Masculinity and the Other

Masculinity and the Other: Historical Perspectives

Edited by

Heather Ellis and Jessica Meyer

CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PUBLISHING

Masculinity and the Other: Historical Perspectives, Edited by Heather Ellis and Jessica Meyer

This book first published 2009

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-4438-0151-8, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-0151-5

For Alex and Matt,
the men in our lives

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Bedroom

Part II: Masculine Socializations

Adventurers

Soldiers

Knights

LIST OF IMAGES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book developed out of a conference held at Balliol College, Oxford in the summer of 2007. As this collection would not have been possible without the conference, the editors would like to thank all those involved with the organization and running of the conference including The Oxford University History Faculty for generously providing financial support for the conference and Howard Chirgwin for helping to co-ordinate facilities at Balliol. Stella Moss, Jen Robinson and Alex Clarkson all provided invaluable administrative and technical support, for which we are very grateful.

The contributors would like to acknowledge the following for assistance with their research and articles: the Research Committee at the University of Glasgow (Dumfries Campus) for financial assistance (Chapter 3); Alan and Elaine Wells, Brian Young, Faramerz Dabhoiwala, Michèle Cohen, Jonathan Healey, and Elizabeth England for advice on early drafts and financial assistance, gratefully received from Merton College , Oxford , and the Arts and Humanities Research Council (Chapter 4); the Arts and Humanities Research Council UK and the Leverhulme Trust for assistance in completing research (Chapter 5); the National Portrait Gallery and the Bridgeman Art Library for permission to reproduce images (Chapter 8); the British Museum for permission to reproduce images and the Arts and Humanities Research Council for financial assistance (Chapter 10); the National Library of Malta, Archives of the Order of Malta, Biblioteca Magistrale di Roma, Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Fondo Barberini Latino, Cathedral Archives of Medina, Malta, Archives of the Inquisition, Malta, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Segreteria di Stato, Malta, Biblioteca Angelica, Rome and Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Rome for permission to consult their archives, the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the Cambridge Commonwealth and European Trusts, and the Janatha Stubbs Foundation (Malta) for their financial support, and Peterhouse for defraying the costs of participation in the conference from which this book stemmed (Chapter 12); and the National Museums Liverpool, Lady Lever Art Gallery for permission to reproduce an image (Chapter 13). Every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders of the images that appear in Chapter 7. The author and editors would be

grateful if anyone with information pertaining to copyright could contact us in order for omissions to be rectified.

The editors are also extremely grateful to Carol Koulikourdi and Amanda Millar of Cambridge Scholars Publishing for their assistance and support in producing this volume. Finally, the editors would like to thank all the contributors to both the conference and this collection whose participation and enthusiasm have made an enormous contribution to interdisciplinary discussions of masculinity and its definitions. We are particularly grateful to John Tosh for his unstinting support of this project throughout.

INTRODUCTION

HEATHER ELLIS AND JESSICA MEYER

An awareness of "otherness" has long been recognized as a key factor in the process of identity formation, both individual and collective. Hegel was among the earliest thinkers to employ a concept of "otherness" in explaining the formation of self. In his *Science of Logic*, "being" is defined simply as in distinction from its "other", "nothing".[1] Crucially for Hegel, true self-consciousness cannot come into being apart from a dialectical process in which one (imperfect) self consciousness recognizes another like itself.[2] A concept of "otherness" soon established itself as a major theme of modern philosophy and spread to other emerging disciplines including psychology and anthropology. As early as 1908, the psychologist Herbert Foston described "otherness" as central to the "existing basis of our social life and existence."[3] However, it was only in the second half of the twentieth century that the terms "otherness" and "the other" began to achieve the widespread usage they have today. As part of the development of the philosophical school of poststructuralism, thinkers including Simone de Beauvoir, Jacques Lacan, Emmanuel Lévinas, Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault argued that subjectivity and "otherness" were things socially constructed and contingent rather than natural and essential. In recent years, explorations of the ways in which "otherness" has been constructed have become a major part of the burgeoning study of identity formation. As an increasingly significant part of this enterprise, masculinity studies have witnessed, since their inception in the 1980s, much interest in masculinity as a subjectivity and in the "others" against which it has been constructed.[4]

Scholars working on masculinity have tended often to assume that the relationship between self and "other" is a fairly straightforward power dynamic of dominance and subordination. This tendency is related to the powerful influence of the work of feminist scholars, above all, that of Simone de Beauvoir, upon the developing field of masculinity studies. De Beauvoir was among the first to develop Hegel's notion of "otherness" and apply it to the relationship between men and women within patriarchal society. Hegel's own notion of the dynamic between self and "other" was

certainly one which favoured a narrative of dominance and subordination, encapsulated in his famous metaphor of the master and slave.[5] However, while Hegel ultimately foresaw a stage in human history where such distinctions would be rendered unnecessary, de Beauvoir isolated his master-slave dynamic to explain contemporary and historical relations between the sexes. Indeed, she considered this model to "apply much better to the relation of man to woman."[6] Given her politically engaged feminism, it is easy to understand why her conception of "otherness" was characterized by forced submission.

Unsurprisingly, later feminist writers continued to characterize the relationship between men and women as that between a dominant self and a subordinate "other". Women, as such, it was claimed, had been denied a right to their own consciousness. Largely because masculinity studies (or men's studies) developed in the 1980s in response to the success of feminist scholars, a narrative of oppression and submission remained central to attempts to explain the relationship between the sexes. Even those scholars not aiming at a hostile counter-movement to feminism, but at a critical understanding of gender relations, took as their starting point the leading feminist assumption that a simple power dynamic between male self and female "other" ought to be their primary object of study. Ever since the inception of masculinity studies, scholars working in the field have been under continual pressure from feminist scholars not to turn the study of masculinity into an apologetic for male power. June Purvis and Amanda Weatherill, for example, have criticized the history of masculinity as "a male tool used in an attempt to dissipate women's power whereby women become historically viable subjects only when placed alongside men, thus reinforcing their position as 'other.'"[7] Thus much groundbreaking scholarship in the history of masculinity has preoccupied itself with issues of male power. John Tosh and Michael Roper's book, *Manful Assertions* (1991), for example, set itself the task of analyzing 'manful assertions', whether of verbal command, political power or physical violence".[8] Indeed, some scholars have described the attempt to understand the workings of male power as a "founding objective" of masculinity studies.[9] Many have also attributed the decided preference for the term "masculinity studies" over the older "men's studies" to the desire to show that the proper object of enquiry was not men (whom feminists claim have always been the primary object of scholarship), but the workings of male power.[10]

Today masculinity scholars are still keen to show that they share the feminist agenda. Thus, in a recent article published in the *Journal of British Studies*, Karen Harvey, a leading historian of masculinity,

expressed the view that in order to take her discipline forward, it was necessary to produce scholarship which "meets the challenges of feminist women's historians" and "look[s] to more traditional questions first raised by…historians of women."[11] Significantly, in the same article in which the organizers of a 2003 colloquium called for equal weight to be given to male "others", they also confirmed the primacy which is still given to women as "other". While "hegemonic masculinity", they maintained, ought certainly to be considered "in relation to deviant and cadet masculinities", it should still, they argued, be considered "primarily in relation to women."[12] Likewise, in a recent discussion of "hegemonic masculinity" by geographers, Bettina van Hoven and Kathrin Hörschelmann, special emphasis was placed on "its contrast with, and assumed superiority to femininity."[13] Moreover, they affirmed that many scholars "continue to define masculinity in relation to men…and their difference from women/femininity."[14] Sociologists Stephen Whitehead and Frank Barrett have employed a similar definition in their introductory chapter to *The Masculinities Reader* (2001). "Masculinities", they wrote, "are those behaviors, languages and practices, existing in specific cultural and organizational locations, which are commonly associated with males and thus culturally defined as not feminine [original emphasis]."[15]

However, such an over-concentration on the male-female binary can unnecessarily limit the usefulness of the concept of "otherness". Such a narrative makes it difficult to see either self or "other" as multi-faceted and ironically serves to reinforce the idea of women as essentially different from men. As long ago as 1990, the literary scholar, Donald Morton picked up on this when he called for a more nuanced theory of the "other" in gender studies. "Even while seeking to evade the concept of a feminine 'essence'", he wrote:

> many prominent feminists…continue to represent woman as a site of opacity, as an unknown and…perhaps unknowable difference…Such a strategy has the distinct disadvantage not only of leaving "opaque" to the dominant system what the dominant system has already designated as opaque, but also of accepting "opacity" as such as a part of the strategist's own "self-understanding." Considering these limitations, such conceptual maneuvers [sic] stand forth more and more markedly as complicitous with the status quo.[16]

In a review article for the *European Journal of Cultural Studies* in 1998, Stefan Dudink reiterated the point that by concentrating on a power relationship between masculine self and an external female "other", both categories are reified and appear stronger and more "natural". In this

article, he stressed the need to look at the ways in which "otherness" has been internalized within the male self and has served to destabilize it from within. At present, he wrote, scholars are intent on relegating uncomfortable aspects of the male self such as sexuality "to the outside of masculinity" by inscribing them onto women.[17] Indeed, scholars from a variety of disciplines have emphasized the need to study what they have termed "the otherness within."[18]

It is not simply the influence of women's studies which has encouraged a tendency among masculinity scholars to view the relationship between self and "other" in the form of a one-way power dynamic. The other significant disciplinary influence has been poststructuralism, above all the work of Michel Foucault.[19] Foucault has often been criticized himself for overstating the importance of a dominance-submission dynamic in the relationship between self and other. For Foucault, the self is the product of the existing power relations within a society, a type embodying the characteristics considered desirable (or "normative") for that society. The "other", by contrast, is the negative construct opposed to this which contains those characteristics designated atypical and undesirable. As with feminist scholars, it was the politically engaged nature of Foucault's work which strengthened his tendency to emphasize the oppressive element in the process of "othering". Contrary to the view which is sometimes expressed that Foucault deliberately adopted a politically neutral approach,[20] there is much in his theories of identity formation to support the view that he was indeed committed to a "liberating" philosophy. His desire to "free" those knowledges and peoples designated "other" by western society is clear from much of his work. Indeed, according to William E. Connolly, the notion of "freedom" for Foucault centred on "the release of that which does not fit into the moulds of subjectivity and normalization". "This", he continued:

> is what Foucault means…when he supports the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges" that speak, although imperfectly and indirectly, to that which is subjugated by normalization. Foucault also explicitly aspires to a conception of rights attached not merely to the self as subject, but especially to that which is defined by the normalized subject as otherness, as deviating from or falling below or failing to live up to the standards of subjectivity.[21]

There is little doubt that it has been this "liberating" aspect of Foucault's approach to "otherness", the idea that he explored "histories" of "otherness"[22] with the aim of setting free what had previously been

subjugated, which has appealed so strongly to politically engaged feminist (and masculinity) scholars.

****

Recently the possibility of wider definitions of masculine alterity has, in fact, become the subject of scholarly enquiry. With reference to nineteenth-century Britain, for instance, John Tosh has commented that "manliness was only secondarily about men's relations with women." "The dominant code of Victorian manliness", he continued, "with its emphasis on self-control, hard work and independence, was that of the professional and business classes, and manly behaviour was what (among other things) established a man's class credentials vis-à-vis his peers and his subordinates."[23] Investigations of imperial masculinities, of the changing status of working-class men in the industrializing world, of education of both the working and middle classes, and of alternative sexual subcultures in historical periods have all explored a variety of male "others" against which hegemonic masculinity might be presented as "normal".[24]

Yet despite the variety of men whose identity has been deemed "other" to the hegemonic norm at various times, the centrality of the gender binary to such definitions remains. Thus effeminacy has become the signifying word in establishing the non-hegemonic status of men such as the homosexual, the toff and the racial "other". At the same time, the myth of heightened sexuality attaching itself to descriptions of other "races" has been explored in terms of fears about sexual and gender relations and the ability of the white man to retain power over women. Men's relations with women have thus come to define the language with which men's relations with other men are discussed despite the fact that, as Stefan Collini has noted, Victorian understandings of manliness have been shaped by contrast "less with the 'feminine' and more with the 'bestial', non-human, childlike and immature."[25]

Collini's comments, it should be noted, relate specifically to understandings of "manliness", an ideology of masculinity that, as John Tosh has noted, if taken at face value, offers "no scope for exploring the meanings given to sexual identity and sexual desire which are fundamental to masculinity."[26] The focus of many historians on manliness as the dominant ideology of masculinity in nineteenth-century Britain has meant that until recently, according to Roper and Tosh,

> women are almost entirely absent from these accounts, seemingly on the assumption that masculinity takes on a sharper focus when women are removed from the scene - as they may appear to be when men write about

> manhood or live together in schools and clubs....There is a persistent British tradition of masculine autonomy in such writing that needs to be dismantled.[27]

It was this focus on manliness that Tosh and Roper, along with others, sought to challenge through work inspired by an informal research group on the history of masculinity that met between 1988 and 1990.[28] Tosh himself has used narratives of masculine domesticity to demonstrate effectively how nineteenth-century definitions of masculinity relied not only upon relations between men, their peers, superiors and subordinates, but also upon their role in the home in relation to wives and children. Similarly, Graham Dawson has shown how the soldier hero of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was defined as much by his conscious distance from domesticity as by the masculine sphere in which he was located.[29] This new complexity of historical views of masculinity has allowed for a far more rounded understanding of men as historically gendered actors, as well as permitting a fuller exploration of the power structures that existed between men and women in the private as well as the public sphere.

While such studies of the domestication of historical masculinity have deepened our understandings of men as sexually gendered figures in their own right, they have also, to some extent, unnecessarily limited the ways in which historians of gender discuss the concept of alterity. Tosh may have argued that by discussing the "three foundations of work, home and association, [he] showed how the social definition of masculinity was determined by the balance between them – and how that balance was inherently variable";[30] there has, however, been something of a failure to integrate the different forms of alterity which these different spheres promoted. While women's privacy and domesticity continue to be the primary benchmarks against which men's roles as workers, providers and fathers are evaluated and the concept of effeminacy dominates characterizations of masculine "others", the question of men's relations to other men remains problematically limited. While the history of masculinity as an identity lived in a gendered context, both subjective and social, has flourished, the complex relationships of gender to other facets of identity, including age, species and status, have been subsumed by this focus.

Donald E. Hall, for one, has criticized this tendency to over-emphasize the male-female binary and the assumption of the existence of a single masculinity which is "simply 'not femininity'"[31] Similarly, John Pettegrew has remarked upon the limiting nature of what Robert S. McElvaine has termed the "'notawoman' definition of manhood."[32] As Pettegrew goes on

to explain, an over-concentration on women as "other" obscures not only the role of male "others" in the process of masculine identity formation; it also prevents full weight being given to other sets of distinctions or cultural markers which perform the role of "other" in this process: distinctions of class, "race", age, sexuality, ethnicity and so on. Collini's argument, that femininity was less important to nineteenth-century definitions of manliness than animality and immaturity, was made as long ago as 1991. Three years later, John Tosh made a similar case for the importance of distinctions of age and maturity in shaping masculine identity in nineteenth-century Britain. "The distinction which exercised them", he wrote, of men at the time, "…was that between men and boys; worries about immaturity counted for much more than the fear of effeminacy, at least until the 1880s."[33] Such views, however, remain decidedly in the minority; and critics continue to blame the influence of feminist scholarship, in particular, for over-privileging the male-female binary in the construction of identity. The tendency to focus exclusively on "the otherness of women", argued Susan Stanford Friedman in 1995, "denies the structural process of 'othering' by a host of other factors such as race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, religion, national origin, and age."[34] It is similar, she wrote, to the disproportionate attention which Marxist scholars tend to pay to the role of class in their analyses. Whichever cultural marker is focused on, the problem arises when it is considered "as the primary category of oppression to which all other systems of alterity must be subsumed, thus reproducing, with all its limitations" a sort of "categorical hegemony."[35]

Despite the acknowledgement of recent conferences on masculinity studies that other cultural markers need to be integrated into a more complex analysis of gender identity formation,[36] relatively few scholars have put forward positive suggestions about how this might be done. Some hints for a model of how we might proceed can be gleaned from an important article entitled "The Trouble with Men" by historian, Stefan Dudink. Here he argues that we should stop seeing masculinity as a separate category and think of it instead as embedded in a multiplicity of other interconnecting cultural discourses. "In masculinity and its history", he wrote, "other social, political and cultural histories – with their own temporalities – merge, making for an uneven development of a seemingly coherent masculinity."[37] R.W. Connell has suggested a similar strategy for achieving a more nuanced study of masculine identity formation. "Any one masculinity" ought to be seen, she wrote, as "simultaneously positioned in a number of structures of relationship, which may be following different historical trajectories."[38]

Such suggestions build on the work of Judith Butler and her notion of gender as performance. At the centre of this theory is her understanding of "othering" as an example of Hegelian dialectic, as a creative process which produces something new by opposing two dissimilar things.[39] She has stressed that an individual's gender identity is not constructed in isolation but through a reciprocal dialogue with other people and places. In the same way, the role played by the "other" (and, indeed, "others") in the formation of masculine identity should be seen as that of an active partner in a process of mutual exchange: in the words of Mary Jo Kietzman, a conversation "in which self and other do not remain fixed in polarized positions but are rewritten through discursive and social interaction."[40] It is important to stress the point that "otherness" is at bottom a point of view and that those individuals and groups designated as "other" possess subjectivities and "others" of their own. Masculinity studies are often criticized for focusing too much on representation and unpacking codes of masculinity at the expense of individual experience and subjectivity. What Butler's theory of performance allows us to do is to marry the public and personal aspects of masculinity, to better understand how the codes and discursive practices of masculinities are informed by, and, at the same time, produce, internal subjectivity.

Implicit in Butler's construction of gendered performance as dialectic is the assumption that such constructions are a peculiar product of modernity.[41] Many historians of masculinity appear to accept that it is not possible to investigate masculinity as a subjective identity (or those "others" against which it has been constructed) before the modern era. Indeed, it is assumed that the term "masculinity" may itself only be used to designate a subjective identity and that a different term (for example, "manhood") is needed when exploring the significance of what it meant to be male in earlier periods of history. "Historians", writes Karen Harvey, "swap the study of manhood for the study of masculinity around the time of the Glorious Revolution."[42] She refers, in particular, to the argument of Anthony Fletcher that "manhood is not an internalized subjectivity in the seventeenth century and that the key to difference during this period was 'outward gender significations.'" For Fletcher, she observes, "manhood was based upon honor, a quality made externally and constituted by 'reputation in the eyes of others'" while "masculinity, by contrast, is "an internalized identity—an interiority of the mind and emotions—as opposed to a sense of role-playing."[43] Although Harvey is able to criticize aspects of Fletcher's approach, significantly, she does not question the appropriateness of restricting the term "masculinity" to the modern period,

for, at a later point in the same article, she refers (apparently without trouble) to the "move from manhood to masculinity."[44]

Yet in their introduction to *Manful Assertions*, Tosh and Roper make clear that subjective masculine identities have been a feature of all historical periods, as have those "others" against which they have been defined.[45] Thus, as Lin Foxhall has noted, while the history of classical antiquity has never been taught as a history of male subjectivity, it is in fact just that. There are, she points out, "abundant records of masculine perspectives. Almost every piece of evidence we possess, whether literary, epigraphical, iconographic or material, is the product of men's thoughts or actions."[46] The chapters in the collection she edited with John Salmon on masculinity in classical antiquity cover subjects ranging from male violence to leadership, from the experience of the male body to fatherhood, indeed many of the same issues that have been the subject of study for those examining masculinity in the modern period. Similarly Isabel Davis' work on masculine identity in medieval narratives and Ruth Mazo Karras' history of educating boys to be men in the late Middle Ages present the question of gender identity as both culturally constructed and subjectively experienced, often by those involved in the very process of that construction.[47] Likewise, the question of age and maturity has been the subject of a number of recent studies, highlighting the ways in which masculine subjectivities are shaped through education and authority.[48] The field of disability studies has similarly challenged perceptions of the limits of disabled masculinities, even as it has exposed how such "otherness" can be exploited to define masculine ideals.[49]

****

It was to address these and similar issues in light of such recent scholarship that a conference on "Masculinity and the Other" was held at Balliol College, Oxford in August 2007. Our aim was to explore forms of "otherness" against which ideas of masculinity have been defined over the course of modern history in order to uncover a fuller and more complex picture of what, historically, socially and culturally, it has meant to be a man. The interdisciplinary approach was particularly important to this project. Where historians have been exploring gender relations more fully, sociologists have moved from examinations of men's relations with the women's movement to explore how new forms of popular culture have altered understandings of masculine association. Literary scholars and art historians, meanwhile, have used the imagery created by the human imagination to tease out the many forms of alterity that cultures draw upon

in their definitions of masculinity. In bringing together scholars from these several disciplines, the conference aimed to expand the discussion of alterity to embrace issues of age, spirituality, animality, social control and status as well as those of race, class and gender. The focus on interdisciplinarity not only allowed for debates that questioned approaches emphasizing otherness as a hegemonic strategy of control, but also raised new debates over the very nature of that hegemony.

What emerged from the resulting discussions was clear evidence of the vitality of the specialism of masculinity studies within the broader field of gender studies, as a new generation of scholars investigates and challenges the subjects and theories that have shaped the field to date. From questioning the concept of multiple "masculinities" as a way of categorizing male identities[50] to the challenging of the chronology narratives of fatherhood that construct Victorian male domesticity as a masculine aberration,[51] the conference papers demonstrated the variety of levels of engagement with which scholars are seeking to enrich our knowledge of how men define themselves and are, in turn, socially, culturally and historically defined.

The chapters presented here, developed from papers given at the conference, have been selected precisely for the depth and variety of analyses that they represent. Covering subjects ranging from the images of nature in the work of the contemporary poet John Burnside to the history of the Hospitaller knights, they cover a wide range of time frames, subject matter and theoretical approaches. Historical eras examined include the medieval and Renaissance, as well as the more commonly discussed early modern and modern periods. While the main cultural focus is on Anglo-Saxon masculinities, the examination of other national and ethnic groups against which these have been defined is not limited to their roles as "others", but also seeks to investigate their own constructions of subjective masculinities. The source material drawn upon ranges from epic poetry to political doggerel, high art to pulp fiction, law court records to private letters.

Despite their diversity, these chapters touch on a number of important shared topics – the place of biography, autobiography and fiction in our understandings of masculine subjectivities, the definition of "manliness" prior to the concept's nineteenth-century dominance, the role of the association man as "other" in the United States and the centrality of fatherhood to masculine identities across cultures and periods. Taken together, all thirteen chapters address two of the most interesting directions that the field of masculinity studies has recently been taking. The first of these is the move to explore masculinities as they exist in

unexpected spheres and locations with a view to demonstrating how "otherness" is shaped by the space in which it is defined. Where sociologists and historians have unpacked the definitions of men in the workplace, in the political arena, in cultural imagery and in the home,[52] the analyses collected here approach the subject from a slightly different angle. David Marshall and Willemijn Ruberg locate the identities of the men whose lives they examine in borderlands, between nations in the case of Cornelis J. de Brauw, and between domesticity and public life in the case of Charles W. Gordon. In doing so, both challenge our assumptions about how masculinity has developed in liminal spaces, whether in terms of nationalism or in terms of the flight from domesticity. The natural world, discussed in the chapters by David Borthwick and Andrew Wells, while inflected by power relations between the genders and the politics of racism, also provides a new language of expression through which poets such as John Burnside and racial theorists such as Charles White and Edward Long developed understandings of both contemporary and historical masculinities. Finally, in their histories of men in the bedroom, Sean Brady and Clive Baldwin demonstrate how male sexuality interacted with the public spheres of media representation and the law in ways that went beyond simple categorizations to allow for the expression of alternate male sexualities as more than just deviancy. Masculinities, as all these chapters show, draw on multiple resources and the interaction between different definitions of selfhood and alterity to construct complex but coherent forms of identity.

The second direction in masculinity studies that the chapters in this book illustrate is the growing interest in masculine socializations. Male violence and male roles have long been the subject of both sociological and historical studies.[53] The chapters that form the second half of this book all look at the way these two aspects of masculinity interact to construct social definitions of appropriate masculinities. While violence is by no means the only aspect associated with masculinity through which such socialization can be examined, the roles through which it can be defined and regulated make for a particularly useful study of this process. Jeff Hearn has noted how, in modern society, "Men may be seen as...naturally aggressive, and violence may be naturally associated with men. Ideas of "Nature" and "the natural", whether in terms of the natural right to perpetrate violence or natural explanations of the prevalence of violence, are very persistent in both everyday and professional discourses of violence, frequently underpinned by ideologies of biology."[54] The processes by which such "natural" masculine violence may be channelled and trained to society's ends are a fruitful area of study. The more

formalized types of violence that are one outcome of such socialization are thus associated with masculinity. As Dudink, Hagemann and Tosh have noted, along with politics, "war [has] become [one of] the seemingly 'natural' homelands of masculinity".[55] The chapters in the second half of this book seek to unpack these associations by exploring the complex identities of men who engage with violence, whether through the reading of adventure narratives, engagement in warfare as a soldier, or through identification with the ideal of the medieval knight.

In addressing the relationships of masculine identity to violence through the prism of alterity, these chapters demonstrate the variety of masculine roles that could be adopted in relation to violence. The violence of mid-twentieth century American adventure narratives, as discussed by Bill Osgerby, is constructed predominantly in relation to women, but also, equally importantly, to the corporate ethos and the association man. Meanwhile, technological advances, discussed by Michael Budd, allow for a re-examination of imperial violence that extends our ideas of how the imperial mission constructed the racial "other". Similarly, as Sharon Murphy demonstrates, the inherently violent identity of the soldier can be manipulated and redefined through the intervention of alternate models of masculinity, such as that of the missionary, while Julia Banister explores the complexity of qualities associated with the competent soldier in wartime. Finally, in their studies of the images of knighthood, presented in a variety of social and cultural expressions, Anna Caughey, Emanuel Buttigieg and Rosemary Mitchell all examine the ways in which a role that developed out of soldiering and violence became symbolic of a variety of other masculine identities, including the father, both of man and nation, the cleric and the good husband. As with the chapters in the first section of the book, these chapters on the socialization of masculine identities, as defined by violent roles and actions, demonstrate both the multiplicity of masculinities as both social and subjective identities and the variety of alterities through which these identities might be defined.

Bibliography

Bailey, Joanne, "Fashioning the 'Sentimental Father' in England c.1760-1830: Fatherhood, Masculinity, and the Culture of Sensibility", Keynote Address, Masculinity and the Other Conference, Balliol College, Oxford, August 2007

de Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex*. New York: Vintage, 1989.

Brady, Sean. *Masculinity and Male Homosexuality in Britain 1861-1913*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
Connelly, W.E. "Taylor, Foucault and Otherness." *Political Theory* 13 (1985): 365-76.
Brooks, Douglas Renfrew. "Encountering the Hindu 'Other': Tantrism and the Brahmans of South India." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 60, no. 3 (Autumn 1992): 405-436.
Collini, Stefan. *Public Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
Davis, Isabel. *Writing Masculinity in the Later Middle Ages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Dawson, Graham. *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities*. London: Routledge, 1994.
Dudink, Stefan. "The Trouble with Men: Problems in the History of 'Masculinity'", *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 1, no. 3 (1998): 419-431.
Dudink, Stefan, Karen Hagemann and John Tosh, eds., *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
Ellis, Heather ed., "Boys, Boyhood and the Construction of Masculinity", Special Issue, *Thymos: Journal of Boyhood Studies* 2:2 (Fall 2008).
Foston, Herbert, "Non-Phenomenality and Otherness." *Mind* 17, no. 65 (January 1908): 1-19.
Fletcher, Anthony, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800*. London and New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
Foxhall, Lin. "Introduction." In *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity*, edited by Lin Foxhall and John Salmon, 1-9, London: Routledge, 1998.
Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Beyond White and Other: Relationality and Narratives of Race in Feminist Discourse." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 21, no. 1 (Autumn 1995): 1-49.
Green, William Scott. "'Otherness' Within: Towards a Theory of Difference in Rabbinic Judaism." In, *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity*, edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs, 49-69, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.
Haggerty, George E. *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.
Hall, Donald E. "The End(s) of Masculinity Studies." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 28 (2000): 227-237.
Harvey, Karen. "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800." *Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005): 296-311.

Harvey, Karen and Alexandra Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950." *Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005): 274-280.

Hearn, Jeff. "Definitions and Explanations of Men's Violence." In *Men and Masculinities: Critical Concepts in Sociology*, edited by Stephen M. Whitehead, 364-5, London: Routledge, 2006.

—. *The Violences of Men: How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*. London: Sage, 1998.

—. *Men in the Public Eye: The Construction and Deconstruction of Public Men and Public Patriarchies*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

—. *Science of Logic*. London: Routledge, 2004.

van Hoven, Bettina and Kathrin Hörschelmann eds. *Spaces of Masculinities*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Karras, Ruth Mazo. *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003.

Kovan, Seth. "Remembering and Dismemberment: Crippled Children, Wounded Soldiers and the Great War in Great Britain." *American Historical Review* 99, no. 4 (1994): 1167-1202.

Magan, David H.J. "Theatre of War: Combat, the Military and Masculinities." In *Theorizing Masculinities*, edited by H. Brod and M. Kaufman, 175-82, Newby Park, California.: Sage, 1994.

McClelland, Keith. "Some Thoughts on Masculinity and the 'Representative Artisan' in Britain 1850-1880." *Gender and History* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 164-77.

McElvaine, Robert S. *Eve's Seed: Biology, the Sexes, and the Course of History*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001.

McCormack, Matthew. *Public Men: Masculinity and Politics in Modern Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Meyer, Jessica. "Separating the Men from the Boys: Masculinity and Maturity in Understandings of Shell Shock in Britain," *20th Century British History*, forthcoming (Fall 2008).

Morton, Donald. "The Cultural Politics of (Sexual) Knowledge: On the Margins with Goodman." *Social Text* 25/26 (1990): 227-241.

Mosse, George. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Perry, Heather R. "Re-Arming the Disabled Veteran: Artificially Rebuilding State and Society in WWI Germany." In *Artificial Parts, Practical Lives: Modern Histories of Prosthetics*, edited by Katherine

Ott, David Serlin, and Stephen Mihm, 75-101, New York: New York University Press, 2002.
Pettegrew, John. “Deepening the History of Masculinity and the Sexes.” *Reviews in American History* 31, no. 1 (March 2003): 135-142.
Purvis, June and Amanda Weatherill. “Playing the Gender History Game: A Reply to Penelope J. Corfield.” *Rethinking History* 3, no. 3 (1999): 333–38.
Roper, Michael and John Tosh. “Introduction: Historians and the Politics of Masculinity.” In *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*, edited by Michael Roper and John Tosh, 1-24, London: Routledge, 1991.
Salih, Sara. *Judith Butler: Essential Guides for Literary Studies*. London: Routledge, 2002.
Seccombe, Wally. “Patriarchy Stabilized: The Construction of the Male Breadwinner Norm in Nineteenth-Century Britain.” *Social History* 2, no. 1 (January 1986): 53-75.
Springhall, John. *Youth, Empire and Society: British Youth Movements 1883-1940*. London: Croom Helm, 1977.
Taylor, Charles. “Foucault on Freedom and Truth.” *Political Theory* 12, no. 2 (May 1984): 152-183
Tosh, John. “What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain.” *History Workshop Journal* 38, no. 1 (1994): 179-202.
—. *A Man’s Place: Masculinity and the Middle-class Home in Victorian England.* New Haven, CT and London : Yale University Press, 1999.
Whitehead, Stephen M. and Frank J. Barrett. “The Sociology of Masculinity.” In *The Masculinities Reader*, edited by Stephen M. Whitehead and Frank J. Barrett, 1-26, Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 2001.
Whitehead, Stephen M., ed. *Men and Masculinities: Critical Concepts in Sociology*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Notes

[1] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Science of Logic* (London: Routledge, 2004), 109.
[2] Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit* (Oxford,: Clarendon Press,1977), 211.

[3] Herbert Foston, "Non-Phenomenality and Otherness", *Mind* 17:65 (January 1908), 19.
[4] For example, see the aims of the colloquium on the history of masculinity held at the University of Sussex in September 2003 (Karen Harvey and Alexandra Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950", *Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005)) which included (274-5) the questions 'How has masculinity as a concept been defined and employed as an analytical category?' and 'What is the relation of masculinity to other determinants of status such as age, sexuality, ethnicity and class?' Similar questions were posed at a conference held in May 2008 at Birkbeck College, London, entitled 'What is Masculinity? How Useful is it as a Historical Category'.
[5] Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, 111-118.
[6] Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Vintage, 1989), 64.
[7] June Purvis and Amanda Weatherill, "Playing the Gender History Game: A Reply to Penelope J. Corfield," *Rethinking History* 3, no. 3 (1999), 333–38, 335 cited in Karen Harvey, 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800', Journal of British Studies 44 (April 2005) , 296.
[8] Michael Roper and John Tosh, "Introduction: Historians and the Politics of Masculinity," in *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800*, (ed.) Michael Roper and John Tosh (London: Routledge, 1991), 1.
[9] Harvey, 'History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800', 297.
[10] Ibid.297.
[11] Ibid.298.
[12] Harvey and Shepard, 'What Have Historians Done with Masculinity?', 278.
[13] Bettina van Hoven & Kathrin Hörschelmann (eds.), *Spaces of Masculinities* (London: Routledge, 2005), 8.
[14] Ibid.9.
[15] S.M. Whitehead & F.J. Barrett, "The Sociology of Masculinity" in S.M. Whitehead & F.J. Barrett (eds.)., *The Masculinities Reader* (Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, 2001), 15.
[16] Donald Morton, "The Cultural Politics of (Sexual) Knowledge: On the Margins with Goodman", *Social Text* 25/26, (1990), 227.
[17] Stefan Dudink, "The Trouble with Men: Problems in the History of 'Masculinity'", *European Journal of Cultural Studies* (1998) 1:3, 426.
[18] On the concept of "otherness within", see e.g. William Scott Green, "'Otherness' Within: Towards a Theory of Difference in Rabbinic Judaism'" in (eds.), Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs, *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 49-69; Douglas Renfrew Brooks, "Encountering the Hindu 'Other': Tantrism and the Brahmans of South India", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 60:3 (Autumn,1992), 408-9.
[19] Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800'" 297.
[20] See e.g. Charles Taylor, "Foucault on Freedom and Truth", *Political Theory* 12 (May 1984), 162: Foucault, writes Taylor, "adopts a Nietzschean-derived stance of

neutrality between the different historical systems of power, and thus seems to neutralize the evaluations that arise out of his analyses."

[21] W.E. Connolly, "Taylor, Foucault and Otherness", *Political Theory* 13 (1985), 365-76.

[22] Ibid.374, 375.

[23] John Tosh, "What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain", *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994), 183.

[24] See, for instance, Keith McClelland, "Some Thoughts on Masculinity and the 'Representative Artisan' in Britain 1850-1880", *Gender and History* 1:2 (Summer 1989), 164-77; Wally Seccombe, "Patriarchy Stabilized: The Construction of the Male Breadwinner Norm in nineteenth-century Britain", Social *History* 2:1 (January 1986), 53-75; John Springhall, *Youth, Empire and Society: British Youth Movements 1883-1940* (London: Croom Helm, 1977); George Mosse, *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); George E. Haggerty, *Men in Love: Masculinity and Sexuality in the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Sean Brady, *Masculinity and Male Homosexuality in Britain 1861-1913* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

[25] Stefan Collini, Public *Moralists: Political Thought and Intellectual Life in Britain 1850-1930* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 186.

[26] John Tosh, "What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-century Britain" , *History Workshop Journal* 38 (Autumn 1994), 183.

[27] Roper and Tosh, "Introduction", 3.

[28] Other members of the group included Kelly Boyd, Norma Clarke, Graham Dawson, David Kutcha, Peter Lewis, Keith McClelland, Jonathan Rutherford, Pamela Walker and Julian Wood. See John Tosh, *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-class Home in Victorian England* (New Haven, CT and London : Yale University Press, 1999), xi.

[29] Graham Dawson, *Soldier Heroes: British Adventure, Empire and the Imagining of Masculinities* (London: Routledge, 1994).

[30] Tosh, "What Should Historians do with Masculinity?", 192.

[31] Donald E. Hall, "The End(s) of Masculinity Studies", *Victorian Literature and Culture* 28 (2000), 228-229.

[32] John Pettegrew, "Deepening the History of Masculinity and the Sexes", *Reviews in American History* 31 (2003), 136. The term appears in Robert S. McElvaine, *Eve's Seed: Biology, the Sexes, and the Course of History* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2001), 58.

[33] Tosh, "What Should Historians Do with Masculinity?", 183.

[34] Susan Stanford Friedman, "Beyond White and Other: Relationality and Narratives of Race in Feminist Discourse", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 21:1 (Autumn 1995), 9.

[35] Ibid.15.

[36] See e.g. Harvey and Shepard, "What Have Historians Done with Masculinity?", 275. Referring to the September 2003 colloquium on the history of masculinity, they say that participants were asked to consider "what is the relationship of

masculinity to other determinants of status such as age, sexuality, ethnicity, and class?"

[37] Dudink, "The Trouble with Men", 427.

[38] R.W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 73.

[39] Sara Salih, *Judith Butler: Essential Guides for Literary Studies* (Routledge, 2002), 20.

[40] Kietzman, "Montagu's Turkish Embassy Letters", 538.

[41] Similar conclusions have been derived from Foucault's arguments. See William E. Connolly, "Taylor, Foucault and Otherness", 368. Elsewhere in the same article (374), Connolly, drawing on Foucault, refers to the self as specifically the "achievement of modernity", a product of the "disciplinary society" which characterizes it, and the lynchpin of many features he considers characteristic of modern life such as "democratic citizenship'" and "moral responsibility."

[42] Karen Harvey, "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800", *Journal of British Studies* 44 (April 2005), 303.

[43] Ibid.303. Harvey quoting Anthony Fletcher, Anthony Fletcher, *Gender, Sex, and Subordination in England, 1500–1800* (1995; New Haven, CT, 1999), 83, 322.

[44] Ibid.311.

[45] Michael Roper and John Tosh, "Introduction: Historians and the Politics of Masculinity" in Michael Roper and John Tosh, (eds.)., *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800* (London: Routledge, 1991), 1.

[46] Lin Foxhall, "Introduction" in Lin Foxhall and John Salmon (eds.), *When Men Were Men: Masculinity, Power and Identity in Classical Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1998), 1.

[47] Isabel Davis, *Writing Masculinity in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 1-11; Ruth Mazo Karras, *From Boys to Men: Formations of Masculinity in Late Medieval Europe* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 3-8.

[48] Heather Ellis (ed.), "Boys, Boyhood and the Construction of Masculinity", Special Issue, *Thymos: Journal of* Boy*hood Studies* 2:2 (Fall 2008); Jessica Meyer, "Separating the Men from the Boys: Masculinity and Maturity in Understandings of Shell Shock in Britain," *20th Century British History*, forthcoming (Fall 2008); and Anthony Fletcher, *Growing Up in England: The Experience of Childhood 1600-1914* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), Chapters 11-14.

[49] Heather Perry, "Re-Arming the Disabled Veteran: Artificially Rebuilding State and Society in WWI Germany" in *Artificial Parts, Practical Lives: Modern Histories of Prosthetics*, Katherine Ott, David Serlin, and Stephen Mihm (eds.) (New York: NYU Press, 2002); Seth Kovan, "Remembering and Dismemberment: Crippled children, wounded soldiers and the Great War in Great Britain" ,*American Historical Review* 99:4 (1994), 1167-1202.

[50] R.W. Connell most influentially argued for both the recognition of multiple masculinities and the power relations between different forms and expressions of masculinity in *Masculinities*, 35-7.