius is slain, but manages to reach his brother's camp to bring him the news. Spartacus, who is overcome with grief, decides to take his revenge on Rome and refuses Praetor Crassus's pardon. He convinces his men to fight one last battle. He is eventually killed in Crassus's camp, but the praetor decides to have him buried as a free man, thus paying a tribute to his honour and bravery.

Robert Conrad's *Jack Cade* focuses on a fifteenth-century rebellion that is dramatised in the fourth act of *2 Henry VI*, but the play was intended to be a political response to Shakespeare's treatment of the rebellion: while the Elizabethan playwright depicted the rebel as illiterate and bloodthirsty, Conrad's hero is a learned and benevolent man who fights for justice and individual freedom. In the American play, Cade has to go into self-imposed exile to Italy, after standing up to Lord Say, who killed his father. He comes back to England under the name of Aylmere at the beginning of the play. In order to free his countrymen who are oppressed by a cruel aristocracy, he decides to lead a rebellion. The king eventually accepts to grant yeomen a certain number of rights, but Cade's mother, wife and son are the victims of Say's men and die during the rebellion. The rebel himself is wounded to death and passes away just after he is informed that the king has signed the charter.

These parts enabled Forrest to perform and to extol the masculine values of Jackson's presidency, but what this phrase encapsulates is less coherent and totalizing than is often believed. Although the parts Forrest impersonated were meant to be unambiguous—yet invisible—vehicles of Jacksonian ideology, the form of masculinity embodied in the parts of Spartacus and Cade was not as homogeneous as it seems. This overtly democratic type of masculinity was to be displayed onstage, but as it aimed at naturalizing socially constructed heteronormative gender relations, it also partly operated invisibly. The aim of this article is precisely to shed light on these ideological models, and thus to make them "more" visible.[1] Central to this study is also the idea that "the context of the broader social organization and representation of gender" must be taken into account in order to understand the way masculinities are constructed (Chauncey 1994, 28). An analysis of the ways in which masculinity is given shape—with special attention to space—may reveal to what extent the political and ideological content of these plays are ambivalent and often contradictory gendered constructs. Jacksonian masculinity laid emphasis on action, independence, self-advancement courage and physical strength, but also championed a democratic and clearly anti-elitist stance which materialized for instance in a distrust of federal institutions such as the Bank of America (Anthony Rotundo, in Mangan, 1987, 36; Wilentz, 2005, 2, 8; Pugh, 1983, 3-4). In what follows, I will argue that not only does Jacksonian masculinity partly undermine the revo-

lutionary and democratic values or ideals it was to promote, but it also suggests that the kind of masculinity at work in these two plays might turn out to be an unstable experience involving different forms of performance which may prove incompatible.

Spartacus, Cade and the Attributes of Jacksonian Masculinity

The Pastoral and Social Mobility

Blurring the distinction between the actor and his most famous parts, Forrest's biographer, William Rounseville Alger, called him "the authentic hero" (Alger 1877, 53). Like the frontiersman, the Indian fighter or the mountain man who were as many "prototypes for the manly ethos" in Jacksonian America (Yacovone 1990, 85), Cade or Spartacus enabled Forrest to perform an idealised vision of Jacksonian masculinity recalling the model of the Heroic Artisan defined by Michael Kimmel (Kimmel 2006, 13, 20)—a performance involving political, ideological and class issues.

Cade's words on liberty are anchored in a Jeffersonian tradition extolling individual virtue and a pastoral ideal:

> When we *are* free, Jack Cade
> Will back unto his hills, and proudly smile
> *Down* on the spangled meanness of the court,
> Claiming a title higher than their highest,—
> An honest man—a freeman! (IV.ii 510)

He and his followers advocate a rural society protected from the vices and corruption of cities. A shepherd missing his Thracian hills and fighting Rome's imperialism, Spartacus also embodies an ideal that is reminiscent of Jeffersonian virtue. However, one may notice that despite the pastoral mode at work in *The Gladiator* and *Jack Cade*, the shepherd and the yeoman turn into the bravest of all soldiers.

Following a Jacksonian ideological line, both heroes are symbols of social mobility. Cade "sought / The gentle fruits of science," "was graced / With the mind's title of nobility," and is now "known as Doctor Aylmere" (I.iv 478). Although he is but a shepherd, Spartacus defeats the most experienced officers of the Roman army and is presented as a self-made general of sorts. As Jovius, a Roman centurion, acknowledges:

> He has formed,
> Out of this slavish, ragged scum, an army;
> Arms it and feeds it at his foeman's cost,
> Recruits it in his foeman's territory;
> Which foe is renowned Rome, resistless Rome,
> Rome the great head and empress of the world!
> Is he not then a general? (III.i 199)

The shift from the present perfect to the present simple lays emphasis on action and performance as a constituent element of masculinity. Spartacus's military value—his courage, his skills as leader as well as his ability to overcome any or-

deal—encapsulates some of the "masculine" values of the Jacksonian era and sharply contrasts with the behaviour of traditional urban elites representing "decadent institutions that signaled Europeanized overcivilization" (Kimmel 2006, 24).

It is therefore not surprising that both plays clearly endorse an anti-aristocratic stance. Political power in Republican Rome is confiscated by patricians who manipulate the people and their economic power relies on the exploitation of enslaved populations. The English nobility treat their serfs like dogs and prey on young girls to indulge in their lustful pleasures. When he encounters Cade in the forest, Lord Say—who killed the hero's father when he was a child—claims his titles of nobility to dissuade the rebel from attacking him, but the latter retorts that he believes in another form of nobility: "The people are God's own / Nobility; and wear their stars not *on* / Their breasts, but *in* them!" (III.iv 502). In Conrad's play, this ideological stand consists in challenging the social legitimacy of the nobility by questioning their masculinity, as they are called "minions" on two occasions by the rebels. The image dismisses their manhood all the more so as Clifford himself later calls Mariamne an "insolent minion" when she refuses to accept his advances. Spartacus also challenges his opponents' masculinity when he calls them "sheep" after he invades Consul Gellius's camp. As it is evocative of gentleness and weakness, the term undermines the Romans' *virtus*. Such strategies recall Jackson's "vent[ing] his manly rage at "effete" bankers and "infantilized" Indians," stating his own manhood while questioning that of his opponents (Kimmel 2005, 4). The combination of pastoral motifs and American values thus enables both heroes to position themselves as men.

As masculine champions of individual freedom and self-reliance, Spartacus and Cade express a desire to gain their independence by taking up arms against their oppressors—respectively Rome and the English aristocracy. Independence being a central element to the shaping of the Jacksonian masculine ethos—this was particularly visible when Jackson declared war on big government and on the Bank of America—, both rebels' insurrectionary movements may be regarded as gendered performances through which their masculinity is tested, proved and achieved. In this reading, the political rebellion contributes to the promotion of gendered values and is indissociable from the shaping of the masculine ethos in 19th-century America.[2]

The Performativity of Physical Strength

This Jacksonian ideal of masculinity is made visible through the two heroes' as well as Forrest's amazing physical strength. Both Spartacus and Cade turn out to be outstanding soldiers. The gladiator is described as "unconquerable" and of "extraordinary prowess" (I.i 177). Lentulus, a master of gladiators, recalls that he sent a man to attack the Thracian with a weapon, but the latter "struck the assailant with his fist, and felled him as one would a wall with a battering ram" (I.i 178). In fact, the Romans only managed to capture him in his sleep. Cade's physical strength is less emphasized than Spartacus's, but the rebel proves to be a formidable opponent. Although he was but a child, he struck Say "to his feet" (I.ii 472) to avenge his father's death. By refusing to capitulate or to be bribed by the aristocracy, both characters are also models of military honour and courage. This combination of physical strength and moral worth may foreshadow the phenomenon of muscular Christianity which became central to the definition of masculinity at the

turn of the 20th century (Mangan 1987, 3) and may be read in line with the growing emphasis on physical health and strength in the 19th century, for instance with the development of physical exercise in young men's education and the "game-playing cult" (Roberta J. Park, in Mangan 1987, 8, 10).

Edwin Forrest himself came to symbolize self-improvement and individual effort. Alger's biography is particularly revealing in this respect: a self-taught man, "Forrest did not inherit that herculean poise of power which for half a century made him such a massive mark of popular admiration. He attained it by training," for instance by taking boxing lessons (Alger 1877, 159, 161).[3] To paraphrase Elisabeth Badinter, the man is here presented as "an artefact" (Badinter 1986, 15). This emphasis on physical strength was also visible in the acting style developed by the actor, who scorned Macready's "effete" style (Levine 1988, 67). According to Richard Moody in his well-documented biography of the actor, *The Gladiator* offered Forrest "abundant opportunities for muscular exertions, ferocious passions" (Moody 1960, 104). As the *Courier and Enquirer* wrote about *Metamora* and *The Gladiator*: "in these roles he has no rival. They require a physical energy, an almost awful power and vigor which we doubt if any actor on earth but himself can put forth." The *Democratic Mirror* also compared his powerful voice with a raging hurricane (*Ibid.* 167-8; 398).[4]

The many engravings in Alger's biography representing the actor in his most famous parts (Spartacus, Jack Cade, Metamora, but also Shakespeare's tragic heroes) emphasized his muscular strength and turned him into an ideal of Jacksonian masculinity. They were like mirrors held up to Forrest's audience, offering them an image of masculinity which could be attained "by gaining self-control (over one's body and its physical expression)" (Flood 2007, 130). Yet these images are more ambivalent than they seem. Not only do they glorify self-improvement and individual effort, but they also simultaneously legitimize gender difference and inequality as they paradoxically naturalize a socially constructed gender identity.[5]

The Limits of Democracy

Because of their outstanding physical abilities and moral fortitude, Cade and Spartacus seem to have little in common with their fellow counterparts—despite the democratic values they embody—and sometimes stand alone in their heroic masculinity. In V.1, Spartacus, who has been deserted by thousands of his men, laments that:

> But yestermorn, [he] was a conqueror,
> On the high verge and pinnacle of renown;
> Today a skulking, trembling, despised man,
> Thrust in a pit. (V.i 224)

The passage recalls the wheel of fortune, which symbolised the rise and fall of great men in the Middle-Ages and in the Renaissance, and hardly fits into a democratic scheme. It is also the case later in the same scene when the Thracian tries to reassure his wife, who does not want to part from him:

> A cloud is on my path, but my ambition
> Has glory in't: as travellers who stand

> On mountains, view upon some neighbouring peak,
> Among the mists, a figure of themselves,
> Traced in sublimer characters; so I
> Here see the vapory image of myself,
> Distant and dim, but giantlike—I'll make
> These perils glories. (V.i 227)

Although Cade shows less appetite for power and glory, the plot of the play is almost entirely focused on its central character, who does not even need anyone's help to escape from Say's castle. Indeed, when Straw asks Worthy[6] if they have freed Cade, his companion answers: "No, by my troth; / He freed himself" (IV.ii 508). The two heroes' "imperial self-reliance"—the term is used by William Rounseville Alger to refer to Edwin Forrest himself—and overwhelming presence make them central, almost ubiquitous, figures around which text and performance revolve. The two larger-than-life heroes impersonated by Forrest were meant to champion democracy and equality, but the type of masculinity involved in the plays may paradoxically undermine these very ideals.

GENDERED MASCULINITY

Men as Protectors and Providers

As male domination seems to be inherent in the democratic stance of both *The Gladiator* and *Jack Cade*, this pattern of domination and exclusion is also relevant to the treatment of gender relations in both plays. Drawing on L. Fielder's *Love and Death in the American Novel*, Michael Kimmel reminds us that classic "American novels are marked by the absence of sexuality, the absence of marriage and families—the virtual absence of women entirely" (Kimmel 2005, 25). However, this statement may not apply to antebellum melodrama. Although the heroes take part in the public sphere, they are generally depicted as loving husbands and fathers. The first time he appears in the play, Cade is knocking at his mother's door and accompanied by his family. As he is first brought onstage, Spartacus accepts to fight for Bracchius only because the latter has promised to free his wife Senona and his son. The aim of such scenes was obviously to humanize the two characters. Yet Spartacus's third line in I.i may lend itself to a more ambivalent interpretation. As Lentulus and Bracchius mock him for his asking how far from his native land Rome is, Spartacus replies: "Have Romans father, and wives, and children?" (I.i 179). This emphasis on domesticity and family life enabled Bird to extol individual liberty and address the question of Rome's imperialism from an individual and domestic perspective—thus making it easier for the audience to identify with the play's ideological leanings. It was also a way of dismissing the idea that the rebel may be nothing but an agent of chaos. Yet Spartacus's address is more ambivalent than it seems and may be regarded as a performance of masculinity within the domestic sphere. His words are clearly anchored in a patriarchal vision according to which "to be manly was to accept responsibilities as a provider, producer, and protector of a family" (Kimmel 2005, 38).

The first scene of *Jack Cade* stresses the impossibility for men to perform their part as protectors and providers. Straw and Pembroke lament over their living conditions: while the former mentions what little corn they have, the latter reminds him

that "Yet must he feed, from this, his wife and children" and adds a few lines later: "Would we were not men, / But brutes—they are used kindlier!" (I.i 465). The semantic ambiguity of the term "men"—meaning both "human beings" and "male human beings"—allows us to venture two interpretations of the passage. It emphasizes the plight of the yeomen, who are but animals to the nobility, but it also suggests that this economic subjection questions their own masculinity.[7] Later in the same scene, Pembroke asks Courtnay (one of Say's men) to give him food only to feed his children, thus placing himself outside this form of dependence and humiliation. Women are no more autonomous than children and presented on several occasions as frail beings that are to be taken care of. Pembroke, for instance, "must watch by" his wife: "O'ercome with toil, she fainted / I' the field" and is now "sick to death" (I.i 466-7). In the second act, he informs Father Lacy, a priest who supports the rebellion, that "she's in her grave," "beyond the whip and chain." (II.iii 490). Although many men die in battle during the rebellion, none of them starves to death, no matter how little food they may be given.[8]

Lines which do not address domestic issues and seem to revolve entirely around political matters are also relevant to the vision of gender relations conveyed in the play. At the end of Act I, Cade recalls a stormy night during which he knelt to the genius of his country and swore "to make the bondman free" (I.iv 480):

> O'er the tempest's din,
> I heard the genius of my country shriek
> Amid the ruins, calling on her son—
> On me! (I.iv 479)

England is clearly identified as a maternal figure,[9] yet one that can no longer protect her children. With the depiction of political fight in domestic terms and the use of grammatical gender, two forms of male domination—a political one and a domestic one—are mutually justified: on the one hand, man must protect the nation the way he must look after his ageing mother, but on the other one, if man is to be the protector of the nation, then he must look after women. These discursive strategies may thus be regarded as almost invisible performances of a hegemonic form of masculinity which champions political change while legitimising domestic conservatism.

Controlling Space

One of the main instruments of this male domination is space control. The characters' relations to space are relevant to the treatment of gender relations in the play and involve concepts of power, exclusion and domination. In *The Gladiator*, Spartacus accepts to serve Lentulus and Bracchius, on condition that they buy his wife and son and do not part them from him:

SPARTACUS: Well, it is not chains alone
That make the slave. What will my master have?
LENTULUS: I'll have thee exercise thine arm in practice.
Thou wilt have brave men to contend with.
SPARTACUS: Well,
I will do so: but speak it not before my wife. (I.i 184)

While these lines stress—yet not quite invisibly—Spartacus's desire to protect his wife, they also suggest that Senona is not to interfere in a negotiation in which her future lot is to be determined. Submission in this scene may thus be analysed according to ethnicity—Romans against Thracians—, class—a powerful elite subjugating masses—, but also according to gender. The performance of masculinity may not tolerate the intrusion of women, who must remain invisible and whose exclusion from a male-controlled space is literally dramatised onstage.

This control of space is also exemplified at the end of Act III, when Spartacus frees his wife, who has been captured by Gellius's men. As soon as the latter is informed that his camp is being attacked, all the Romans escape whereas Senona and her child stay where they are. While she is denied the possibility to regain her freedom, except through the intervention of her husband, men—both Thracians and Romans—are depicted in terms of mobility and women in terms of immobility. The Thracian rebel suddenly bursts onto the stage and exclaims:

> Victory! Ha! ha!
> Romans are sheep—search every tent—ah! Jove!
> I have found ye wife, aye, and have ransomed ye.
> What, did you think I had deserted you?
> Look, I have found you in a noble hour:
> When last we met I was a slave: and now
> In a Consul's camp I stand a conqueror! (III.iv 210)

Central to the masculine and democratic ethos performed by Forrest are female subjection and military prowess: Spartacus is no longer a "slave" but a "conqueror" because he obviously defeated his enemies, but also because he performed his role as protector of his family. The gladiator may function as a complete antithesis of Roman citizens and patricians, the liberty he fights and dies for only involves men within the public arena, thus perpetuating the domination of men within the family sphere.

Space in *Jack Cade* turns out to be a gendered construct too. Shortly after the start of the rebellion, the rebel and his family find refuge in the forest. His wife, Mariamne, remains hidden in a cave with her son while Cade has gone in search of food. She suddenly hears branches rustle:

> Am I discovered? Heaven protect me!—Yet
> It may be Aylmere—now 'tis nearer!—nearer!
> Ha! my husband! (III.iii 499)

Once her husband is back, it seems that a divine intervention is no longer required to protect her. Although the characters have left their home and hide in the forest—a space that is only partly domesticated by man—the passage relocates traditional 19th-century gender relations but never reconfigures them: the home is turned into a cave and the rest of the forest is the territory on which men have to confront ordeals in the outer world. The wild space with which the public sphere was often compared at the time is here literalised. Paradoxically, this form of spatial displacement—caused by the insurrection—only confirms and naturalises pre-existing heterosexual norms which naturalize the subordination of women.[10] While Mariamne has not left the cave, Cade has "been far / And ha[s] suffered much"

(III.iii 499). It is significant that he does not tell his wife where he actually went: Mariamne is denied access to the outer world both physically and discursively. The space where Cade fights for his people's freedom remains invisible to her.

Such spatial configurations recall the Cult of True Womanhood, an ideological and discursive apparatus according to which:

> Women were not to be excluded from participation in the public sphere as much as exempted from participation in such competitive and ugly world. Delicate and fragile, women were not subservient but "chosen vessels" requiring protection from the world, said Henry Harrington in *Ladies Companion* in 1838. (Kimmel 2006, 37)

The performance of masculinity therefore requires a performance of femininity that suits this model of gender relations.[11] Yet the separation between private and public spheres is disrupted by the unfolding of events in both plays.

The Impossible Performance of Masculinity: The Public and the Private Spheres

As loving fathers and husbands as well as warriors and leaders of riots in which women have no role to play—except that of frail beings to be protected—Spartacus and Cade participate both in the private and public spheres. Following a melodramatic line of development, the bloody dénouements of the plays are precisely triggered by the overlapping of these two spheres. By subverting the distinction between public and private spaces, the melodramatic mode creates conditions in which the model of masculinity performed by the two heroes can no longer be sustained.

From the very start, political stakes and family matters are intertwined in *The Gladiator*. Spartacus accepts to fight for Bracchius only on condition that the latter then frees his wife and son; his refusal to fight his younger brother, whom he recognizes in the arena—the scene is characteristic of the melodramatic genre—, is what triggers the rebellion at the end of Act II. Later in the play, Phasarius's desertion and his failure to protect Senona and her son, who are both killed by Lentulus's men, precipitate Spartacus's fall. Consequently, the unfolding of events in the play suggests the impossibility for the masculine hero to perform the different parts incumbent upon him—the leader of a rebellion and a protective father and son. Private and political stakes are also linked in the dénouement of Conrad's play. After she stabs Clifford, Mariamne is driven to madness and eventually dies. In both plays, it thus seems that women are "the ultimate victims of the painful contradictions in the gender system that regulates men" (Kosofsky Sedgwick 1985, 134) from which women are excluded. Consequently, masculinity proves to be a contradictory and heterogeneous realm of experience which requires the performance of different parts that can hardly be reconciled.[12] Both Bird's and Conrad's heroes are torn between a benevolent ideal of masculinity to be performed within the domestic sphere and their military role, but the latter turns into an untameable form of violence once the domestic and public spheres overlap.

Although Conrad's Cade was meant to be a clear response to Shakespeare's depiction of the rebel in *2 Henry VI*, the American playwright's hero also shows a potentially destructive energy. Two scenes involving his wife are particularly revealing in this regard. In Act II, Clifford tries to seduce Mariamne, but she

adamantly refuses his advances. Cade bursts onto the stage and threatens to kill the lustful aristocrat, who has no other choice but to leave. When the rebel swears to take his revenge on Clifford—although it is not clear whether he wants to avenge his honour or his wife's—Mariamne tries to appease him, assuring him that "now [she] is with [him], [She] care[s] not for this wrong" (II.i 486). Cade suddenly puts an end to the discussion, asking his wife on two occasions to go back into his mother's house:

> Aylmere: ''Tis well—very well! But get thee in.
> Marianme: Thou'rt not in anger with me?
> Aylmere: With thee, love!
> Why was I ever? Nay girl, get thee in. (II.i 487)

As soon as he is left alone, he immediately expresses his intention to chastise Clifford for what he has done. Once again, male domination is a matter of space: by sending Mariamne into the house, not only does he confine his wife to an enclosed domestic space, but he also takes control of a space where women may not interfere with his more violent drives. In the final scene, Say confronts Cade and ironically asks him how Mariamne fares. Suddenly seized with anger, Cade immediately stabs his foe, who has reminded him of his failure as a provider and protector for his family.

In *The Gladiator*, Phasarius's thirst for Roman blood is referred to in the first scene of the play and so is his brother's raging energy. Spartacus's concluding words in Act II are a testament of the character's ambivalence:

> Death to the Roman fiends, that make their mirth
> Out of the groans of bleeding misery!
> Ho, slaves, arise! it is your hour to kill!
> Kill and spare not—For wrath and liberty!—
> Freedom for bondmen—freedom and revenge! (II.iii 198)

He later invokes lex talionis when he is informed by Phasarius that Senona and his child have been murdered by Lentulus and tells his men to slay any Roman woman or child they may encounter. Such violence points to the impossibility for the two heroes to perform their different parts, but also to a failure in exercising self control, one of the main patterns shaping the masculine ethos in 19th-century America (Kimmel 2006, 31-35). Once the reassuring domestic world is disrupted—Cade's mother dies when Say's men set her cottage on fire and Spartacus's own cottage is also burned down by Roman soldiers—it seems that Cade and Spartacus can no longer conciliate their roles in the private and in the public spheres.[13] Under these circumstances, the performance of masculinity operates in a particularly visible way and is turned into an unstable experience. In this respect, both plays question the viability of a model of masculinity that needed to rest on stable grounds, although 19th-century American men were confronted with social and economic evolutions to which they had to adapt in order to preserve and prove their masculinity. Once again, such changes point to the idea developed for instance by Gail Bederman that masculinity is a process which is constantly redefined.

During this period the United States underwent major economic changes which had an impact on the definition of manhood. As the market economy developed,

the world in which men evolved grew more unstable and less secure (Sellers 1991, 239). Yet it was in this restless sphere that man was to prove his manhood, with the risk of failure always looming ahead. This evolution challenged the model of the Genteel Patriarch, whose masculine identity was manifested through "property ownership and a benevolent patriarchal authority at home" (Kimmel 2006, 13), but also that of the Heroic Artisan, which is celebrated in *Jack Cade* and *The Gladiator* (*Ibid.*, 6, 22).

From the Pastoral to the Market Economy

Whereas these two models referred to different social groups, they linked identity with a sense of place and stability. Both Spartacus and Cade define their identity in relation to their native land. In Conrad's play, Mariamne remembers how Cade told her about his native land when they were still in Italy. It is no coincidence that Spartacus's Thrace and Cade's England are associated with the pastoral mode. In his first line, the gladiator expresses his desire to return to his country, when he asks Bracchius and Lentulus: "Is it a thousand leagues away from Thrace?" (I.i 179). He also evokes the Thracian hills and the cottage where he grew up on several occasions, while Cade refers to his country as "our green merry England" (II.i 481) and Mariamne wonders at "the loveliest grove [she] found,—trellised with flowers, / And 'neath its trembling shade, the brightest stream" (*Ibid.*).

This pastoral mode which creates a form of timelessness is often combined with a sense of loss, as if the places the two characters long for may be nothing more than a remembrance of things past, never to be restored. Cade was forced to leave his native land after he defied Say. Once his mother is murdered, he must flee once again. Spartacus has been captured and sent to Rome against his will. Both heroes thus testify to a model of masculinity that can no longer be anchored in a stable place. The last words uttered by the Thracian as he is dying are particularly telling:

> Well—never heed the tempest—
> There are green valleys in our mountains yet.—
> Set forth the sails.—We'll be in Thrace anon.—[*Dies.*] (V.iv 440)

This return to his native land proves an impossible enterprise, except in the imagination of the fatally wounded hero. His dying just after these three lines is emblematic of a model of masculinity which appealed to Jackson's supporters and yet was becoming obsolescent and progressively threatened by the figure of the self-made man, whose masculinity was to be proved constantly in the economic arena. It may be no coincidence that *Jack Cade* and *The Gladiator* champion a form of individualism and self-reliance which does not fit into a capitalistic framework. Indeed, both plays show a form of distrust towards the market economy and the power of economic and political elites, whose wealth is derived from the work of oppressed masses of workers, yeomen and craftsmen.

While the gendered political performance at work in *Jack Cade* and *The Gladiator* does not question normative gender relations—and also glorifies the figure of Edwin Forrest—its paradoxically excessive visibility points to the contradictions inherent in the heroic and democratic form of masculinity it was meant to champion through the actor's impersonation of the two heroes. In other words, it aims at producing an "intelligible gender ... institut[ing] and maintain[ing] relations of

coherence and continuity among sex, gender, sexual practice and desire," but is haunted by "the spectres of discontinuity and incoherence, themselves thinkable only in relation to existing norms of continuity and coherence" (Butler 1999, 23). Both plays map out gender relations and the place of men in society. Yet the masculinity they aim at proves to be an elusive experience performed in an ever-changing social and economic world and is crushed under the weight of conflicting forms of performance which point to the idea that masculinity is not a stable set of categories, but an ever-changing process involving different forms of combinations. It ultimately seems that the performance of the invisible is not only the mode through which a dominant masculine ideology operates, but also the sign that this ideological apparatus may be threatened by other ideological constructs and might lose its central position in society. The hypervisibility of the performance of this masculine world may thus ultimately testify to a form of insecurity and hint at its constant redefinition.

Notes

[1] For more information on the unmasking of gender, see Gail Bederman's *Manliness and Civilization* (1995, 7).

[2] In his essay on Edwin Forrest, David A. Gerstner explored the link between the actor's body, democracy and masculinity (especially p. 10-12, 38-39). Yet his analysis deals with another kind of performance since it focuses on a biographical episode involving a Native-American companion's body. Gerstner comments on the way homoerotic references are evacuated from this episode.

[3] This passion for individual effort and physical exercise is mentioned on several occasions by 20th-century biographers of Forrest, especially by Richard Moody (Moody 1960, 76-77). According to the author, Forrest's fascination with circus performers may shed light on his taste for physical culture.

[4] Although most American actors at the time developed a vigorous and physical acting style—as if the actors and characters were on the verge of madness—Lawrence W. Levine points out that Forrest "carried this romantic tradition to its logical culmination" (Levine 1988, 38).

[5] This form of hypervisibility ultimately reveals the social processes into which bodies are brought in "the reproductive arena" (Connell 2002, 9) as well as the performativity of Forrest's masculinity, "a repetition and a ritual, which achieves its effects through its naturalization in the context of a body, understood, in part, as a culturally sustained temporal duration" (Butler 1999, xv).

[6] Straw and Worthy are two of Cade's companions. So is Pembroke, who is referred to later in this essay.

[7] According to such a line of interpretation, the play may thus indirectly suggest that only in a democratic nation can a man of the people perform his masculinity.

[8] For more information on the way the body is a construction which comes into being "through the marks of gender," see Butler (1999, 13).

[9] It is also referred to as a feminine entity earlier in the speech.

[10] For further information on the link between hegemonic masculinity and the subordination of women, see Margaret Wetherell's and Nigel Edley's article entitled "Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices" (especially p. 336).

[11] The scene also shows that masculinities and femininities are not produced separately, but together (see Connell 2005, 38).

[12] For more theoretical information about gender as "an ongoing process impl[ying] constant contradiction, change and renegotiation," see Bederman (1995, 7-12).

[13] These destructions of individual property may also be seen as an attack on the heroes' masculinity.

REFERENCES

Alger, William Rounseville. *Life of Edwin Forrest, the American Tragedian*. London, Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co, 1877.

Badinter, Elisabeth. *XY De l'Identité Masculine*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 1986.

Bederman, Gail. *Manliness and Civilization. A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Bird, William Montgomery. "The Gladiator." In *Early American Drama*, ed. Jeffrey H. Richards. New York, London: Penguin Books, 1997.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. 1990. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Chauncey, George. *Gay New York. Gender, Urban Culture and the Making of the Gay Male World. 1890-1940*. New York: Basic Books, 1994.

Connell, R.W. *Gender*. Cambridge: Polity, 2002.

Connell, R.W. "Masculinities and Globalization." In *Gender through the Prism of Difference*, eds. Maxine Baca Zinn, Pierette Hondagneu- Sotelo, Michael A. Messner. 3rd edition. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005: 36-48.

Conrad, Robert. "Jack Cade." In *Representative Plays by American Dramatists*, ed. Montrose J. Moses. New York: E.R. Dutton & Company, 1925.

Flood, Michael, Judith Kegan Gardiner, Bob Pease and Keith Pringle, eds. *International Encyclopedia of Men and Masculinities*. London, New York: Routledge, 2007.

Gerstner, David A. *Manly Arts. Masculinity and Nation in Early American Cinema*. Durham, London: Duke University Press, 2006.

Kimmel, Michael S. *Manhood in America. A Cultural History*. 1996. 2nd ed. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kimmel, Michael S. *The History of Men. Essays on the History of American and British Masculinities*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Kosofsky Sedgwick, Eve. *Between Men. English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Levine, Lawrence W. *Highbrow/Lowbrow. The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. Cambridge (Mass.), London: Harvard University Press, 1988.

Mangan, J. A., and James Walvin, eds. *Manliness and Morality. Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1987.

Moody, Richard. *Edwin Forrest. First Star of the American Stage*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

Pugh, David G. *Sons of Liberty. The Masculine Mind in Nineteenth-Century America*. Westport (Conn), London: Greenwood Press, 1983.

Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution. Jacksonian America, 1815-1846*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Wetherell, Margaret, and Nigel Edley. "Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices." *Feminism and Psychology* 9, n°3 (1999): 335-356.

Wilentz, Sean. *Andrew Jackson*. New York: Times Books—Henry Holt & Company, 2005.

Yacovone, Donald. "Abolitionists and the 'Language of Fraternal Love'." In *Meanings for Manhood. Constructions of Masculinity in Victorian America*, eds. Mark C. Carnes and Clyde Griffen, 85-95. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Yann Roblou*

Complex Masculinities:
The Superhero in Modern American Movies

The first decade of the twenty-first century has seen an exponential increase in the production of superhero movies made in Hollywood. One of the ways to explain the phenomenon has to do with reading these fictions as answers to contemporary issues following the 9/11 trauma, one of which concerns the understanding of the multi-faceted problematic of masculinities. This essay attempts to present some of the essential elements that make masculinities complex and to inscribe them in the larger context of their production.

Keywords: masculinity, superheroes, cinema, body, United States, ideology

"What is it that makes a man a man?" asks John Hurt's Trevor "Broom" Bruttenholm in a voice-over as the first images of *Hellboy* (Guillermo del Toro, 2004) flicker on the screen. The strangeness of the question only emerges later, as it is not yet clear who the "man" in question is. Is the locutor indulging in a bit of introspection? Or is the narrative voice referring to the eponymous character, who, as his name suggests, is a compound of two species: a humanoid creature brought from the netherworld? The question is relevant, however, for two reasons: first, it requires the viewer's acceptance that superheroes have something to tell us about such a complex issue as "masculinity;" secondly this diegetically justified question entails that one should pay a certain amount of attention to the contemporary representations of masculinity proposed by cinematographic fiction made in Hollywood. What can justify the choice of studying such a corpus is the fact that this type of movie has (re)gained the favors of the paying public. Never before in the American movie industry have there been so many productions dealing with superheroes in a single decade. Between the turn of the millennium (*X-Men*, Bryan Singer, 2000) and 2010 (*Ironman 2*, Jon Favreau), more than twenty films showing the exploits of characters who have made it to the motion pictures before (Superman, Batman, Spider-Man) and not so frequently seen ones (the X-Men, the Fan-

* Université de Valenciennes.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yann Roblou, Faculté des Lettres, Langues, Arts et Sciences Humaines, Université de Valenciennes, Le Mont-Houy, 59313 Valenciennes Cédex 9, France. Email: yann.roblou@univ-valenciennes.fr

tastic Four, Elektra, Catwoman) have been seen around the world. These—with the addition of such contemporary creations as the Incredible family or Hancock—have become traditional summer fare for movie-goers of the early twenty first century.

WHAT MAKES A (SUPER-)MAN A MAN?

To proceed in the exploration of the matter under scrutiny, let us return to the film mentioned above. "What is it that makes a man a man? Is it his origins? The way things start? Or is it something else, something harder to describe?" continues the voice-over. The potential answers thus provided can indeed be justified as ways to approach a possible understanding of "what makes a man a man," and will be used as guidelines in the present analysis.

The first two questions may appear to be reasonably straightforward, since they concern principally a male hero and a male superhero. As far as the origins of the latter type of celluloid characters are concerned, it can easily be argued that canonical North American comic book depictions of masculinity are the quintessential roots of the expression of the commonly shared cultural beliefs about what it means to be a male superhero, albeit in an external, fantasized delineation—the critical reader of comic books cannot but notice "the exaggerated visualisation of the (barely) human body."[1] Strikingly, from the first pulp, adolescent-oriented issues of superhero comics, the masculine figure immediately emerged as hyperbolically masculine: Superman was born on the printed page in June 1938 as a *super*man, and set the standard for the scores of superheroes that followed.

The final (rhetorical) question ("Or is it something else, something harder to describe?") draws attention to what makes masculinities complex. As a first approach to tackling what is not a static but a constantly negotiated and re-negotiated concept, Lynne Segal suggests that: "To be 'masculine' is *not* to be 'feminine', *not* to be 'gay', *not* to be tainted with any marks of 'inferiority'—ethnic or otherwise" (x). In this negative formulation, one can easily discern what Michael Kimmel describes concerning American men at the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: in response to the period's socio-economic situation and the alleged negative influences it had on men's virility, self-assertion and self-confidence, traits such as aggressiveness, physical strength and courage, among others, were increasingly glorified, while physical weakness, dependence and emotionality were branded as effeminate, and thus unmanly character traits (Kimmel, 83-112). Significantly, in the present context of superhero movies, this definition of masculinity is supported by the fact that the fictional figures under analysis are overwhelmingly non-feminine, straight and white.

To follow another helpful line of argument, Lee Clark Mitchell defines masculinity in the following terms: "(it) is not simply a blunt biological fact but it is as well a cultural fiction that must be created" (155). The notion of creation is of primordial importance here both because superheroes are indeed fabricated (by comic book artists as well as film-makers) and because, though they have evolved from page to screen, these characters allow for the reproduction—and hence the continuity—of cultural fictions concerning masculinity. After all, since their inception in the sixties, the look of comic book superheroes has constantly been reinvented—be it only because the artists working on their creation themselves have changed regularly—but the characters have remained essentially identical to their original

selves. R.W. Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity[2] can be a useful tool in this perspective. When Connell argues that there is always one dominant ideal of masculinity, which leads to the oppression both of women and of such so-called marginalized masculinities as, for example, marking "the homosexual," manliness is also connected to the power inscribed in the male body. Connell also develops the idea—which has some resonance in the context at hand—that body technologies (such as bodybuilding—in Connell's analysis, or the use of special effects—in superhero films) enable men to transform their bodies in ways that can support or challenge dominant notions of masculinity. If the passage from one medium (comic books) to another (film) may offer an alternative representation of a superlative masculinity, it is questionable whether this passage really affects the conventions at work concerning the configurations of masculinity.

Why is Hancock the only black superhero in recent Hollywood creations? To what extent do characters such as Catwoman and Elektra, who have gained some screen existence, stand as alternatives or counter-models to an apparently hegemonic masculinity? To address such issues, it is essential to focus on the physical dimension of the superhero, which presents itself as the paradoxical vector of an aggressive masculinity as well as the locus of the characters' limitations. Analyzing the centrality of the superhero's body on screen can then be useful in presenting how contemporary America (through its most effective ambassador, Hollywood) projects social, sexual models, as well as ideological postures concerning masculinity.

The first element that needs to be put forward is that, as Mitchell puts it, masculinity "must be created," thus presenting itself not so much as a given rather than a constructed dimension of the characters (as the verb "make" in the earlier quote from *Hellboy* also suggests) and begins with a necessary anchoring in the protagonist's origins. Superman, Hellboy and the mutants populating the X-men series may be set apart from other superheroes (as they were *born* different and were not submitted to accidental bites, radiations... in later life), the screen treatment of their birth is similar, be it only because superhero movies habitually dedicate an important part of their running time to the depiction of the source and development of the superhero's power(s) through the physical impact of the latter. Incidentally, it is also to be noted that part of the film industry's capitalizing on—and exploitation of—the success of a franchise now consists in making an entire film on the origins of a character, and *X-Men rigins: Wolverine* (Gavin Hood, 2009) is an obvious case in point.

Typically, the films describe an ordinary character affected by an event over which (s)he has no control; (s)he then becomes aware of the change; and has to adjust to his/her new condition privately, then publicly. Whether it is treated in a comical (as for the eponymous hero in *Spider-Man*—Sam Raimi, 2002) or a tragic mode (as is the case of Catwoman, to take a feminine example, in the film by the same name [Pitof, 2004]), the central issue at stake is the physical revelation of the existence of a supernatural power.

SUPERNATURAL BODIES

The body, as an external signifier, has then come to represent all the conventions traditionally linked to assumptions of male power and masculinity. And, as a heavily inscribed sign, the muscular body clearly marks an individual as a bearer of

masculine strength and superiority, all the more so in fiction. Muscles symbolize masculine power as physique-derived, operating as a means of coding the performative nature of the superhero—he does what he does because he physically can. Furthermore, since a large part of these characters' universe is irenic, the masculine hero essentially exists through his actions, his body becoming the tool of his feats as well as the sign of his belonging to a distinct category. It is noteworthy to underline here how technology has increased the physical capacities of the superheroes: the fairly recent advent of efficient special effects has made possible the staging of feats heretofore reserved to the pages of comic books. For instance, seeing Spider-Man's graceful and fluid evolutions in the last sequence shot of Sam Raimi's 2002 film seems perfectly natural though it is the result of an elaborate combination of several techniques.

It is also interesting to observe that men and women are treated differently when it comes to muscularity. To account for this disparity, one has to evoke spectatorship reception. Following Laura Mulvey's seminal theory of the male gaze, the essentially male viewer's aesthetic pleasure is preserved in its phallocentric perspective by seeing superheroes embodied by actors displaying their powerful bodies while actresses playing superheroines in a leading role (Jennifer Garner as Elektra, or Halle Berry as Catwoman) are given the muscular strength (if not size) of the masculine principle combined with a shapely feminine silhouette, thus only moderately challenging traditional gender roles.

Apart from its muscular aspect, the superhero's body is remarkable for its permanent state of tension, readiness ("This is a job for...") or its perpetual motion, like a force of nature in chain mail. To emphasize the anabolic quality of the superhero's body, regeneration (Wolverine) and invulnerability (Superman, Hulk) then become ultimate physical qualities and performances. There seems never to be a hesitation or a backward glance: the superhero knows what he has to do, even if this implies only being on the move—performing, in a word. This can be connected to what Douglas Aoki observes in bodybuilders: "When the bodybuilders poses, what he performs is himself" (35). In this respect, the way his actions are pictured for the screen make the contemporary superhero a direct heir of the action man of 1980s Hollywood action flicks, as is suggested in Susan Jeffords' remarks[3] on the films of that period:

> American masculinity was largely transcribed through spectacle and bodies, with the male body itself becoming often the most fulfilling form of spectacle. Throughout the period, the male body—principally the white male body—became increasingly a vehicle of display—of musculature, of beauty, of physical feats, and of a gritty toughness.

To take Jeffords' argument further, one may add that, in conformity with comic book narrative techniques, the use of low angle shots, lengthy dolly back shots, slow motion, rotating shots, long shots (to name but a few recurrent visual features), accompanied by an exploding background (and by a perceptible dosage of hard rock'n'roll music[4]), participate in the display of the male superhero's intimately physical relation to his environment. As a striking example, *Wolverine* combines all the trappings of an external spectacle—weaponry, explosions, infernos, crashes, high-speed chases, hyperbolic fights with nemeses—with a symptomatic emphasis on the quasi-permanent display of the muscularity of the actor embody-

ing the eponymous character. However, the exposition of Hugh Jackman's body[5] is also combined with an insistence on the phallic attributes of the character: prominent among which are his cigar and his retractable claws (made of an imaginary metal alloy aptly named "adamantium"), making this demonstration of all the possible signs of masculinity nothing short of caricature. In a sense then, by trying to make Wolverine an epitome of masculinity, the film-maker (as well as the writers and producers) has gone overboard and only achieved an exaggerated (and unwittingly comical) version of one of Marvel's most-liked characters, hence compromising audience identification. Nonetheless, Gavin Hood's film provides us with a genuine insight into contemporary American anxieties/fantasies about masculinity. Or, as Segal puts it:

> The closer we come to uncovering some form of exemplary masculinity, a masculinity which is solid and sure of itself, the clearer it becomes that masculinity is structured through contradiction: the more it asserts itself, the more it calls itself into question. (Segal 1990, 123)

And indeed, another revealing component of the superhero is this: though generally more conservative than its comic book forefathers in its usage of the human anatomy, the pictorial language of cinema seems to have focused on a relatively fixed set of problematic elements, all of which appear to stem from the male body.

Though superheroes share an apparently common physical presence onscreen, their powers (innate, caused by an accident or as the result of a mutation, depending on their origins) also give their bodies an eruptive dimension. Their supernatural essence permanently challenges the delicate balance of identity within the hero's physical envelope as well as jeopardizing the order of the cosmos around him. The bodily torment of the mutant superhero, for instance, expresses a desire, a need, to transcend the confines of the body. The heightened transgression of its corporeal boundaries is accompanied by a hardening of the body. The mutant body is therefore explicitly traumatic, armored against the world outside yet racked and torn apart by complex forces within.

Another specificity of the superhero's body lies in its paradoxical nature: the mutant's physical shell is rigidly protected but dangerously unstable. If some superheroes can summon their physically volcanic magnitude at will, others cannot master it and have to keep themselves in check through sheer self-will (for instance, Bruce Banner cannot help turning into the green, monstrously disproportionate Hulk when under stress—unless he practices meditation and respiratory exercises, as it is shown in Louis Leterrier's *The Incredible Hulk*, 2008) or thanks to ingenious contraptions (such as the famed solar glasses of Cyclops in the X-Men series which prevent the character from blasting whatever he touches with his optic rays to oblivion). This highly problematic constituent is one of the easily recognizable elements directly connecting masculinity and hyperbolic violence. Generally put to use in the defense of a higher good, the energies that are normally unleashed only in battle can also break free from the hero's control and turn him into what Denis Duclos[6] analyzes as the "berserker" or "mad warrior" whose frantic actions wreak havoc and (occasionally) destroy lives. It must be pointed out that, in harmony with their comic book origins (and with regard to matters of censorship), the superheroes very seldom *visibly* spill blood on screen. Surprisingly, the only character to actively decimate the villain population, and still be able to maintain his popularity, is Wolverine.

The display of the superhero's potentially and hyperbolically harmful physicality should be perceived as an experience akin to that of the sublime, in the sense that the sublime is constituted through the combined sensations of astonishment, terror, and awe that occur through the revelation of a power greater, by far, than the human. It threatens human thought, habitual signifying systems and, finally, human prowess. The final effect is not a negative experience of anxious confusion, however, because it is almost immediately accompanied by a process of appropriation of, and identification with, the infinite powers brought to light. And so the sublime is grounded in a pervasive ambivalence—the tension between diminution and exaltation is evident in the oxymoron of Burke's "delightful horror" and in Kant's description of "a quickly alternating attraction toward, and repulsion from, the same object." The Hulk is probably the most appropriate illustration of this ambivalent experience of the sublime: the character's spectacularly amplified rage turns him into a monster (an heir to Frankenstein's creation), whose existential fear and hatred of the whole world takes on a fantasized capability of destruction and yet lends him the dimension of an object of pity in the eyes of the spectator.

Anchoring this sensation into the fictional world of the superheroes, the most frequent reaction of other characters devoid of extraordinary capacities to the presence/existence of these extraordinary beings reveals the mixture of awe, disgust and utter rejection felt by the layman in front of a phenomenon he cannot grasp, which frightens him and which he wants to discard in one stroke, encapsulated in the derogatory denomination: "Freak!" The word, in its performative capacity, deprives the recipient of any form of humanity[7] but it also makes explicit the problem of a (materially and symbolically) challenged masculinity.

If superheroes can be perceived as freaks (as they are systematically designated by the other—ordinary—characters in the various films), it follows logically that their masculinity (insofar as it is defined by their powers) should also be determined as being a "progressively degenerative" "disease," a "damage" "needing a cure," an "infection," a "contagion," an "epidemic" in the wording of the characters themselves. Interestingly, it is precisely because superheroes combine human and superhuman dimensions that their alternative existence, being and capabilities threaten to demasculinize the world they live in. Their superpowers materially and symbolically exclude them from the realm of traditional, ordinary, conventional masculinity and therefore condemn them to be associated with non-masculinity. In other words, superheroes may look like men, their super attributes forbid them to fully realize their capacity to be men. Consequently, superheroes are shunned, anathemized and ostracized. And none more so than the mutants, in the X-Men series, whose powers are stigmata that must be kept hidden from the unreasoning mob of mere normal beings. Perhaps all the more so as they are not invulnerable. In fact, not only are they distinguished by their emotionalism, but their first and most dangerous enemies are their own bodies. This allows, to return to the example of Cyclops, for a symbolic feminization of the character whose visor cannot be removed under penalty of instant death, thus echoing the mythological feminine figures of Medusa or Pandora.

Following this line of reasoning, it becomes manifest that entering a seemingly endless process of pain is part and parcel of becoming a superhero. The psychologically complex character of Peter Parker is a case in point. He cannot be honest about his other self with the three people he loves. Because Spider-Man is seeking revenge on himself for the death of his uncle Ben, no matter how many symbolic

stand-ins for the villains he defeats, it will never be enough for him. Peter Parker's internalization of his guilt over his perceived culpability in his uncle's death can be defined as typical neurotic behavior. Despite his obvious courage, integrity, self-lessness, and determination, he has a compulsion to get in his own way. He is obsessed with finding the *bad* in whatever *good* he does. Significantly, it also impacts his body (and consequently his masculinity)—he even loses his powers for a time in the second installment of his adventures. Also, though gifted with super-strength, Peter Parker does his fair share of bleeding, principally from the wounds inflicted by his enemies. And not content with piling punishment upon punishment on Peter Parker, the director, Sam Raimi, actively participated in physically "roughing up" the lead actor, Tobey Maguire, on the set of his films (as is revealed in the director and actor's commentaries, as well as the *boni* on the DVDs).

Pain can also stem from moral quandaries. The most significant instance of this can be found in *The Dark Knight.* Seldom until Christopher Nolan's 2008 recreation of the adventure of the billionaire-turned-masked-avenger has Hollywood looked so deeply into the abyss of superhero vigilante ethics. And Bruce Wayne's grief of having failed to provide Gotham with a "white knight" (as District Attorney Harvey Dent is called by the Gotham press) to cleanse the city can only be equated with the physical pain experienced by Batman (doubled with the agony of having to impose the role of outcast upon himself, thus becoming the "dark knight" of the film's title) until his final rejection by the social body he is bent on trying to protect.

The examples chosen standing as the most salient illustrations of the general rule, it is evident that from the moment they achieve consciousness of their powers, superheroes are doomed to endure an eternal and ever-renewed physical ordeal associated with self-inflicted inner turmoil, worthy of such an illustrious predecessor as Prometheus. To the point where one is lead to wonder whether, besides serving as vectors of cathartic expiation for the spectator, the prominently male characters do not show a definite (albeit unconscious) masochistic tendency. This could be one possible way to interpret their assuming the general public's safety by taking on an infinite line of evil-doers. The ultimate masochist, in this perspective, appears to be Wolverine: to avenge himself from his brother Sabertooth, and under the assumption it will give him the edge over him, Logan complies with the evil Colonel Stryker, who wishes to experiment on him by injecting "adamantium" into his skeletal structure. Just as the procedure is about to begin, Logan is told by Stryker: "You'll suffer more pain than any man can endure. We're going to make you indestructible. But first we'll have to destroy you." Though he knows he has to take Stryker's words literally, Logan obviously bears the agony not only like a man (as the phrase—redolent of macho ethics—goes) but like a superhero, thus para-doxically further enhancing his masculinity. In other words, what the spectacle of pain brings to the delineation of the character is the intertwining of the solidity of masculine presence and demonstration of the destructibility and recuperability of the masculine body. From the recurrence of such a step in the characters' *Bildung*, it seems the superhero cannot achieve "true" masculinity if he has not gone through the process of being beaten, injured, even mutilated, and brought to breaking point before being restored through violent brutality.

Another of the significant traits pertaining to the analysis of the superheroes' problematic masculinities, then, concerns their split personalities.[8] It is common knowledge that superheroes are all about multiple identities. However, an alter-native reading of this characteristic can be suggested. Drawing on Adorno's idea

that "the tough guys are the truly effeminate ones, who need the weaklings as their victims in order to admit that they are like them" (1978:46), it is possible to understand why the hypermasculine hero needs his ordinary self in order to let off steam, to release some of the pressure of his exacting masculinity. All the more so as the inadequacies of the ordinary Other are exacerbated. Though an essential appendix to traditional superheroes, the double identity element also deserves particular mention in the case of the characters of the X-Men universe. It has a special significance for the mutant community insofar as, for them, their real name is the mutant one (given or adopted and generally connected to their power), the official one being designated as a "slave name" (by the polymorphous character called Mystique, among others, in *X-Men: The Last Stand*, Brett Rattner, 2006).

We also know that superheroes have a special relationship with their costumes which have to be understood as essential items in the external signifying of the character's masculinity. Costume and logo constitute the heroic body as publicly marked; the mask serves to protect the self by placing a barrier between the subject and the world. Whether it is perceived as a screen, a disguise, a false front, the outfit is the sign and source of power, the mark of grace, and not only provides a means to show and legitimize the function[9] of the superhero, but may also signal his belonging to a group.[10] If ordinary costumes are streamlined amalgams of the machinic, the historical, and the organic (yet always emphasizing the human body's shapely forms), the recurrent use of leather has to be singled out. Not unlike the dandy's predilection for distinctive attire, in most of the recent films some superheroes wear their leather costume with affection (and affectation), as a second skin. For others, in an echo of the original flamboyance—and virtual nakedness—of the costumes in the comic books they originate from, the leather outfits are more problematic. Tellingly, the production—in its etymological sense of *pro-ducere*: to render visible, to cause to appear and be made to appear—of an identity through a recognizable (dis)guise becomes a matter of anxiety for the bearer of masculinity. Most films present elements of dialogue concerning the characters' apparel in terms redolent of heterosexually (and -sexist) masculine demeaning of the feminine or homosexual. To give but a few examples, in *X-Men*, the following exchange between Wolverine and Cyclops can be heard: "You actually go out in these things (black leather uniforms adorned with an X across the chest)?" "What would you prefer? Yellow spandex?" This glib remark is also a form of inside joke for the benefit of the spectators familiar with this universe, since it refers to Wolverine's original comic book costume. Ben Grimm/The Thing can also be quoted on the blue and black outfits of the *Fantastic Four* (Tim Story, 2005): "I don't know whether I should be flying or doing Swan Lake in this suit. (...) I wouldn't be caught dead wearing that." Then, of course, there is Hancock. When he is asked by Ray what he thinks of superhero costumes on comic book covers, the sulky superhero retorts successively: "Homo... Homo in red... Norwegian homo..." And when he is presented with a yet unseen costume in jail, his reaction is in character: "I will fight crime butt-ass naked before I fight it in that."

THE OTHER

Such a stance makes evident that the status and the power of the hard, muscular, male body is only achieved in contrast to those cultural identities represented as soft and vulnerable. The myth of idealized masculinity remains dependent on the

material and symbolic split between masculinity and femininity, between the hard male and the soft Other. In the misogynistic, homophobic (and racist) view of this ideology, the despised Other that masculinity defines itself against conventionally includes not just women but also feminized individuals. Hence the ambivalent response of the male characters to the use of garments which potentially signals them as Other (feminine, homosexual, transgender).

Be that as it may, the superheroes' relations to other figures further inform us on the problematic formation and delineation of masculinity. For one thing, it is noteworthy that current superheroes do not encounter female evil-doers who would challenge their power and hence their masculine prerogatives. Besides, there are few (but significant) instances when the male character shows some reluctance to assert himself as a leader or as a hero. To illustrate the first case, in the second installment of the Fantastic Four's adventures, *Four: The Rise of the Silver Surfer* (Tim Story, 2007), seemingly meek and ill-adjusted Reed Richards finally overcomes his reluctance and assumes the leadership of the oddly recomposed family unit when he is thus antagonized by General Hager: "Let me make it clear for you and your pack of freaks here. I'm the quarterback. You're on my team. Got it? But I guess you never played football in high school, did you, Richards?" To which Reed replies: "No, you're right, I didn't. I stayed in and studied, like a good little nerd. And fifteen years later... I'm one of the greatest minds of the 21st century! I'm engaged to the hottest girl on the planet. And the big jock who played quarterback in high school... Well, he's standing right in front of me, asking for my help... And I say he's not gonna get a goddam thing... Unless he does exactly what I tell him to... And starts treating my friends and me with some respect." As for the second element, an apt example can be found in *Spider-Man 2*. Crushed when he realizes his own reticence has induced a frustrated Mary Jane to become engaged to another man, Peter finds his superpowers occasionally failing him. This subconscious manifestation of his misgivings about fully assuming the responsibilities of society's savior provides a dramatic one-act climax, as, at the story's precise midway point, Peter tosses his Spider-Man costume in the trash.

In most cases, however, it would seem that masculinity naturally encompasses assuming such demanding tasks. Furthermore, superheroes seldom *openly* question their own masculinity, though they might use jokes debasing their opponent's (or rival's) masculinity[11] and naturally take for granted a communion of masculine essence when bonding with other male characters. Thus it is that, in an ironic take on this emblematically human model, two such alien characters as Hellboy and Abraham Sapien can deliver a drunken duet reprise of Barry Manilow's "Can't Smile Without You" in *Hellboy 2: The Golden Army* (Guillermo del Toro, 2006) when sharing and comparing their individual (and difficult) love entanglements.

Strangely enough, in the current batch of films, superheroes do not enjoy the presence of side-kicks, as was the case, for example, in the previous series of the Caped Crusader spin-offs (namely *Batman Forever* (1995) and *Batman & Robin* (1997), both directed by Joel Schumacher) in which Batman and Robin seemed engaged in a homosocial (arguably homoerotic) style of bonding. Consequently, the problematic relations with the same sex then appear to consist mostly in the transfer of homosocial relations to antagonistic relations with super-villains. On the one hand, when faced with (historic or unearthly) evil, the superhero has no qualms (though it may not always be an easy task) to disparage the villains. On the other hand, fighting it out with wrong-doers can feel like looking at one's dark side, the exem-

plary version of which is obviously the relationship between Batman and the Joker. And it is all the more problematic when the opponent is regarded by the hero as an actual or potential mentor/model (as an adequate example, in *Spider-Man 2*, Otto Octavius—to become the evil Doc Ock—and his wife Rosie, first appear as the parents Peter Parker never had, and the scientist stands as a model he wishes he could emulate), father (Norman Osborn plays a particularly troublesome father figure for Peter Parker and the same can be said about Colonel William Stryker for Wolverine), and/or brother (we can take the same characters with, respectively, Harry Osborn and Victor/Sabretooth)—which is not the most uncommon feature of superhero films.

As has just been pointed out, a crucial constituent of the superhero's *Bildung* as a man (which in turn inflects how his masculinity is determined) is the problematic role of parental figures. All the characters without exception have either absent or, most commonly, dead parents and, to emphasize this conventional trope of the original psychological trauma, more often than not their death occurs with the young superhero as a witness. This is usually accountable for the character's relation to violence, death, but also to his being dedicated to continual, unsatisfied movement, as if launching himself into an insatiable (fruitless?) search was a means to forever mourn the (original, lost) father, the masculine ideal with which he might have identified.

Another key defining element of the superhero's problematic masculinity concerns his love interests. Though perfectly consistent with contemporary western society's dominant form of sexuality, as supported by David Halperin's statement:

> The traditional codes or conventions for representing "love" in European-American culture (...) also govern the culture's visual rhetoric, restrict the use of erotic symbols (...) to heterosexual contexts and employ exemplary (situations) to typify and thereby to naturalize contemporary human social and sexual arrangements. (Halperin 2004, 83)

One cannot but consider this dimension of the superhero's relationship to the feminine Other as highly complicated. For one thing, male superheroes find themselves connected to other male superheroes in intriguingly numerous love triangles. Drawing from René Girard's claim that such triangles may disguise as rivalry what is actually an attraction between men, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick defines male homosociality as a form of male bonding with a characteristic triangular structure in which, "through the exchange of women, men both cement their bonds and displace their homoerotic desires" (68). This recurrent situation thus provides a possible (unconscious?) jeopardizing of the superhero's heterosexual masculinity.

Hence, what emerges as the most common feature of the majority of male superheroes is their incapacity to interact with the other sex in any satisfying fashion. Though they do experience desire, which, as Lynne Segal reminds us, "plays a central role in constructing 'masculinity' and affirming or subverting men's power and authority" (101), superheroes are notoriously incapable of "keeping a girlfriend," let alone have stable, intimate intercourse with one. If Daredevil is arguably one of Marvel's unluckiest characters in matters of the heart (all the women he meets either die or become extremely resentful), at the other end of the spectrum of masculine behavior towards "the fair sex" stands Johnny Storm (aka Torch)'s incessant womanizing. In both cases, at any rate, nothing stable ensues from the interaction with women.

Censorship notwithstanding, this is an essentially sexless universe the spectator is presented with, in keeping with the illustrated origins of the characters. Once again, the bodily activities (which consist quasi-exclusively in fighting off villains, rescuing innocents and saving the world at large) of the superhero are directed towards other concerns. Still, there are exceptions: the principal difference (and interest?) between the 1978 version of *Superman* and its latest installment, *Superman Returns* (Bryan Singer, 2006), lies in the plot twist which makes the Man of Steel become a father. In a similar vein, director Guillermo del Toro and screenwriter (as well as author of the original comic book) Mike Mignola confront their creation, Hellboy, not only with imminent fatherhood (of twins), but also with the prospects of marriage. In this respect, the two characters stand out in a universe where male superheroes cannot escape loneliness by choice or by imposition. Perhaps granted more leeway (within limitations, surely), the makers of *The Incredibles* (Brad Bird, 2004) created a family of "supers," with a happily married couple and three children—an (almost) archetypal, socially acceptable unit. The sacred institution of marriage (between Sue Storm and Reed Richards) is also at the heart of *Rise of the Silver Surfer*'s peripeteia.

To explain this recurrent inadequacy, one need not look any further than in the significant presence of strong female characters. There are obviously the staunchly independent superheroines, Catwoman and Elektra, who stand on equal footing with both men and superheroes. But there are also more ordinary women who are nonetheless apt to make drastic choices, heedless of masculine interference. A striking example can be found at the end of *Spider-Man 2*: M-J has just run away from her own wedding to come to Peter's apartment; when he exclaims: "You shouldn't be here!," she answers: "I know you think we can't be together. But can't you respect me enough to let me make my own decision, I know there'll be risks. But I want to face them with you. It's wrong that we should only be half alive, half of ourselves. (...) Isn't it time somebody saved your life?" It is also interesting to observe how repeatedly women are not taken in by the wiles of the aggressive masculinity displayed by male superheroes. The following exchange, in *Four: The Rise of the Silver Surfer*, between Johnny Storm and an unreceptive Captain Raye encapsulates this resistance: "Why are you so down on me? You don't even know me." To which he is retorted: "Actually, I know you very well. I read your personality profile: confident, reckless, irresponsible, self-obsessed, bordering on narcissism." Or the woman District Attorney of Los Angeles to Hancock: "From where I sit, I see a selfish, self-absorbed man, with a lot of muscle, but no regard for anyone but yourself."

As if to challenge such a pivotal example as Wolverine, screenwriters seem to have been bent on confronting him with the broadest range of feminine endangerment of his masculinity: in the film bearing his mutant name, Logan is kept under check and manipulated—though for good reasons: she has been promised her young sister would be released from the hands (and scalpel) of Colonel William Stryker if she executes that (not so unpleasant) task—by (the aptly named) Kayla Silverfox, a woman he thinks is an ordinary school teacher. In a reversal of iconic masculine prerogative, he *is* seduced by Mystique (in the shape of Jean Grey) in *X2* (Bryan Singer, 2003), then by Jean Grey (under the influence of her destructive other self, Dark Phoenix) in *The Last Stand*. He is even threatened to be "drained" of his life force (and hence, symbolically, of his masculinity) by Rogue in *X-Men*, and to be disintegrated by Phoenix in *The Last Stand*.

This most radical menace to the very essence of masculinity—the disappearance of the masculine body—recalls the "fear of disintegration" experienced by the "martial man, locked up within his armoured totality" described by Klaus Theweleit (118), and has to be connected to the threat of being taken over by, in the words of the author, "the slimy," i.e. the (ontologically feminine) liquidity, secretion[12] and color which takes over the "clean and proper" body. Not unlike the abject in Julia Kristeva's theory,[13] this phenomenon is appropriately illustrated by the oozing "symbiote" taking over Peter and turning him into a darker version of himself, in *Spider-Man 3*.

MUTANTS

As a result of these imperilments, the masculine hero acquires a heightened sense of isolation. Even for the characters closest to a model of ordinariness, fitting in remains a challenge: the Incredible family, for instance, needs a "superhero protection programme" in the hope of leading a "normal" life. And, in *Four: Rise of the Silver Surfer*, Sue Storm repeatedly expresses how desperately she yearns for some normalcy to raise a family. The unrequited desire to fit in shared by most characters at some point, is best explored in the figure of the mutant.

Mutants are categorical mistakes of a specific type. While they want to fit in, they know their birthright is to exist outside the normative. They are eternal adolescents. As a point of fact, historically, the first mutant superheroes were the X-Men, and were dubbed "The Most Unusual Teen-Agers of All Time!" Whether explicitly analogized to adolescent bodies, Jewish bodies, Japanese or Native or African American bodies, they are, first and foremost, subjected, subjugated and colonized figures. If they are victims, however, theirs are also challenging, transgressive, uncontrollable, and alternative bodies, and as such, valuable sources of disruption. Such marginal beings pose a question and are constantly perceived by the rest of humanity as a threat to the social body, which must somehow reincorporate this ambiguous species or brand it (with an X?) as taboo: "X-Bodies as in taboo; X as in impure and polluted and under erasure; but also X as in X rays, with their power to reveal; X as in extreme; X as in ex—the ex-men" (Bukatman, 73-4). Never fully citizens, nor fully dispossessed, it is little wonder they feel the necessity to belong to a group, a corporation, a fraternity or a school which provides alternative concepts of home and family.

Under the tutelage of Professor X, the mutants are sited both inside and outside society. Thanks to his guidance and counseling, their powers move from uncontrolled and eruptive to controlled and articulate. Thus, by constructing such an alternative social order, the categorical mistake is resituated as a fundamental force of social cohesion. This aspect of the mythology of the world of the X-Men is indicative of an ideological undercurrent common to all superhero fictions: that of the White Anglo Saxon Protestant, phallocentric and male-dominated model, preserved and propagated by Hollywood. In concise terms, "Hollywood blockbusters, and superhero comic books constitute a rather blunt form of ideological interpellation: reactionary, masculinist, and driven to mastery" (Bukatman, 5). Drawing on the Althusserian theory of ideology as interpellation, Silverman also writes that "the dominant fiction consists of the images and stories through which a society figures consensus; images and stories which presumably both draw upon and help to shape" and reinforce normative male identification (30). And it comes as no sur-

prise that all the figures of power are embodied by white masculine characters. Though there is no questioning Ray Embrey's kind and charitable intentions, the public relations expert's expression, "I'm doing this for his own good," puts the African-American superhero Hancock in a position where he has to abide by the rules set by a white man's approval and benediction. Similarly, though a resolute loner and bent on preserving her independence, Elektra is only allowed to come into her own after receiving her (white, wise, old) mentor. It is also a telling item of trivia that Stan Lee, the creator of many of the characters, makes a cameo appearance in most films drawing their inspirations from his Marvel comic books, thus symbolically placing them under the aegis of "the old white man."

WITHER SUPERHEROES?

A defense of patriarchal, masculine ideals, mass media culture plays a decisive role in regulating a "hegemonic masculinity, which is not static but always in process, (which) not only shapes images of ideal manhood; it also becomes institutionalized" (McCall, 6). Even formulaic, one might add, when looking at some of Hollywood's less successful attempts to propose syncretic responses to gender formation issues. Clearly, the seemingly innocuous, low-brow depictions of boosted-up bouts of fisticuffs that superhero films present, while delivering their share of entertainment, have something else to offer: something that, in keeping with the functions of legends and fairy tales, has to do with proposing fictional solutions to very real issues, prominent among which is defining an image of oneself as an individual, and as a part of a larger whole (any social group can be concerned, including a country or nation).

This points to a tension between two poles: on the one hand, the existence of genre films has to take into account the intrinsic inclination of Hollywood studios to be attentive to what pleases (or is supposed to please—remakes and sequels are the most flagrant instance of the flip side of this propensity) the audiences; and also to what is lucrative (and superhero productions have shown that they can be profitable, as U.S. and worldwide gross figures for discussed movies readily show). In this perspective, although (depending on box-office returns) it is inevitable that Hollywood's (and the audience's) infatuation with superheroes is likely to wane,[14] as was the case for other genre productions (*films noirs* or westerns, for instance), it is equally inevitable that it will, after a period of quiescence, rise again.

On the other hand, spectator response to this type of films is connected to the capacity for superheroes to (consciously and unconsciously) present vectors of optimism proposing a reassuring world view when circumstances on the home front and abroad are not so favorable. And in this perspective, the social, historical and political circumstances of the emergence of superheroes cannot be ignored. Most productions of superhero movies have come into existence after the 9/11 trauma, not just to offer escapist fantasy in the wake of a terrible tragedy, but to address issues, albeit in an oblique manner, about American power and the morality of using extreme methods to deal with challenging, slippery foes. Not all superhero movies in the past decade have dealt with terrorism or the Iraq/Afghanistan wars, but most have commented on the post 9/11 era. For example, *The Dark Knight* is about how Gotham's only superpower (Batman) copes with a lawless terrorist (the Joker) and how far Batman is willing to go to restore order in the wake of the Joker's rampage (even if it entails using NSA-style tapping into the general population's cell

phones). *Iron-Man* is not even metaphorically about the war in Afghanistan—Tony Stark is a leader of the weapons industry, and he goes to Afghanistan and gets mired in the conflict. Strikingly, most films (the best and the worst) signal their inscription in the problematic of war, the cost of warfare, and an apparently simplistic view of global politics: good versus evil, heroes versus villains.

If the tone of the films have turned unmistakably, dark, paranoid and questioning, it is also undeniable that, because most of the protagonists are male superheroes, they embody various forms of "crisis of masculinity," as was shown above. When compared to the relative inefficiency of the soldiers sent abroad to successfully fight a (ludicrously named) "war on terror" or to the inadequacies of the emblematic figure of the Father of the Nation (for instance, George W. Bush's belated response to hurricane Katrina or President Obama's current unwillingness—or incapacity, as most of his detractors insist—to take drastic decisions concerning social and economic issues), the conservative Superman-like superhero's instant ability to make the right choices may come as a relief. However, the more subversive (because of their human foibles) superheroes provide more complex, sometimes not fully resolved answers. Then again, revolutionary changes may not be what the paying public is looking for.

The question then arises: does the fictional figure of the superhero paradoxically constitute "real" masculinity at a time when the culturally constructed phenomenon of gender roles is, once again, questioned, challenged and debated, or do the superheroes manifest a marginalized masculinity? A possible answer lies in the argument that, since they have become a cornerstone of popular culture, it is a necessity for each generation to redefine the superhero according to its needs, not unlike masculinity, according to Abigail Solomon-Godeau:

> I would argue that masculinity, however defined, is, like capitalism, always in crisis. And the real question is how both manage to restructure, refurbish, and resurrect themselves for the next historical turn. (in *Constructing masculinity*, 70)

At worst, then, engineering consent over what is supposed to form a culture in which masculinity is emphasized as a reference and an ideal borders on caricature. However, such achievements as *The Dark Knight* or *Spider-Man 2* transcend genre limitations to reach a form and degree of hypnotic universality (which could account for their extremely large success at the box office). What also makes this particular genre so fascinating might lie in the fact that, by formulating a denial of human limitations—a denial of death which connects to the overall denial of sexuality, mortality, and fleshly bodies in superhero films—the spectator is offered a glimpse of immortality, as Danny Fingeroth suggests (p. 37).

NOTES

[1] Scott Bukatman, *Matters of Gravity*, Durham & London, Duke University Press, 2003, 50.

[2] R.W. Connell, *Masculinities*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995. R.W. Connell, and James W. Messerschmidt, "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept" in *Gender and Society* 19.6 (2005): 829-59.

[3] "Can Masculinity be Terminated?" *in* Cohan 245.

[4] The first scene of *Ironman* (Jon Favreau, 2008), with its fast editing, rapid and hu-

morous dialogue, together with AC/DC's *Back in Black* serving as hetero-, then homodiegetic accompaniment, stands as an appropriate instance of the use of that kind of music.

[5] Interestingly, by being acclaimed "Sexiest Man Alive" in 2008 by the magazine *People*, this film has also brought Hugh Jackman something of a macho aura worthy of such cinematic icons of the 80s as Bruce Willis, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Sylvester Stallone.

[6] Denis Duclos, *Le Complexe du Loup-Garou: La Fascination de la Violence dans la Culture Américaine* (Paris: Editions La Découverte, 1994).

[7] In *Hellboy*, Agent Manning (who is fed up with "Red"'s antics, which he has to go out of his way to cover up) tells the eponymous character: "After you've captured, after you've killed every freak, every monster, there's still one left—you. (To other agents) I want that thing locked up."

[8] In *Spider-Man 2* (Sam Raimi, 2004), the use of the play in which Mary-Jane Watson (Spider-Man/Peter Parker's love interest) has a role, Oscar Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest,* is very much a type of *mise-en-abîme* for its reflective quality. In *Spider-Man 3* (Sam Raimi, 2007), a further step in the reflection on duality is taken when a "symbiote" from outer space transforms Spider-Man into a black version of himself, "amplifying the characteristics of its host. Especially aggression!," as Dr Connors tells a metamorphosed Peter Parker.

[9] In Peter Berg's film, Ray, the Public Relations guru who wants to amend Hancock's catastrophic public image, offers as the ultimate argument to convince the said Hancock to shed his hobo-style attire in favour of a black leather costume: "This is a uniform. A uniform represents purpose. Doctors, policemen, firemen, right? It represents a calling."

[10] It is noteworthy that one of the recurrent words used by Bryan Singer in the running commentary he makes of the first two X-Men films is "ensemble" when he considers the cast/Professor Xavier's team. Obviously standing in opposition to the individualistic heroes, this "ensemble" also has to be paralleled and contrasted with Magneto's "Brotherhood."

[11] In *X-Men*, when Cyclops, Storm and Wolverine first encounter shape-shifting Mystique, to prove his own identity Wolverine exclaims: "Hey, it's me!" Cyclops then asks: "Prove it." Wolverine peremptorily concludes the exchange with: "You're a dick."

[12] See Lawrence D. Kritzman "Hauntological Mater and Sartre's Family Romance" *in* Todd W. Reeser and Lewis C. Seifert, eds., *Entre Hommes* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008).

[13] In *Powers of Horror*, Kristeva links abjection with "what disturbs identity, system, order. What does not respect border, position, rules" (4).

[14] Though not in the near future, since at least three superhero films have been released in 2011: *Thor*, *Green Lantern*, and, last but not least, *Captain America*. Obviously the crowning moment of the succession of Marvel-inspired films has come in May 2012 with the release of *The Avengers*, which features Iron-Man, Hulk, Thor and Captain America united. (Source: IMDb.com)

References

Adorno, Theodore. *Minima Moralia.* Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1951; reprint, London, England: Verso, 1978.

Aoki, Douglas Sadao. "Posing the Subject: Sex, Illumination, and *Pumping Iron II: The Women*." *Cinema Journal* 38.4. 1999.

Basso, Matthew, Laura McCall, and Dee Garceau. *Across the Great Divide: Cultures of Manhood in the American West*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2001.

Berger, Maurice, Brian Wallis, and Simon Watson. *Constructing Masculinity*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1995.

Bukatman, Scott. *Matters of Gravity: Special Effects and Supermen in the 20th Century*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003.

Cohan, Steven and Ina Rae Hark, eds. *Screening The Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1993.

Connell, R.W. and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the concept" in *Gender and Society* 19.6, 2005.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1995.

Daniels, Les. *Comix–A History of Comic Books in America*. London, Great Britain: Wildwood House, 1973.

Duclos, Denis. *Le Complexe du Loup-Garou: La Fascination de la Violence dans la Culture Américaine*. Paris, France: Editions La Découverte, 1994.

Fingeroth, Danny. *Superman On The Couch*. New York, NY: Continuum, 2004.

Halperin, David. *How to Do the History of Homosexuality*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Jeffords, Susan. "Can Masculinity be Terminated," in Cohan, Steven and Ina Rae Hark, eds. *Screening The Male: Exploring Masculinities in Hollywood Cinema*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1993.

Kimmel, Michael. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Free Press, 1996.

Kristeva, Julia. *Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Kritzman, Lawrence D. "Hauntological Mater and Sartre's Family Romance," *in* Todd W. Reeser and Lewis C. Seifert, eds., *Entre Hommes*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.

Lawrence, John Shelton and Robert Jewett, *The Myth of the American Superhero*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2002.

Mitchell, Lee Clark. *Westerns: Making the Man in Fiction and Film*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Reeser, Todd W. and Lewis C. Seifert, eds. *Entre Hommes: French and Francophone Masculinities in Culture and Theory*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.

Robinson, Sally. *Marked Men: White Masculinity in Crisis*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Savran, David. *Taking It Like a Man: White Masculinity, Masochism, and Contemporary American Culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men: Male Homosocial Desire and English Literature*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Segal, Lynne. *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. London: Virago Press, 1990.

Shaviro, Steven. *The Cinematic Body*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Silverman, Kaja. *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.

Theweleit, Klaus. *Male Fantasises*, vol.2. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1987.

Thomas, Calvin. *Male Matters*. Urbana and Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1996.

ANNE-VALÉRIE DULAC*

"I Never Knew Him Other Than a Man": Masculinity as Ornament in Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*

The present article aims at showing how Sir Philip Sidney's two versions of the *Arcadia* deal with the issue of masculinity. Patricia Fumerton's propositions about the parallels between Hilliard's miniatures and Sidney's sonnets are here confronted to the two pastoral romances, which seem to have retained a rather similar approach to the idea of ornament. The issue of disguises and ornamental attributes of one's sex in the old and new *Arcadia*, compared with the limner's vision of the same, thus turn to prove central in understanding the fascinating complexities of sex in Sidney's original and revised works.

Keywords: *Arcadia*, Sir Philip Sidney, masculinity, miniature, ornament

Though the 1563 *Homily Against Excess* of *Apparel* "sets out to chastise both men and women,"[2] a significant part of the sermon was devoted to the threat that some Elizabethan "effeminate" men posed to good order:

> Yea, many men are become so effeminate, that they care not what they spend in disguising themselves, ever desiring new toys and inventing new fashions. Therefore a certain man that would picture every countryman in his accustomed apparel, when he had painted other nations, he pictured the Englishman all naked, and gave him cloth under his arm, and bade him make it himself as he thought best, for he changed his fashion so often, that he knew not how to make it.[3]

The text shows how despite the queen's own cunning manipulation of gender roles and boundaries,[4] Elizabethans were expected to know of and follow some visible rules common to their sex in order to both secure stable ontogeny and undermine superficiality.[5] The (in)visible dimension of gender differences is here central: the homily's reference to "a certain man that would picture every countryman in his accustomed apparel" is most certainly a reference to Ghent-born painter and sculptor Lucas *de Heere* (1531-84), who spent a number of years in England as a

* Université Paris 13 Nord.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anne-Valérie Dulac, Université Paris 13 Nord, UFR des Lettres, Sciences de l'Homme et des Sociétés99, avenue Jean-Baptiste Clément 93 430 Villetaneuse, Paris, France. Email: annevaleriedulac@yahoo.fr

Protestant refugee at the end of the 1560's and beginning of the 1570's. Around these years, he developed a pictorial style very similar to the one found in illustrations for "Books of Habits and Customs," a genre "often linked to travellers' ethnographies."[6] Proto-ethnographic pictures were fast developing in Elizabethan England, as a result of the increasing number of voyages made by English explorers. Once he travelled back to France, where he would spend the rest of his life, he started or continued working on a costume book documenting each and every known nation's sartorial trends and stereotypes in a bid to illustrate his most ambitious work thus far, later published under the title *Théâtre de tous les peuples et nations de la terre, avec leurs habits et ornements divers, tant anciens que modernes, diligemment dépeints au naturel par Luc Dheere, peintre et sculpteur gantois*.[7] The very last watercolour of this theatre shows a bearded man standing in the nude, except for a small white loincloth wrapped around his hips. He is shown with a pair of scissors in his right hand, and a large piece of yellow fabric is rested on his left arm. The short poem on the page opposite does not mention the nationality of the naked man, but De Heere's pupil, Van Mander, offers a detailed explanation for the watercolour in *Het Schilderboeck* (1604):

> It once happened that when [Lucas de Heere] was in England he obtained a commission to paint in a gallery for the Admiral in London [the Lord High Admiral, Edward Clinton] in which he had to paint all the costumes or clothing of the nations. When all but the Englishman were done, he painted him naked and set beside him all manner of cloth and silk materials, and next to them tailor's scissors and chalk. When the Admiral saw this figure he asked Lucas what he meant by it. He answered that he had done that with the Englishman because he did not know what appearance or kind of clothing he should give him because they varied so much from day to day; for if he had done it one way today the next day it would have to be another—be it French or Italian, Spanish or Dutch—and I have therefore painted the material and tools to hand so that one can always make of it what one wishes.[8]

Van Mander's suggestion that the red-haired bearded man is indeed English seems most plausible given that the picture bears a striking resemblance to a much earlier one, appearing in *The Introduction of Knowledge* by Andrew Boorde (which was published in the 1550's but written around 1542). Boorde's own naked man was meant to illustrate the following verse:

> I am an Englishman, and naked I stand here,
> Musyng in my mynde what rayment I shal were;
> For now I wyll were thys, and now I wyl were that;
> Now I wyl were I cannot tel what.
> All new fashyons be pleasaunt to me;
> I wyl haue them, whether I thryue or thee.[9]

"New fashions," "toys" and "disguises" were therefore associated in both Boorde's text and in the later homily with the changing tastes of fickle English men. Yet how much were visible devices or apparel considered a defining part of manhood and/or effeminacy in Elizabethan England?

In a recent article about the Renaissance beard, Will Fisher has argued very con-

vincingly that the morphology of genitals in the Renaissance was only one among many other equally important sex-defining features:

> [S]ex was materialized through an array of features and prosthetic parts. A list of some of these parts would have to include the beard and the genitals, but would also have to include clothing, the hair, the tongue, and weapons such as swords or daggers (to name just a few).[10]

Clothing, like genitals or facial hair, may have been historically equally important in determining someone's sex, sharing a common "prosthetic" function with them. Yet in materializing sex, some "features and prosthetic parts" may be used as mere props, disguises or, conversely, as clues. As such, the visible materialization of these features on the representational stage of Elizabethan literature reveals the complex and at times undecidable role they play in revealing or concealing sexual identities. I would here like to use the example of one central passage in Sir Philip Sidney's revised *Arcadia* to try and see how much some pastoral characters in the romance, toying with disguises, may be read as performers of their own sexual identity, forever delaying the unveiling of visible evidence.

Ornaments of Sex

Bearing Fisher's visible features of Elizabethan sexes in mind, I would first like to go back to the formerly extremely wide-ranging meaning of *ornament*, which, in early modern English, could be applied to describe any single one of these "features and prosthetic parts" and was also recurrently used in Sidney's prose works and correspondence.

In early modern days, the word ornament retained a truly animistic dimension. In Walter J. Ong's words:

> The terms *ornamentum* or *ornamentatio* have certain definite synonyms which come from Cicero and Quintilian; An "ornament" of rhetoric is also indifferently styled a "praise" (*laus*) or an "honor" (*honos* or *honor*) or a "light" (*lumen*) of words or of speech. […] The whole field over which *laus, honor, lumen,* and *ornamentum* play is obviously one where the distinctions between persons and objects now made automatically at least by English-speaking persons are more or less blurred.[11]

Philip Sidney knew his Cicero and Quintilian intimately, and he was also one of England's most prominent Ramists: the Latin meaning of "ornament" could not have escaped him in any way, as well as the many ambiguities of the word.

Sidney's varying uses of the word show that the degree of subject/object incorporation is never settled, and ornamental visibility thus continually hovers between essentiality and superficiality, ostentation and concealment. *The Defence of Poesie* is fraught with such contradictions. The first occurrence of *ornament* is in the following passage:

> He said soldiers were the noblest estate of mankind, and horsemen the noblest of soldiers. He said they were the maisters of war, and ornaments of peace, speedy goers, and strong abiders, triumphers both in Camps and Courts.[12]

Sidney's avowed goal was to *defend* poetry by showing that "Poetrie is the Companion of Camps"[13]: the reader is thus led to understand this one use of "ornament" as the expression of necessity and the prolongation of manly strength.[14] This may further be due to the Latin etymon of "ornament," referring to a warrior equipment, including armour and weapons, themselves "prosthetic parts" of the man sporting them. Reflexively, this also means that soldiers are the very condition of peace, or, in other words, its "equipment," much in the way early modern "hands" were thought to equip the body:

> Because it conceives of ornament as equipment rather than as decoration solely, the fifteenth century can conceive of the hand as 'a great help and ornament to the body', and the sixteenth century of tackling as the 'ornaments of a ship'.[15]

The war imagery may also have been a way for Sidney to answer the then current view that poetry was an unmanly, effeminate art. We know that *The Defence* was meant partly as an answer to Stephen Gosson's *School of Abuse* (1579), which reiterated Plato's strictures on poets: "No marvel though Plato shut them out of his school and banished them quite from his commonwealth as effeminate writers, unprofitable members, and utter enemies to virtue."[16] To which Sidney replied:

> Again, a man might ask out of what commonwealth Plato doth banish them. In sooth, thence where he himself allows community of women. So as belike this banishment grew not for effeminate wantonness, since little should poetical sonnets be hurtful when a man might have what woman he listed.[17]

In Sidney's *Defence*, poets become manly ornaments essential to courtly and soldierly life. Yet only moments after the ornamental soldier example, Sidney reverts to another definition of ornament:

> [T]he greatest part of poets have apparelled their poetical inventions in that numbrous kind of writing which is called verse—indeed but apparelled, verse being but an ornament and no cause to poetry, since there have been many most excellent poets that never versified.[18]

Here on the contrary ornament becomes the antonym for "cause." Provided that Sidney was very well versed in Aristotelian concepts,[19] which he mentions and analyses throughout the whole *Defence*, he may here have meant "cause" in its essential meaning (as opposed to substantial). Verse does not belong to the essence of poetry and is only accidental: this "grammatical"[20] view of ornament is therefore the exact opposite of the "equipment" version of ornament.

This division is made even clearer in Sidney's dedication of *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia* to "his dear lady and sister." In this short text, the loving brother describes the pastoral romance as an "idle work": Sidney described most of his own literary works as toys, which he thought were most likely to blemish his reputation and fame, should they have been published.[21] Philip had indeed no intention of circulating the *Arcadia* around anyone outside the close circle of friends his beloved sister would deem trustworthy and benevolent enough to lay eyes upon it:

> Now it is done only for you, only to you; if you keep it to yourself, or to such friends who will weigh errors in the balance of goodwill, I hope, for the father's sake, it will be pardoned, perchance made much of, though in itself it have deformities.[22]

The all too reluctant begetter of the allegedly misshapen offspring goes on to compare his unwanted progeny to frivolous sundries:

> And so, looking for no better stuff than, as in a haberdasher's shop, glasses, or feathers, you will continue to love the writer who doth exceedingly love you, and most heartily prays you might long live to be a principal ornament to the family of the Sidneys.[23]

Here again two kinds of ornaments come to clash: feathers and other props cannot be put on a par with the ornamental Countess who makes the Sidney family proud. Are the ornamental "prostheses" of sex in the *Arcadia* on the side of the essence or of the artificial?

Chinese Boxes

I would here like to turn to Patricia Fumerton's comparison of what she calls a "literary locket," i.e. "the 'case' of prefatory letters speaking the convention of 'secrets bewraide'"[24] to the "ornamental picture case [of miniatures] richly decorated for all to see."[25] Though Fumerton's article deals with sonnets rather than with the pastoral romance, I do think that the case she makes for the comparison between the poetic and visual ornaments (Hilliard's miniatures) also helps better understanding some major ambiguities relative to the display and performance of manhood within the *Arcadia*.

Sidney's 1590 *Arcadia*, otherwise known as the "new" *Arcadia*, tells the long and eventful story of two princes as they try and make their strenuous and winding way back home through Arcadia after they have been shipwrecked. At one point in the course of their progress, Pyrocles, one of the two heroes, becomes obsessed with the table[26] of an exceptionally beautiful woman that is exhibited in the picture gallery at old Kalander's country lodge. He thus embarks upon another journey to conquer young Philoclea, the mesmerising princess shown in the portrait. Upon arriving at her kingly father's court, Pyrocles dresses up as an Amazon in order both to avoid arousing suspicions in her father and to be granted the right to spend more time with Philoclea than his real sexual identity would have allowed. From then on, Pyrocles calls himself Zelmane, after the name of a young woman who we learn died in his service long before he and Musidorus were marooned on the Arcadian shores. The original Zelmane -whose story is told in the revised version of the *Arcadia*[27]- falls in love with Pyrocles and takes on the appearance of a page to escape her father and follow the object of her affection without him knowing. The narrator eventually has her confess her true identity to Pyrocles on her deathbed:

> For your sake myself have become of a princess, a page, and for your sake have put off the apparel of a woman, and (if you judge not more mercifully) the modesty. [...] And I pray you, said she, even by these dying eyes of mine [...] and by

these polled locks of mine (which, while they were long, were the ornaments of my sex, now in their short curls, the testimony of my servitude) and by the service I have done you […] think of me after my death with kindness, though you cannot with love.[28]

The obvious parallel between the two episodes, made explicit by the circulation of Zelmane's name, highlights the overall theatrical dimension of amorous ploys, hinging upon the hiding and/or revealing of the "ornaments" of the characters' sex. This is only one of the many dramatic twists and turns in the new *Arcadia*, which most critics agree is mainly about performing one's identity: "[w]ithout distortion the entire conduct of Pyrocles and Musidorus in Arcadia can be called a performance, an act."[29] The two Zelmane stories differ in one significant respect. Even though Pyrocles is not killed by the narrator and gets to unveil who he really is under seemingly better circumstances, the new Zelmane proves only relatively luckier than his namesake. Indeed, young Philoclea, upon discovering Pyrocles's real name and sex, fails to fully acknowledge the change in her lover's identity and is torn apart between Pyrocles and Zelmane:

Alas, how painful it is to a divided mind to make a well-joined answer! How hard it is to bring inward shame to outward confession! And what handsomeness, trow you, can be observed in that speech which is made one knows not to whom? Shall I say, "O Zelmane"? Alas, your words be against it. Shall I say "Prince Pyrocles"? Wretch that I am, your show is manifest against it.[30]

Following the revelation scene, the narrator deliberately prolongs the confusion further by keeping on referring to Pyrocles as Zelmane and using feminine pronouns whenever mentioning him. After having divested himself of his womanly ornaments, Pyrocles still attempts to provide multiple proofs of his sex to the ever incredulous Philoclea:

Pyrocles […] presented her with some jewels of right princely value, as some little tokens of his love and quality; and withal showed her letters from his father, King Euarchus, unto him, which even in the sea had amongst his jewels been preserved. But little needed those proofs to one who would have fallen out with herselft rather than make any contrary conjecture to Zelmane's speeches […].[31]

The validity or impact of the proofs is therefore never really tested, provided that Philoclea would not dare contradict Pyrocles for fear of losing Zelmane: "O Zelmane," Philoclea exclaims, "for so I love to call thee, since in that name my love first began […]."[32] Schwarz sees in this confession the perfect illustration that Pyrocles's revelation "enables Philoclea to confess her love for a woman."[33] Yet it does remain telling that Pyrocles should brandish the aforementioned letters as proof. The insignia of birth, implicitly aristocratic ("his father, King Euarchus"), is the social ornament that Pyrocles thinks Philoclea needs, thus confirming that the romance, much like *Astrophel and Stella*, shows lovers resorting to public and courtly forms of expression to show and tell their true selves: "The lovers are readers of each other whom they at the same time write. And because they can only express their private love through public or conventional conceits and poses, they each become 'wrapt' in a fictional case"[34], or, in this particular example, in an ornamental case

full of jewels and letters miraculously preserved from a shipwreck. Instead of the rhetorical ornaments found in the sonnets, the letters serve as social tokens of one's identity.

The revelation does not put an end to the ornamental logic the reader may have thought was only part of the disguise. Behind the disguise stand yet further ornaments—be they jewels or letters—whose link to the characters' true identity remain undecided. Much like the heart according to Fumerton, Zelmane-Pyrocles's sexual identity "exists more in 'Idea' than in actuality, like the generic 'She' that stands for the real-life Stella. It lies […] beneath the […] convention, hidden in the white 'ground of the page'."[35] The reader, like Philoclea, never catches a glimpse of the bottom of the "Chinese box of ornament"[36] where sex materializes in Arcadia.

DEFERRING SEX

Kathryn Schwarz, analysing the endless deferral of the proof of Pyrocles's manhood explains how "The [old] *Arcadia* deploys female pronouns, importunate parents, unruly peasants, and a great deal of occasional poetry to hold the conditions of speaking as speaking as and acting like a man."[37] She then goes on to quote Kinney on the deferral of sexual intercourse: "In the narrative present of Arcadia, immediate—and in particular *erotic*—action is repeatedly deferred as Sidney's lords and ladies demand (and supply) additional narrative performances."[38] In this quotation again, performance is said to screen or delay action and to postpone the erotic encounter between Pyrocles and Philoclea. Later on in the romance, when the two lovers finally get an opportunity to consummate their love, the rhetorical ornament of convention prevails, once again:

> When Pyrocles' seduction of Philoclea finally takes place, we do not see it. Instead, the text presents an intensely conventional love poem that Pyrocles once heard from a friend. Rather than reading about the triumph of manhood, we contemplate a blazon that […] displaces sexual consummation.[39]

Rather significantly, the blazon - which Catherine Bates sees as a form designed to promote "male poetic display"[40] - is said to have circulated between men beforehand, so that even within the privacy of the chamber, "one is left with the conventional artifice of rhetoric, the verbal mirror to Hilliard's limning ornament."[41] The blurred distinction between body and ornament, inner truth and outward show is also made manifest within the blazon itself whose speaker marvels at his lover's beauty in the following terms: "The tip no jewel needs to wear / The tip is jewel of the ear."[42] The difference between the jewel and the lover's body becomes unclear, thus embodying the dual nature of ornaments. Conventions, as ornaments, screen the lover's body from the reader's view, and one is left to guess what is hinted at beyond or behind the narrator's words.

MINIATURES

The blazon also features in the new *Arcadia*, except at a different and rather telling stage in the narrative. In the second version of the pastoral, the poem is uttered by Zelmane, before she reveals her true identity to Philoclea. While Philoclea, Pamela and female friends go and bathe in the Ladon river, Zelmane decides to follow

them. She is then so moved by the vision of the naked Arcadian nymphs that she starts "quivering" and thinks '"it more wisdom to lean herself to a tree and look on."[43] Why has the blazon been placed in such new context?

First of all, one of the main differences between the two versions is that "in the *New Arcadia*'s bathing scene, the blazon does not simulate a sex-act as it specifically does in the *Old*."[44] Erotic action is not just delayed in the new *Arcadia* but replaced by more of less subtle suggestions of Pyrocles's physical arousal. Besides, in lieu of the erotic encounter, the reader is presented with a miniature:

> But as the ladies played them in the water, sometimes striking it with the hands, the water (making lines in his face) seemed to smile at such beating, and with twenty bubbles, not to be content to have the picture of their face in large upon him, but he would in each of these bubbles set forth the miniature of them.[45]

This is generally thought to be the first written use of the word « miniature » in English, and may be an echo of Sidney's familiarity with this pictorial genre:

> Sidney's opportunity to view limnings by Hilliard would have been great. […] Everyone who was anyone at court was limned by Hilliard, including Elizabeth, Drake, Leicester, Raleigh, Essex and Sidney's very own Stella, Penelope Rich. Sidney's uncle, Leicester, and friend, Essex, were both patrons of Hilliard, and through them Sidney may have met Hilliard. Or he may have met him during their joint participation in the Alençon marriage negotiations. That they did meet is certain: Hilliard in his *Treatise* reports a long conversation with Sidney. Considering their different social status, this exchange probably occurred at a sitting for a miniature, although no authentic limning of Sidney has yet been found.[46]

Roy Strong has argued that Sidney may have sat twice for Hilliard and that the sittings may have occurred between 1578 and 1585, at which time he was also revising his *Arcadia*.[47] The juxtaposition of the blazon and the miniature therefore points to the Chinese box logic of sex ornamental materializations in the *Arcadia*. Though sex can be made manifest through "an array of features and prosthetic parts,"[48] these parts and features, turned ornaments, both point to and conceal the true ground of the characters' sex. The comparison that Patricia Fumerton draws between Sidney's sonnets and Hilliard's miniatures may thus be extended to encompass the representation of sex within the new *Arcadia*. Indeed, as Catherine Bates writes, the new *Arcadia* further destabilizes the masculine writing subject by taking "the querying of that subject to a whole new level,"[49] and I would add, to a whole new layer of ornament. The romance turns into a speaking miniature, bodies turn into ornaments, tips of the ear turn into jewel, as though the distinction between inward "truth" and outward show could not be solved but by exhibiting their interlocking curls, as gender-ambiguous as the River Ladon where the bathing scene is set.[50]

THE IDEA OF SEX

Pyrocles' s sex therefore never acquires actuality in the *Arcadia* and is consequently both displayed, exhibited and concealed *through* the changing ornaments the Prince chooses to conjure up. As Duncan-Jones suggested about *Astrophil and*

Stella's true identities, the truth of the (sexual) matter in the *Arcadia* probably lies in the hidden "Idea" of sex rather than in its outward show. In explaining what he meant by the *Idea* or "fore-conceit" of representation in the *Defence*, Sidney tellingly used yet another pictorial comparison:

> There is such a kind of difference [between right and meaner poets] as betwixt the meaner sort of painters, who counterfeit only such faces as set before them, and the more excellent, who having no law but wit, bestow that in colours upon which is fittest for the eye to see: as the constant though lamenting look of Lucretia, when she punished in herself another's fault, wherein he paints not Lucretia whom he never saw, but paints the outward beauty of such a virtue.[51]

Likewise, Pyrocles's identity is never seen except through the outward ornaments of sex. Coincidentally, the painted image of Lucretia is also the example chosen by Derrida in *The Parergon* to exemplify the fluidity of the notion of ornament in relation to the body:

> For example, Cranach's Lucretia holds nothing but a flimsy transparent veil over her sex: where is the parergon? Must we also consider a *parergon*-not part of her nude body, au naturel-the dagger which she points at herself and which touches her skin (only the point of the *parergon* touches her body, in the middle of a triangle formed by her two breasts and her navel)? Is her necklace also a *parergon*? It concerns the objectifying, representational essence, its inside and outside, the criteria used in this definition, the value attributed to the natural, and, either secondarily or principally, the privileged position of the human body.[52]

That Derrida chose the same picture as Sidney to discuss "representational essence" is of course fully accidental, yet his study of Cranach's painting may offer a most interesting way of beginning to understand the amazing complexity of the representation of sex in the *Arcadia*.

Notes

[1] Fulke Greville, *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907), 6.

[2] Amanda Bailey, *Flaunting: Style and the Subversive Male Body in Renaissance England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 46.

[3] *Sermons and Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches* (London: Prayer Book and Homily Society, 1833), 214.

[4] For example, she once famously declared "I know I have the body of a weak and feeble woman, but I have the heart and stomach of a king, and of a King of England too" (quoted in Derek B. Alwes, *Sons and Authors in Elizabethan England*, Cranbury: Rosemont, 2004, 65).

[5] Many early modern masculinity studies focus upon the Jacobean era rather than the previous one as moral constraints imposed upon womanish men and mannish women became considerably more rigorous, thus fostering many publications dealing at length with these issues. The public debates peaked with the 1620 publication of two famous pamphlets, *Hic-mulier or the Man-Woman* and *Haec-vir or the Womanish Man* in 1620.

[6] Joan-Pau Rubiés, "Texts, Images, and the Perception of 'Savages' in Early Modern Eu-

rope: What We Can Learn from White and Harriot," in *European Visions: American Voices*, ed. Kim Sloan (London: British Museum Research Publication 172, 2009), 129.

[7] Historians of art are still not sure about the exact moment when De Heere started his *Théâtre*.

[8] Michael Gaudio, "The Truth in Clothing: The Costume Studies of John White and Lucas de Heere," in Sloan, *European Visions*, 26. The *Man-Woman* frontispiece shows a hairdresser brandishing a pair of scissors in a way strikingly reminiscent of De Heere's Englishman: the circulation of the "man/woman with shears" motif between Elizabethan and Jacobean periods reflects the durability and historical continuity of certain key visual representations of gender confusion.

[9] Andrew Boorde, *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge* (London: William Copland, 1550), 6.

[10] Will Fisher, "The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54-1 (2001):157.

[11] Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004), 278.

[12] Philip Sidney, *An Apology for Poetry* or *The Defence of Poesy* (1595), ed. Geoffrey Shepherd and R.W. Maslen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 81.

[13] *Ibid*.

[14] The idea of "need" is not absent from the apparel metaphor either:
[T]he first meaning of *ornamentum* in Latin—rhetoric as an art existed almost entirely in Latin—is equipment or accoutrements, which the "naked causes" of dialectic, like naked persons, would need rather more than pretty clothing to get along in this world"(Ong, *Ramus*, 278).

[15] Ong, *Ramus*, 278.

[16] Stephen Gosson, *The Schoole of Abuse* (London: Arber, 1868), 20.

[17] Sidney, *Defence*, 106-107.

[18] Sidney, *Defence*, 87.

[19] Aristotle also warns his readers against the excessive use of ornament in his *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*. For a more detailed account of his use of the notion, see *Histoires d'ornements. Actes du colloque de l'académie de France à Rome, Villa Medicis, 27-28 juin 1996*, ed. Patrice Ceccarini *et al.* (Paris-Rome: Klincksieck, 2000), 11-13. The editors to the book conclude their passage on Aristotle by stating that the "linguistic function ornament acquires [in Aristotelian texts] does not go as far as to grant it the autonomy that its distance from truth had denied it in Plato's texts" ("La fonctionnalité linguistique que récupère l'ornement, ne va pas en effet, jusqu'à lui procurer l'autonomie que son éloignement de la vérité lui avait déniée dans les textes platoniciens," 16).

[20] I here translate the phrase from the introduction to *Histoires d'ornements*. The opening pages of the book make it clear that, looking at Plato's opposition from the *Sophist* between *eikastike* and *phantastike*, it appears that "ornament has to be eliminated from all human practices for orthopaedic reasons" ("dans une preoccupation orthopédique, il faut l'éliminer de toutes les pratiques humaines," 16). Rightful stances and posture thus depend on the absence of ornament- a view close to that formulated by Sidney in *The Defence of Poesie*:
For I will not deny but that man's wit may make Poesy, which should be *eikastike*, which some learned have defined « figuring forth good things », to be *phantastike*, which doth contrariwise infect the fancy with unworthy objects; as the painter, that should give to the eye either some excellent perspective, or some fine picture, fit for building or fortification or containing in it some *notable example*. (De-

fence, 104)

[21] Elsewhere in *The Arcadia*, Sidney also calls it a "toyfull booke." The same happens with his other works: in *The Defence of Poesy*, he refers to his apology as "this ink-wasting toy of mine" (*Defence*, 106) and *Astrophil and Stella* sonnet 18 has the speaker regret that "My youth doth waste, my knowledge brings forth toys," (Philip Sidney, *Astrophel and Stella* in *The Major Works*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 160.

[22] Philip Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 3.

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] Patricia Fumerton, "'Secret Arts': Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets," *Representations* 15 (Summer, 1986), 73.

[25] Furmerton, "Secret Arts," 62.

[26] "In the *Arcadia* the word "table" is most often found instead of pictures whenever the narrator describes paintings. This was common lexical usage in Elizabethan England.

[27] There are two known versions of the *Arcadia*: one commonly referred to as "the old *Arcadia*" and the newer yet unfinished second version which Sidney was still in the process of revising at the time of his untimely death.

[28] Philip Sidney, *The Countesse of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. Maurice Evans (London: Penguin, 1977), 365-366.

[29] William Craft, *Labyrinth of Desire: Invention and Culture in the Work of Sir Philip Sidney* (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1994), 95.

[30] Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, 329-330.

[31] Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, 330.

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Schwarz, *Tough Love*, 187.

[34] Fumerton, "Secret Arts", 84.

[35] Fumerton, "Secret Arts", 85.

[36] Fumerton, "Secret Arts", 78.

[37] Schwarz, *Tough Love*, 192.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] *Ibid*.

[40] Catherine Bates, *Masculinity, Gender and Identity in the English Renaissance Lyric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 105.

[41] Fumerton, "Secret Arts", 75.

[42] Sidney, *The Old Arcadia*, 108.

[43] Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, 285.

[44] Bates, *Masculinity, Gender and Identity*, 109.

[45] Sidney, *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia*, 286-287.

[46] Fumerton, "Secret Arts", 86.

[47] Roy Strong, "Sidney's Appearance Reconsidered", *AMS Studies in the Renaissance* 28 (1990): 16.

[48] Fisher, "The Renaissance Beard", 157.

[49] Bates, *Masculinity, Gender and Identity*, 107.

[50] For a discussion the gender ambiguity of the river, see Bates, *Masculinity, Gender and Identity*, 113.

[51] Sidney, *Defence*, 58.

[52] Jacques Derrida, *The Parergon*, transl. Craig Owens, *October* 9 (Summer, 1979): 22.

REFERENCES

Alwes, Derek B. *Sons and Authors in Elizabethan England* (Cranbury: Rosemont, 2004).

Bailey, Amanda. *Flaunting: Style and the Subversive Male Body in Renaissance England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

Bates, Catherine. *Masculinity, Gender and Identity in the English Renaissance Lyric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

Boorde, Andrew. *The Fyrst Boke of the Introduction of Knowledge* (London: William Copland, 1550).

Craft, William. *Labyrinth of Desire: Invention and Culture in the Work of Sir Philip Sidney*, (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1994).

Derrida, Jacques. *The Parergon*, transl. Craig Owens, *October* 9 (Summer, 1979): 3-41.

Fisher, Will. "The Renaissance Beard: Masculinity in Early Modern England," *Renaissance Quarterly* 54-1 (2001):155-187.

Fumerton, Patricia. "'Secret Arts': Elizabethan Miniatures and Sonnets," *Representations* 15 (Summer, 1986): 57-97.

Gaudio, Michael. "The Truth in Clothing: The Costume Studies of John White and Lucas de Heere," in in *European Visions: American Voices*, ed. Kim Sloan (London: British Museum Research Publication 172, 2009), 24-32.

Gosson, Stephen. *The Schoole of Abuse* (London: Arber, 1868).

Greville, Fulke. *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).

Ong, Walter J. *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004).

Rubiés, Joan-Pau. "Texts, Images, and the Perception of 'Savages' in Early Modern Europe: What We Can Learn from White and Harriot," in *European Visions: American Voices*, ed. Kim Sloan (London: British Museum Research Publication 172, 2009), 120-130.

Sermons and Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches (London: Prayer Book and Homily Society, 1833).

(Sir) Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry* or *The Defence of Poesy* (1595), ed. Geoffrey Shepherd and R.W. Maslen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002).

(Sir) Sidney, *Astrophel and Stella* in *The Major Works*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

(Sir) Sidney, Philip. *The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia (The Old Arcadia)*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973).

(Sir) Sidney, Philip. *The Countesse of Pembroke's Arcadia*, ed. Maurice Evans (London: Penguin, 1977).

Strong, Roy. "Sidney's Appearance Reconsidered," *AMS Studies in the Renaissance* 28 (1990): 3-31.

Library Recommendation Form

I recommend the library subscribe to:

☐ **Journal of Men's Studies Press**
ISSN 0060-8265, e-ISSN 1933-8139, Tri-annual
Edited by James Doyle, PhD
Current Volume: 20

☐ **Culture, Society & Masculinities**
ISSN 1941-5583, e-ISSN 1941-5591, Semi-annual
Edited by Diederik Janssen, MD, The Men's Studies Press
Current Volume: 4

☐ **The International Journal of Men's Health**
ISSN 1532-6306, e-ISSN 1933-0278, Tri-annual
Edited by Steve Robertson, PhD (Leeds Metropolitan University)
Current Volume: 11

☐ **Fathering: A Journal of Theory, Research, and Practice about Men as Fathers**
ISSN 1537-6680, e-ISSN 1933-026X, Tri-annual
Edited by Andrea Doucet, PhD (Carleton University)
Current Volume: 10

☐ **Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies**
ISSN 1931-9045, e-ISSN 1872-4329, Semi-annual
Edited by Diederik Janssen, MD, The Men's Studies Press
Current Volume: 6

All With Current Access

All current year print + electronic *or* electronic-only subscriptions will have e-access to their subscribed journal's previous volumes. Complete e-access to *all* volumes will continue as long as the subscriber maintains a current journal subscription. Inquiries via awca.msp@gmail.com

Please visit **www.mensstudies.com** for current pricing,
or email us via **publisher@mensstudies.com** for further information.

PROFESSOR

DEPARTMENT

DATE

SIGNATURE

Reason for acquisition:

☐ This journal will be an essential resource for myself and my colleagues
☐ I will refer my students to this journal
☐ I publish/intend to publish articles within this journal
☐ Other_____