

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: RETHINKING ON GENDER

This study proposes to examine the androgynous characters in the nineteenth century English and American literature. The arguments in this dissertation rest upon the assumption that, in the texts I have selected from the nineteenth century English and American literature, the leading characters contradict the heterosexual gender norms of the nineteenth century Victorian era suggesting that an individual, who is assumed to be exclusively either masculine or feminine gender in the nineteenth century patriarchal society of America and Britain, is androgynous by nature as he/she possesses both masculine and feminine potentials in him/her and, despite being androgynous, the gender that each person adopts in the society is in accordance with the heterosexual norms of the patriarchal society. Hence a man lives as a masculine and woman as a feminine individual. The frequent or constant gender disruption, whereby the male tends to act in a feminine way and vice versa, is the evidence about the presence of androgynous potentiality in a person. It is the evidence that the given individual is androgynous and the given gender is only a masquerade that conceals the presence of cross-gender traits in him/her.

In this dissertation I have chosen the texts written by the representative writers of the nineteenth century English and American literature – more precisely Thomas Hardy, George Eliot, Charlotte Bronte, Nathaniel Hawthorne and Harriet Beecher Stowe – because they represented and reflected different personality traits that contribute to the concepts of androgyny, gender as a stereotype and gender as a masquerade with instances of gender conformity and gender disruptions. The activities of both male and female protagonists will be analyzed to point out the gender and cross-gender traits as an evidence for the presence of androgynous

potentiality in them. Each of the five novels – *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *The Scarlet Letter*, *Adam Bede*, *Jane Eyre* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* – I examine provides a literary discourse with evidence about androgyny, gender as a stereotype and gender as a masquerade. They challenge the traditional norms of gender identity by including the concrete instances where the male protagonists act in a feminine way and female protagonists behave in a masculine way under the influence of circumstances. Such characters upset the gender norms and bring forth unfamiliar and fluid forms of identity. At the same time these works demonstrate the minor characters behaving in conformity with gender norms. The gender conformity and the gender instability as found in these works enable us to analyze the identity of male and female characters from the perspectives of androgyny and gender stereotype. Thus these texts facilitate in illustrating the subtle aspects of gender and androgyny with striking instances.

American and English literature of the nineteenth century defies the sexual ideology – which determines “what is deemed to be a socially acceptable behavior for men and women” (Ruthven 31) – with instances that mark the deviation from the given ideology. The acceptable behavior for men and women involves “the formation of human personality along stereotyped lines of sex category” (Millet 26) known as masculinity and femininity. It implies “aggression, intelligence, force, and efficacy in the male; passivity, ignorance, docility, virtue and ineffectuality in the female” (26). However, the personality traits as displayed by male and female characters in the literary works of the period strike the fluid and flexible dimension by being in conformity with their gender [masculine and feminine] occasionally and by disrupting the conformity for an indefinite period. The conformity through the sex-typed behavior and disruption through the cross-sex-typed behavior reveal in them the combined traits of both genders. Consequently a female character exhibits masculine

attributes on some occasions and feminine qualities on some other situations or both traits one and the same time. In this dissertation my arguments rest upon the concept that an individual is androgynous with potential for masculine and feminine thinking and performance; that gender identity of the individual [gender] is a masquerade; that gender conformity or gender disruption cannot be taken in totality, that is, if there is conformity in one gender aspect, there can be disruption in another aspect of the same gender as “individual may blend these complementary modalities in a single act, being able, for example, to fire an employee if the circumstances warrant it but with sensitivity for the emotion that such an act inevitably produces” (Bem “Utility” 196).

Terry Eagleton’s comments on Charlotte’s heroines as “divided selves” being “outwardly demure yet inwardly passionate” (129), and Jane, a female protagonist of *Jane Eyre*, as “demure and dissenting, ambitious and self-effacing, submissive and self-assertive” (130) revealing “many of the masculine virtues of endurance, rugged self-reliance and self-enterprise” (132) expose the combined traits of both genders in Charlotte’s heroines and their stereotyped behavior as a masquerade.

Representations of gender and gender blending of characters in their works project gender as masquerade, upset norms and categories of gender and represent unrecognized forms of identity that can be interpreted as androgynous. This dissertation will focus on five novels – *Adam Bede*, *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* and *Jane Eyre*, by English writers George Eliot, Thomas Hardy and Charlotte Bronte respectively and *The Scarlet Letter* written by American writer Nathaniel Hawthorne and *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* by Beecher Stowe – in an effort to examine how these novels suggest “a full range of experience open to individuals who may, as women, be aggressive, as men, tender; it suggests a spectrum upon which human beings choose their places without regard to propriety or custom” (Heilbrun x-xi). More precisely,

my assumption is that a protagonist acts in gender conformity in certain instances and acts in gender disruption in some instances which implies that the given character is masculine in some cases and feminine in some cases, suggesting the androgynous potentials in him/her. Apparently these authors / novels undermine the patriarchal assumptions about the appropriate gender roles for men and women. What is more, these texts are not merely reflective of assumptions relating to gender. Rather, they participate in the ongoing discursive construction of gender fluidity.

I will argue that these five novels deconstruct the patriarchal assumptions on gender roles through their characters who transgress the gender norms and the so-called appropriate gender behavior. Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* illustrates the unnaturalness of gender and exposes the hidden potential in male and female characters for femininity and masculinity. Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter* challenges the notions of natural difference between men and women. Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, George Eliot's *Adam Bede*, and Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* help the reader to look into the androgynous capabilities in individuals and speculate that gender roles are bound to undergo changes as the society flourishes due to innovations in industry and education.

My study will discuss that gender identities are not naturally occurring phenomena. Rather, gender identities are imposed by the patriarchal culture. Nature is the way things are, and culture what we make them out to be (Ruthven 44-5). In growing up we internalize cultural conventions (45). Simone de Beauvoir's aphorism "One is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" (295) implicates the same thing, influence of culture on people. In the absence of this patriarchal culture, men and women are able to develop their androgynous potentials and evolve as (androgynous) beings having access to masculine and feminine attributes.

What these novels evidently suggest in this regard is that the recurrent image of a strong woman like Hester Prynne in *The Scarlet Letter*, Tess in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Jane and Bertha in *Jane Eyre* or weak man like Angel Clare in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Arthur in *The Scarlet Letter* is the tip of the iceberg that runs counter to patriarchal ideals of gender as pointed out by Inge K. Broverman:

The male-valued items seem to us to reflect a competency cluster. Included in this cluster are attributes such as being independent, objective, active, competitive, logical, and skilled in business, worldly, adventurous, and able to make decisions easily, self-confident, always acting as a leader, ambitious. A relative absence of these traits characterizes the stereotypic perception of women: that is relative to men, women are perceived to be dependent, subjective, passive, non-competitive, illogical, etc.

The female valued stereotypic items, on the other hand, consist of attributes such as gentle, sensitive to the feelings of others, tactful, religious, neat, quiet, interested in art, literature, able to express tender feelings. These items will be referred to as the "warmth and expressiveness" cluster. Men are stereotypically perceived as lacking in these characteristics, relative to women. (66- 7)

Such assumptions as mentioned above and expectations suggest the possibility of gender disobedience everywhere and every time. The American and English literature of the nineteenth century including those five novels gives evidence contrary to these ideals. For instance, aggression of Bertha against her husband Rochester in *Jane Eyre* and Tess's act of killing Alec who has seduced her in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* are inexplicable acts from an essentialist's perspective. Essentialist

argues: “The construction of male gender requires one’s molding into a masculine role which presupposes autonomy, competition, and aggressiveness, and the suppression of the innate human needs for connectedness, intimacy and self-disclosure” (Gagne et al. qtd. in Philaretou 26). This argument is inconsistent with the aggression of the female characters. Such an act of female aggression in the novels is an act of gender disruption.

On the base of the sociological theory and research evidence, Snowdon suggests that both sexes are capable of aggression and of maintaining peace and intimacy (276). The conclusion drawn by some researchers, according to Brenner and Greenhaus, that female managers are found to be “more aggressive, more achievement-oriented and more dominant than female non-managers” (198) signifies the same thing that both men and women are open to full range of experiences and potentialities.

Turning towards Androgyny

The gender identity is unstable because it is not the replica of the the individual with his or her inherent potential. The stereotype or gender does not give the true representation of the person. Rather it masquerades the potential of the individual. Nancy Topping Bazin and Alma Freeman argue on this very aspect which can be considered as a step ahead:

Each human being derives from male and female elements; thus the true human personality is androgynous, that is, it contains both male and female or masculine or feminine traits. Both men and women, then, are potentially capable of both Masculine and Feminine responses to life. (190)

The true personality tends to be untrue when an individual gets into the mold of masculinity or femininity. They imply the same when they quote Eric Neumann, “The integrity of the personality is violated when it is identified with either the masculine or feminine side of the symbolic principle of opposites” (Bazin and Freeman 190).

Full-fledged personality of a being is far from being gender- stereotype. Paula Rothenberg’s description of an ideal woman of 1970s enables us to see it:

the ideal woman of the late 1970s was portrayed as a kind of a superman who could and should be able to combine successfully her multiple roles of corporate attorney, girl scout leader, femme fatale, super mom, loving wife, PTA volunteer, gourmet cook, little league coach, bonsai gardener and fashion model. . . . Highly visible women in society from Supreme Court Justices to Law School Deans to Best Selling authors are presented to us as women who stayed home and took their motherhood role seriously thus earning the right to pursue their careers later. (52-53)

This extract reveals feminine qualities of women as loving wives, super moms, and fashion models and so on. At the same time it points out the masculine traits in them as successful corporate attorney, coach, justices, deans, authors and so on – in short, bread-winners. Describing these women as feminine alone is evaluating only the part of the individual and ignoring the true potential that lies within.

Michael J. Diamond too argues, “In every culture, the individual internalizes a culturally shaped gender polarity that directs him or her to develop qualities attributed to his or her own sex and, in some measures, to suppress qualities of other sex” (29). Fogel “speaks heuristically and metaphorically of masculine and feminine principles existing within each individual as a gender polarity and argues that dialectical balance

between them is required for healthy maturation” (qtd. in Diamond 29). Freud (1905) once stated:

Observation shows that in human beings pure masculinity or femininity is not to be found either in psychological or biological sense. Every individual on the contrary displays a mixture of character-traits belonging to his own and to the opposite sex; and he shows the combination of activity and passivity whether or not these last character-traits tally with his biological ones. (qtd. in Fogel 245)

This observation reinforces the concept of gender blending and undermines the sex role stereotyped personality. Teresa Brennan clarifies that Freud “insisted that femininity, like masculinity, occurs in both sexes” (6).

David Glover and Kora Kaplan argue that a promiscuous qualifier “feminine” can and does attach itself to almost anything, including men and even women described as unfeminine are inscribed with femininity (2-3). Carl Gustav Jung also states about the presence of masculine and feminine attributes in every man and woman with an assertion that “man is compensated by a feminine element and the woman is compensated by a masculine one” (*Feminine* 195). He elaborates his argument:

Here, without a doubt, is one of the main sources for the feminine quality of the soul No man is so entirely masculine that he has nothing feminine in him. The fact is, rather, the very masculine men have – carefully guarded and hidden-- a very soft emotional life, often incorrectly described as ‘feminine’. A man counts it a virtue to repress his feminine traits as much as possible, just as a woman, at least until recently, considered it unbecoming to be ‘mannish’. (*Feminine* 87)

Jung is convinced that the wholeness of personality results from the presence of masculinity and femininity in every person.

The strong man must be somewhere weak and clever man must be stupid because a woman's love wants whole man – not mere masculinity as such but also its negation (*Feminine* 77). Jung refers to the male part in women as animus (*Masculine* x), and female in man's psychology as anima (*Masculine* 151). Thus a masculine element is always paired with feminine part (*Masculine* 128). In Chinese philosophy they are referred as masculine and feminine souls of a man (*Masculine* 151). Jung claims that “since masculine and feminine elements are united in our human nature, a man can live in the feminine part of himself, and a woman in her masculine part” (*feminine* 68).

Judith Butler implies the possibility for the same when she argues that there is “no gender identity behind the expressions of gender,” “gender is always a doing,” “the doer is merely a fiction added to the deed” (*Gender* 33) and that if it is possible to speak of a ‘man’ with a masculine attribute and to understand that attribute as a happy but accidental feature of that man, then “it is also possible to speak of a ‘man’ with a feminine attribute, whatever it is . . .” (*Gender* 32). Thus she underscores the argument that masculine and feminine attributes are not exclusive to male and female bodies respectively. She elucidates it:

Assuming for the moment the stability of binary sex, it does not follow that the construction of “men” will accrue exclusively to the bodies of males or that “women” will interpret only female bodies When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that man and masculine might just as easily signify a

female body as a male one, and a woman and feminine a male body as easily as a female one. (*Gender* 10)

Butler rules out the argument that masculinity is exclusively limited to male body and femininity to female body.

J.S. Mill's argument in *The Subjection of women* highlights the potential in women that works as the seminal concept of androgynous personality in women. He asserts that the so-called mental differences between male and female are not biological. He explains it:

Let us at first make entire abstraction of all psychological consideration tending to show, that any of the mental differences supposed to exist between women and men are but the natural effect of the differences in their education and circumstances, and indicate no radical differences, far less radical inferiority, of course. (98)

This argument suggests that women can be as good as men in every aspect if they are brought up in the same way as men.

He implies it when he claims that it is "quite certain that a woman can be a Queen Elizabeth, or a Deborah, or a Joan of Arc, since this is not inference, but fact" (99). He points out the masculine qualities of reigning Queens:

Of this smaller number a far larger portion have shown talents for rule . . . they have, in a great number of instances, been distinguished by merits the most opposite to the imaginary and conventional character of women: they have been as much remarked for the firmness and vigor of their rule, as for its intelligence. (100)

J.S. Mill holds that women have same potential as men, which is bound to manifest when women receive the same treatment as men in every aspect.

This view serves as a challenge to patriarchal assumptions about the superiority of male and inferiority of female seen in terms of binary opposition:

They [women] have always hitherto been kept . . . in so unnatural a state, that their nature cannot but have been greatly distorted and disguised; and no one can safely pronounce that if women's nature were left to choose its direction as freely as men's, and if no artificial bent were attempted to be given to it except that required by the condition of human society, and given to both sexes alike, there would be any material difference, or any difference at all, in the character and capacities which would unfold themselves. (105)

“The character and capacities” signify the androgynous potential present in all men and women, not withstanding their sex, race, religion and age.

Plato too reasoned in the same vein as Mill. Regarding an extraordinary new role for women in his ideal state, he argues:

Once removed from the traditional role of private wife, and once given the same education and training as men, women would be capable of performing the full range of activities and functions that men performed. . . . Although “all the pursuits of men are the pursuits of women also, in all of them a woman is inferior to a man.” (qtd. in Bem, *The Lenses* 52)

Plato's reasoning presupposes the fact that the patriarchy deprives women of their capacities and they can project themselves with all their hidden potentiality only when they are removed from the traditional surroundings.

Sandra Bem points out this dimension in her comment as a challenge to the patriarchal assumptions on gender norms:

Specifically, he [Plato] argued that in the ideal city, women would not only be persons in their own right; they would also play precisely the same role that male guardians would play. Plato was serious about this identity of male and female roles; requiring that women participate fully in the military, for example and that men participate fully in communal child-rearing. (*Lenses 52*)

Women's participation in the military indicates the presence of masculine impulses in them and men in child-rearing assures the femininity in them.

Plato's arguments are based on the androgynous potential in them. He suggested in book 5 of *The Republic*:

there is no pursuit of the administrators of a state that belongs to woman because she is a woman or to a man because he is a man. But the natural capacities are distributed alike among both creatures, and women naturally share in all pursuits and men in all. (qtd. in Spellman 38-9)

Apparently "the natural capacities" refer to the masculine and feminine capabilities in men and women.

Further, in a dialogue called *Meno*, he refers to virtue as being 'eternal' and 'unchanging' (Spellman 39). Virtue as virtue does not "differ" in its character as virtue, whether it be in a child or an old man, a woman or a man (qtd. in Spellman 39). Obviously Plato's virtue stands for "nature" present in men, women and children, which is thought to be same in its essence. Further Spellman argues:

Plato insists that our souls are the most important part of us. Not only is it through our souls that we shall have access to knowledge, reality, goodness, beauty, but also, in effect we are our souls . . . our bodies

are not essential to our identity. . . . If we are our souls, and our bodies are not essential to whom we are, and then it does not make any difference ultimately whether we have woman's body or a man's body. . . . If the only difference between women and men is that they have different bodies, if bodies are merely incidental attachments to what constitutes one's real identity, then there is no important difference between men and women. (39)

Plato seems to suggest that despite the difference in sex, men and women possess souls which are similar. It implies there lays no difference in the souls/psyches of beings. Plato obviously perceived the feminine qualities in men for child rearing and masculine qualities in women to be soldiers and defenders of the ideal state. These views clarify that he was aware of androgynous potential in men and women.

Androgyny seeks to liberate the individual from the confines of the appropriate" (x).She furthers explains that Androgyny suggests a spirit of reconciliation between the sexes; it suggests, further, "a full range of experience open to individuals who may, as women, be aggressive, as men, tender; it suggests a spectrum upon which human beings choose their places without regard to propriety or custom" (x-xi). This explanation suggests the mental and emotional states of wholeness. It is the state that combines masculine and feminine attributes, impulses, actions and thoughts without concern for the sex role stereotypes and appropriateness of such choice and behavior. It counters the dichotomy of simplistic thinking.

Donald W. Mackinnon, director of the Institute of personality Assessment and Research at the University of California in Berkeley, strikes the same note as Plato and Heilbrun by asserting the presence of femininity in creative men. He wrote in 1962:

[Openness to experience] may be observed, for example, in the realm of sexual identifications and interests, where creative males give more expression to the feminine side of their nature than do less creative men. On a number of tests of masculinity-femininity, creative men score relatively high on femininity and this despite the fact that, as a group, they do not present an effeminate appearance or give evidence of increased homosexual interests or experiences. (qtd. in Heilbrun XVIII)

This argument reminds the readers of Samuel Taylor Coleridge who looked into the masculinity- femininity dimension in creative minds and admitted that “a great mind must be androgynous” (Heilbrun XX).

Virginia Woolf held the same conviction in *A Room of One's Own*, as a challenge for the traditional gender norms:

In each of us two powers preside, one male one female; and in the man's brain, the man predominates over the woman and in the woman's brain, the woman predominates over the man. The normal and comfortable state of being is that when the two live in harmony together, spiritually cooperating. If one is a man, still the woman part of the brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her. . . . (102)

Thus androgyny stands for the capability of a person to be cooperative, dynamic and to change according to situations and requirements.

Alexander G. Kaplan and Joan P. Bean emphasize dynamic part of androgyny when they write:

When we use the word androgyny . . . we mean flexibility of sex role. We refer not to individuals with male and female sex organs, but individuals who are capable of behaving in integrative feminine and masculine ways, which are assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, expressive and instrumental. Androgynous individuals not only survive but thrive in our changing society. (2-3)

‘Masculinity’ is associated with the terms ‘instrumental role’ and ‘agency’ whereas ‘femininity’ with ‘expressive role’ and ‘communion.’

Judith Lazerson in her dissertation refers to Parsons and Bales (1955) and David Bakan’s (1966) work in a way of clarifying the concept of combined gender traits in men and women:

They [Parsons and Bales] suggested a dichotomy, instrumental vs. expressive, as the two basic orientations around which male and female developed. The instrumental role represents tasks oriented to work and managing business external to the home and the expressive role organizes the social relations within home. Each individual internalizes a system of social object [person] relations which include both expressive and instrumental roles. This is a complex process. Without exploring it fully here, the result is a stereotypic view of masculine and feminine development. . . . He [Bakan] too argued that the integration of communion and agency is fundamental to human, emotional, and spiritual growth. . . . For him, agency refers to the need to protect, expand, and assert oneself and to separate from other beings. Communion is the tendency to conduct and unite with

other beings. Due to the different reproductive roles, agency is stronger in males and communion in females. (21)

Thus both men and women internalize both tendencies and roles.

Edward Drinker Cope, a well-known paleontologist, remarked that men experience a phase of feminine emotionality when they are young and he describes it as “woman stage.” During this time, feminine instincts tend to be active. Edward elaborates it:

The gentler sex is characterized by a greater impressibility . . . warmth of emotion, submission to its influence rather than that of logic; timidity and irregularity of action in the outer world. All these qualities belong to the male sex, as a general rule. . . . Perhaps all men can recall a period of youth when they were hero worshippers – when they felt the need of a stronger arm, and loved to look up to the powerful friend who could sympathize with and aid them. This is the “woman stage” of character. (qtd. in Russet 55)

All these studies and observations are affirmative about the combined traits of both genders in men and women. Sigmund Freud meant the same when he noted, “We speak of a person, whether male or female, as behaving in a masculine way in one connection and in a feminine way in another connection” (qtd. in Glover and Kaplan xxvii).

If Freud’s ‘Femininity’ suggests that “all humans are potentially bisexual” (qtd. in Glover and Kaplan 2), James Baldwin seems to reiterate Freud with his argument that “we are all androgynous” since “each of us, helplessly, and forever, contains the other – male in female, female in male, white in black and black in white” (qtd. in Glover and Kaplan 99). Baldwin’s essay ‘Freaks and the American

Ideal of Manhood’ was “partly inspired by the gender-bending personae of performers like Boy George and Michael Jackson, figures who might be thought to play upon or externalize what is for Baldwin our unrecognized inner being” (qtd. in Glover and Kaplan 100). In the case of Baldwin, the concept of androgyny is not a hypothesis, but fact.

Patriarchal ideology is a matter of assumptions taken for granted and the fact is the matter meant for observation. Aristotle’s argument – as cited in *The Lenses of Gender* – that “the male is such in virtue of a certain capacity and the female is such in virtue of an incapacity” and that “we must look upon the female character as being a sort of natural deficiency” (qtd. in Bem 54) forms the part of the patriarchal ideology whereas the fact is bolstered up by “a brave new world where the privileges and priorities of gender inequality have disappeared” (Glover and Kaplan 46) and by “‘universalizing attitudes’ that celebrate the ‘liminality’ or ‘transitivity’ of gender, effacing hard and fast divisions between the male and the female sex” (Bristow 208). Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) – the most discussed Victorian thinker, English sociologist and philosopher, advocate of the theory of SOCIAL DARWINISM and the concept “the survival of the fittest” – pointed out:

Where women shared food procurement with their men, as among the Clatsop and Chinook Indians who lived on fish and roots, or where they fought as warriors side by side with the men, as in Dahomey, they enjoyed extraordinary prestige and influence. Where, on the contrary, men monopolized war and the chase, while women were restricted exclusively to gathering food and carrying burdens, the women were “object slaves.” Spencer inferred from this information that social status and political influence were more evenly divided between the

sexes when men and women shared pursuits in common, rather than the specialized according to sex. (Russet 140-1)

This information shows the potential of woman to be a ‘warrior’, ‘bread-winner’ and ‘independent’. What is more, it serves as the evidence that [patriarchal] ideology is a “fantasy-construction,” (Zizek 27) “a false representation of social reality” (27) and “a false consciousness” (16).

Judith Butler’s arguments – that “gender ought not to be considered as a stable identity,” the impression of “an abiding gendered self” is an “illusion” (qtd. in Glover and Kaplan 157) and performances of gender are open to disruption, unexpected variation and transformation (157) – signify the androgynous psyche in men and women. This psyche enables women to be warriors and bread-winners and men to be cooks and baby-sitters at home.

Judith Halberstam’s argument “what we understand as heroic masculinity has been produced by and across both male and female bodies” (“Introduction” 355) suggests the similarity between men and women. She considers tomboyism as “an extended childhood period of female masculinity”. It is “associated with a ‘natural’ desire for the greater freedoms and mobilities enjoyed by boys” and “it is read as a sign of independence and self motivation”. Apparently it is a masculine impulse present in a girl before it is “remodeled into compliant forms of femininity” (“Introduction” 358).

Sigmund Freud points out the feminine attitude in little boys and masculine activity in women. He explains it that “in boys the Oedipus complex has a double orientation, in accordance with bisexual constitution; a boy also wants to take his mother’s place as the love object of his father – a fact which we describe as the feminine attitude” (15). On the other hand, a girl “may harden herself in the

conviction that she does possess a penis and may subsequently be compelled to behave as though she were a man” (17). The little girl’s recognition of the anatomical distinction between the sexes forces her away from masculinity onto new lines to the development of femininity (18). He concludes:

We shall, of course, willingly agree that the majority of men are also far behind masculine ideal and that all human individuals, as a result of their bisexual disposition and of cross inheritance, combine in themselves both masculine and feminine characteristics, so that pure masculinity and femininity remain theoretical constructions of uncertain content. (19-20).

It suggests the potentiality of men and women for fluidity.

Tim Carrigan, Bob Connell and John Lee argue that “the feminine personality” with the primacy of expressive interests, needs and functions, and “the masculine personality” with the predominance of instrumental interests, needs and functions, men assuming “technical, executive and judicial roles, women (assuming) more supportive, integrative and tension managing roles” do not exist. They state that Parsons, who analyzed the acquisition of sex roles, find normative case on the one hand and deviance on the other hand. Parsons assumed that the connection between the two sex roles is one of the complementarity, not power (102).

Fluidity is the requirement of the changing time. Helen Hacker in her notable paper “The New Burdens of Masculinity” (1957) showed that in the modern male role expressive functions had been added to the traditional instrumental ones:

As a man, men are now expected to demonstrate the manipulative skill in interpersonal relations formerly reserved for women under the headings of intuition, charm, tact, coquetry, womanly wiles, and

etcetera. They are asked to bring patience, understanding, and gentleness to their human dealings. Yet with regard to women they must still be sturdy oaks. (qtd. in Carrigan et al.104)

This extract points out the change in sex role and this change illustrates the presence of feminine attributes in men. Besides, “the first contributors were surprised to find clinical evidence of a preoedipal femininity in boys, resulting from identification with mother” (Connell 11).

Don Kulick also points out the same fluidity in the article “Gender Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes.” He isolates gender from one’s body and illustrates it [feminine] as a feeling. He admits, “Gender in Latin America should be seen not as consisting of men and women, but rather of men and not-men, the latter being a category into which both biological females and males who enjoy anal penetration are culturally situated” (390). According to Kulick, a group of males who enjoy anal penetration happen to be effeminized prostitutes known as travestis that don female attributes. They modify their bodies with massive doses of female hormones not because they feel themselves to be women but just because they feel themselves to be “feminine”. Journalists and social commentators argue that travestis transcend maleness and femaleness and constitute a kind of postmodern androgyny (391-7). Males and females who enjoy being penetrated belong to the same category and they are on the same side of gendered body (399). Kulick argues:

It is important to stress the claim I am making here is that travestis share a gender with women, not that they are women (or that women are travesties) But in as much as travestis share the same gender as women, they are understood to share (feel themselves to share) a whole spectrum of tastes, perceptions, behaviors, styles, feelings and

desires. One can assert these men – who have become travesties – feel just as women feel. (400)

That men feel just as women feel asserts the similarity between men and women about what they both feel.

Judith Halberstam, as a person and as a writer, underscores the gender fluidity. She confesses, “I was a masculine girl, and I am a masculine woman. For much of my life, my masculinity has been rendered shameful by public responses to my gender ambiguity. However, in the last ten years, I have been able to turn stigma into strength” (Preface to *Female* xii). She argues:

The momentous negotiations about gender that took place at and around the turn of the century . . . produced particular forms of masculinity and femininity and clearly showed that femininity was not wed to femaleness and masculinity was not bound to maleness. The transition from affiliation marriages to romantic marriages, the development of women’s rights movements, the trials of Oscar Wilde, the social upheaval caused by World War I, and the development of sexological models of sexual definition all played a part in untangling once and for all the knots that appeared to bind gender to sex. . . .
(*Female* 48)

It suggests that sex and gender are complementary to one another.

Havelock Ellis (1859-1939) – a British sexuality researcher, a medical doctor and a champion of women’s rights – reinforces the same argument. He writes, “It has been noted of distinguished women in all ages and in all fields of activity that they have frequently displayed some masculine traits” (qtd. in Halberstam, *Female* 78). Ellis infers that in the upper class or royal inverts, their masculinity corresponds to

high levels of intellect and distinction and in lower class or middle class, he claims that the masculine instinct could easily lead to criminality (78). Thus the views that suggest the androgyny are not hypothetical. They are based on experience.

Halberstam shows the concern of some women for the presence of masculine attributes in them: “Even women who are involved in the most masculine activities, such as boxing or weight lifting, attempt to turn the gaze away from their own potential masculinity” (*Female* 270). According to Halberstam, the father of one white fifteen-year-old woman boxer, Madeline Davies, assures against the endangered femininity:

He believes boxing has matured her quickly and bolstered her confidence. He’s quick to insist that she’s lost none of her femininity. “She’s never been a cuddly-toy sort of girl,” he says, “But she’s soft to talk to and concerned for other people. As long as she does not become overly aggressive, the boxing doesn’t worry me.” (qtd. in *Female* 270)

The assurance of the father about her daughter is the assurance of an androgynous blend in his daughter, not a cross-gender being.

Halberstam illustrates the concept of androgyny through the concern of female boxers:

The boxers themselves, surprisingly, also voice assurances that their physical toughness is not accompanied by a depletion in femininity. A black female boxer, Fosterer Joseph, the Super-Welterweight champion in 1995, voices a common defense of femininity of the female fighter. She says: “We’re fighting a society that says women should be in the house with the children. . . . We have our father’s

genes as men have their mother's. Men can work on the feminine side, so why shouldn't we box? I love romance and flowery dresses, too, but, I'm asserting my femininity by being true to my nature." (qtd. in *Female* 270)

It implies the true nature implies neither feminine nor masculine alone but amalgamation of both.

Halberstam's observation of drag kings (a female in a "recognizable male costume," performing theatrically in that costume 232) can be taken as a significant achievement in the study of gender:

Many drag kings in New York felt that drag gave them the chance to really play with gender in a way that expressed a wide range of identities . . . many talked about themselves as androgynous or femme. Lizerace, the twenty-three-year-old drag king deejay at club Casanova, calls herself "androgynous". . . . Evil Cave Boy, a twenty-seven-year-old performance artist, echoes these sentiments: "sometimes I'm very masculine, sometimes very feminine depending on my situation; I go back and forth all the time." . . . Shelly Mars . . . feels that she is some combination of masculine, feminine, performer and "changer": "I change all the time. . . . I'm a girl-boy, a tomboy, a changer, a performer." (*Female* 263)

These views show the complexity and remind the reader of Freud who puts it, "the concepts 'masculine' and 'feminine' . . . are among the most confused that appear in science" (qtd. in Savran 7).

The confusion is caused by the change in the society and attitudes of people. All the rigid ideals of the past seem to have got into a melting pot. Morris Zelditch, a

postwar sociologist, illustrates this change and the domestic bliss of 1950s due to gender blending activities at home:

Father helps mother with the dishes. He sets the table. He makes the formula for the baby. Mother can supplement the income of the family by working outside. Nevertheless, the American male, by definition, must “provide” for his family. He is responsible for the support of his wife and children. His primary area of performance is the occupational role, in which his status fundamentally inheres; and his primary function in the family is to supply an “income,” to be the “breadwinner.” There is simply something wrong with the American adult who doesn’t have a job.” American women, on the other hand, tend to hold jobs before they are married and to quit when “the day” comes; or to continue in jobs of lower status than their husbands. . . . The cult of the warm, giving “Mom” stands in contrast to the “capable,” “competent,” “go-getting” male. The more expressive type of male, as a matter of fact, is regarded as “effeminate,” and has too much fat on the inner side of his thigh. (qtd. in Savran 46-7)

The given portrait suggests the fluid part of gender and this assures the presence of androgynous psyche in each man and woman, which drives for the gender disruption, when it is essential, and also for gender conformity.

Robert Corber finds the same change and explains that, in the business world, men are discouraged from competing aggressively with one another and the organization man is expected to cultivate “respect for authority, loyalty to one’s superiors, an ability to get along with others – all qualities traditionally associated with femininity” (qtd. in Savran 47). This explanation not only asserts the presence

of androgyny in every individual but also suggests that this androgynous potential is the requirement for survival. Arthur Schlesinger seems to suggest that it facilitates things at home too. He observed in 1959, “American man is found as never before as a substitute for wife and mother – changing diapers, washing dishes, cooking meals and performing a whole series of what once were considered female duties” (qtd. in Savran 48-9).

It is a new masculinity. David Savran argues that the aggressive masculinity with real men being independent, adventurous, competitive, morally upright and wholly predictable is an embarrassment for most countercultural youth (123). He writes:

Countless writers noted that the new masculinity is not . . . structured around fears and anxieties. “There is no masculinity or femininity hang-up,” Reich observes; “A boy does not feel he has to dress in a certain way or ‘he will not be a man’; he is not that anxious or concerned about his own masculinity.” Leonard notes the “clear message” being sent “to all who will listen: ‘we are no longer afraid to display what you may call “feminine.” We are willing to reveal that we have feelings, weaknesses, and tenderness – that we are human.’” Men, in other words, were reimagined as androgynous being who could be “assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, job-and people-oriented, strong and gentle, in short, both ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine.’ ” (123-4)

This extract shows that masculinity and femininity are present in every man and woman.

Savran further adds that “the new, counter cultural masculinity represents a

much more deeply contradictory identity,” “the relatively androgynous new (white) male by no means signals repudiation of traditionally masculine goals,” and “on the contrary, his gender identification testifies . . . to a reconsolidation of the characteristics and fantasies associated with a residual, entrepreneurial masculinity combined with an avowal of certain qualities traditionally associated with femininity” (125). Savran adds:

The neoprimal young man . . . becomes one of the new “manly males” who are not yet able to “reveal their emotions . . . become sensitive to others,” and “weep openly if that is what they feel like doing.” He is . . . “both ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’” in which “both these ‘sides’” practice a kind of guerrilla warfare one against the other, in which the masculine part of the self, feeling increasingly threatened and vulnerable, subjugates its other (within the self). (126)

This argument corresponds to what Mary P. Ryan asserts, “We know each man has a woman inside him, and each woman has a man inside her” (qtd. in Savran 176).

Joseph Bristow’s argument – “that transgendered and transsexual identities present models of gender liminality, since they suggest a transitive movement that eradicates any fixed boundary between male and female, masculinity and femininity” (208) – appeals to this very situation.

Apart from the instances cited by Halberstam, Morris Zelditch, Robert Corber and David Savran, transgendered American writer Leslie Feinberg’s identification can be taken as the models of gender liminality that eradicates the boundary. He identifies the self by saying, “I am transgendered. I was born female, but my masculine gender expression is seen as a male. It’s not my sex that defines me, and it’s not my gender expression. It’s the fact that my gender expression appears to be at odds with my sex”

(qtd. in Bristow 226 -7).

The confusion that this explanation causes actually stems from the patriarchal practice of associating genders with the sex. Once the sex and gender are prized apart, it becomes relatively simple to see that an individual chooses either masculine or feminine gender present in the androgynous psyche of the self through the suppression and repression of the other gender traits.

Phyllis Bird illustrates the gender blending in the Old Testament. In “Images of Women in the Old Testament,” Bird admits that despite the fact that “the picture of women obtained from the Old Testament laws” appears “as that of a legal non-person,” “a dependent, and usually an inferior, in a male centered and male-dominated society” (56), “the Old Testament historical texts portray the woman as intelligent, strong-willed and capable, and especially endowed with the gift of persuasion” (65). She admits, “The wives depicted in the historical writings exhibit a wide variety of characteristics She [the good wife] is intelligent, beautiful, discreet Prudent, quick-witted and resourceful, she is capable of independent action . . .” (65).

In a patriarchal society, the qualities of being “intelligent,” “discreet,” “prudent,” “quick-witted,” “resourceful” and “capable of independent action” are considered to be masculine traits. She further argues:

“A detailed list of the activities and skills of the wife of quality” is found in the acrostic poem of prov. 31:10-31 She is manager of the household, directing the work of servants and seeing to it by industriousness and foresight that her family is well provided for in food and clothing. She engages in business transactions, apparently on

her own initiative, buying land, setting out a vineyard . . . and manufacturing clothing. (57-8)

Bird simply seems to suggest with this argument that a good wife is not passive and she is full of masculine activities inside and outside the home.

The short selections as offered by Bird, from the bible, give the impression that women are capable of transgressing the patriarchal image of the selves as timid, soft, weak, passive and helpless:

Most blessed of women be Jael
 the wife of Heber, the Kenite,
 of tent-dwelling women most blessed.
 She put her hand to the tent peg
 and her right hand to the work man's mallet;
 she struck Sisera a blow,
 she crushed his head,
 she shattered and pierced his temple. (Judge. 5:24, 26)

A certain woman threw an upper millstone upon
 Abimelech's head and crushed his skull. (Judge. 9:53)

Now when Athalia the mother of Ahaziah saw that
 her son was dead, she arose and destroyed all the
 royal family. . . [And she] reigned over the land
 for seven years. (11 Kings: 1, 3) (qtd. in Bird 42-5)

These quotations draw our attention to the hidden and unfamiliar part of the woman – the masculinity – that remains suppressed so long as things can be managed in a decent manner. When things take a turn on the contrary, the mold of femininity breaks, giving way to masculine impulses hidden in her. Jael has to crush the head of

Sisera to save the family from further oppressions; a certain woman has to crush the skull of Abimelech to save the people and a mother turns into a murderer. In all these instances, masculinity in women is not denied.

What is more, Levi-Strauss describes that every society has the division of labor by sex, concluding that it is not a biological specialization and the purpose for “the sexual division of labor is nothing else than a device to institute a reciprocal state of dependency between the sexes” (qtd. in Rubin 121). In the same context Rubin writes, “In some groups, agriculture is the work of women, in others, the work of men. Women carry the heavy burdens in some societies, men in others. There are even examples of female hunters and warriors and of men performing child-care tasks” (120).

This observation gives the information contrary to patriarchal way of thinking because women carrying the heavy burdens can be neither weak nor passive. Similarly women who are active as hunters and warriors cannot be considered as being passive and timid. In the same way men performing child-care tasks are not supposed to be exclusively masculine. Thus the very information is in the form of asserting the androgynous psyche in both men and women of aforementioned groups. Besides, “a reciprocal state of dependency between the sexes” (121) presupposes the fact that male and female cannot be independent without being reciprocally dependent.

In addition to it, different cultures have different stereotyped notions about women and men and they [the notions] cannot be viewed as universal. Margaret Mead in *Sex and Temperament* (1935) points out:

In some societies, characteristics we think of as typically ‘female’ are assigned to men, and others, typically “male,” are assigned to women

in similarly arbitrary fashion. Thus, among the Tchambuli of New Guinea, women are dominant and impersonal and manage tribal affairs. The men, in contrast, are less responsible and more emotionally dependent. (qtd. in *Hunter* 134)

Besides, this observation clarifies that sex and gender are unconnected and unfortunately societies fail to notice it. Consequently, individuals work to shape their genders in accordance with their sex according to the expectations of societies. This involves the process of suppression and repression of the other gender traits.

Margaret Mead's comment – “we are forced to conclude that human nature is almost unbelievably malleable, responding accurately and contrastingly to contrasting culture conditions” (qtd. in *Hunter* 136) – is significant in this aspect. So women of different cultures, for instance, have different contrasting qualities in them. Black women have been characterized as strong, dominant and nurturing; Hispanic women as emotional, nurturing and passionate; Jewish women as aggressive, dominant and intellectual; and so forth (*Hunter* 138). If the given sex had been rigidly, unconditionally, exclusively and naturally collocated with a particular gender, such differences in women (and men) would not have been witnessed. There would have been universality in sex-typed stereotypes. Albert Bandura would not have stated, “Our researcher found that when girls were given an incentive to behave aggressively, they were as aggressive as boys” (qtd. in *Hunter* 123).

All these instances show that human nature is ambiguous. Considering a man or a woman as a stereotype is to ignore the complex part of the human nature. There are strong women and weak men; there are assertive women and submissive men (Krishnaraj10). We have mothers-in-law and other varieties of kin-related hierarchies where women dominate other women and men (10). Such cultural variations in

gender delineate the flexibility and lack of uniformity. They further lead to the ambiguity. Only when we consider human beings as androgynous, do we see the ambiguity being reduced. The Indian concept of ‘ardhanareshwar’ which conceptualizes God as half man and half woman (Krishnaraj 13) is the symbol of androgyny present in human being.

One study found that black women and men in the United States do not perceive any differences in the way they were socialized to achievement (*Hunter* 155). The psychologist Virginia O’ Leary states, “Forced to compete in the economic market place, often in the role of the sole provider of financial resources for her family, the black women adopted behaviors and attitudes characteristically assumed to be ‘masculine’ ” (qtd. in *Hunter* 156). A great deal of responsibility and the need for economic independence enable them to come out of their mold of femininity by activating the masculine traits in them. Consequently, black women know it is unrealistic to depend on men for protection and nurturance (156).

Since the notion of gender is not stable as “the gender-based expectations for human behavior” are not “constant across time and place” and “the content of gender categories changes over time, place, culture, religion and a host of other factors” (Sjoberg and Sandra 4) and since “masculinity is a dynamic system rather than an invariable pattern” (Braudy 24), the patriarchal assumptions based on stable gender norms tend to be fallible. Leo Braudy points out the mutable aspect of masculinity:

. . . throughout the history the definitions of “man,” “manly,” and “masculinity” have shifted in response to the prevailing social, cultural demands The medieval warriors in *The Song of Roland* can simultaneously slice an opponent entirely in half with a blow and weep

copiously over a dying comrade in a manner that more tight-lipped definitions of masculinity reject. (12)

At this point Roland's masculinity implies his bravery in the battlefield, his strength as a warrior, his act of aggression and violence against enemies and his compassion for a dying comrade. The compassion expressed through the act of weeping is considered a feminine attribute in the modern situation. It is a matter of controversy whether this act should be judged as feminine or masculine. However the controversy ceases when Roland's activities are viewed from the androgynous perspective.

Besides, the documented events – “Women's participation in the American Revolutionary War appeared to be socially and politically subversive as women's actions challenged the gender roles” (Mayer 171) and “women have been more active in the ‘new’ wars of the 21st century than any documented time through history” (Sjoberg and Sandra 5) – refute the patriarchal assumptions about women being weak and expose the true identity of women [and men as well] as androgynous being. Joshua S. Goldstein draws our attention to historical event when women served as soldiers with same courage and strength as men. According to her, “the eighteenth- and- nineteenth century Dahomey Kingdom of West Africa (presently Benin) is the only documented case of a large-scale female combat unit that functioned over a long period as part of a standing army” (60). Goldstein further adds that “The women soldiers were armed with muskets and swords. They drilled regularly and resembled the men in dress and activities. They stayed in top physical condition and were fast and strong” (61). She continues to describe,

The women showed at least as much courage as the men – more, by several accounts – and had a reputation for cruelty. There was no known case of women warriors fleeing combat, although men often did

so. One European observer concluded that, “if undertaking a campaign, I should prefer the females to the male soldiers.” (62-3)

It is evident in the extract that courage and cruelty are not exclusive to men.

In this dissertation I will use these arguments and endeavor to trace out the cross-gender traits and characters as evidence for the androgynous psyche in them. My dissertation will also show [the efforts of] the characters to get back into the mold of their gender stereotypes due to the presence and working of patriarchy for reinforcing the gender norms.

Gender Conformity as an Obligation

Patriarchal ideology about gender roles continues to prevail despite the strong evidence found against it because “the function of an ideology is to justify the status quo and to persuade the powerless that their powerlessness is inevitable” (Ruthven 31). Classical epics, fairy tales, Bible and literature that uphold patriarchal culture celebrate the androcentric culture and thinking. Karen E. Rowe refers to fairy tales, for instance, as “entertaining fantasies” and “powerful transmitters of romantic myths which encourage women to internalize only aspirations deemed appropriate to [their] ‘real’ sexual functions within patriarchy” (qtd. in Ruthven 80). Marcia R. Lieberman argues that they [fairy tales] are “training manuals for girls” which “serve to acculturate women to traditional roles” (qtd. in Ruthven 80).

An individual is androgynous when she or he has both masculine and feminine potentials. However, as the member of the patriarchal society, she/he picks up what is ‘appropriate’ gender role according to culture, and “the body, for Foucault, is the passive recipient of any and all social and cultural influences and pressures” (qtd. in Cranny- Francis et al 91). Rubin elucidates the formation of gender identity as an act of suppression and repression of natural similarities between sexes:

Men and women are, of course, different. But they are not as different as day and night, earth and sky, yin and yang, life and death. . . . Far from being an expression of natural differences, exclusive gender identity is the suppression of natural similarities. It requires repression: in men, of whatever is the local version of 'feminine' traits; in women, of the local definition of 'masculine' traits. The division of the sexes has the effect of repressing some of the personality characteristics of virtually everyone, men and women. (qtd. in Glover and Kaplan XXIV)

What Rubin tries to explain is the whole process of transformation from the natural self –virtually everyone or androgynous being – to a being of the sex role stereotyped gender and a masquerade. An individual, prior to the psychological act of suppression and repression, is the real being.

Joan Wallach Scott reiterates the concept of suppression and repression while commenting on problematic aspect of gender that masculine and feminine are subjective or fictional constructs:

(But) gender identification, although it always appears coherent and fixed, is in fact, highly unstableThe principle of masculinity rests on the necessary repression of feminine aspects – of the subject's potential for bisexuality – and introduces conflict into the opposition of masculine and feminine. Repressed desires are present in the unconscious and are constantly a threat to the stability of gender identification. . . . This kind of interpretation makes the categories of 'man' and 'woman' problematic by suggesting that the masculine and

feminine are not inherent characteristics but subjective (or fictional) constructs. (163)

The authentic behaviour of man/woman manifests when masculine and feminine traits are not repressed.

In the same way as Seidler argues, men are socialized in ways that prevent them from expressing their emotions and establishing positive relationship with other men and children (qtd. in Ashe 407). Thus men and women are molded into sex-stereotypes. Every individual is expected to follow the normative expectations due to societal reinforcement. Patricia Del Rey argues:

This observation with gender has established a narrow band of acceptable behavior for each sex, and for the most part, these behaviors do not overlap. In fact, an individual who deviates from his/her assigned sex role is often labeled “deviant”, and as such, risks being abandoned, ostracized, and sometimes vilified by the normal members of society. The benefits and losses to be absorbed by conforming to sex role expectations serve to set the sexes apart to such an extent that each member of our society develops normative expectations about what behavior, desires, and feelings men and women ought to display. (8)

Fearing punishment men and women are obligated to act in favor of gender conformity.

Fidelma Ashe too points out such obligation for men to maintain his gender by being aggressive, violent and assertive:

Farrell and Goldenberg claim that the negative traits that are associated with traditional masculinity such as violence, aggressiveness and assertiveness are not natural manifestations of a masculine identity.

These traits, according to Farrell (1993) and Goldenberg (1976), are a response by men to the burdens of 'male sole'. (65)

The sense of obligation to maintain the expected traits in the self is the beginning of gender identity.

Goldenberg argues that traditional masculinity is largely a psychologically defensive operation. He further adds: "A man's psychological energy is used to defend against proving to himself and others what he is not: feminine, dependent, emotionally passive, afraid, helpless, a loser, a failure, impotent and so on." (qtd. in Ashe 65) So when a man behaves exclusively in a masculine way, he is only lost in the defensive operation.

In the same way a woman tries not to deviate because "women who are active and independent will be considered non-feminine by that society" (Rey 8). Such social conditioning process reinforces appropriate sex role behavior in females and inhibits the development of independence and self-confidence which are necessary for successful career participation and advancement (8-9). Naturally the fear of discrimination obliges females to accept the inhibition. Judith Butler acknowledges it with her comment that "the risks of discrimination, loss of employment, public harassment and violence are heightened for those who live openly as transgendered person" (*Undoing* 9). Betsy Lucal points out the gender reinforcement for women:

"... as Butler noted, "We regularly punish those who fail to do their gender right" (1990, 140). Feinberg maintained, "Masculine girls and women face terrible condemnation and brutality – including sexual violence – for crossing the boundary of what is 'acceptable' female

expression” (1996, 114). People are more likely to harass me when they perceive me to be a woman who looks like a man. (792)

Obviously the fear of punishment and the punishment itself obligate women to behave in accordance with norms.

A.G. Johnson, in his book *The Gender Knot* (1997), argues that when it comes to gender and patriarchy, most of us follow the paths of least resistance; we “go along to get along” allowing our actions to be shaped by the gender system (qtd. in Lucal 795). Lucal critiques, “Collectively, our actions help patriarchy maintain and perpetuate a system of oppression and privilege” (795).

Gender deviation turns out to be a sensitive aspect and a matter of anxiety. Matina Horner claims that intellectual achievement in the case of woman is equated with loss of femininity. Joy D. Osofsky and Howard J. Osofsky refer to Horner:

According to Horner, “if she [a woman] fails, she is not living up to her own standards of performance; if she succeeds, she is not living up to societal expectations about the female role”. Horner’s major hypothesis was that, for woman, the desire to achieve is often very much in conflict with what she labeled the “motive to avoid success.” She found that 65 percent of the girls in study demonstrated attitude which could be classified as desiring to avoid success; fewer than ten percent of boys showed evidence of such conflicts. (415)

The social expectations obligate women to resist their desires to achieve their aims.

Joy D. Osofsky and Howard J. Osofsky have made observations on the role played by the patriarchal society in inculcating gender norms in males and females. They point out their observations as evidence for the cultural insistence on gender conformity:

Males have been encouraged to be verbally and physically aggressive, whereas females have been discouraged and sometimes even prohibited from showing these traits. In fact, the same behaviors . . . encouraged among males have often been labeled as aggressive among females and . . . condemned and prohibited for them.

By our cultural standards it has not been desirable for females to manifest the competency. . . . At the same time, males have been encouraged to inhibit passivity, dependency and conformity, all of which have been encouraged, among females Females have been taught to be submissive with males, inhibit overt signs of sexual desire, and cultivate domestic skills. (414)

Thus culture plays a vital role in molding men and women as two different beings.

Whenever anyone deviates from gender norms, he is admonished back into the traditional track. In this regard parents, teachers, friends and patriarchs take the initiative. Patricia Gagne and Richard Tewsbury explain how children are expected to put themselves in the acceptable molds of the patriarchy:

Most of our respondents recognized early in their lives that the way they perceived themselves and were comfortable interacting in society did not meet with other's expectations of the way they "should" be. They reported being scolded for wanting to "iron and be just like mummy"; having their dolls taken away and being told, "You are a little boy and boys don't sleep with dolls"; being called "queer" by their friends, parents and "faggot" by other children; and being chastised by their parents and teachers for being "too feminine". Even

the most understanding parents demanded conformity when children started school. (69-70)

Thus parents and teachers also do their best in artificial upbringing of their children.

A two- year post operative transsexual explained, “I had to fit the mold that my dad wanted me in” (qtd. in Gagne and Tewksbury 70). Feminine males “were stigmatized, ostracized, beaten, cajoled, corrected, scolded, punished and otherwise socially pressured to be masculine males” (78). Even tomboys are not free from the patriarchal pressures. Empirical research reveals that a substantial minority or even a majority of American women recall being tomboys in childhood and most of girls – because of increased peer and parental pressures and physical changes – renounce their tomboyish ways in adolescence (Carr 530). Tomboyism is interpreted as a case of cross-gender or masculine identification and also as a case connected with androgyny (531).

In the case of women, gender conformity is maintained so long as they experience the social obligation for the maintenance of the gender. However it breaks when they face the financial pressures to transgress. A middle class woman underscores “her own feminine dependency” “to reinforce her husband’s prestige” and “if a woman tried to take over a man’s role she must be mad or a drunkard or a poor creature taken in by unorthodox feminist ideas” (Townsend 307). On the contrary, a working class woman has to defend her ability to survive, so she discards the idea of feminine dependency on men when it is not economically viable and in such a case she does not accept the idea that one’s gender identity is inherently tied to one’s body (307). She violates the expectations for gender conformity in this aspect, and follows it where it does not cause the conflict between her social obligation and natural impulses. One of such social obligations is the requirement of male to restrain

their emotions. Males are not allowed to express their feelings – openly to weep when they are sad, to be emotional and demonstrative – which leads to “a deadening of their emotional life and makes them less sensitive overtime and a sex-stereotype in course of time” (Krishnaraj 11).

Patriarchal society enforces sex-role stereotypes by stating that men should be dominant, competent and self-assured, as an indicator of their success and breadwinner whereas women should be submissive, make them more ‘feminine’ without being competitive and ruthless (Sawyer 25-7). This kind of social programming deprives both men and women of attaining a fuller concept of humanity which “recognizes that all men and women are potentially both strong and weak, both active and passive, and that these and other human characteristics are not the province of one sex” (26-7). Reynaud argues:

Man identifies woman with nature and treats her accordingly: he tames and cultivates her. Just as he turns forests into fields and gardens, so he makes women into housewives and models . . . seeks to give her a reassuring and reductive image. She represents the fear and disgust he feels for the flesh; by molding her according to his own interests, he is trying to give her a reassuring form She must wear makeup, be deodorized, perfumed, shave her legs, emphasize her breasts, pull in her stomach, and paint her nails, dye her hair, tame her hairstyle, pierce her ears, reduce her appetite, without making a single clumsy gesture . . . she must seem happy, dainty and original. By imposing femininity on women, man not only establishes his power . . . he also aims to produce . . . the inverted image of his own freedom and independence (144)

Thus the gender of a woman is brought forth in a way that appeals to the man.

The same patriarchal man creates a different image for himself. That image projects him as a “pure mind”, “strength, rationality and transcendence”, on the basis of which he defines himself as “masculine” (Reynaud 142). When an “inferior” woman tries to break her image, she is “accused of being out to ‘castrate’ men, ‘cut them down to size, and subvert their ‘power’” (Hoch103). Little boys are pressured to renounce gender-inconsistent traits (Diamond 39). Taboos, as stated by Maccoby, against cross-gender behavior tend to be enforced much more brutally by parents, peers and society generally when exhibited by boys (qtd. in Diamond 39).

The rigidity of patriarchal expectation for femininity in women was not unusual in the nineteenth century. If a woman, as stated by Friedrich Pockets, was endowed with manly strength, manly courage and a manly spirit, all her charm would vanish (qtd. in Mosse 54). Because of such expectations, women were often pictured as being surrounded by flowers and children such as Charlotte in Goethe’s *Werther* (1774) or in Max Van Schenkenderf’s poem of 1814 “where is flowering rose garden, where is the sweet-maid?” (qtd. in Mosse 55). Fichte argues that “the more female the women and the more male the man . . . the healthier society and the state” (qtd. in Mosse 55). Those who did not fit the set pattern laid down for men and women were the enemies of society (55).

Young boys are rewarded by their parents and teachers for conforming to gender-role standards; playmates congratulate peers for performing like men and mentors pat them on the back for their “masculine” achievements (Harris 10). A masculine ideology generated by news media, artists, teachers, historians, parents, priests and public figures dominates how men think about themselves and these common understandings of masculinity constitute dominant cultural norms (Harris

10). Cultural myths, going back to ancient Greece, give the male messages about the deeds of men, accomplishment of male heroes, noble standards for male behavior, and superhuman aspects of masculinity and ,thereby, set forth prescriptions for men to behave accordingly (Harris 11). Mothers teach their sons about masculinity by telling them how to behave, modeling certain behavior and rewarding them for their actions (Harris 28). According to L.J. Weitzman, boys are more closely restricted in their behavior and are punished for not adhering to traditional male behavior patterns (qtd. in Harris 42). Gender-role socialization of boys is often characterized by negative prescription: “don’t be sissy; don’t engage in feminine behavior” (Harris 42) and so on.

Rousseau and Kant were of the opinion that women could only be free if they agreed to subordinate themselves to men; but men could only guarantee their own freedom if they insisted upon identifying themselves with their rational powers (qtd. in Seidler, *Rediscovering* 130). Men should learn to disdain their emotions, feelings, and dependence and desires (130). Middleton argues that “men in western cultures are not supposed to show any emotion in public life other than anger” (qtd. in Ashe 115).

According to Butler, gender is not the choice of a person. The practice by which gendering occurs, the embodying of norms, is a compulsory practice, a forcible production (*Bodies* 231). Femininity is not a product of a choice, but the forcible citation of a norm, one whose complex historicity is indissociable from relations of discipline, regulation and punishment (232). Gender, as she emphasizes, is not volitional, but coercive and regulatory ideal whose materialization is compelled and this materialization takes place through certain highly regulated practices (qtd. in Savran 8-9).

Eliza Lynn Linton defines womanliness as a quality of woman, which sounds like “a series of difficult journeys and passages” (Auerbach 187). Linton elaborates it,

we call it womanliness when a lady of refinement and culture overcomes the natural shrinking of sense, and voluntarily enters into the circumstances of sickness and poverty, that she may help the suffering in their hour of need; when she can bravely go through some of the most shocking experiences of humanity for the sake of the higher law of charity; and we call it womanliness when she removes from herself every suspicion of grossness, coarseness, or ugliness, and makes her life as dainty as a picture, as lovely as a poem. She is womanly when she asserts her own dignity; womanly when her highest pride is the sweetest humility, the tenderness, self-suppression . . . womanly when she submits to the stronger. (qtd. in Auerbach 186-7)

It is a social programming for women and it is made to look natural.

The education system too contributes to the production of specific kinds of gender identities which are overwhelmingly conservative, with boys consistently positioned to adopt stereotypically masculine identities and modes of behavior (Cranny-Francis, et al. 80). The men’s rights groups and father’s rights groups, being critical of the social roles available to men, argue that men are forced into limited and damaging social roles, as are women; men are success objects as women are sex objects (81). The masculine behavior which they are expected to display offer them pleasure and power on one side and grief as well as powerlessness on the other side (82).

The social programming creates the sex-stereotypes out of the raw-human being. The way it happens is described as “embodiment,” an “incorporation” which

“may be primarily physical or emotional or psychological or intellectual or spiritual – or a combination of these” (Anne Cranny-Francis, et al. 83). They explain it:

Young girls are taught by experience to modify their behavior so that they do not appear too masculine, and young boys are taught to modify their behavior so that they don't appear too feminine. The result of this learning (acculturation) is to produce their bodies in particular ways – creating certain postures, mannerisms, physical abilities and limitations, which are their bodies. So it is not that they have a real body underneath crying to get out; but that the body they develop is the result of their acceptance and/or rejection of learning experiences. They have embodied a range of social and cultural demands related to gender. Sometimes those demands are complied with – many girls stop being so physically active in adolescence while boys continue or become more so; at other times the demands are rejected – some girls continue their physical activities while some boys refuse to be coerced into displays of physical strength – although not without consequences. In each case, however, the demand is experienced and action is taken, with the resultant effect on the individual's body. (83-4)

It is the social endeavor to create stereotypes.

The stereotypes conceal the operation of power within society by characterizing inequalities as natural differences of ability or inclination (142). The fact that women have a womb links them with patience, a natural disposition towards children, a nurturing affectionate nature and madness (143). Unfortunately, the reversed stereotypes (the masculine woman, the predatory woman and the career women) are considered to be “threats to civilized society” (149). Even the fairy tales

consistently rest on gendered stereotypes of passive women and active men and the dichotomies and associated connotations of (active) masculinity and (passive) femininity, (good) beauty and (evil) ugliness recur as potent archetypes within a range of favorite children's stories (244-5).

Even the tomboyism which may be encouraged to the extent that it remains comfortably linked to a stable sense of a girl identity is "punished" when "it appears to be the sign of extreme male identification (taking a boy's name or refusing girl clothing of any type) and when it threatens to extend beyond childhood and into adolescence" (qtd. in Habersham, *Introduction* 358). Tomboyism is tolerated as long as the child remains prepubescent and as soon as puberty begins, the full force of gender conformity is pressed onto all girls, not just tomboys (358). In the context of female adolescence the tomboy instincts of millions of girls are remodeled into compliant forms of femininity (358).

The role played by society in the formation of femininity is something that Simone de Beauvoir emphasizes by stating that "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" and "it is civilization as a whole that produces this creature, intermediate between male and eunuch, which is described as feminine" despite the fact that "the girl, like the boy, kisses, handles and caresses her mother in an aggressive way" feeling "the same jealousy," "rage, sulkiness," being "as strong as her brothers," and showing "the same mental powers" (295). She must become a passive thing, a promise of submission (698). A woman is easily reconciled to a moderate success; "she does not dare to aim too high" (709) because "the more she seems to be getting ahead on her own the more her other chances fade; in becoming a bluestocking, a woman of brains, she will make herself unattractive to men in general, or she will humiliate her husband or lover by being too outstanding as a success" (708).

Thus a woman is obligated to get into the mold of femininity and her “identity remains confined to the unnecessarily unhappy status of wife and mother, from which she cannot deviate, transgression being punished by exclusion or by a violence that sometimes proves fatal” (Dauphin, et al 578). As men and women are programmed to behave in accordance with norms, they “see it as normal and natural for the male to play a more dominant or assertive role in a heterosexual encounter and for the female to play a more yielding or accommodating role (Bem, *Lenses* 163). They also see it as emasculating for the man and effeminizing for the woman if those assertive and yielding roles are reversed on a regular basis (163). The education based on gender polarization begins at home. Bem illustrates it:

[home] where parents dress their children in pink or blue, coil them (as soon as possible) with long hair or short, put them into bedrooms decorated with ballet dancers or football players and tell them . . . that they can't wear or play with either this item of clothing or that toy because it's “just for boys” or “just for girls.” (146)

Children go through such gender-polarizing social practices and subtle aspects of language such as “she is eating an apple”; “the fingers are ladies and thumbs are men” and soon pick up this gender polarizing message (146) and internalize it. The language lessons “at the meta level teach children to look at social reality through a lens that is gender polarizing” (147).

The differential treatment given to boys and girls by adults in the child's social community causes girls and boys to become different from one another in the way the adult's preconceptions determined (134). Besides, the assignment of women and men to different and unequal positions in the social structure is responsible for the construction of conventionally gendered women and men (135). Such a different and

unequal assignment constrains both children and adults psychologically, by channeling their motivations and abilities into either stereotypically male or a stereotypically female direction (135).

In addition to it, external pressures to conform to gender-appropriate behavior are augmented by an internal need to actualize one's gender identity (Hunter150).

According to Cognitive-Development theory, the children construct gender classification in the course of social interaction; they learn to label certain persons female and others male, associating physical as well as psychological attributes with these categories of people, based on experiences with representatives of each gender (151).

Once children have classified themselves as female or male, they are motivated to approximate to the best of their ability the social definitions of the identity: the girl strives to be the best female possible, and the boy strives to be the best male (151). Kohlberg and Ziegler claim that often girls and boys will conform to stereotypic gender roles even when their parents or other socializing agents do not differentially reinforce feminine and masculine behavior in them (qtd. in *Hunter*151).

Social learning theory maintains:

Females and males act in gender-stereotyped ways because these roles have been rewarded in the past and cross-gender roles have been punished When reinforcement for behavior is changed – for example, when women are rewarded rather than punished for engaging in “masculine” activities – behavior changes accordingly. Bandura suggests that the introduction of rewards for cross-sex behavior will enable girls and boys to expand their behavioral repertoires with little difficulty. (151)

As “strength, independence and resourcefulness” are “most highly valued” (155) in black community in America, black woman like black man displays these qualities and competes in the role of “sole provider of financial resources for her family” (156). This has happened as the result of rewarding the cross-sex behavior. On the contrary, within the Asian community in America, the family supports the development of male’s personality and aspirations, while the sister is discouraged from forming any sense of high esteem and individuality (156). Asian women fail to project their masculinity because they fear the punishment.

The rigidity of the patriarchy about the enforcement of gender norms is the matter of great concern in the society. John Archer and Barbara Lloyd point out the concern connected with cross-gender behavior:

The masculine role involves greater rigidity: deviations from the expected forms of behavior occur less often among boys, and incur great disapproval when they do. Effeminate boys, or sissies, are discouraged or ridiculed, whereas masculine girls, or ‘tomboys’ are tolerated.

Boys displaying feminine behavior are not only teased and shunned by other boys (e.g. Thorne, 1986), but they also attract parental concern and alarm. In the USA, from 1970 onwards, feminine boys were viewed as requiring treatment. Rekers and Yates (1976) described the UCLA Gender clinic program, to which boys who showed ‘childhood gender disturbances were referred. The boys preferred girl’s clothing, girl’s games, and girls as their friends. They tended to avoid rough-and-tumble play and sports. (80)

The concern of the parents for the deviant behaviour of children is the result of the rigidity of the patriarchy to regulate the gender norms.

Relatively, feminine behavior represents a loss of status for a boy whereas masculine behavior represents an increase in status for a girl (81). Stereotypically, women who are overtly aggressive are seen as lacking femininity and men who cry, seem afraid, or betray other negative emotions, are viewed unmanly (135). There are strong social pressures on men not to show the negative emotions of fear and anxiety, but women are permitted to do so, and even encouraged in such expressions, which is consistent with patriarchal notions of femininity (135). Those boys who become easily afraid are under strong social pressure to hide or suppress their reaction, and those girls who are relatively unafraid and forthright in their actions are under – perhaps, more subtle – pressure-to conform to a stereotypically feminine pattern of behavior (136).

The social pressures lead to stereotyped personalities. As Kagan and Kohlberg assert, the highly sex-typed individual is motivated to keep his behavior consistent with an international sex-role standard, a goal that he presumably accomplishes by suppressing any behavior that might be considered undesirable or inappropriate (qtd. in Bem “Measurement”155). The patriarchal men and women in 1970s did not acknowledge the women’s competence as a natural phenomenon. Hagen and Kahn evaluate it:

When a woman behaves in a competent manner, observers of both sexes are confronted with a disconfirmation of their expectations. In the force of such disconfirmation, they can attribute the woman’s performance to chance, punish her, or change their beliefs about the woman’s competence. . . . The present study . . . presents clear

evidence that men, and to some extent women, punish a high-performing woman by excluding her more than a high performing-man. (372)

Thus the gender stereotype is reinforced through the efforts of patriarchy. However, it tends to be deviated very frequently due to the presence of androgynous psyche in each individual which manifests through the gender blending behavior. Consequently, gender conformity and gender deviations become a common spectacle. In this regard, the edifying power of literature is that it gives ample evidence against the traditional norms by recording fluid movements of characters between gender stereotyped activities and cross-gender ones that I will explore in this dissertation by going through specific texts. Besides, the evidence of fluid back and forth movements appears to endorse the concept of gender as masquerade/mask with the true self concealed behind that can be spotted and identified when (s)he takes it off intermittently or frequently. My use of the concept “masquerade” requires brief explanation before applying this term to my analysis of specific texts.

Gender as a Masquerade

Gender is “an obligatory masquerade” (Beasley 24). Patriarchal femininity and masculinity are masquerades in which both sexes adopt a role which covers over the ambivalence and anxiety of subjectivity and sexual identity (Anny Cranny Francis et al. 167-8). Gender is doing and doer is merely a fiction added to the deed (Butler, *Gender* 33). All these views suggest that the gender reinforcements conceal the “real me” and compel the individual project only the part of the self through gender stereotype. Elaine Showalter feels the same when she admits: “[W]omanliness” is the putting on of veils, only ‘masquerading in feminine’” (qtd. in Doniger 200). Every woman since Pandora has masqueraded as herself, concealing within the deceptive

superficial image of a woman the true nature of – a woman (200). It is true with everyman who appears in his gender stereotype. Joan Riviere, in her article “Womanliness as Masquerade” argues that “womanliness could be assumed and worn as a mask, both to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals expected if she was found to possess it – much as a thief will turn out his pockets and ask to be searched to prove he has not the stolen goods” (qtd. in Doniger 200).

Butler suggests that masquerade might construct this exaggerated femininity in order to disguise bisexual possibilities that threaten the assumed heterosexual basis of the masquerade (qtd. in Doniger 200). Maguire Marie too argues that although individuals may present themselves as having a fixed and unified sense of what it means to be male or female, this is often a veneer, a masquerade (1). Sexual identity is always fluid, and never exactly what it seems (1).

The masculine masquerade consists of the concealing of a disturbing presence of femininity and homosexuality (Lenning, Alkeline, et al. 95). Doane feels that the masquerade, by creating a distance between self and image, problematises comfortable assumptions of gender, sexuality and categorization as a system (qtd. in Lenning, Alkeline, et al. 98). Tseelon writes:

Masquerade unsettles and disrupts the fantasy of coherent, unitary, stable, mutually exclusive divisions. It replaces clarity with ambiguity, certainty with reflexivity The masquerade, in short, provides a paradigmatic challenge not only to dualistic differences between essence and appearance. It also challenges the whole discourse of difference that emerged with modernity. (3)

When gender stereotype is approached as the masquerade, coherent and exclusive division of gender gets disrupted and gender differences disappear.

Referring to a cross-dressing type of masquerade in her *Vested Interests: Cross-dressing and Cultural Anxiety*, Garber notes that it constitutes a challenge to easy notions of binarity, putting into question the categories of “female” and “male” whether they are considered essential or constructed, biological or cultural (qtd. in Tseelon 2). As readers we need to observe the individual characters to perceive the true self beneath the covering. The true self is the being with androgynous potential.

Tseelon elaborates:

Oxford English Dictionary makes fine distinction between mask, disguise, and masquerade in terms of totality and intention. It refers to masking as concealing in the sense of ‘protecting, hiding from view’. It defines disguise as concealing in the sense of ‘misrepresenting’ (employing false elements), and masquerade as ‘assuming false appearance’. . . . Masquerade . . . is a statement about the wearer The mask is partial covering; disguise is full covering; masquerade is deliberate covering But these distinctions are tenuous, as each also shares the attributes of the other, at least in some uses or historical context. (2)

From this perspective, manliness is masquerade for a man and womanliness is masquerade for woman. It is a deliberate covering, a false appearance. Cross gender traits are hidden/ masked, which is partial covering. Further psyche or the inner being with androgynous potential is disguised as gender stereotype, which is full covering.

According to Lacan, masculinity involves the posture or pretence of having the phallus, while femininity involves the masquerade of being the phallus (Homer 95). Riviere illustrates it by stating that when the little girl is caught in a double bind between appeasing her father and appeasing her mother (Homer101), she can achieve

the task of placating and appeasing the father by masquerading in feminine guise for him, that is showing him her ‘love’ and guiltlessness towards him (101). In the case of the mother too, Riviere admits, “As we know, she identifies herself with her father; and then uses the masculinity she thus obtains by putting it at the service of the mother” (qtd. in Homer 101). It implies that the girl uses femininity and masculinity as masquerade. The assumption of the mask suggests that there is something hidden behind it (101).

Methodology

This dissertation was designed to contribute to understanding literary works from the perspectives of gender, androgyny and gender as masquerade. Therefore the theoretical concepts and definitions of all the technical terms were collected from different books written by Sandra Bem, Heilbrun, Carl Jung, J.S. Mill, Judith Halberstam and other writers like Judith Butler and Simon de Beauvoir. Besides computer based information searches were conducted on these topics.

Further content analysis was used to point out personality traits in terms of masculinity, femininity and androgyny. The objective of the content analysis was to illustrate how the given characters of literary works were gender-stereotyped or androgynous; how the gender subversion/ gender disruption was taking place and how the given gender identity was only a masquerade concealing the true-self within. For this purpose, the literary works of familiar writers of the nineteenth century American and English literature were selected in general and five specific novels – *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, *The Scarlet Letter*, *Jane Eyre*, *Adam Bede* and *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* – in particular.

The specific approach to the content analysis of these five novels was categorized in terms of androgyny, gender stereotype and gender as masquerade. The

interpretation of the content was based on familiar and established definitions.

Besides, for the purpose of analysis, both male and female leading characters were set aside to perceive the presence of masculine and feminine traits in them. As the events and occasions played vital role to activate the gender and cross-gender traits in characters, such events and occasions were considered for the content analysis.

A list of personality traits categorized as masculine and feminine traits was developed on the base of the definitions given and used as a blue-print to approach the leading characters of literary works and assess their identities as masculine and feminine or androgynous being.

Masculine Traits	Feminine Traits
Independent	Dependent
Objective	Subjective
Active	Passive
Logical	Illogical
Rational	Emotional
Confident	Non-confident
Authoritative	Submissive
Courageous	Timid
Aggressive	Tolerant

If a male character was found to have possessed exclusively masculine traits and female characters feminine traits, they were categorized as gender-stereotypes. On the other hand, if there was blending of gender traits in any character, (s)he was considered as being androgynous. To establish the validity and reliability of content

analysis, the opinions of narrators and characters – if any – were included and assessed.

Chapter

Overview

In my dissertation, the first chapter concerns the breaking of the boundaries between masculinity (for men) and femininity (for women) in the nineteenth century literature of Britain and America. What activities – mental and physical – are regarded as the violation of gender norms? How do these violating and appropriate acts of gender display the androgynous psyche in the individuals concerned? In this chapter I will focus on these aspects and illustrate how gender norms are subverted in the specific texts of the nineteenth century literature. The visibility of gender deviation will be examined to show the workings of the androgynous psyche in individuals. I will argue why it is important to examine various texts of different genres concerning gender deviation/gender disruption. The contributions of these texts provide a fuller understanding of how gender identities are formed over the individual psyche with potential for both gender traits and how each individual is programmed to be a sex-stereotype that tends to disrupt infrequently.

The second chapter will examine five novels – *The Scarlet Letter*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Adam Bede*, *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, and *Jane Eyre* – written in the nineteenth century to see how the characters are depicted against the grain. This chapter will show how a major aspect of these novels centers round the female characters' conscious or unconscious endeavors to activate their repressed masculinity in the discriminating patriarchal society and how the male characters tend to violate the gender norms by crossing their gender boundaries to the point of being feminine on certain occasions. Through such occasional cross-gender behavior – male activating the femininity in him and female activating masculinity in her – in the

context of gender issues, these novels expose such characters which are close to the real identity of the individual beneath the traditional gender identity. In the context of gender issues, portrayal of strong female characters and weak male characters is against the gender norms and it reveals that each individual – male/female – is capable of going through the cross-gender experiences prohibited in the patriarchal society. This chapter, therefore, will look into this aspect so as to explore and expose the androgynous potential in man and woman.

The Scarlet Letter and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* depict the female characters like Hester Prynne and Tess who violate the gender norms by being strong, independent and breadwinners and male characters like Arthur Dimondale and Angel Clare who fail to meet the gender expectations of being strong and rational. The male and female characters in these five novels display the combined gender traits – independent and dependent, strong and weak, thoughtful and emotional, active and passive – which give the impression that they are fluid and flexible and they are the complete human beings, not stereotypes. Following the lead of Sandra Bem, Heilbrun, Carl Jung and others, this chapter will highlight the capacity in male and female protagonist from the five novels to exhibit a wide range of behavior and attitudes of both genders. My analysis will focus on these occasions when they conform to the gender norms and disrupt the binary categories as a positive response to their cross-gender impulses within their androgynous psyche.

The third chapter will focus on those characters that are socially programmed to be exclusively sex-stereotypes and also on those physical and mental activities of protagonists, which are in accordance with gender norms. My analysis also centers on patriarchal involvement in regulating the conventional roles, social norms and societal restrictions. Patriarchal society comes forward to punish Hester Prynne, the female

protagonist of *The Scarlet Letter* for adultery because she has violated the Victorian norms of purity, modesty and passivity of a woman as an angel at home, suggesting that she can be a threat to the ideologies of gender that expect women to be feminine. Following the lead of Seidler, Goldenberg and other scholars, I will argue that many of the characters in these five novels, under the pressure of patriarchy (in) frequently or consistently, conform to the gender stereotypes, avoiding or minimizing gender transgressions. Mother of Tess always conforms to her feminine gender by being passive, submissive and dependent. In this regard, gender is socially and culturally imposed on an individual for being a gender stereotype. So this chapter will offer a close reading to locate the appropriate gender behavior as dictated by patriarchal society. If the second chapter intends to show androgynous being as natural and true self, the third chapter will show sex stereotypes as social, cultural and artificial so that one can see the smooth transition or transformation at the psychological level from androgynous being to sex stereotyped being.

The fourth chapter will focus on gender as masquerade. Based on Joan Reverie's concept "that womanliness could be assumed and worn as a mask . . . to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals" (qtd. in Doniger 200), my analysis centers on how both manliness and womanliness – masculinity and femininity as genders – serve as the masquerade in the case of male and female protagonists and other major characters from the five novels. My analysis includes both genders stereotyped and cross-gender activities used as masquerade. The male characters – uncle Tom of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Alec of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Edward Rochester of *Jane Eyre* and Roger Chillingworth and Arthur Dimmesdale of *The Scarlet Letter* – project their gender identity as a masquerade. This chapter analyses the convincing explanations for the use of masquerade.

The conclusion highlights the significance of the study in gender, focusing on the fluidity and multiplicity of the characters. It reiterates and reinforces that complete success in resistance to patriarchal assumption helps in the projection of androgynous personality and complete failure leads to complete conformity and development of sex stereotyped personality.

CHAPTER II

NINETEENTH CENTURY LITERATURE: BEGINNING OF RESISTANCE

Nineteenth century was the time when two contradictory convictions about gender traits prevailed in literary works in America and Britain. One favored the traditional gender roles for men and women and another resisted the patriarchal ideology that emphasized the superiority of men. The literary works literally provided the battle ground for the ideas of gender conformity and gender disruption to clash. The readers witness the sexual ideology being reinforced in certain aspects and undermined in some in these literary works.

Many factors led to the breaking of agreement on gender and gender identity of men and women in the nineteenth century. The industrialization, expansion of middle class, the education of men and women in all classes, the institutionalization of democracy and democratic values, and development in the fields of communication, transportation, trade and travel brought the drastic change in people's way of thinking in the American and European society. These things caused upheaval in socioeconomic boundaries. People under the influence of science no more took things for granted.

These developments, including the effective rule of Queen Victoria in Britain, prompted the people to be critical towards patriarchal assumptions on gender. Stephan Reagan writes about the critical spirit in the nineteenth century:

While it is clearly important to emphasise some degree of congruence between nineteenth-century and twentieth-century critical opinions, including sophisticated doubts, about the very nature of realism, we also need to register some of the seismic shifts that rocked Victorian society in its middle years and profoundly affected its cultural and

artistic life. Criticism in the 1860s, especially, shows the powerful impact of new models of scientific enquiry. Darwinian notions of evolution have begun to permeate social and cultural theory, unfixing settled habits of belief, and transformations in philosophy, especially epistemology, have brought about a sharply sceptical spirit in criticism. (Regan 3)

This skeptical spirit in criticism marked “the transition between the death of the old century and the birth of the new” (5). One of the outcomes can be witnessed in the resistance to traditional gender norms.

Resistance to Gender Ideology in English Literature

The nineteenth century English literature reflects the change of outlook. The weak female characters and strong male characters are replaced by the strong female characters and weak male characters. Female characters' involvements in public life, the notion of separate spheres breaking and women's resistance to cultural concept of purity are frequently witnessed in literary works.

Androgynous Characters in Novels

In Victorian Britain, where capitalism was the system of power, the portrayal of masculinity in women and femininity in men was inconceivable. Capitalism, according to Gayle Rubin, “requires the association of maleness with activity and femaleness with passivity” (qtd. in Dever 160). The Victorian domestic ideal of white, middle-class femininity was a cultural myth, an ideology and feminine delicacy was frequently cited as a truth (162). However, the subversive literary works and “Victorian novelists demonstrate great ambivalence toward the ‘Angel in the House’”: identifying her as a site of the symbolic and material power associated with feminine

moral virtue, they locate alternative modes of power in figures who subvert her ideal” (Dever 164).

One of such alternative modes can be located in the widow Lizzie Eustace, of Trollope’s novel *Eustace Diamonds*. She reveals her insidious power less by means of her physical form than by action (167):

Her feet and hands might have been taken as models by sculptor. Her figure was little, and soft, and slim, and slender. If it had a fault it was this, – it had in it too much of movement. There were some who said that she was almost snake. Like in her rapid bendings and the almost too easy gestures of her body; for she was much given to action, and to the expression of her thought by the motion of her limbs. She might have made her way as an actress, had fortune called upon her to earn her bread in that fashion. (qtd. in Dever 167)

Associated both with a snake and an actress, the young lady Eustace gives the impression that her femininity is a put-on, a performance (167). This insidious power in her subverts the patriarchal assumption that women are weak and passive.

Joe Gargery of *Great Expectations* and Jos Sedley of *Vanity Fair* suggest that “conventional masculinity in Victorian Fiction slips the divide of sexual difference and converges toward a feminized ideal” (171). Carolyn Dever elaborates it:

This ‘masculine femininity’ is every bit as problematic for the novel’s male characters as it is for women, and indeed, it is a far cry from the hybrid, strong, masculinized women, the Marians, Minas, and even Dorotheas who challenge the sex/gender system more audaciously. Oscar Wilde’s *The Picture of Gray Dorian* takes on the problem of masculine sexuality in ways that are both direct and elliptical. The

novel opens as Lord Henry Wotton watches his friend, the artist Basil Hallward, finish the portrait of a beautiful young man. (171)

“Masculine femininity” or feminine masculinity is obviously a deviation from the traditional gender ideology. By portraying such characters, the writers resist the patriarchal assumptions that approve only sex stereotypes.

In many literary works, the characters are aware of the need to fit into the sex stereotypes. For instance, Walter Hartright, an “effeminate” protagonist (Adams 210) of *The Woman in White* (1860) – written by Wilkie Collins – informs about a voyage he has undertaken to boost his masculine personality:

In the waters of a new life I had tempered my nature afresh. In the stern school of extremity and danger my will had learnt to be strong, my heart to be resolute, my mind to rely on itself. I had gone out to fly from my own future. I came back to face it, as man should. (qtd. in Schmitt 16)

The confession on the part of the male character shows his concern to train himself to have strong will, resolute heart and mind guided by confidence, that is, masculine trait.

Walter Hartright is eager to train himself in accordance with gender ideology. This confession reflects the influence of imperialism on gender roles. Andrew Thompson argues:

Several scholars have argued that it [imperialism] was responsible for a sharp division of gender roles: manliness and empire confirmed one another, guaranteed one another, enhanced one another, whether in the practical disciplines of commerce and government or in the escape zones of writing, travel and art. (97)

The expression in the extract “my will had learnt to be strong, my heart to be resolute, my mind to rely on itself” shows that the gender is the matter of learning against what is natural – the androgyny. This learning takes place at the cost of suppression and repression of cross-gender traits.

Like the character Walter Hartright, many novelists prefer to represent the patriarchal culture and masculinity in males. Cannon Schmitt explains it:

Countless novels by Henry, John Buchan, R.M. Ballantyne and others represent non-European parts of the world in these terms: as places of maturation or regeneration where boys can discover or, in cases like Hartright’s where incomplete or failed men can rediscover – their adult masculinity. (16-17)

The novels that talk about Britain as an empire are actually talking about their masculinity and superiority and the need for the maintenance of their colonial culture that considers white as masculine and non-white as feminine.

Nevertheless, resistance to dominant gender ideology has been consistent. It can be witnessed in Mary Elizabeth Braddon’s novel *The Lady Audley’s Secret* (1810). Its male protagonist, Robert Audley, and another male protagonist, Walter Hartright, of *Women in White* by Collins show the similarities: both have combined gender traits in them – an instance of gender blending. James Eli Adams argues about them:

Despite their different social positions, both men are effeminate, lacking the conventional markers of masculinity derived from erotic and social power . . . Both men gain virility by rescuing others from oppressive mystery: as they assume the role of detectives, their wayward energies gain focus and force. Robert is elevated, ironically,

by becoming an accomplished lawyer Hartright overcomes his social inferiority by being absorbed into the gentry, as father of heir to Limmeridge. (210)

Such a portrayal that involved gender blending is a transgression for traditionalists and patriarchal men and women whereas it is the representation of a person's psyche or true self for others who perceive the fluidity in individual's behavior. This kind of portrayal of character undoubtedly results from resistance to gender ideology.

Anthony Trollope (1815-82) – a novelist – also affiliated himself to resistance with a comment made through a narrator on one of his fictitious personages – Lady Glencora, a major character of his Palliser novels that included *Can You Forgive Her?*, *The Eustace Diamonds*, *Phineas Finn*, *Phineas Redux*, *The Prime Minister* and *The Duke's Children*. In his *Autobiography* (1883) that was published posthumously, the narrator remarks, “I do not know that she [Glencora] was at all points a lady, but had Fate so willed it she would have been a thorough gentleman” (qtd. in Adams 268). Her energy and independence resist entire submission to conventional femininity (268). The change is most notable in Glencora, who comes to sacrifice, as Trollope put it in his *Autobiography*, “the romance of her life” for “a rich reality” within which she comes to savor the pleasures of social and political eminence (qtd. in Adams 268). Her energy and independence masculinise her and her emotional temperament – feminine attribute – gradually moves into the background. This kind of portrayal is deviation from the ‘appropriate’ traits as expected in a woman during the Victorian period. At the same time, it asserts the androgynous potential in every individual notwithstanding the biological sex.

Lucilla of *Miss Marjoribanks* (1866) by Margaret Oliphant evolves from the feminine world, combining it with masculine world while acting as a bridge between them. Adams illustrates the way she does it:

Margaret Oliphant offered a strikingly different image of young femininity, but also a more subtle probing of prevailing gender norms in *Miss Marjoribanks* Lucilla Marjoribanks has been aptly called a Victorian Emma: an only child, imperious, meddling, unflappably confident, and blithely self-absorbed When she loses her mother at 15, she finds her mission in life: under the guise of devoting herself to her father, she undertakes to transform “the lamentable condition” of Carlingford society; “all that was wanting was a master-hand to blend these different elements.” The domestic “queen” of Ruskin’s celebration turns into a young social reformer, or a female Napoleon Ultimately her single mindedness, which culminates in engineering an unlikely election of her candidate for parliament, turns out to bring genuine comfort and happiness to others. . . . (271-2)

“Domestic queen of Ruskin” embodies femininity in Lucilla and “female Napoleon” stands for her feminine masculinity. Her undertaking to “transform the lamentable condition of Carlingford society” involves activities of a master-hand. These activities and resultant comfort and happiness suggest the masculinity or acceleration of masculine traits in her. Inclusion of opposite gender traits in Lucilla defies the conventional gender ideology.

Gender Projection in Dickens’s Novels

In the case of Charles Dickens too, male and female characters appear in different shades that lie between conformity and gender disruption. The virtues of the

home-making women are embodied in a number of Dickensian heroines, including Little Nell, Agnes Wickfield, Esther Summerson, Little Dorrit and Belk Wilfer and the representation of these domestic angels helps to define the middle class ideal of the family (Waters 122-3). On the other hand, Mrs. Bucket of *Bleak House* is a lady of natural detective genius (129). Lady Deadlock is a strong character and even the detective “Mr. Bucket is unable to outwit her in her final escape” (129). Number of more complex female figures are ambiguously poised as part of simultaneous confirmation and critique of domestic ideology (129). The transformation of Lady Deadlock into the mother of an illegitimate child enacts a redefinition of female identity according to the requirements of domestic ideology (129-139). It shows that some variations can be observed in female characters of Dickens deviating from the feminine ideal. Rosa Dartle of *David Copperfield* aggressively refuses to endorse the middle-class ideal of womanhood (130). She surprises the readers with “her smoldering anger as a result of her sexual betrayal by Steerforth” (Waters 130). This kind of portrayal contradicts the gender norms. If Rosa is violent and aggressive, Sissy Jupe of *Hard Times* is active and helpful. She organizes a search party and rescue operation to look for a character –Stephen – missing for few days. As the result of her efforts, Stephen is located in a pit and raised to the surface before his death. The qualities that these female characters demonstrate are masculine.

As for the male characters too, variations can be noticed. Mr. Murdstone of *David Copperfield*, step-father of David, gives the impression of being an authoritative husband, conforming to conventional gender role. On the other hand, Joe Gargery of *Great Expectations* vividly symbolizes the power relation that presents male characters as the meek chattel of strong women (Dever 171). The following evaluation of the narrator, Philip Pirrip, of the novel illustrates his qualities:

She was not a good-looking woman, my sister; and I had a general impression that she must have made Joe Gargery marry her by hand. Joe was a fair man, with curls of flaxen hair on each side of his smooth face, and with eyes of such a very undecided blue that seem to have somehow got mixed with their own whites. He was a mild, good natured, sweet tempered, easy-going, foolish, dear fellow – a sort of Hercules in strength, and also in weakness. (qtd. in Dever 171)

This extract refers to the feminine traits such as “mild” and “sweet-tempered” present in a person who can be compared to Hercules. In short, he is the embodiment of androgynous personality. Dever further comments that he (Joe) is “loving and sweet, passive and fair, manipulable, gentle and weak” (171) and adds that “Joe Gargery makes a better angel in the house than any of his female counterparts in *Great Expectations*” (171). The feminine traits pointed out in him are an instance of gender disruption. Joe Gargery’s wife collocated with “by hand” is masculine. Such a portrayal of male and female characters marks the resistance of Dickens to dominant ideologies of gender and suggests fluidity in gender formation.

The deviation from the appropriate behavior can be located in his other novels too. *Dombey and Son* (1848) is one of them. Kate Flint points out the strong female characters in Dickens’s novels:

Dombey’s taking of a second wife is, effectively, the purchase of a potential breeding partner. It is also linked to the domestic dynamic I identified earlier, because counter pointed with Dicken’s ostensible praise of harmonious home life is his lively interest in strong, often angry woman – like Edith Dombey or, in *David Copperfield*, Rosa Dartle. . . . Edith was under no illusion about the degrading financial

deal involved in marrying Dombey: “Knowing that my marriage would at least prevent the hawking of me up and down; I suffered myself to be sold as infamously as any woman with a halter around her neck is sold in any market place.” Her passion and resentment fire up not just in relation to him, but in response to Carker – his “parasite and tool,” as she terms him – with whom she runs away. This flight is not, however, to commit adultery, but to punish the arrogance of them both, men who, in their different ways, thought they could own and subdue her She refuses to remain as property: the subject of purchase, sale, and exchange. (“The Middle” 40-1)

The female characters being “strong” and “angry” and Edith Dombey’s refusal to “remain as property” display the fact that they are not weak and submissive.

Obviously these characters deviate from gender norms.

Gender Deviation in the Novels of Bronte and Gaskell

Dickens knew that the doctrine of “separate spheres” for men and women was changing. However the society was not prepared for this change. Caroline Norton was denied access to her infant children when she offended her husband (Stoneman 131-2). The very act of offending the husband was the signal of transformation in the attitude of men and women. It was the signal for inevitable change. Annie Bronte’s novel, *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* (1848) denies the concept of Angel in the House and “gives a fictional confirmation that “woman’s mission can be a futile dream” (qtd. in Stoneman 132). It is about a “heroine, Helen Huntingdon” who “marries a known profligate with the intention of reforming him through her feminine influence; instead she is forced to flee the marital home to protect her infant son from her husband” (Stoneman 132). The angel in the house can be rebellious to the extent of breaking

away from the dependent, modest and submissive state to become the protector of her son. The masculine spirit that has been suppressed in her breaks through the mold of her femininity. This novel is the outcome of Annie Bronte's successful resistance to patriarchal ideology. Neither Annie Bronte nor her heroine Helen Huntington act in accordance with what Sarah Lewis argues in her work *Woman's Mission* (1839) that "woman's mission is at home, exerting a beneficial influence on her menfolk" (qtd. in Stoneman 131).

Elizabeth Gaskell, a novelist and a mother of four daughters, does not cut the figure of a patriarchal woman believing in the inherent weakness and inferiority of a woman when she makes comparison between a creative man and creative woman in her work *The Life of Charlotte Bronte* (1875):

When a man becomes an author, it is probably merely a change of employment to him. He takes a portion of that time which has hitherto been devoted to some other study or pursuit But no other can take up the quiet, regular duties of the daughter, the wife, or the mother, as well as she whom God has appointed to fill that particular place: a woman's principal work in life is hardly left to her own choice; nor can she drop the domestic charges devolving on her as an individual, for the exercise of the most splendid talents that were ever bestowed.

(qtd. in Peterson 61-2)

Gaskell is clear that even exceptional gifts, such as those of Charlotte Bronte, do not absolve a woman from domestic duties (Stoneman 132). A woman's responsibility is bound to her feminine appeal as a mother, daughter, and wife and also to her masculine appeal that comes with "exceptional gifts" (132). Gaskell's acknowledgement of "exceptional gifts"/ "splendid talents" in a woman like Jane

Eyre and placing women in the place of men resist the concept of “in-born inferiority of women” (Tyson 85).

Besides, in her novel *Mary Barton* Gaskell deviates from the gender norms by showing “working-class men as emotional and feeling, indicating the maternal, feminized, and nurturing aspects of working-class culture” (Matus 36). The use of gender disguise in *Cranford* (1851-53) and the strange discovery about Miss Pole being a man (Jaffe 48) is the violation of gender norms and it foresees the complex dimension of transgender in the twenty first century. Gaskell’s resistance to dominant ideologies of gender can be witnessed in both *Cranford* and *Ruth* (1853) that “seek to expel both men and what they identify as masculine sensibilities from worlds that have traditionally been governed by them” (Jaffe 48). Audrey Jaffe elaborates it in the context of *Ruth*:

In *Ruth* (miss) Faith Benson’s invention of a fictional identity similarly bespeaks a distance from the rules that govern the larger community as well as the realist genre: rules that lend authority and consistency to the very structures that Gaskell here wishes to contest. Putting to work a belief in the efficacy of fictions to paper over, if not overcome, ideological stalemates, Faith’s device suggests that the alternative to masculine rule is not feminine rule but rather a more profound destabilization of categories: a refusal to play by the rules that perpetuate such oppositional logic. (57)

Ruth is one of Gaskell’s novels that carry the message against the norms. Ruth refuses to be feminine alone. Her bravery during cholera outbreak shows her masculine potentials.

Gaskell's *Sylvia's Lovers* (1863) also enables the readers to perceive that women need to transgress the gender norms by being independent and active. It presents the humiliating position of women in society and a contrast between a female protagonist Sylvia – a dependent lady –and Hester Rose, an independent figure. Sylvia's dependent way of living provides a foil for Hester. Marian Shaw comments on it:

It is with wry amusement that Gaskell notes the low estimation of women in the rural community of her novel; for example, that men would rather talk to their dogs than their wives. . . . Women accept this subordination, as in the case of Sylvia's mother Bell, who is better educated and more sensible than her husband, but believes, against all the evidence, that he has "the superior intellect of the masculine gender." Illiterate Sylvia is trapped in a world of dependency on men: unequipped to earn her own living, her beauty is her only asset. . . . Gaskell perhaps points to an alternative though austere future for women in the figure of Hester Rose, the shop assistant. . . . She earns her keep, refuses to marry a man she does not love, and gives her life to duty and service to others. (84-5)

The character of Hester Rose as an independent and active woman is an example of gender subversion.

Gaskell's characters suggest the need for "the reformulation of gender types and rules" (Foster 113). Mrs. Leigh – the female protagonist of Gaskell's longer short story "Lizzie Leigh" (1855) – has "rebelled against her husband as against a tyrant with a hidden, sullen rebellion, which tore up the old landmarks of wifely duty and affection" (Foster 113). It is another instance of gender disruption. In another story

“The Grey woman” (1861), Amante “cuts her hair, puts on men’s clothes and acts out the role of male protector to Anna” (113). It is another instance of gender subversion and “the cross-dressing foregrounds false assumptions about gendered roles and behavior” (Foster123). The same story presents a cruel and ruthless man Tourelle described as having delicate features of girls, and having his bedroom filled with the perfume (123). Such divergent portrayal suggests the complexity of human nature that has been simplified in terms of gender category.

Mrs. Leigh’s rebellion assures the presence of masculinity in her and other women as well, which prompts her and them to react in self-defense and in defiance of patriarchal ideas and exploitations. However, Gaskell does not rule out the possibility for an angel in the house. In her story “The Heart of John Middleton” (1850), Nelly Hadfield, a female protagonist, proves to be an angel of the house. According to the story, she gets injured and invalidated while trying to protect her lover John Middleton from a stone aimed at him by his rival, Dick Jackson; she becomes angelic influence by softening the morose and violent Middleton after their marriage and by dissuading him from his vengeful desire to turn Jackson over to the law (Foster 115-116). The female sacrifice leads to death when saintly Nelly dies (116). She is the embodiment of exclusive feminine appeal. However, her instinct to protect her lover is the masculine attribute that we can trace in all men and women who devote themselves to their near and dear ones. This kind of resistant ideology acted as a counter flow to the patriarchy in which men inhabit an active sphere while women remain passive and iconic.

Even Victoria, Queen of Great Britain, did her part to reinforce and undermine the patriarchal ideology. As a ruler, she represented the masculinity and “as the lady for whose honor men fight, she added the greater emotive sense of the queen as

embodiment of waiting wife and mother while women throughout the country followed her example of knitting socks and mittens and sending them with notes of sympathy to soldiers, a symbolic and patriarchal act that underlined the conventional demarcation of gender roles in times of war” (Saunders 71). It was a paradoxical phenomenon that exposes the androgynous potentiality in her. Kate Flint refers to a similar situation:

The Heroine of Ella Hepworth Dixon’s *The Story of a Modern Woman* (1894), studying painting, and trying to make a living by writing, finds that both spheres expect the work of women artists to confirm to a well-established set of conventions. Interestingly, however, in *The Romance of a Shop* (1888), Amy Levy’s main women characters express few of these anxieties in running their very commercialized photographic studio after their father’s death, whatever the responses of their more traditionally minded relatives and acquaintances, who, in turn, are viewed with ‘three pairs of searching and intensely modern young eyes.’ Their familiarity with cameras and studio props, with printing frames and developing chemicals, and even their willingness to undertake such commissions as photographing a corpse on her death bed are simultaneously signs of their modernity and courageous efforts at establishing financial independence. (“Seeing” 33-4)

The female characters in both novels act contrary to their conventional roles by getting out of the role of angel in the house. However, Dixon’s heroine is concerned with patriarchal expectations whereas Amy Levy’s main characters have gone ahead of their concern. They have already been masculinized unlike the heroine of Dixon,

by being independent as businesswomen, active in photography and brave in “photographing a corpse.”

Gender Disruption in the Novels of Collins and Thackeray

Wilkie Collins is another renowned writer of the Victorian period who has managed to resist the sexual ideology. Collin’s work enacts a complex interplay of subversion and containment, critique and compromise (Taylor 2). He represents cross-gendered androgynous male and female figures alongside conventional masculinity and femininity (2). Dever suggests that Collins’s same-sex couples walk a fine line between affective convention and erotic transgression (qtd. in Taylor 5). Taylor admits:

The other side of Collins’s much discussed dissection of femininity is his depiction of the identity crisis facing Victorian men, and in his discussion of melancholia and masculinity in *Basil*, *The Woman in White*, *Armadale* and *The Moonstone* Kucich explores how the split in Collins’s fiction between melancholic and self-aggrandizing masculinity expresses wider social transformations and cultural shifts in gender norms. (5)

Collins’s portrayal of female protagonist in *The Woman in White* indicates his deviation from the norms. Laura Fairlie is fair and pretty with feminine traits in her whereas her half-sister Marian Halcombe is ugly, dark, intelligent and strong-minded. Because of the masculine spirit she works with Walter and saves her sister from conspiracy. The male protagonist Walter Hartright is not heroic. His comment on his night-time encounter with a mysterious woman – “in one moment, every drop of blood in my body was brought to a stop by the touch of a hand laid lightly and suddenly on my shoulder behind me” (qtd. in Pykett 55) – shows his feminine quality

of getting nervous. Lyn Pykett's comments on characters signify something that is inappropriate:

The meeting leaves Walter disoriented, questioning his own actions, and in a thoroughly 'disturbed state of my mind' (WW 2) – a condition exacerbated by his own encounters with Marian Halcombe and his employer Mr. Fairlie, both of whom confound his gender expectations. As seen . . . Marian's voluptuous feminine form. . . belies her masculine features: the dark down on her lip resembles a 'moustache' and worse still, she had a large, firm, masculine mouth and jaw; prominent . . . eyes and bright, frank, 'intelligent' expression . . . wanting in feminine attractions of gentleness and pliability.' Frederick Fairlie . . . is 'womanish' . . . neither masculine nor feminine. . . . It suggested 'something' singularly and unpleasantly delicate. . . .

Federick Fairlie seems to belong to an intermediate sex or gender. (55)

The description of the characters contradicts their conventional gender expectations. Walter lacks confidence – the masculine quality – and Marian lacks the feminine quality whereas Frederick combines both qualities.

Similarly Magdalen Vanstone, the heroine of *All the Year Round* (1862), acts energetically (57). Collin's representation of Magdalen challenges gender stereotypes (57) because she is masculine and also feminine with "many of the negative traits often associated with femininity" (Pykett 57). Besides, his male protagonists suffer from "melancholia" (Kucich 125) which is associated with "inaction, indecisiveness, inhibition and other forms of emotional debility traditionally reserved for depressed women" (Kucich 126-7). Collin's *Basil* (1852) portrays the dangerous feminization of male identity when melancholia is divorced from narcissistic power (127). Due to the

fragmentation of heroic male ego of the pre-Victorian past, his traditional males (male characters) are represented as effeminate (128). Basil is one of the most antiheroic, debilitated male melancholics in Victorian fiction (128). Collins's male characters are not devoid of masculinity but they lose it because of melancholic events. In the case of Basil too, his aggressive behavior – the masculinity – breaks loose when he “violently assaults Mannion” (129) and the “repercussions of the attack feminize him” (Kucich 129). Such activities – mental and physical – are interrelated, getting affected by one another: activity leads to passivity and aggression leads to repentance. All these things suggest the presence of masculine and feminine traits in him and in each individual.

William Thackeray, a great Victorian novelist, stood against the conventional way of thinking when he wrote of his mother in 1852: “When I was a boy at Larkbeare, I thought her an Angel and worshipped her. I see but a woman now, O so tender so loving so cruel” (qtd. in Auerbach 89). The cruel part added to the tender and loving quality of the mother is the quality of masculinity added to the quality of femininity in her. Because of this deviant way of thinking in him and in Dickens as well, their heroines turned out to be “the most potent angels” (Auerbach 82). Thackeray's conception of women reflects at the end of his novel *Vanity Fair* in the description of mermaids:

They look pretty enough when they sit upon a rock, twanging their harps and combing their hair, and sing, and beckon to you to come and hold the looking-glass; but when they sink into their native element, depend on it those mermaids are about no good, and we had best not examine the fiendish marine cannibals, revelling and feasting on their wretched pickled victims. (qtd. in Auerbach 90)

The extract with its metaphorical language focuses on the feminine activities followed by masculine movements. Becky Sharp, a leading female character in *Vanity Fair*, is a mermaid, who “reminds us that this ‘serpent with a lady visage’ had a longer, stronger fictional life than did her male counterparts in heaven and hell” (Auerbach 94). In other words, Becky Sharp does not represent the myth about woman as angel in the house but the real woman in flesh and blood who behaves in accordance with her androgynous psyche.

Rachel, a female protagonist of Thackeray’s *The History of Henry Esmond* does not sound as an angel of the house when she critiques the patriarchal society:

The men who wrote you books . . . your Horaces, and Ovids, and Virgils . . . all thought ill of us, as all the heroes they wrote about used us basely. We were bred to be slaves always; and even of our own times, as you are still the only lawgivers, I think our sermons seem to say that the best woman is she who bears her master’s chain most gracefully. (qtd. in Auerbach 96)

The voice of Rachel is the voice of an intellectual person well-informed in classics and to be intellectual is the masculine spirit embodied.

Beatrix, another female protagonist of the novel, is assertive in her expressions which shock any patriarchal man or woman. She is also ready to be a wife and a commodity to be bought. The following expressions of her expose her androgynous traits:

“Why am I not a man? I have ten times [my brother’s] brains, and . . . had I worn a sword and periwig instead of this mantle and commode, to which nature has condemned me . . . I would have made our name talked about . . . I solemnly vow, own, and confess, that I want a good

husband My face is my fortune. Who'll come? – buy, buy, buy!”

(qtd. in Auerbach 97-8)

It is the voice of masculinity in her that prompts her to claim of having ten times the mental power of her brother and the confidence in her enables her to think that she could be famous if she were to wear sword and periwig. Besides, the voice of femininity in her drives her to long for a husband. Beatrix and Rachel are androgynous. This kind of portrayal on the part of Thackeray is the deviation from conventional roles and this deviation results from the resistance to dominant ideologies of gender.

Carolyn G Heilbrun implies the same when she considers *The Scarlet Letter*, *Wuthering Heights* and *Vanity Fair* as the examples of androgynous novels (62). She evaluates Thackeray and Becky Sharp, a female protagonist of *Vanity Fair*:

Becky is unique in her energy Thackeray's genius was to recognize this energy as “feminine,” in impulse, not in personality. To put this differently, Becky Sharp has the energy, the thrust of personality which we have been taught to think of as masculine. Such energy, incarnated in a female form, while it fascinates, is not able, Thackeray's novel suggests, to transform. *Vanity Fair* is an important androgynous novel in the extent to which, in forcing upon the reader an ambivalent attitude toward Becky, it identifies the “heroic” possibility. Neither the comic mode of the novel, nor the selfishness of Becky, should be allowed to mitigate the force of Thackeray's vision: the society of sexual polarization is doomed, the fabulous energy that remains to this decadent world is not likely to appear in its wounded form. (69)

As for male characters, Thackeray seems to suggest in a cynical way that their masculinity is shallow. Jos Sedley of *Vanity Fair* turns up as ironic portrayal of the manliness. At the battle of Waterloo, with his enormous military-style moustache, he intends to prove his manliness but soon his nerve breaks and he panics on learning that the English are losing badly. He cuts his moustache off, and beats a hasty retreat without even bothering about his sister, Amelia – female protagonist (ch. 32). As he returns to India, he brags about his courageous exploits at the battle of Waterloo. His masculinity is only a masquerade, concealing his feminine traits. Other characters of the novel, George Osborne, Amelia's husband and Rawdon Crawley – Becky's husband – fail to make a successful living independently when they are “disinherited” (ch.21, 24). It seems that their independence – a masculine attribute – depends on the fortune they are supposed to inherit. The sub-title “A Novel without a Hero” and masculine qualities shown in Becky signify the writer's resistance to gender ideologies.

Gender Boundaries Blurred in Tennyson and Ruskin

In English literature Lord Tennyson reinforced the patriarchal culture that regards men as being masculine – rational, strong, protective, active, decisive, independent, and so on – and women as being feminine – emotional, weak, passive, dependent and so on – and voiced the sense of ‘separate spheres’ for men and women. His poem *The Princess* asserts it,

Man for the field and woman for the hearth;
 Man for the sword and for the needle she;
 Man with the head and woman with the heart;
 Man to command and woman to obey;
 All else confusion. (V. 437-441)

Obviously Tennyson was influenced by sexual ideology of difference. These lines illustrate his faith in biological essentialism that associates biological sex with certain psychological attributes.

In the earlier part of the poem too, he is found to have reiterated his assurance about the dominant role of men and subordinate role of women:

Man is the hunter; woman is his game;
 The sleek and shining creatures of the chase;
 We hunt them for the beauty of their skins;
 They love us for it, and we ride them down. (V. 147-150)

Tennyson's voice here is the voice of patriarchy and as a patriarchal man, he argues about gender and sex in terms of binary oppositions.

John Ruskin's *Sesame and Lillies* (1864) also emphasizes the difference between men and women, their rights and their spheres of activities. According to it, a man's duty is to assist in the maintenance, in the advance and in the defense of state whereas a woman's duty lies in the ordering, in the comforting and in the beautiful adornment of the state (55). A lady (woman) is a "bread giver"/ "loaf giver" whereas a lord [man] is the "maintainer of laws" (56). Men, by their aggressive nature, are prone to fight for any cause or for none and women need to choose the cause for them (men) and forbid them when there is no cause (57) because they [women] are not aggressive but "wise" (45). "Men are feeble in sympathy" and women can "feel the depth of pain" (57). Women are "tender and delicate and the path of good women is strewn with flowers" (58). "Passionate gentleness," "modesty of service," (45) and "kindness" (47) are their qualities. Although Ruskin claims that it is "foolishly wrong" to consider the woman as "the shadow and the attendant image of her lord, owing him a thoughtless and servile obedience" (36) and that it is foolish to speak of

superiority of one sex to the other as “each completes the other” (44), he allocates men a higher place by stating:

The man’s power is active, progressive, defensive. He is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender. His intellect is for speculation and invention, his energy for adventure, for war, and conquest wherever war is just, wherever conquest necessary By her office, and place, she [woman] is protected from all danger and temptation. (44)

The above description gives the picture of a striking contrast between man and woman. It reinforces the conventional gender role with a modest suggestion that a woman should not be considered inferior. Ruthven seems to summarize Ruskin’s views when he (Ruthven) states, “Victorian men were happy to idealize women provided that they stayed in their proper sphere –the home – and posed no threat to men in the world at large” (75). However Ruskin is not free from ambivalence.

This ambivalence can be taken as the seed of resistance to the dominant ideology of patriarchy. Tennyson is also not free from it. This kind of resistance to gendered stereotyping recurs repeatedly through the nineteenth century novel, from Austin through Hardy to Sarah Grands (Richardson 214). Silas Marner mothers a child, Sarah Grand’s heavenly twins cross-dress in childhood in one of Grand’s more radical passages (1893), and in *The Well-Beloved* (1897) Hardy’s narrator points out that it is child bearing and rearing that hold women back: they move up and down the stream of intellectual development like flotsam in a tidal estuary (Richardson 214). Alfred Tennyson, despite his faith in sexual ideology that emphasizes difference between men and women in terms of gender traits, perceives the feminine attributes in his friend Arthur Henry Hallam in his elegy *In Memorium* written over the death of

Hallam. The poem records the gender switch when the poet regards Hallam as a female and a friend, a brother, a husband and a mother. While referring to the self as a lover and Hallam as a beloved, he writes:

A happy lover who has come
 To look on her that loves him well,
 Who lights and rings the gateway bells,
 And learns her gone and far from home

 So find I every pleasant spot
 In which we too were wont to meet,
 The field, the chamber, and the street,
 For all is dark where thou are not. (VIII. 1-4, 9-12)

In these lines and in other sections as well Hallam is presented as a feminine being.

Hallam is described as “dear as the mother to the son” (IX. 19); “the perfect flower of human time” (LXI. 3), and “manhood fused with female grace” (CIX. 17). Such a portrayal exposes and highlights masculine and feminine traits in Hallam, displaying androgynous personality in him. In the later sections of the poem, Tennyson himself undergoes the transformation from stereotyped gender to an individual with both genders blended. The lines “But thou and I are one in kind, / As molded in Nature’s mint” (LXXIX. 4-5) imply that they are identical because both have the feminine sensibilities. It is clarified in the lines, “My spirit loved and loves him yet, / Like some poor girl whose heart is set / On one whose rank exceeds her own” (LX. 2-4). The comparison of self or Hallam to a female sex is the recurrent image as in the following lines:

Two partners of a married life—

I looked on thee and thought of thee
 In vastness and in mystery,
 And of my spirit as of a wife. (XCVII. 4-7)

In these expressions, the poet transgresses and transcends the gender boundaries, going through the experience of the opposite gender and feeling exactly as a woman does. It reveals the androgynous potential in the poet and this revelation is the outcome of resistance to gender ideals.

In the case of Ruskin too, resistance is equally active and effective. Hence Ruskin deviates the gender norms by stating that the woman is not the “shadow and attendant image of her lord” (36) and the question of “superiority of one sex to the other” is “foolish” (44) way of thinking. Further his arguments that “the woman’s power is not for rule . . . but for sweet ordering, arrangement and decision” (44) and “it is for you [women] to choose” the cause for men to fight and “to forbid them [men] when there is no cause” (57) apparently go against the sexist belief of patriarchy “in the in-born inferiority of women” (Tyson 85) and the traditional gender roles that exclude women from “decision-making positions” (85). He subverts the gender ideology by claiming:

Male protagonists in Shakespeare are noted for weakness: Coriolanus, Caesar and Antony fall by their vanities; Hamlet is indolent and drowsily speculative; Romeo is an impatient boy; the Merchant of Venice is submissive to adverse fortune and Kent is rough and unpolished. (Ruskin 37)

The weakness itself is a feminine quality and the weaknesses Ruskin finds in male protagonists of Shakespeare are the feminine traits.

Ruskin, at this point, rules out the patriarchal ideal that men are strong and women are weak. He admits further:

. . . there is hardly a play that has not a perfect woman in it, steadfast in grave hope, and errorless purpose: Cordelia, Desdomona, Isbella, Hermione, Imogen, Queen Catherine, Perdita, Sylvia, Viola, Rosailand, Helena and last perhaps loveliest Virgilia are faultless; conceived in highest heroic type of humanity. (37)

This argument subverts patriarchal way of thinking of man as the only being that can be described as the heroic or the highest heroic type of humanity. Ruskin locates this masculine quality – heroism – among women and turns the table against men. Ruskin tends to undermine what he actually intends to reinforce about sexual ideology.

Auerbach evaluates Ruskin by stating “Ruskin insists that ‘man is eminently the doer, the creator, the discoverer, the defender,’ but his own language contradicts him” (60). Ruskin’s arguments – though they are ambivalent – initiated the resistance to dominant ideologies of gender and approved the possibility for the presence of masculinity and femininity in men and women.

Crossing the Borders of Gender in Poetry and Painting

Lord Byron’s resistance to gender ideologies can be noticed in his play *Sardanapalus* (1820-1). It illustrates that masculinity and femininity are not bound to the biological sex of the individual. The king Sardanapalus goes through the experiences of femininity and masculinity unconnected with soldiership and his beautiful Greek female slave Myrrah embodies the masculinity of a warrior apart from being the feminine beauty and concubine of the king. The king is not fond of fighting a war to “expand his empire and conquer new territory” (Garofalo 54). His “effeminacy becomes . . . a sign of profound inability” (54). Several characters testify

to the belief that beneath the king's effeminacy beats a manly heart that can be roused to renewed manhood (54). At this instance, his male body is not appropriately associated with his gender – femininity. Even in the battlefield, “unnoticed by his followers, the king experiences a continuing effeminacy” (65). When the sword is placed in his hands, he gives it back, with the remark that it is too heavy (65).

Sardanapalus's foremother, Semiramis, is a woman who has become a man by going to war (67). She is known as a man-queen and Sardanapalus as the she-king (67). In the battlefield, Myrrah fights like a lion (68). Garofalo describes the situation by stating:

By connecting her violence to her maternal feelings, Sardanapalus sees Myrrah's capacity to fight as the natural expression of her gender. After all, “all passions in excess are female” . . . Both figured as mothers, Myrrah and Semiramis become examples of warriors who fight as though violence were part of their nature. (68)

It is an account of gender disruption and subversion with female character being masculine in the battlefield and the male character – the king – being feminine. It is an instance of transgender/ cross-gender behavior. As violence is associated with masculinity (Edwards 220), and it is the part of their nature, Myrrah and Semiramis are masculine by nature.

If according to Salemness (brother-in-law of the king) a warrior woman becomes a man, now, according to Sardanapalus's logic, a warrior man becomes woman (69). The king describes the self: “I am no soldier, but a man: speak not / of soldiership, I loathe the word, and those / who pride themselves upon it” (qtd. in Garofalo 69). The king makes the distinction between manhood and soldiership, defining a new manliness (69). The whole episode of Sardanapalus and Myrrah gives

the strength to the assumptions that there can be different masculinities – masculinity of the king and masculinity of Myrrah and Semiramis and that the masculinity and femininity are combined in each individual notwithstanding the biological sex of the person. Thus the play subverts the traditional gender norms.

Even in his poems too, male and female characters fail to conform to gender norms. In *Don Juan*, the mother of Don Juan is noted for masculine qualities. The elaborate description of her qualities – “His mother was a learned lady, famed / For every branch of every science known –” (1.73-4); “Her favorite science was the mathematical” (1. 89); “She knew the Latin – that is, “the lord’s prayer” / And Greek – the alphabet – I’m nearly sure” (1. 97-9); “In short, she was a walking calculation” (1. 121) and “Now Donna Inez had, with all her merit, / A great opinion of her own good qualities” (1. 153-4) – exposes her as a woman of substance: intelligent, and self-confident. Although she was the embodiment of masculinity known as “prodigy” (1. 94) with “a devil of a spirit” (1. 157), she was a “doting” (1. 195) mother and caretaker of Don Juan, which assures the presence of femininity too in her.

Byron’s resistance to gender norms can be witnessed in his male protagonists known as Byronic hero “who allowed him to mask and reveal homoerotic expression and resistance to heterosexual imperatives” (Keegan 9). The primary characteristics of Byronic hero parallel the tropes used to produce the sodomite within the public discourses of the eighteenth and, early nineteenth centuries (10). Keegan adds:

The sodomite . . . was produced as a sexual criminal, a foreigner, a disturbance of codified gender identities, and a figure whose naming became a social impropriety. These figurations are the rhetorical strategies by which the sodomite is made object, and they become the dominant signs of Byron’s transgressive hero. (10)

Byronic hero is transgressive not exclusively from the perspective of sexuality. He is transgressive in the matters of gender because he projects the feminine qualities along with his masculinity. Peter Thorslev argues that the Byronic hero is a “Man of Feeling . . . suffering from unrequited love; in spite of his often confessed preference for solitude” (qtd. in Keegan 53). Thus Byron’s male characters have the touch of femininity whereas the female characters have the touch of masculinity in them. In his poem *The Bride of Abydos* (1813), the gender blending can be traced in the male and female protagonists. Selim, the male protagonist, is inverted with both masculine and feminine impulses. He is still enough like a woman that he is not a threat to women, nor they to him (Keegan 103). Selim continues to represent femininity until he rebels against his uncle Giaffir to win the hand of his daughter, Zuleika. Keegan illustrates his feminine aspect:

During their encounter, the Giaffir tells Selim that he is not his son. Because Selim is “Greek in soul” and the son of a foreign slave, he is less than a man. The Giaffir criticizes Selim’s effeminate gestures: “When thine arm should bend the bow, / and hurl the dart, and curb the dart,” Selim instead lies about, “listless,” watching “unfolding roses blow”. (Keegan103)

The effeminacy of Selim, evident in his passive activity of lying “listless” and “watching ‘unfolding roses blow,’” is the manifestation of feminine impulses in him.

This deviation of gender norm continues till he realizes the need to rebel. Then his behavior undergoes the change for masculinity. Lord Byron describes the change in him for masculinity in the following extract:

His robe of pride was thrown aside,
His brow no high-crown’d turban bore,

But in its stead a shawl of red,
 Wreathed lightly round, his temples wore:
 That dagger, on whose hilt the gem
 Where worthy of a diadem,
 No longer glitter'd at his waist,
 Where pistols unadorn'd were braced;
 And from his belt a sabre swung (qtd. in Keegan 108)

“The shawl of red wreathed round his temples,” “dagger,” “pistols” and “sabre” are the symbolic representation of manliness that has sprouted up within. The manliness, obviously, comprises courage, confidence, domineering spirit and determination.

Keegan describes it in an appropriate language, “Selim becomes determined against his uncle and win Zuleika from him” (107) and further adds:

Masculinity is marked as a defence. Wounds . . . seem inevitable
 The sexing of a man bears so much weight that it wounds and binds
 identity as it creates it.
 Selim believes that he actively chooses to be a man He throws
 aside, braces, and belts himself to become a threat to the laws of the
 nation – state and the father, but he simultaneously becomes subject to
 the laws of masculinity. . . . By the time Selim goes to meet with
 Zuleika, and tell of his plans, he has changed. (109)

The transformation of Selim into a warrior is the act of suppressing femininity into the deep self and projecting the masculinity out of the same depth. Byron’s male and female characters successfully resist the gender norms and manage to project themselves according as they desire.

Similarly Byron's poem *The Corsair* (1814) is another piece of work that "erases gendered figures" (Keegan 113). It exemplifies the masculinity in a female protagonist, Gulnare – a slave – who rescues a pirate Conrad "out of gratitude for Conrad's attempt to rescue and because of pity for Conrad's impending execution" (122) from her master, despotic Turkish Pacha, and "in the process of rescuing Conrad, kills her master, freeing herself of slavery and sexual submission" (116). Gulnare as the cross-gendered figure violates and disrupts the laws of gender (124) and proves to be a threat to patriarchal society. Making Gulnare a hero challenges the ideal figure of the domestic woman and heterosexualized norms that require men to save women (125). The poem reads as a literary work of gender subversion and it displays the poet's resistance to conventional gender roles.

Amanda Vickery holds the view that "eighteenth and early nineteenth century women were associated with home and children, while men controlled public institutions" and "loosely speaking, there have always been separate spheres of gender power . . ." (qtd. in Saunders 7). Despite such views about separate gender spheres that reinforce the traditional patterns of gender, works disrupting the conventional gender roles and norms continued to appear throughout the nineteenth century in Britain and America.

Resistance to traditional gender norms can be witnessed in art. Dante Gabriel Rossetti's portrait *Joan of Arc Kisses the Sword of Liberation* (1863) is unlike the representative art of patriarchy. Joan in the picture is an androgynous knight: the fair face could be Galahad or Lancelot as easily as Joan (79). Saunders elucidates the androgynous implication:

Pictured kissing the sword of liberation as an offering before the feet of the crucified Christ, Rossetti's Joan is simultaneously a spiritual

warrior, on a divine mission, and a martial savior of France, the white lily in the foreground symbolizing both Joan's virginity and nationality. (79)

Besides, the sword can be interpreted as masculinity and phallic symbol and lily as the symbol of femininity and purity.

In a century dominated by the ideas of the correct spheres of behavior for male and female, the cross-dressing, arms-wielding Joan of arc held an intriguing force, inspiring ideas of chivalry (80) and as active female she immediately overturns chivalry, a code in which woman serves only as passive icon to active male (80). Robert Southey (1774-1843) resists the gender norms when he projects Joan as "inciter" and "warrior" (81) in his poem "Joan of Arc." He writes, "Then the Maid / Rode thro' the thickest battle: fast they fell, / pierced by her forceful spear" (qtd. in Saunders 81). The ending of the poem is quite striking because the poet presents her as protector and father: "protect the lowly, feed the hungry ones, / And be the orphan's father" (qtd. in Saunders 81). The image of "protector" and "father" transforms Joan into a 'Man' and the word 'feed' retains the feminine aspect of Joan. For Southey, Joan's greatness is in her subversive military exploits and courageous righteousness (81) which are the masculine activities. It is axiomatic that both the poem and the poet acknowledge that a female has the potential to turn into a warrior in the battlefield and an angel in the house. Southey seems to suggest that it is not the biological sex, but the deed that determines the gender of a person. Her naked corpse was shown to the crowd at her execution to disprove theories that she was a noncorporeal fiend, or a disguised man, as her military expertise implied (81). Such an act was the natural outcome of long-established fallacy about women as being soft,

weak, timid, and passive and so on. Through this act the patriarchs intended to assure that she was just a woman, therefore, powerless.

In the biography about Joan entitled *Memories of Celebrated Female Characters* (1811), the writer Mary Pinkington assures that “prodigies of valor were, doubtless, performed by this female [Joan]” and adds that “loaded with chains and ignominiously treated, she still maintained an undaunted intrepidity of mind, and amidst the insulting scoffs of her persecutors, displayed a heroism that ought to have executed the admiration of mankind” (qtd. in Saunders 84). This assurance about Joan’s heroic deeds acts as resistance to patriarchal assumptions about women as being weak and men being strong and as a gender subversion.

All the interpretations, poems and portraits highlighting Joan of Arc simply ignored conventional gender norms, and glorified the masculine personality in her. This writing is more like the literature of gender subversion. Maria Jane Jewsbury’s poem “Joan of Arc” (*Phantasmagoria*, 1825) presents Joan as “a chivalrous knight, fighting for the honor of her country,” “who crowned a king, / And bade a realm be free,” (qtd. in Saunders 86). These lines celebrate the masculinity in Joan as the heroic quality. Saunders observes the heroism of Joan even at the time of her (Joan’s) death:

The immediacy of the depiction of Joan’s burning in stanza six, the chaos of the scene at the pyre, “I hear their curses round the sake; / I see the fiery column make, / the boldest shield his brow” (130), come in juxtaposition with the stoic heroism of Joan herself: “I see, their victim, and their queen, / Die as she lived, severe, serene!” (86)

Saunders’s use of the term “stoic heroism” is also a masculine trait. The brave deeds attained by the female hero are similar to those of the male heroes. The words

“severe” and “serene” placed in juxtaposition suggest her masculinity and femininity as androgynous personality and stoicism.

Felicia Dorothea Hemans (1793-1835) in her poem “Joan of Arc in Rheims” explores “Joan’s womanhood through her military role, and in doing so explores the categories of gender and gender behavior found in her own society” (87). The poem’s focus is on the “domestic affections”: “to me – woman – bring / sweet waters from Affection’s spring!” (qtd. in Saunders 87). Although she is a woman of “victorious power,” (87) she is also a daughter. Saunders points out the paradox:

Here lies the next paradox of Joan’s position, her role as warrior of the public sphere, in contrast to Joan the daughter amidst her family and the bonds of domestic affections. Instantly the glory of chivalry is dissolved in the stronger domestic ties, “She saw the pomp no more, / . . . Her spirit turned.” The pull of home is too strong: she removes “The helm of many battles” to reveal feminine “bright locks,” and begs to return to her family. (88)

The poem reveals Joan as a ‘warrior’ and then as a ‘daughter’ which asserts the true personality of a being based on masculinity and femininity prior to the suppression of any one gender. It is the personality that lies beneath the masquerade of sex/gender stereotype. The poem obviously rules out and subverts the conventional gender norms of man being exclusively masculine and woman being exclusively feminine.

Elizabeth Barret Browning’s unpublished poem “The Princess Marie” is also a deviation from traditional gender norms. It is about the daughter of King Louis Phillipe of France (1773-1850), who abandoned the trappings of royalty to fulfill her ambition as a sculptor (90). The poetic persona – Princess Marie – confesses, “I go among you, [. . .] men of earth / to choose my own free place / & not [...] sovrenty,

nor birth / Nor beauty in my face” (qtd. in Saunders 91). Such a confession on the part of Princess Marie and such a portrayal on the part of the poet resist the gender norms because the lines quoted illustrate the confidence and strong sense of freedom in Marie which are unfeminine. The decision taken by the poetic persona to be a sculptor does not display her as subordinate, passive, dependent and submissive. This poem of Elizabeth Barret Browning is a step taken against conventional gender norms.

In a sonnet “To George Sand: A Desire” that addresses the female French writer George Sand, a pseudonym, of Amandine-Aurore-Lucile Dupin, Barret calls her, “thou large-brained woman and large-hearted man, / Self-called George Sand” (qtd. in Saunders 91) and blurs the gender boundaries. In the sexual ideology, (large) brains – symbol of intellectuality – and (large) hearts, symbol of emotional dimension, are associated with men and women respectively. By reversing them, the poet resists the gender norms by implicating woman as being intelligent and man being emotional. What is more, by addressing the female writer George Sand as (an intelligent / intellectual) woman and (emotional) man, Barret indicates the presence of masculinity and femininity in George Sand, suggesting the androgynous personality in George Sand. It is an instance of gender subversion. Besides, the expressions – “large brained woman” and “large-hearted man” – imply intelligent woman and compassionate man and challenge the gender norms that associate intelligence and brain with men and heart as well as emotion with women.

“The Romaunt of the Page” is another poem of Barret, noted for gender subversion. Dianne Dugaw argues that “The Romaunt of the Page” as a “Female Warrior” is a story that “exposes to view and subverts – at least by implication – the structuring according to gender of its world” (qtd. in Saunders 54). The poem shows that a “marriage built on chivalrous ideals of active masculinity and passive

femininity is hollow and empty (55). The page [of a knight] maintains that his “sister” best fulfilled female virtue by breaking the chivalric ideal for the love of her husband (55). The readers learn at the end that the sister is no other than the person in the guise of the page and knight is her husband. The knight without knowing the truth confesses how she [the page] has saved his life: “And once in the tent, and twice in the fight / Didst ward me a mortal blow” (11.5-6). She saves his life for the third time from his enemies but loses her life: “They cleft her golden ringlets through; / The Loving is Dying” (XLII. 7-8). With her death, she becomes a savior of his life, doing what a man is expected to do for a woman. It is the masculine part of the woman, not known to her husband who is guided by a conventional way of thinking and gender norms: “That womanhood is proved the best / By golden brooch and glossy vest / The mincing ladies wear” (XXVI. 3-6). He believes that “Alone amid the skies! / So high, so pure and so apart, / A Woman’s honor lies!” (XXX. 3-6). The irony is that the husband is unaware of the sacrifice made by his wife in the guise of a page. In a reversal of the usual chivalric roles, the woman page dies as champion of the [unknowingly] passive, and therefore socially emasculated, knight, recognizing her triumph over her social confinement (Saunders 56). Thus Barret subverts the gender norms by depicting the female protagonist –the knight’s wife – as a warrior and savior of her husband and the knight as passive and helpless that needs to be saved by his page.

Nearly every review of Barret Browning wrestled to capture the leavening of femininity with “masculine” strengths – “intellectual discipline,” “vigor” – while frequently decrying transgression of the properly feminine (Adams 234). Even the political atmosphere in Britain enabled the people to be skeptical about gender norms. Dorothy Thomson summarizes the usual situation in nineteenth-century Britain: “It is

an odd contradiction that in the period in which the doctrine of separate spheres of activity for men and women was most actively developed and propounded, the highest public office in the land was held by a woman [Victoria]" (qtd. in Saunders 117-118).

Historically too, violation of gender norms can be occasionally witnessed. While Victorian married women were legally the property of their husbands, subject to the law of coverture, Victoria was uniquely independent (118). In a letter from 1852, she [Victoria] wrote, "[W]e women are not made for governing – and if we are good women we must dislike these masculine occupations; but there are times which force one to take interest in them I do, of course, intensely" (qtd. in Saunders 118). There can be no other evidence than the given one that she had the potential to govern and women have the potential to perform masculine occupations. There was masculine potential in her on one side and feminine obligation on the other side. This letter clarifies the control mechanisms influencing the behavior of women and, of course, men. As a matter of fact, resistance to dominant gender ideologies was inevitable in the nineteenth century although it had to be slow and subtle.

The medieval tradition of holding women as the angels in the house – either Eve or Mary – required passive obedience (130). Jeanie Watson notes that "in actual medieval life, women were required by the demands of ordinary existence to be quite capable, integrated members of society" (qtd. in Saunders 130). Women of the nobility had "responsibilities of their absent (often warring) husbands, while peasant women had to be equal to their husbands to struggle for survival" (130). So naturally there was an ongoing resistance to gender norms at the psychological level before it appeared on the surface.

William Morris's poem *The Defense of Guenevere and Other poems* (1858) also subverts the gender norms and the concept of true wife when "a vibrant and compelling Guenevere . . . in a vocal self-defense, asserts her right to be both lover and queen" (qtd. in Saunders 144-5). Morris maintains Guenevere in her medieval guise, and allows her to focus on her roles as queen and lover, while being aware that the contemporary society would judge her only as adulteress (146). Morris's Guenevere is an assertive heroine, "who boldly fashions for herself the roles of queen, lover and political victim" (147). If Guenevere is evaluated from the perspective of Morris, she is a woman with masculine and feminine traits well-balanced. Her bold and assertive nature unveils her masculinity and her emotional involvement with Lancelot discloses her feminine impulses. This kind of portrayal goes against gender norms according to which women need to be faithful and virtuous as wives besides being timid and submissive.

Photographic illustrations of Alfred Tennyson's *The Idylls of the King* by Julia Margaret Cameron (1815-79) have the same appeal as Pre-Raphaelite paintings (154). Cameron saves her Enid from being simply the passive female object for a male gaze by making her active: Enid here is singing, and accomplishing herself on a musical instrument, her contemplation justified by her own artistic creativity (155). In making Enid respectably active, Cameron is highlighting the propriety of her own artistic endeavors. Cameron's illustrations of paintings are based on her successful resistance to her gender ideologies: Enid being active and independent displays the masculine impulses being present in a woman. According to Lukitsh, Cameron's women are active, while her men remain passive: "Lynnett [a female character] watches over a sleeping Garth, Vivien [another female character] seduces and imprisons Merlin and the pale nun inspires Galahad" (qtd. in Saunders 155). It clarifies that one does not

have to be a female or male, in order to be active or passive. An individual who is active in certain occasions tends to be passive in some instances and vice versa. Obviously Garth, Merlin and Galahad – being warriors – need to be active on various occasions such as jousting, hunting, duel, horse-riding and so on.

Aubrey Beardsley (1872-1898), a British illustrator, invests his portrayal of Guenever as nun, “commanding queen, constant lover and potential woman” (162). Appalled by Victorian attitudes to women, and insistence on female passivity, Beardsley’s portrayal of Guenever recuperates a positive view of active femininity (163). Muriel Whitaker points out:

Instead of engaging energetically in tournaments or riding into the forest to seek adventures which involve performing ‘noble acts of chivalry,’ his [Beardsley’s] knights recline languorously, use their swords as walking sticks or stand about in dreamy contemplation of phallic floral arrangements. (qtd. in Saunders 163)

Beardsley’s resistance to conventional gender norms is evident in the given portrayal.

Florence Nightingale strikes the same chord of resistance in her lengthy essay *Cassandra*. Florence Nightingale who established her image in the Crimean War as the “Lady with the Lamp” shows her contempt for the iconization of women with these words, “What else is conventional life? Passivity when we want to be active. So many hours spent every day in passively doing what conventional life tells us, when we would so gladly be at work” (qtd. in Saunders 62). Nightingale obviously refuses to abide by the traditional gender norms, rejecting “the chivalric images of ideal womanhood” (62). Her resistance to patriarchal ideals for woman can be witnessed in her works and also in the society where she was “the most celebrated of a whole cohort of women who went and worked on the battlefield” (qtd. in Saunders 63).

Other women who “recorded their experiences [of the battlefield] in letters and journals” (63) were like Nightingale, resisting the patriarchal norms for women.

Louisa Stuart Costello (1799-1870) – novelist, painter and biographer – is one of the women writers of the nineteenth century who “highlight the suffocating social stereotypes of Victorian gender ideology” (65). Her narrative poem *The Lay of the Stork* (1856) subverts the gender norms by presenting a situation where the male protagonist “has to learn to obey and accept Lila [the female protagonist] as a flesh and blood woman not as the chivalric icon of his imaginings” (66). The castle on the Mountain of Faithful Wives is “steeped in the history of women’s courage” (66) and they are so strong that “each [of the robust heroines] shouldered her husband, and marched down the mountain triumphantly” (qtd. in Saunders 66) during the attack on the castle.

Lila, despite the place of passivity given to women, “offers practical help to the villagers, rebuilding the nearby village after it is discovered that the gorge in which it lay was unhealthy and causing disease” (68). Lila gives the impression of being strong assertive in her reflection:

And I – the last of all my line,
 Can, at my will, a world command,
 And hold a scepter in my hand,
 Because in gold such spirits dwell
 Can bind all creatures to its spell. (qtd. in Saunders 68)

Lila – the lady of Shallot – reflects about the self as a woman of confidence with an ability to “command” a world at her “will” and acts, which subverts the conventional gender role meant for women.

Saunders points out the counterstereotypic traits in Lila by highlighting her

personality as a nurse in the battlefield, associating her with “the position of control and activity” in the arguments below:

Her true identity hidden, Lila is thus brought to the position of control and activity, telling the patient that it is his role “to obey her, and to live.” Wilhelm can only be rewarded with marriage to Lila when he has accepted her humanity, particularly her “mind” Lila demands the right to share her life with one who can identify his romantic “dream” in the active flesh and blood woman, irrespective of her social status. (70)

Obviously the personality of Lila stands as the embodiment of gender subversion because her activities subvert the patriarchal assumptions about women being weak and obedient. It illustrates the masculine spirit in combination with feminine impulses in them. Lila’s insistence on the patient’s role to “obey her” turns the table of gender norms.

Elizabeth Barret’s narrative poem *Rhyme of the Duchess May* discloses “the impossibility and destructive nature of the social construction of ‘manhood’ ” (Saunders 57). Sir Guy, “at the crucial moment of crisis on the battle” (57), expects the Duchess – his wife – to leave him so that she can find grace with Lord Leigh, and happiness with another. The Duchess refuses the position of being the passive object by leaving her husband as it would be “unwomanly” in her terms (qtd. in Saunders 57). Duchess proves that to be womanly is not to be passive. Thus the female protagonists in the narrative poems of Barret challenge socially endorsed gender roles.

Felicia Dorothea Hemans (1793-1835) also makes a similar challenge and suggests that “chivalry is not the sole possession of Christian men, but also of a Moorish woman” (36). By questioning the values at its very core, she “thus

problematizes the whole notion of chivalry, a criticism equally relevant to chivalric social constructions of the nineteenth century” (36). In her narrative poem, *The Siege of Valencia*, her female protagonists – Ximena and her mother – appear in “contrasting roles.” Ximena and her mother Elmina play out complex political roles and display a spectrum of women’s roles in war (38). Ximena, and her mother as impotent observers of the horrors of war, are provoked into taking “transgressively active female roles” (38). Ximena’s activity develops from the feminine role as a nurse, to that of inciter, rousing the beleaguered and war-weary citizens to a final battle (38). She appears as a Joan of Arc figure to citizens, but does not actually perform martial acts (38-9).

Ximena as a beloved as well as impotent observer and Ximena as an inciter reveal feminine and masculine impulses in her. Elmina – mother of Ximena – also transgresses her conventional gender role as a woman by “cross-dressing in her disguise and entering the enemy camps,” which “proves that courage is not the remit of ‘warrior-men’” alone (39). In the poem “Marguerite of France,” Hemans explores another “figure of female inciter” as the queen to St.Louis, who defends the self, her child, her city and faith in the role of commander (39). It can be interpreted as another contribution in the subversion of tradition gender roles (39). In the absence of her husband Louis, she commands army. It illustrates that a woman is capable of playing the role of a man when the circumstances demand for it. In the poem, during the time of Turkish siege, she projects the masculine spirit by inciting the knights, shaming their cowardice with her courage and insisting on taking the role of warrior if need be (39). It is a subversive poem which cannot be ruled out as a fantasy because “De Pauw provides a compelling evidence of the role of woman soldiers” and as such “from the late sixteenth through the eighteenth century, there were hundreds of

women soldiers and sailors passing as men, and everybody knew about it” (qtd. in Saunders 30). All these evidences and the poem reinforce that a woman can be masculine apart from being feminine and man can be feminine apart from being masculine.

To conclude, despite the fact that sexual ideology was predominant in English literature of nineteenth century and Great Britain, the voice of resistance to conventional gender ideology was getting stronger and louder in it and the aspect of gender blending/gender disruption/gender subversion was evolving as a seminal idea.

Resistance to Gender Ideology in American Literature

In the nineteenth century, American literature presented the same scenario in the context of gender and sex as English literature. There was gender conformity imposed and it was opposed subtly through gender disruption. In other words, there was insistence for gender norms and there was resistance against them.

In a way of enforcing the traditional gender norms, “the Civil War helped to sustain the icon of the white, middle-class woman as queen of her domestic sphere by promoting a code of rhetorical behavior for women that required the performance of conventional femininity” (Johnson 2). Besides, at the start of the nineteenth century in America, “the arts of rhetoric were the undisputed province of the male professional classes and women were chastised or worse for trying” (3). Lillian O’ Connor describes the wide-spread resistance to women speakers (3). Nevertheless, resistance to gender norms was evident in anti-slavery movement supported by women and in campaigns for women’s suffrage. Yoakum, the historian, writes about courageous minority of women orators: “A small minority of women, who possessed courage,

ambition, and curiosity . . . continued to chafe under the legal, economic and social restrictions imposed by a society formed and controlled by men” (qtd. in Johnson 4).

This situation clarifies the fact that patriarchy was extremely dominant in the nineteenth century and the resistance initiated against the “cult of domesticity, cult of true womanhood and Republican motherhood” (4). Afro-American women also faced the patriarchal oppression and became the victims of the cult of true womanhood.

Kohr Camphel Karlyn elucidates it:

Afro-American women, in addition to the special problems arising out of slavery, historically faced the same problem as all other women. Married, they were dead civilly; unmarried, they were dependents with few possibilities for self-support; regardless of marital and socio-economic status, they were oppressed by the cult of true womanhood, which declared that true women were pure, pious, domestic, and submissive. (qtd. in Johnson 5)

It is evident on the base of this extract that there was obligation for women to be feminine in the name of true cult of womanhood. Campbell writes that “no true woman could be a public speaker” and women “who entered the public sphere,” “lost their claim to purity and piety” (qtd. in Johnson5).

Mrs. Samuel Lindsay – a patriarchal woman – points out the consequences of losing feminine nature in her article “What is Worthwhile” in *Three Minute Readings for College Girls*, an advice manual of late nineteenth century (1895):

Little by little that intellectual ambition will draw us away, if we are not careful, from our true place in life, and will make cold, unloved and unhelpful women of us, instead of the joyous, affectionate and unselfish women we might have been. If the instinct of a daughter,

sister, wife, or mother dies out of a college-bred woman, even in the course of a most brilliant career otherwise, the world will forget to love her; it will soon scorn her, and . . . if she herself is not cheery and loving, dainty in dress, gentle in manners and beautiful in soul as every true woman ought to be, the world will feel that one thing needful is lacking, – vivid, tender womanliness, for which no knowledge of asymptotes or linguistics can ever compensate. (qtd. in Johnson 51)

The views expressed in the given article draw our attention to patriarchal expectations and endeavors for reinforcing the gender norms.

Although it is expected that the appropriate behavior for woman is domestic and submissive “a large number of poems written by women address public issues” (Wolosky 149). In historical terms, women were in fact widely engaged in activities and issues beyond their domestic spaces (149). Activities women conducted outside the home sometimes “include direct political activism in abolition, Indian rights, urban-planning, sanitation and women’s suffrage” (Wolosky149). These activities embody the voice of resistance to gender ideology.

New Women against Gender Norms

Howe was one of those women whose “concerns acquired a capital-letter conspicuousness – a startling legibility as the Woman Question, a revolutionary profile as the New Woman, an international publicity as the American girl, a threatening incarnation as an Atavistic Amazon” (Bentley 140). The resistance to gender norms was not limited to individuals alone. It was seen everywhere in the concept of New Woman. The newness of the New Woman concerned a kind of status or agency previously attributed to men and now conspicuously claimed by some middle-class women (Bentley 140). The cult of domesticity was at an end when “in

the name of this transcendent femininity, middle-class women laid claim to a sphere of action that extended their nominally domestic work into new territory outside of the home” (140). The civil war accelerated this change because women, answering civic needs, gained administrative expertise by supplying hospitals, serving on sanitary commissions, and raising money for charities (140). Such activities have upset the gender roles because “the confusions and bloody horrors of war time make for a liminal period in which gender roles are less vigilantly maintained” (141). For instance Clara Barton, as a battlefield nurse, recalls her memories in *Life of Clara Barton* (1915) published posthumously, “I was strong and thought I might go to the rescue of the men who fell” (qtd. in Bentley 140-1). It was an instance of gender disruption and an indication of resistance to the conventional gender norms. The subversion of the cult of true womanhood was executed from individual writers to the whole American society of nineteenth century. Bentley elaborates it:

An understanding of womanhood that was all keyed to hearth and home, then, helped middle-class white women extend putatively feminine roles and skills into the world beyond the household. The emergencies of wartime became established features of postbellum society. Women’s clubs, educational unions, and Christian associations . . . helped to define the emergent urban world as a field that needed the perpetual services of women Demands for more overtly political powers followed as well (141)

These women not only resisted the gender norms but also subverted the very cult of femininity and the image of woman as being dependent, passive, timid, weak and tender.

However, the fear of patriarchy was so powerful that “women authors repeatedly effaced their professional status, taking pseudonyms, disclaiming any aspirations to high art, and expressing their anxiety about their public exposure” (142). Despite the concern, the wave of resistance and subversion of gender ideals continued gathering momentum. It was a moment of confusions and transitions at the level of gender norms. Phoebe Yates in *A Southern Woman’s Story* (1879) remembers, “The women of the South had been openly and violently rebellious from the moment they thought their State’s rights touched” (qtd. in Bentley 141). The turbulent atmosphere in the society disrupted the ideals and brought an end to the well-regulated gender norms. Women turned out to be masculine with a concern about the loss of their true womanhood. Pember – superintending matron at a Richmond, Virginia, hospital – was concerned about the influence of job on her nature that “such a life would be injurious to the delicacy and refinement of a lady – that her nature would become deteriorated and her sensibilities blunted” (Bentley 141). It was the time when artificial categorization of gender was at an end with masculinity and femininity being fully activated in men and women. Pember was masculine because she was active and independent as a job holder and she was feminine because she was concerned about her sensibilities. Such a blending of genders was the voice of resistance to gender ideology.

New public duties, assumed [by women] during wartime, could not but affect permanent changes at the level of feeling and perception, transformations that in turn had the potential to reorder institutions (141). It was a matter of great concern for traditionalists like the Rev. James Weir who argued, “We see forms and phases of [women’s] degeneration thickly scattered throughout all circles of society, in the plays which we see performed in our theatres, and in the books and papers published daily

throughout the land” (qtd. in Bentley 142). This view of Rev. James implies that it was a losing battle for patriarchal ideals in the presence of increasing resistance to gender ideology. The cult of true womanhood and domesticity was breaking everywhere in the nineteenth century America. Passivity of women was replaced with activities all over the country. Nancy Benley writes about it:

Public visibility for women was not limited to hearthside writers. The dancer Fanny Elssler and singer Jenny Lind were among the first female performers in America to acquire national celebrity through new networks of mass publicity. The personal lives of stage began to supply material for secondary dramas In the footsteps of reformers like Stowe, women lecturers became celebrities whose activities on behalf of various causes brought attention to their lives.

(142)

It appeared as if the patriarchal ideals about dichotomized activities got into the melting pot.

Observers of this phenomenon stressed the changed look of American society, its transformed countenance (137). One journalist writes there is “scarcely an occupation once confined almost exclusively to men in which women are not now conspicuous” (qtd. in Benley 137). Sociologist Thorstein Veblen contended that the essential purpose of the middle-class wife was no longer to nurture and instruct in private but to advertise affluence in public through her clothes, accessories, and manners, so even as wives, women had become public creatures (137). William Dean Howells’s gender anxiety points to a larger concern about the authenticity of modern self (146). Bentley points out:

As portrayed in Howell's essay, the paradoxical artifice of a stage performance makes self-hood and human agency at once more transparent, more legible, and yet more subject to mutability. The shock of seeing an "alien" femininity, even in the comic stage play, actually provides for a new and striking inside view of male and female selves. At the same time, that interior view opens strange and disquieting questions that challenge conventional notions about the self. (146)

This interior view reveals the real-self that challenges the conventional notion. In his essay 'The New Taste in Theatricals,' Howells described the actresses impersonating men in the popular comic plays called burlesques (137):

They were not like men, [they] were in most things as unlike women and seemed creatures of a kind of alien sex, parodying both. It was certainly a shocking thing to look at them with their horrible prettiness, their archness in which there was no charm, their grace which put to shame. (qtd. in Bentley 137)

This information suggests that external behavior of men and women can be imitated to such an extent that we cease to see the difference between imitators and imitated. It exposes and explores the potential in them to project their femininity and masculinity whenever it is necessary.

Besides, the way the female protagonists act counters the patriarchal assumptions about women. Marcia Gaylord, the heroine of the novel *A Modern Instance* (1881) by Howells, decides to take divorce from her husband Bartley Hubbard due to his unscrupulous conduct despite her love for him. This decision shows that she is not dependent upon him and she has the ability to take decision,

which represents the masculinity in her whereas love for the husband assures the presence of the feminine impulses in her. Portrayal of such a character is against the traditional gender ideology about woman being patient, indecisive and angel of the house who has the potential of reforming her husband.

The female protagonist – Verena Tarrant – of Henry James’s *The Bostonians* (1885) also does not represent the woman of patriarchal ideals. She gives rapturous speeches on social topics (Bentley147). Once defined as domestic and religious in nature, she has become a public sensation (147). These are the qualities of gender blending. Her life in public is the masculine part which reveals her confidence in oratory whereas her love for Basil and association with ‘domestic’ and ‘religious’ aspects expose the feminine impulses in her. The rhetorical action of any sort is assumed to be a masculine quality (Johnson 103) and by projecting Verena as eloquent speaker in public, Henry James approves the presence of masculine trait in women and tends to resist the gender ideology. Mizruchi comments, “It is a novel about Reconstruction and about social developments that . . . include changing gender roles, ideas about sexuality . . .” (443). *The Bostonians* was the first major novel in English to deal seriously with the feminist movement, and to portray Lesbian desire with respect and sensitivity (443). All these aspects assert the resistance of the writer to gender norms.

Mortimer Plantagenet Sprague of the novel *Struggling Upward* written by Horatio Alger in 1890 is a character wearing the mask of femininity. Luke Larkin, the protagonist, has the conviction that despite “his [Sprague’s] affected manners and somewhat feminine deportment,” Mr. Sprague who is “the fellow passenger on the Black Hills stagecoach” “is not wholly destitute of manly traits, if occasion should

call for their display” (664). Mizruchi reveals the instance of his masculinity in the following extract:

Suddenly the robbers appear, barking orders to the terrified passengers. In classic Superman style, Sprague produces a pair of revolvers “and in a stern voice, wholly unlike the affected tones in which he had hitherto spoken: ‘Get out of here, you ruffians, or I’ll fire!’ ” Minutes later, the “dude” is back, lavishly praising the minister and denying his own heroism. (664)

Sprague is a replica of every individual with the true self concealed and the masquerade of the false identity projected. Mizruchi comments:

Mortimer Plantagent Sprague is not a deceiver but rather a human being in Alger’s deepest sense of the term: combining the impulses of weakness and courage, the aspiration to self-display and self-effacement, passivity and assertiveness, masculinity and femininity. (664)

This comment signifies as well as reinforces the concept of androgynous psyche in an individual.

Colonel Braddon is antithetical to Sprague as he (Braddon) “blusters about his courage but turns out to be a coward” (663). Braddon wears the mask of masculinity as a courageous man, concealing his timidity, the feminine trait. The portrayal of Sprague with combined gender traits is a deviation from and resistance to dominant gender ideologies with a message that a human being in deepest sense of the term has the androgynous personality.

Louisa May Alcott (1832-88) as a novelist published almost a hundred fictional pieces featuring young heroines who pursue independent existences in place

of traditional role as wives and mothers (435). Alcott's writing seems to have been a means of liberating her from the conventions of femininity (435). Mizruchi explains:

Her father [Bronson Alcott, an American educationist] had decreed that boys and girls alike at Fruitland wear trousers. He also held that any person in whom the intellect dominates was a man, and anyone ruled by the heart was a woman. Deciding that her own soul was ruled by the intellect, Louisa concluded . . . that she had been born "with a boy's spirit." (435)

According to Bronson, what makes an individual a man or woman is not the biological sex but the quality – intellect / heart – that dominates him. Man symbolically stands for masculinity and woman femininity. Accordingly a man can be feminine and woman can be masculine on the base of what dominates them. From this perspective an emotional man is a woman and an intellectual woman is a man. Louisa concludes that she is an intellectual man.

Gender Blending Characters in Fiction

Louisa May Alcott's novel *The Little Women* published in two parts – *The Little Women* (1868) and *Good Wives* (1869) – displays gender as "a far more elastic category: many characters fulfill conventions, but many others blur them" (Mizruchi 436). Joe – a female character – wants to be a novelist but she "must learn to limit her literary aspirations, eschewing the type of writing she finds empowering and financially rewarding" (436). She "learns true self-control in the face of the greatest loss of all – that of beloved Beth – renouncing her "old ambition" of literary fame" (436). Such a portrayal of Joe appears to be unconventional due to masculinity in her – such as self-control, intellectuality, active life and so on. In other words, Joe – a female being – is a man because of being dominated by intellect. Obviously this novel

subverts the gender norms as a result of its resistance to conventional gender ideology.

Mc Teague (1899), a novel by France Norris (1870-1902), is also subversive of gender because gender polarities are broken down (511). The male and female protagonists of the novel subvert the sexual ideology by deviating from the gender norms. Mizruchi argues:

The drive towards extinction in *Mc Teague* is shown to be independent of gender. It is both feminine and masculine: present in Trina's [Mc Teague's wife] to hand over her gold though she knows Mc Teague will kill her, and in Mc Teague's desert fight to death with Marcus Schouler. (511)

If aggressive instinct in Mc Teague asserts the presence of masculine impulses in him, the self-effacement and the absence of rational thinking assure the feminine temperament. Similarly, the stoic fortitude, which enables Trina to live with Mc Teague despite his brutal treatment, is the masculine attribute in her and her irrational attachment with her money and husband is the feminine trait.

Norris has ignored the conventional gender norms while portraying these two characters, which registers his resistance to the dominant gender ideologies. Besides, in course of their living together, both characters make a living on their own as bread-winners and yet depend on one another—McTeague depends on her money and Trina depends on “her passion for her money and her perverted love for her husband when he was brutal” (qtd. in Mizruchi 360). These acts of being independent and dependent account for the presence of masculinity and femininity in them. They change their jobs as they just have masculine inclination to be independent: “Mc Teague goes from dentist to maker of surgical instruments to Piano mover to miner;

Trina from homemaker to trymaker to washerwoman” (510). Thus according as the circumstances demand, they switch from dependence to independence and vice versa, combining masculine and feminine traits in them.

As for James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851), his novels are very often criticized on the grounds that the “characters are conventional,” (White 35); that they are “archetypes” (35); that they “do not invite close identification or sympathy but stand as titanic figures on a grand historical stage in a theatre of the collective or national consciousness” (36) and they are “shallow and stereotyped” (85). Despite that, readers find the deviation. Some of his novels resist the gender norms by featuring strong young women: Elizabeth Temple in *The Pioneers*, Cora Munro in *The Last of the Mohicans*, and Ellen Wade in *The Prairie* (38). Cora Munro, unlike her sister Alice Munro, emerges as a strong character with stoic fortitude. As a person, she “observes, inquires, and commands with the collected and feminine dignity of her presence” (115). As a captive of Magua who is a native Indian, “she has no choice but to journey like a knight of medieval romance, testing her spirits and braving the shadow of death” (115). She exhibits no signs of timidity, nervousness, weakness and anxiety when she, as a captive, is driven away in the wilderness from her father, sister and lover. At a certain point she boldly revolts and Cooper describes it:

“I will go no farther,” cries Cora, stopping unexpectedly . . . “Kill me if thou wilt, detestable Huron, I will go no farther!” The Huron chief . . . drew his knife . . . said, “choose; the wigwam or the knife of le Subtil!” Cora regarded him not . . . raised her eyes . . . saying (to God), in a meek and yet confiding voice – “I am thine! do with me as thou seest best!” “Woman,” repeated Magua . . . “Choose!” But Cora

neither heard nor heeded his demand. The form of Hurontrembled in every fibre . . . one of the assistants . . . sheathed his own knife in the bosom of the maiden. (Cooper 276)

The courage, the defiant manner, the undaunted spirit and above all stoicism as witnessed in Cora Munra in the given extract are hardly the feminine qualities. They embody the masculinity and such a portrayal of woman deviates from the traditional gender norms that hold woman as an angel of the house as well as weak, submissive and timid.

Mark Twain (1835-1910) adds another feather in the cap of gender subversion although a critic like Susan Harris argues that “Twain’s portraits of women are persistently cast in one or another stereotypical mode” (qtd. in Fishkin 59). Despite such comments that Aunt Polly and Aunt Sally in *Huckleberry Finn* are “almost interchangeable,” that “old ladies are vaguely defined civilizers who worry about manners, clothes and religion” and that “younger female characters in *Huckleberry Finn* are less fully developed” – according to Warren (qtd. in Fishkin 59) – there are occasions when we see him struggling to push beyond the gender conventions that he usually simply accepted (60). Laura Hawkins of *The Gilded Age* taking on “the tone and attitude of Twain’s debunking personas” (60) is one of the instances of going beyond the gender norms. Harris argues that Twain eliminates Laura in the novel because he could not allow a female trickster to add to the chaos of the male sphere and an “alienated woman” like Laura threatens to destroy cosmic scheme, a scheme in which women’s primary function is to provide security for men suffering from self-doubt, to be a refuge from alienation rather than to exhibit it themselves (qtd. in Fishkin 61).

Similarly Roxy of *Pudd'n head Wilson* – a light skinned slave – who switches her son, Chambers, with Tom Driscoll, the son of the slave owner, as they resemble each other and a Mexican woman – in a short story “The Judge’s Spirited Woman” – who murders her husband’s killer in a crowded court when a corrupt Jury fails to convict him (62) are against the norms of gender ideology. Fishkin points out:

Twain’s interest in the possibility of women characters who break out of familiar molds becomes apparent in many of the experimental pieces that remained unpublished at Twain’s death. Twain’s Eve and her daughter Gladys (in the Posthumously published “Extract” and “Passage” from Eve’s autobiography); the spunky tomboy heroine “Hellfire Hotchkiss” in the fragment by that name; Twain’s Scherezade, the “masculine” princess “Fatima,” and feminine prince Selim in “The 1002^d Arabian Night”; and the cross-dressing Nancy Jackson in “Freud Story and The Girl Who Was Ostensibly a Man” . . . all attest to an imagination genuinely intrigued by gender bending, gender blending alternate realities open to the possibility of women who break out stereotypical roles. (62-3)

Rachel of “Hellfire Hotchkiss Sequence” is a young girl who makes her entrance “riding bare back” and “thundering by on a great black horse” (qtd. in Fishkin 64). She rushes to the rescue of a boy drowning and “finds the preoccupations of little girls in dolls and name calling ‘weariness’” (qtd. in Fishkin 64). She learns to fish, boat, hunt, trap, break horses, and box and she becomes an honorary member of the local fire department (64), which “allowed her to scale the roofs of burning houses and help handle the hose; for she liked the sort of employment” (qtd. in Fishkin 64). Rachel’s day to day activities are masculine. Such a representation of a female

character, who has “a good judgement and coolness in danger” and who is “spry and active” (qtd. in Fishkin 64), resists and subverts traditional gender norms. The end of the story sounds quite practical in the patriarchal society. A kindly aunt takes her aside for a word of caution about enemies spreading nasty gossip about her; she is advised to change her ways; she makes some resolutions the first of which is to withdraw from the boys and she goes to bed feeling refreshed and contented (65). Thus we find that “sometimes Twain reinscribed gender norms of his time; sometimes he transcended them” (69). His own work embodies and reflects in key ways inconsistencies and ambiguities that inhered in the society (69). Rachel is the embodiment of identity which has plural dimensions. She is feminine and also she is masculine: she is bold in certain aspects and she is timid in certain aspects. Post-Civil War local-color-writing represents a swing towards the sense of identity as plural, in new ways and with new implications than had been the case through most of the nineteenth century (Wolosky 325). It may be said to foreshadow, or show the first glimmerings, of new senses of pluralism that will emerge much later in the twentieth century (325).

Similarly Emily Dickinson’s poem “I’m Nobody” – 260(288) – refers to the complex identity of an individual in terms of plurality and points out the monotony in the fixed identity:

260 (288)

I’m Nobody! Who are you?

Are you – Nobody – too?

Then there’s a pair of us!

Don’t tell! They’d advertise – you know!

How dreary – to be – Somebody!

How public – like a frog –
 To tell one's name – livelong June –
 To an admiring Bog! (1-8)

Obviously “Nobody” stands for an individual who has no fixed identity as a man/woman or as feminine/masculine or as anything else whereas “Somebody” is the one with a fixed identity in terms of sex and gender. Wolosky points out that it is a famous poem of Dickinson and she (the poet) “must negotiate her way between denial and claim of body, as a trope for public emergence and publication” (477). She wants both to be in the body and to be bodiless; to be gendered and yet to be genderless; to be in the world and yet to be in the spirit, where these two remain in some sense antithetical (478). This poem is an attempt to resist dominant gender and also patriarchal ideologies. The desire to be “Nobody” is the desire to be true self without any gender identity. This is the step towards androgyny.

Maria Susana Cummins (1827-1866) is another American novelist who helps the readers to look into the psyche that has the potential for masculine and feminine experience through her novel *The Lamplighter* (1854). The novel deals with the female protagonist Gerty Flint, an orphan of mysterious parentage, living in the charge of vicious landlady. She shows the signs of masculinity as a child. However, “the kitten [a gift given by the lamplighter] elicits a maternal and self-sacrificing ‘tenderness’ from the otherwise belligerent Gerty” (Lang 129). Cummins is actually pointing out the fluidity of gender traits in Gerty in the event: “When Gerty first found herself locked up for the night . . . she stood . . . began to stamp and scream and tried to beat open the door, and shouted, ‘I hate you, Nan Grant; Old Nan Grant I hate you!’ . . . she wept until she was utterly exhausted” (8). This extract enables the readers to look into the psyche of Gerty that has masculine and feminine capabilities.

The way she reacts in a wild and aggressive manner indicates the masculine impulses in her and the way she wept shows the femininity. Both attributes blended in her and she exhibited both aspects one and the same time. The writer Cummins suggests the same thing in the following description:

How much she came in time to love that kitten, no words can tell her. Her little, fierce, untamed, impetuous nature had only expressed itself in angry passion, sullen obstinacy, and even hatred. But there were in her soul fountains of warm affection yet unstirred, a depth of tenderness never yet called out, and warmth of devotion of nature that wanted only an object to expend themselves upon. (13)

This description reveals that she is internally mild yet she can be wild when provoked. This extract clarifies that masculine and feminine identities are not bound to biological sex. The “fierce, untamed, impetuous nature” stands for masculinity in her whereas “fountains of warm affection” as well as “depth of tenderness” for femininity.

Both impulses remain within the psyche of the individual and they get roused according as the situation prompts the individual. For instance, when Nan Grant “had flung the poor creature [kitten] into a large vessel of steaming hot water,” “little animal struggled”, “writhed an instant, then died” (16), and this cruel act stirred masculine impulses in Gerty and she reacted in a wild manner: “All the fury of Gerty’s nature was roused. Without hesitation, she lifted a stick of wood which lay near her, and flung it at Nan with all her strength. It was well aimed, and struck the woman on the head” (16-7).

Such an act of aggression from a girl is inconceivable in the patriarchal culture that is based on the assumptions that girls are tender, soft, weak and submissive. The

novel from this perspective subverts such gender norms and assumptions. It illustrates that a person, notwithstanding the biological sex, tends to be aggressive (masculine impulse) if he/she is put through the experiences of humiliation, ill-treatment and deprivation.

Gender Resistance in African American Slave Narrative

Even in the black community of America, the cult of true womanhood was resisted in the nineteenth century. On plantations with a large number of slaves, “black women performed the same tasks as black men; they plowed, planted, and harvested crops” (Hooks 23). Harriet Jacobson, the only black woman novelist, places the slave narrative and the sentimental genre in dialogue, and often in conflict, in order to suggest the ideological limits of “true womanhood” or bourgeois femininity (Mullen 244-5). Besides, the slave narratives do not advise submission to a higher authority imagined as benign; they celebrate flight from overt oppression (Mullen 245). The book *Black Women in Nineteenth Century American Life* has included an oral account of a slave woman, Cornelia, remembering the spirited resistance of her mother to the physical abuse of a mistress. The event remembered subverts the patriarchal assumptions about gender traits and serves as an eye-opener. Cornelia recalls:

One day my mother’s temper ran wild. For some reason Mistress Jennings struck her with a stick. Ma struck back and a fight followed. Mr. Jennings was not at home For half an hour they wrestled in the kitchen. Mistress, seeing that she could not get the better of ma, ran out in the road, with ma right on her heels. In the road my mother flew into her again. The thought seemed to race across my mother’s mind to tear mistress’s clothing off her body She caught hold, ripped and

tore. Poor mistress was nearly naked when the storekeeper got to them and pulled ma off. “Why Fannie, what do you mean by that?” he asked. “Why, I’ll kill her, I’ll kill her dead if she ever strikes me again. (qtd. in Mullen 247)

The given extract shows the aggressive nature in both women – wrestling – and Fannie, mother of Cornelia, proves to be extremely violent, aggressive, rebellious and daringly defiant in the subsequent violent confrontation. It exposes the masculine traits in both of them.

Two mornings afterwards “when two men came in” with a “big lash” for whipping her, she “swooped upon them like a hawk on chickens,” “grabbed” a “long beard” of one man “with one hand and the lash with the other,” and on catching sight of one man pulling out his gun, said, “use it and blow my brains if you will” (qtd. in Mullen 247-8). Fannie’s psyche is obviously free from the process of internalizing the patriarchal ideals about gender. Hence she exactly represents the psyche by being masculine – aggressive for instance – when she is provoked and feminine when she is just the mother taking care of her daughter. This instance clarifies that it is mere fantasy and fallacy to consider women as being exclusively feminine – soft, tender, weak, submissive, emotional, passive and, above all, modest – and men as being exclusively masculine: rational, strong, active, assertive and so on.

Resistance to Gender Norms in Poems

These public engagements are reflected in women’s verse (149). These verses allude to issues about “the care of children,” “public issues,” “political disputes,” “issues and events of central cultural importance,” “women’s activism” on “slavery, poverty, prostitution” (149) and so on. So literally women are found to have used literature as a platform to raise their voice of resistance to gender ideology. Emily

Dickinson gives strong voice to Whiteman's anxieties and suspicions regarding the fulfillment of an American promise (Wolosky 153). Her poems show her active participation in the public affairs. Thus she resists the gender ideology by breaking the cult of true womanhood and the cult of domesticity. In her poetry, the cultural norm of modesty acquires intensified and eruptive expression, exposing models of both male and female selfhood (153). Result is the deviation from the gender norms. In her, modesty expands into a general rhetoric of duplicity, entrapment and assault (430) looking like "modesty in vengeance" (432). So her relation to gender roles is problematic and conflictual (431). While she resists, in her seclusion, certain gendered norms such as marriage and motherhood, she fulfills other norms, such as devoted daughterhood, confinement to domestic space, and modest avoidance of public appearance (431). She protests against the conventional norms through writing.

Wolosky points out:

Her poems . . . become scenes of anatomizing, staging, enacting, and exposing these conflicts. What is more, her treatment of gender-conflicts implicates more than sexual roles narrowly defined. Gender is a crucial perspective with Dickinson's verse, but not only regarding female conventions. Male conventions of behavior and gender cultural values expressed in them are equally exposed.

Modesty becomes in Dickinson a scene of contest among competing gender roles or possibilities Under modest guise, she anatomizes a variety of gender roles (432)

It can be illustrated in one of her poems that begins "I meant to have but modest needs – / Such as content – and Heaven – / Within my income – these could lie" (1-3) and ends "Great Spirit – Give to me / A Heaven not so large as yours, / But

large enough – for me –” (10-12). In these lines (qtd. in Wolosky 432-3), modesty is a challenge (Wolosky 433) and this modest request thus becomes an assertive one for personal independence and earthly satisfaction in competition against, and displaying a heavenly one (433). Modesty is a form of concealment which registers conformity to female restrictions which remain all too real, but it also serves as a persona for expressing feminized and often critical view points (179). Besides, the tone of the given poem is quite significant. The use of past tense – “I meant to have but modest needs” (1) and “I prayed” (12) with the use of first person pronouns repeatedly “I meant,” “within my income,” “I prayed,” “Give to me” (10) and “for me” (12) – in the present context, where/when the basic needs are not fulfilled, helps the readers to feel and perceive the acceleration of irritation, aggression and resentment in the tone under the guise of modesty. In this sense, the poet “under modest guise” “anatomizes [frames] a variety of gender roles” (432). In other words, the given poem shows the masculine resentment underlying the modesty. The expression “I meant to have but modest needs” offers several gender alignments, connecting through masculinity the various authorities of family, religion and economics as against a female modesty that is childlike but explosive (Wolosky 434).

In many poems, female figural systems – of speakers, imagery, attribute, stance, or actor – cross with male ones and in another “Wife” poem, the “wife” and “woman” are figured as “Czar.” The lines of the given poem “I’m “wife” – I’ve finished that – / That other state – / I’m Czar – I’m “Woman” now –” (qtd. in Wolosky 437) show the transformation or transgendering of the poetic persona from the submissive and subordinate state of “Wife” to the state of “Czar” and “Woman”. The poetic persona claims to “have finished” “that other state” – a feminine state, state of modesty, dependence and so on. In the absence of submissiveness, she is Czar

– a state of independence and authority – and a “Woman” which implies the combination of womb and man or a man with a womb. This poem registers the resistance to gender ideologies and the poet alludes to the presence of masculinity and femininity in her through the incongruous collocation of female subject “I” with male complement “Czar”. It is an instance of gender disruption.

Julia Ward Howe (1819-1910) is another poet noted for gender deviation. Howe’s verse reflects tension between resistance and accommodation to conventional female paradigm (182). This ambivalence results from her true personality that deviates from what is appropriate to her biological sex. She is found to have been active in writing, publishing, lecture, and so on with commitments to various reform movements and radical politics (182). Obviously it is a masculine trait to be active. She observes that “in twenty-two years of marriage, my husband had never approved of one that I valued” (qtd. in Wolosky 82). This disapproval of the husband is the disapproval of the patriarchy against the masculine trait in women. This biographical part flows into the poems she writes. Hence *Passion Flowers* (1854) reads like one long agonized modesty topos (179). Wolosky elaborates it:

Whatever the particular subject, verse after verse is devoted to apologizing for its own existence This abject note . . . is sustained through various pleas to a “Master” . . . from whom Howe begs . . . no greater “boon” than “thine approving hand upon my head” and the words, “modest but glorious . . . ‘Thou hast done well.’” (179)

This modesty sounds more like “groveling” (179). In the later poems, a great change can be perceived.

Her patriotic poem “Battle-Hymn of the Republic” (1862) reveals the masculine substance and determination in the poet. The expressions “Let the Hero,

born of woman, crush the serpent with his feet” and “let us die to make men free” (11, 19) do not reflect the soft, tender, and weak – feminine – personality of the speaker who enjoys living in a subordinate position. The word “crush” in the given context reflects the spirit of aggression in the female speaker and the appeal “let us die to make men free” her boldness to accept death for a cause. As an allegorical poem, it is written in the context of American Civil War with a conviction that “Hero (North) crushes the serpent (South) in present and eternal time” (Wolosky 221-2).

Gender Violation in the Works of Whitman and Others

Walt Whitman (1819-92) is another American writer who successfully resists the gender ideologies in his poems. He reaches beyond the binaries of male/female, seeing identity as more accountable to a being’s spirit than contemporary gender theorists posit (Ceniza 195). His attitude towards men and women can be perceived in the following lines: “I am the poet of the woman the same as the man, /And I say it is as great to be a woman as to be a man, /And I say there is nothing greater than the mother of man” (qtd. in Larson 482). The poet in the extract does not see any inferiority in being a woman. It is great to be either a man or a woman. However, mothers are greater than both (482). The identity of the person is connected more with the spirit of the person. He clarifies it in the line “In the faces of men and women I see God, and in my own face in the Glass” (qtd. in Larson 481). When God is present in the faces of men and women, they cannot be differentiated in terms of binary oppositions: strong/weak, independent/dependent, active/passive, rational/emotional, aggressive/calm and so on.

No where do we see the sexist attitude of the poet because his own ideology has enabled him to avoid the internalization of patriarchal ideals of gender. It can be illustrated in his 1860 “Thought (As I sit with others)” which begins with the line, “Of

the veil'd tableau – Women gather'd together on deck, pale, heroic, waiting the/ moment that draws so close – O the moment!" (qtd. in Ceniza 186). In the context of life on the verge of death, metaphorically the poet refers to the ship sinking with women waiting for the hour "pale and heroic". The collocation of "heroic" with "women" on the part of the poet indicates his conviction that women are as masculine (heroic) as men. The term 'heroic' in the context implies the courage and stoic fortitude in women. He fails to see the difference between men and women and acknowledges it in the 1856 "Salut au Monde!"

Each of us inevitable,

Each of us limitless – each of us with his or her right upon the earth,

Each of us allow'd the eternal purports of the earth,

Each of us here as divinely as any is here. (qtd. in Ceniza 187)

"Inevitable" denotes the necessity for us to be here; "limitless" implicates the unlimited potentials in us and the last two lines indicate our association with divinity and eternal purports of the earth. The poet obviously resists the sexual ideology in these lines because he fails to see the difference between men and women in matters of inevitability, limitlessness, having divinity and so on.

A woman beneath the mask of femininity is no different from a man beneath the mask of masculinity. Killingsworth illustrates it through a poem of Walt Whitman:

In taking the perspective of woman, Whitman offers either a subversion or an outright transgression of the gender norms of his day. Subversively he suggests that regardless of restrictions on "womanly life," fantasy runs rampant beneath the surface: "Where are you off to, lady? for I see you, / you splash in the water there, yet stay stock still

in your room.” And the fantasy is no mere sentimental idyll, but a full-blown and sexually charged vision, virtually masturbatory in its intensity: “They do not know who puffs and declines with pendant and bending arch, / They do not think whom they souse with spray.” (35-6)

The poem is subversive because it denies the modesty and timidity in women. The poem suggests that at the psychological level a woman’s sexual instincts tend to be as active as man’s.

Sarah Margaret Fuller (1810-1850) – writer, feminist and a leading figure of Transcendentalism in America – contradicts the concept of separate spheres for men and women and challenges the patriarchal assumptions of women being feminine and men being masculine. In her work *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1854), she argues:

The growth of Man is two-fold, masculine and feminine.
 So far as these two methods can be distinguished, they are so as
 Energy and Harmony;
 Power and Beauty;
 Intellect and Love;
 Or by some such rude classification; for we have not language
 primitive and pure enough to express such ideas with precision.

These two sides are supposed to be expressed in Man and Woman, that is, as the more or the less, for the faculties have not been given pure to either, but only in preponderance. There are also exceptions in great number, such as men of far more beauty than power, and the reverse. But, as a general rule, it seems to have been the

intention to give a ponderance on the one side, that is called masculine, and on the other, one that is called feminine.

There cannot be no doubt that, if these two developments were in perfect harmony, they would correspond to and fulfill one another, like hemispheres, or the tenor and bass in music.

But there is no perfect harmony in human nature; and the two parts answer one another only now and then; or if there be a persistent consonance, it can only be traced at long intervals, instead of discoursing an obvious melody. (169-170)

She further explains that man's "habits and his will" are "corrupted by the past" (171). She argues, "He did not clearly see that woman was half himself; that her interests were identical with his; and that, by the law of their common being he could never reach his true proportions while she remained in any wise shorn of her" (171). Margaret further argues that whenever the poet or artist gave free course to his genius, he saw the truth, and expressed it in worthy forms, for these men especially share and need the feminine principle (171).

This argument about the presence of blended genders in man and woman was the outcome of her resistance to gender ideology based on dichotomy. Gray summarizes Fuller's argument in the following way:

There are no roles that are specific to one gender or the other, because 'male and female represent the two sides of the great radical dualism' that are 'perpetually passing into one another.' Like Emerson, Fuller envisions a world of flux, process, interpenetration where 'fluid hardens to solid, solid rushes to fluid'. So, 'there is no wholly masculine man, no purely feminine woman'. (137)

The arguments included in the work were meant to undermine the traditional gender roles and emphasize the fluidity and fluid transition of man and woman between masculinity and femininity.

Helen Hunt Jackson [1830-1885], a novelist and poet, is another deviant. As a poet she includes conventional meditations on nature, the seasons, and faith in an afterlife (Wolosky 187). Quite often her poems take a “gendered turn” defending women in opposition to a “male point of view” (187). In the poem “A Woman’s Battle,” the speaker who is wounded shows defiance with a determination that she will not show her wounds and distress to her “dear foe” (qtd. in Wolosky 187). The poem is noted for the defiance, stoic fortitude and the courage to go ahead “with colors flying” while “casting female virtue as heroic fortitude” (Wolosky 187):

Dear Foe, I know thou’lt win the fight;

I know thou hast the stronger bark,

And thou art sailing in the light,

While I am creeping in the dark.

Thou dost not dream I am crying,

As I come up with flying colors. (Jackson 1-6)

“The stronger bark” and “sailing in the light” refer to the favorable atmosphere – patriarchal culture – that her foe has.

Despite her vulnerable condition she goes ahead saying “I clear away my wounded, slain, / With strength like frenzy strong and swift; / I do not feel the tug and strain” (7-9). The speaker is aware of her situation and confesses it with defiance, “Fate steers us, – me to deeper night, / And thee to brighter seas and sons; / But thou’lt not dream that I am dying” (15-7). It is obvious that the poetic personae of the poem “A Woman’s Battle” is a woman and the woman proves to be far from being

weak, submissive, emotional, dependent on the mercy of a man – ‘dear foe’ – and modest. This portrayal undermines the patriarchal assumptions about women because even the vulnerable state and fate cannot deprive her of her determination to “sail with colors flying.”

Frances Harper (1825-1911), a black American poet, exposes the double standard of the patriarchal society through her poem “The Contrast”:

They scorned her for her sinning,
Spoke harshly of her fall,
Nor lent the hand of mercy,
To break her hated thrall. (qtd. in Wolosky 194)

In the case of a man who has seduced her, the patriarchal society turns its blind eye and the man looks forward to a new relation:

Through the halls of wealth and fashion
In gait and pride
He was leading to the altar
A fair and lovely bride. (qtd. in Wolosky 194)

The speaker’s critical attitude challenges the value system and values of the patriarchal society and gender ideology. What is a sin in the case of a woman is a matter of choice for pleasure in the case of a man. The challenge of the speaker presupposes that she is neither timid nor submissive in her attitude.

Kate Chopin (1851- 1904) – a novelist and short story writer – wrote stories many of which “dramatize the law of battle that dictates a struggle between the males for the possession of the female, but she also resisted its corollaries concerning the female’s passive and modest role in sexual relations and the male’s physical and mental superiority to the female” (Bender 461). Chopin’s women often manage in

various ways to deny Darwin's definitions of the female inferiority and they not only reclaim the power to select, but select for their own reasons connected with their own sexual desires as in the case of Edna Pontellier in *The Awakening* (461-2). Edna begins her career as a conventional Victorian woman and then awakens to joy of Whitman's transcendental eroticism (Bender 466) and enters bravely into her new sexual independence by moving out of the family into her own "Pigeon house" (471). A woman transgressing sexual ideals is unconventional. She does not consider herself as her husband's possession while declaring, "I give myself where I choose" (Chopin, *Awakening* 183; ch.36) and keeps saying to herself: "Today it is Arobin; tomorrow it will be someone else. It makes no difference to me. . ." (195; ch. 39). The sympathetic portrayal of this character on the part of Kate Chopin is the sign of her resistance to patriarchal ideals about woman as an Angel of the House and Chastity. In a society where the female "was obliged to be monogamous, since males have traditionally reserved for themselves certain polygamous privileges" (Millet 122) and where "chastity is prescribed and adultery severely punished in women" (122), Edna's sexual freedom serves as a challenge to patriarchal assumptions with undertone that woman is like man in every aspect including sexual relations and sexual selections.

By placing Edna in the position of Darwinian male playing the role of active sexual selection, Kate tries to subvert Darwin's theory of sexual selection – "power of sexual choice among human beings" is "awarded" "to the males" (qtd. in Russet 80) – and Edna as the "the primary selector" (80) is masculine and the man. Besides, Edna's economic autonomy enables her to play the role of masculine by being independent. Such a portrayal is evident of Kate's resistance to patriarchal assumptions. Adele Ratignole acting as the stereotype of femininity does justice to her type by being passive, dependent and pure. She provides a foil to Edna owing to the sympathetic

treatment given to the latter. Strangely enough, Edna surpasses the sexual boundaries which project her more as a male / a masculine being – independent and fearless. In order not to surrender herself in a conventional marriage or a string of more or less meaningless affairs, she swims out into the sea with no intention of returning (Gray 272). This approach toward a marriage as a kind of surrender and loss of independence is significant aspect of her resistance to gender ideologies. For Edna, marriage offers “a cultural space” where she is required to obey rules that oppress her as a woman and play a role that denies her as an independent human being (272). Swimming in the sea gives her “a feeling of exultation” (272).

This unconventional attitude toward marriage works at the background of Kate’s short story, “The Story of An Hour” where Mrs. Mallard, on hearing about her husband Brently Mallard’s death in the railroad disaster, withdraws into her room and avails herself to an unexpected reaction. The narrator writes:

She was young, with a fair, calm face, whose lines bespoke repression But now there was a dull stare in her eyes It . . . rather indicated a suppression of intelligent thought. There was something coming to her and she was waiting for it, fearfully. What was it? She did not know; it was too subtle and elusive to name it. But she felt it reaching toward her

Now her bosom rose and felt tumultuously. She was beginning to recognize this thing that was approaching to possess her, and she was trying to beat it back When she abandoned herself a little whispered word escaped her slightly parted lips. She said it over and over under the breath: “free, free, free!” (Chopin, “Story” 99-100)

The narrator wondered if it was (not) “a monstrous joy” and “possession of self-assertion” and “the strongest impulse of her being.” He heard her whispering “Free! Body and Soul free!” In the midst of confusion when Brently Mallard returned home, she was reported to have died of heart disease . . . of joy (?). For Mrs. Mallard, the end of husband’s life is the inception of complete freedom for her, which is more valuable than the return of the husband. The possible loss of husband can be overcome but not the loss of freedom. This kind of message cannot go hand in hand with the cult of true womanhood.

Kate Chopin’s another story “The Storm” (1898) also treats the marital relation in a light and unconventional manner. According to it, a man and a woman, married to others and from different social classes, enjoy a sexual encounter and remain resolutely unpunished with each of them returning to “their intimate conjugal life” (Gray 271). The narrator ends the story, “So the storm passed,” “and everyone was happy” (qtd. in Gray 271). Such a treatment and such portrayal of female characters work against the traditional values, ethics and gender ideologies.

All these writers and the works cited are noted for the transgression of the dominant ideals of the patriarchal culture. These transgressions anticipate the gender subversion of twentieth and twenty first century writers and carry the subversive spirit and impulses for the succeeding generations of writers.

CHAPTER 11

ANDROGYNOUS POTENTIALITY: MOMENTS BEYOND GENDER

CONVENTIONALITY

Until the end of the nineteenth-century both in America and Britain, gender has been culturally imposed upon what is genuine in each individual. Patriarchal societies enforce this artificial dimension of gender on the fallacious assumption that gender is biologically determined. What is natural and genuine in individual is polarized into forms: masculinity for/in men and femininity for/in women, the former being superior to the latter. However, the issue of gender, when related to life experiences, proves to be much more complex. The behavioral aspects in terms of masculinity/femininity are affected by a wide range of factors, resulting in gender disruption. The patriarchal cultures ignore such instances and endeavor to influence the individuals in the formation of their gender personalities in accordance with conventional patterns.

Heilbrun refers to a condition – androgyn – “under which the characteristics of sexes and human impulses [are] expressed by men and women” and suggests about “a full range of experience open to individuals who may, as women, be aggressive, as men, tender” (Introduction X). This suggestion accounts for (in)frequent gender disruptions here and there.

In this chapter, I use the theoretical apparatus presented in Introduction to trace out different instances in the novels – *The Scarlet Letter*, *The Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, *Jane Eyre*, *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* and *Adam Bede* – where the leading characters act and behave contrary to conventional gender norms. As these characters represent the androgynous potentiality that is transgressive to what is usually accepted in the sex/gender system, I argue and analyze here against the implausibility of the

sex-stereotyped behavior in a way of suggesting new possibilities of interpreting and representing gender. After analyzing each work separately, I provide a comparative study between one work and the other to highlight the subversive aspects.

The Scarlet Letter: The Androgyny Within

Nathaniel Hawthorne (b.1804) published the novel *The Scarlet Letter* in 1850. It was an immediate success and its significance in the field of feminism and gender study is still noteworthy. Carolyn G. Heilbrun is one of the writers of the Twenty-first century who acknowledged its contribution in the gender aspects. She concedes:

IT IS TEMPTING TO CALL THE EIGHTEEN FORTIES THE DECADE [capitals used by the writer herself] of the Victorian androgynous novel, particularly if we expand the range of discussion to include the great American novel *The Scarlet Letter*. The great androgynous novel of them all, *Wuthering Heights*, did not attract immediate attention; if it speaks clearly to our generation, it hardly spoke at all to its own. But *Vanity Fair* and *The Scarlet Letter*. . . immediately gained large and enthusiastic audience. (63)

Thus *The Scarlet Letter* is recognized as one of the most significant novels in America. *The Scarlet Letter*, like the other great androgynous novels before the twentieth century, *Clarissa*, *Vanity Fair*, *Wuthering Heights*, is unique in its author's career (63). It's a masterpiece in a new genre. Heilbrun claims, "For Hawthorne, the miracle lay in the creation of Hester Prynne" (63). She is the forerunner of her time. She is "an American *Clarissa* in a Puritan", "unmonied and unclassed society" (63).

Hester is like *Clarissa* because both "turn the apparent waste of their lives, by recognition of what is called their sin, into tremendous sources of androgynous energy" (65). While claiming that "the greatest miracle of *The Scarlet Letter* is the

extent to which the book allows the magnificence of that one act of love to shine as the single living moment in a hard and sterile world” (65-6), Heilbrun argues:

The angel and apostle of the expected revelation has not come. From the day of Hester’s creation to this day, no American literary character (if we exclude characters of Henry James, who did not remain in America) has so much as touched the hem of her gown, or drawn any inspiration from her. That she was created at all is the most extraordinary in that Hawthorne was strongly anti-feminist in his opinions, and unconventional in his view of the proper destiny of the sexes. (66-7)

Heilbrun acknowledges parenthetically that “Hester Prynne, holding her baby, sexually unidentified, on the scaffold, is specially compared to holy pictures of mother and child” (104). Such a portrayal subverts the conventional way of thinking against adultery. Both Hawthorne and Hester can be seen as subversive artists who must enter “the market place” with a scarlet letter (Egan. Jr.26). Tony Tanner argues that adultery is the breaking point of all the norms:

The figure of the wife ideally contains the biological female, the obedient daughter, the faithful mate, the responsible mother, and the believing Christian, and harmonizes all the patterns that bestow upon her these differing identities. But if the marriage starts to founder, then the different identities and roles fall apart or come into conflict . . . the action of adultery portends the possible breakdown of all the mediations on which society itself depends, and demonstrate the latent impossibility of participating in the interrelated patterns that comprise its structure. (19)

This extract accounts for Hester's point of departure from the conventional behaviour meant for Victorian women. The angel of the house leading the restricted life becomes the angel of the community with unlimited potentials. Hester is indeed a kind of "liminal" character, caught betwixt and between social roles as a result of her passionate transgression (Egan Jr.27). Obviously adultery is the cause.

Hester with masculinity and Hawthorne with femininity show the gender blending in them. Ken Egan Jr. notices the complexity in the matters of gender and argues:

As an author of "minor literature," Hawthorne saw himself in conflict with the dominant image of male available within his culture. In his important study of women and masculine aesthetics during the nineteenth century, Leland S. Person Jr. has addressed precisely this crisis of gender definition, observing that "given the identification of masculinity with vigorous, self-reliant activity both inside and outside the home, it must have been difficult indeed for male writers to reconcile their profession with their masculinity." Like Hester, the male writer must dwell among multiple, conflicting personae while somehow making a living and maintaining an imaginative integrity. A father, a husband, a son, a worker, Hawthorne must yet acknowledge his feminine qualities, those qualities associated with his "authorship."
(30-31)

The instances of gender disruptions and subversion in *The Scarlet Letter* are closely related with Hawthorne's experience as an individual and as a father.

He was troubled by something in the character of his daughter Una that he had

difficulty in defining (Herbert 285). Obviously, it was the behavior that deviated from the gender norms. At one place Hawthorne recorded in his notebook:

There is something that almost frightens me about the child – I know not whether elfish or angelic, but, at all events, supernatural. She steps so boldly into the midst of everything, shrinks from nothing, has such a comprehension of everything, seems at times to have but little delicacy, and anon shows that she possesses the finest essence of it; now so hard, now so tender; now so perfectly unreasonable, soon again so wise. In short, I now and then catch an aspect of her, in which I cannot believe her to be my own human child, but a spirit strangely mingled with good and evil, haunting the house where I dwell. (qtd. in Herbert 285)

Hawthorne was not able to see the androgynous potential in her and her inability to adopt the gender stereotyped behavior.

Hawthorne's perplexity illustrates a leading feature of the cultural construction of gender, the way in which perceptions of human reality are concerted – and disconcerted – by the systems of meaning through which gender is constructed (285). He was used to seeing manhood and womanhood “as complementary opposites” (285). The domestic ideal of the early nineteenth century “assigned to women the destiny of fulfilling themselves through tender self-sacrifice in the private roles of wife and mother” (285).

The part of Una, Hawthorne's daughter, is reenacted by Pearl, the daughter of Hester Prynne. Prominent in Hawthorne's description of Una is the confounding of these gender categories: the child's masculine boldness and hardness and unshrinking “comprehension of everything” is amalgamated with tenderness, wisdom and the

finest essence of delicacy (285). Hawthorne's anxieties were easily aroused on these issues because he felt his own character to be anomalous in relation to the prevailing standard of masterful public manhood (285). Hawthorne's painful shyness was a "feminine" trait (285); Henry Wadsworth Longfellow spoke for the common place response when he observed that "to converse with Hawthorne was like talking with a woman" (qtd. in Herbert 285). This could be the reason why "Hawthorne covertly yet persistently resisted conventional definitions of manhood, and his rebellion gave him strong sympathies with the feminist protest against the restricted role assigned to women" (285)

Una's role as a source for Pearl has played a useful part in critical studies of *The Scarlet Letter* (287). Little Pearl is made to enact the qualities that most troubled Hawthorne in his daughter (287). Hawthorne surrounds little Pearl "with a therapeutic program, which includes a diagnosis of her difficulty and a prescription for cure, grounded on the gender categories that he considered natural and defined a femininity he hoped his daughter would grow into" (287). Yet his ambivalence about gender issues leads Hawthorne to subvert these categories (288). So, Hester is depicted as "a vigorous and independent-minded woman who bitterly resents the oppression" (288) and "Pearl has inherited defiance that climaxes in Hester's bitterness at the lot of women" (289).

Baym argues that Hawthorne's dark heroines are "natural" beings "rooted in life and content with it" and they draw their energies "from archaic deeps" "abhorred by the patriarch" (qtd. in Milder 14). Milder asserts, "What Hawthorne would say of Margaret Fuller in a notebook of 1858 – 'She was a woman anxious to try all the things, and fill up her experience in all directions' – might be said of each of

Hawthorne's dark heroines, in ascending order" (15).

* * * *

The portrayal of (major) characters in *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) shows the influence of the work *Woman in the Nineteenth Century* (1845) – written by Hawthorne's contemporary writer Margaret Fuller – in which it is argued that “the growth of Man is two-fold, masculine and feminine” and “these two sides are supposed to be expressed in Man and Woman” (169-170). A close reading enables the reader to perceive the two-fold dimension known as gender blending in the leading characters: Hester Prynne who is guilty of adultery, Arthur Dimmesdale who is a minister and Hester's lover and Pearl, their illegitimate daughter. This two-fold dimension manifests (in)frequently in a subtle way, depending on the external circumstances affecting their lives, thus giving fluidity in the case of gender identity. In the novel, Hester's adultery and her bold decision to live in a Puritanic society of 17th century Boston with her illegitimate daughter alone project her in a different light, unforeseen in the patriarchal society that expects woman to “accept her patriarchal gender role” by being “gentle, submissive, virginal, angelic” (Tyson 89) and so on. The novel helps the reader to look into her androgynous potentiality – the two-fold dimension – which enables her to struggle, and survive in the hostile society.

While referring to the gathering of people before the Boston prison to witness the punishment of Hester Prynne for her adultery, the narrator describes the presence of a “THRONG of bearded men” “intermixed with women” (Hawthorne 40) and “a wild rosebush” “covered” “with its delicate gems” (41). The “delicate gems” stand in contrast to “wild rosebush” which, in totality, appear to be the symbolical manifestation of this inner principle – two-fold dimension/gender blending – of every person. The narrator is slow and cautious in exposing the gender blending so that it

does not appear to be unnatural and inappropriate to the reader. So he refers to “a coarser fibre” in wives and maidens of old English birth:

Morally, as well as materially, there was a coarser fibre in those wives and maidens of old English birth and breeding than in their fair descendents, separated from them by a series of six or seven generations; for, throughout that chain of ancestry, every successive mother has transmitted to her child a fainter bloom, a more delicate and a briefer beauty, and a slighter physical frame . . . than her own.
(Hawthorne 43)

It serves as an explanation about how the change has taken place over the generations due to the rigidity for gender-conformity. The “coarse fibre” in “wives” and “maidens” stands for the presence of masculinity in them. Only “a fainter bloom” of this fibre has been transmitted to her child, which implies the loss of natural quality and intensity. “A fainter bloom,” “a more delicate and a briefer beauty” as well as “a slighter physical frame” refer to the womanliness/femininity that is getting feeble consistently.

The narrator from the eighteenth century, while referring to the events in the 17th century Boston, makes the comparison between the present and the past. He further argues:

. . . the manlike Elizabeth had been the not altogether unsuitable representative of the sex. They were her country women The bright morning sun . . . shone on broad shoulders and well-developed busts There was, moreover, a boldness and rotundity of speech among these matrons, as most of them seemed to be, that would startle us at the present day (43)

This extract highlights the masculinity – “broad shoulders and boldness and rotundity of speech among these matrons” – in women who show neither passivity nor modesty nor compassion which are the feminine qualities. These bold and strong women and “the manlike Elizabeth” represent the full-fledged androgynous personalities in the past.

The remarks made by women standing at the scaffold to see the public humiliation of Hester Prynne for her adultery – “they should have put the brand of a hot iron on Hester Prynne’s forehead,” and “this woman has brought shame upon us all, and ought to die” (Hawthorne 44) – do not project their femininity which consists “of attributes such as gentle, sensitive to the feelings of others . . . able to express tender feelings” (Broverman 66-7) as well as “sympathetic” (Malpass 72). These cruel remarks of the women expose them as being similar to masculine men who “do not . . . show emotions, or cry” (Harris 13) and assure that feminine and masculine impulses are not associated with one’s biological sex. It is the circumstance that activates these impulses. These women represent the patriarchy and react against the adultery in a masculine fashion. It is a matter of their identification with the husband who is the victim of adultery.

Similarly, Hester Prynne, as she is led out of the prison into the market place to face the large crowd, responds in a way that is hardly feminine. She foreshadows the characteristics of an androgynous person. The narrative unfolds the description:

Stretching forth the official staff in his left hand, he [the town beadle] laid his right [hand] upon the shoulder of a young woman, whom he thus drew forward; until, on the threshold of the prison door, she [Hester Prynne] repelled him, by an action marked with natural

dignity, and stepped into the open air, as if by her own free will. She bore in her arms a child, a baby of some three months old. . . . (44-5)

Obviously, she does not show timidity and lack of confidence which reflect feminine impulses. Her femininity can be perceived in her maternal posture of holding the baby in a proper way and her masculinity in her dignified action and confident as well as bold way of stepping into the open air “as if by her own free will.” At this instance she is masculine and a bit feminine. The expression “she repelled him” highlights her bold spirit and “her own free will” points out her independent spirit.

However, a moment later feminine impulse – timidity – is activated in Hester when she recognizes the stranger as being her husband. Her nonchalant appearance seen as her defiant attitude towards the gathering ceases to be replaced with fear. The narrator elucidates it:

Dreadful as it was, she was conscious of a shelter in the presence of these thousand witnesses. It was better to stand thus, with so many betwixt him and her, than to greet him face to face, they too alone. She fled for refuge, as it were, to the public exposure, and dreaded the moment when its protection should be withdrawn from her. (54)

This impulse – timidity – continues to hold her in sway for a while. The narrator also notices her fear and points out, “She seemed conscious, indeed, that whatever sympathy she might expect lay in the larger and warmer heart of the multitude; for, as she lifted her eyes towards the balcony, the unhappy woman grew pale and trembled” (55). She is unhappy because she is the victim of her feminine self-abnegation and her timid nature causes her to tremble. Both traits assert the femininity in her.

This two-fold response continues with a “burning blush” – feminine attribute – “haughty smile” and a “glance that would not be abashed” – masculine quality – as she looks around at her town people and neighbors (45). She is lady-like after the manner of the feminine gentility, characterized by a certain state and dignity (45). The whole range of her behavior is marked for its fluidity: now she is feminine; now she is masculine; now she is both. The narrator’s comment that her attire seems to “express the attitude of her spirit, the desperate recklessness of her mood, by its wild and picturesque peculiarity” and the beadle’s reference to her dress as “her brave apparel” (46) highlight her masculinity. Besides, her skill at her needle emphasizes the masculine spirit in her because in the 17th century skill at needle work was the masculine aspect. In the presence of the crowd, the play of her masculine and feminine impulses continues from masculine to feminine and vice versa: “haughty” “demeanor” replaced by “agony” (47); the stoic act of fortifying “herself to encounter the stings and venomous stabs of public” (48); her impulse to “shriek out with full power of her lungs and cast herself from the scaffold down upon the ground, or else go mad at once” (49). These masculine and feminine impulses which are in a state of flux vindicate that it is not the biological sex but the circumstances that activate these impulses giving out a moment to moment experiences in terms of masculinity and femininity. The “haughty” demeanor and “the act of fortifying” the self refer to the masculinity in her whereas the “agony” and “the impulse” to go mad assert her femininity.

Moreover, masculinity in Hester manifests in the form of her work and income. She works with needles making “embroidered gloves” “apparel” for the dead body, “manifold emblematic devices of sable cloth,” “baby linen” (69) and so on. The narrator enumerates it:

Her needlework was seen on the ruff of the Governor; military men wore it on their scarfs, and the minister on his band; it decked the baby's little cap; it was shut up, to be mildewed and moulder away, in the coffins of the dead . . . her skill was called in aid to embroider the white veil which was to cover the pure blushes of a bride. (70)

This needlework enables her to be a breadwinner – “to supply food for her thriving infant and herself” (69) – which is one of the male messages, “Men provide for and protect family members” by “bringing home the bacon” (Harris 12). Besides, the work is the male attribute. Tim Edwards writes about it:

Historically, work has often stood as the most fundamental foundation of masculine identity, particularly in relation to modernity or, the more specifically, advanced Western industrial capitalism. Moreover, it was a key thesis of many of the critiques of masculinity working within the sex role paradigm that work was seen to be the most fundamental element in the formation of successful masculine. (7)

Hester possesses this masculine quality that enables her to work and produce income. Gary T. Barker argues that “work and producing income are the key requisites for being a man in most cultures” (98). Viewed from this perspective, Hester plays the role of a man by working and producing income.

The circumstances activate her hidden and repressed masculine potential of being independent. It is necessary to survive and to protect her daughter Pearl. The androgynous personality enables her to make a living in the society that expects women to depend on their husbands and fathers for bread and butter. Her success lies in the fact that she shatters the misconception that women are passive and dependent. It also implicates that a woman does not have to live in an inferior state in the male-

dominant society. All that is required of a woman is to perceive hidden potentials in her, modify the self by getting out of the stereotyped femininity and accept the challenge of the circumstances to survive on her own.

Besides, “with little Pearl to be guided and protected alone” (Hawthorne 139), she as mother cannot opt to be feminine alone. The narrator too feels that “she be all tenderness, she will die” (139). She needs to be a masculine woman and a mother. Her life should serve as exemplary for the society misguided by the notions of the sexism and her androgynous projection as an essential step towards the renovation of the social fabric.

In the case of her husband – Roger Chillingworth – too, the aspect of gender blending can be traced out momentarily. His arrival in Boston coincides with her public punishment for her adultery. As the narrator informs that “there was a remarkable intelligence in his features,” his masculine part of being intelligent is evident. As he recognizes his wife as adulteress, he tends to react in an emotional way, which evidently suggests the activation of his feminine part in him:

A writhing horror twisted itself across his features His face darkened with some powerful emotion, which nevertheless, he so instantaneously controlled by an effort of his will, that, save at a single moment, its expression might have passed for calmness. After a brief space, the convulsion grew almost imperceptible and finally subsided into the depth of his nature. (52)

Evidently the feminine part is suppressed and it remains as an inarticulate experience of emotion. The way he “controlled” his emotion signifies the active presence of masculinity in him. Relatively he is more in keeping with gender stereotype than his rival, Arthur.

So far as the attributes like intelligence, independence and activity are concerned, Roger is masculine. Besides he is confident enough to declare repeatedly that “he [Hester’s lover] will be known! – he will be known! – he will be known!” (54). The act of passing instruction to her through gestures at the scaffold for being quiet about his identity reveals his identity as an authoritative husband. He expects her to play the part of obedient and submissive wife. The narrator describes it: “When he found the eyes of Hester Prynne [on the scaffold] fastened on his own, and saw that she appeared to recognize him, he slowly and calmly raised his finger, made a gesture with it in the air, and laid it on his lips” (52).

Arthur Dimmesdale, a young clergyman, seems to be the man the writer Margaret Fuller talks about when she argues, “Man is two-fold, masculine and feminine” (169). The two-fold dimension is clarified in the narrator’s description of him:

A young clergyman [Mr. Dimmesdale]. . . had come from one of the great English Universities, bringing all the learning of the age into our wild forestland. His eloquence and religious fervour had already given the earnest of high eminence in his profession. He was a person . . . with . . . melancholy eyes, and a mouth which . . . was apt to be tremulous, expressing both nervous sensibility and a vast power of self-restraint. (Hawthorne 56)

His “learning,” “his eloquence,” his “high eminence” in profession and power of self-restraint embody the masculinity in him and other aspects such as his “melancholy eyes” suggesting emotional part of his personality, “tremulous” mouth and “nervous sensibility” account for his feminine traits. He represents both “solid” and “fluid” (Gray 137) aspects of human personality.

Hester also does the same. Arthur's judgement on Hester at the scaffold over her refusal to "speak out the name" of her lover (Hawthorne 58) as having "wondrous strength and generosity of a woman's heart" (58) acknowledges in brief that Hester is the embodiment of masculinity and femininity. The narrator's concern on Hester Prynne in prison is equally significant. He states, "After her return to the prison, Hester Prynne was found to be in a state of nervous excitement that demanded constant watchfulness, lest she should perpetrate violence on herself, or do some half-frenzied mischief to the poor babe" (Hawthorne 60).

The desire to punish the self – masochism – and others – sadism – is a very significant aspect in psychoanalysis. Freud associated masochism and sadism with femininity and masculinity (Malson 165) respectively. Both tendencies are aggressive. Men turn their aggression out [sadism] and whereas women are construed as tending to turn their aggression upon themselves (Malson 164). From this perspective too, Hester embodies the masculinity and femininity – sadism and masochism. Helen Malson elaborates the concepts:

And within psychoanalytic theory masochism has frequently been associated with feminine sexuality. Freud, for example, described masochism as 'truly feminine.' Helen Deutch (1944), taking up Freud's term 'feminine masochism' argued that narcissism, passivity and masochism constituted the three essential traits of femininity.

(164)

By making such speculation that Hester is likely to "perpetuate violence on herself or do some half-frenzied mischief to the poor babe," the narrator is passing the judgement that she has the masculine potential of being sadistic and feminine potential of being masochistic.

Arthur Dimmesdale is also influenced and victimized by the act of self-punishment – feminine masochism – and inflicts pain on the self in private through fasts, vigils and scourging. The narrator describes it:

His inward trouble drove him to practices more in accordance with the old, corrupted Faith of Rome In Mr. Dimmesdale's secret closet, under lock and key, there was a bloody scourge. Oftentimes, this protestant and puritan divine had plied it on his own shoulders, laughing bitterly at himself . . . smiting so much It was his custom . . . to fast . . . rigorously . . . until his knees trembled beneath him as an act of penance. He kept vigils, likewise, night after night

(Hawthorne 122-3)

This act of masochism on the part of Dimmesdale exposes his feminine aggression in him. At the same time he follows “the stoic message” that “encourages men to control emotions and deny wounds” (Harris 138). He internalizes the message to “ignore pain” (138). Both aspects vindicate the presence of androgynous potentials in him. These potentials are set in motion by the appropriate circumstances, creating “a world of flux” where “fluid hardens to solid, solid rushes to fluid” (Gray 137).

Chillingworth recalls the past when he had androgynous potentials. This happens when he visits Hester in prison and talks to her as a kind of self-revelation which shows his reasoning power and intellectuality as well as emotional part of the self in the past. The narrator illustrates it:

“Hester,” said he, “I ask not wherefore, nor how, thou hast fallen into the pit or say, rather, thou hast ascended to the Pedestal of infamy on which I found thee . . . It was my folly, and thy weakness. I – a man of thought, the bookworm of great libraries – a man already in decay,

having given my best years to feed the hungry dream of knowledge – what had I to do with youth and beauty like thine own! Misshapen from my birth – hour, how could I delude myself with the idea that intellectual gifts might veil physical deformity in a young girl’s fantasy! Men call me wise. If sages were ever wise in their own behoof, I might have foreseen all this. I might have known that . . . the very first object to meet my eyes would be myself . . . standing up, a statue of ignominy . . . I might have beheld the bale- fire of that scarlet-letter blazing at the end of our path. (Hawthorne 63)

This confession is analytical and it shows both subjective and objective reasoning while reflecting the intellectuality of the speaker. It projects Chillingworth as an intellectual and rational being, which asserts the masculinity in him.

The emotional part of him in the past – femininity – becomes evident momentarily when he confesses to Hester, “I drew thee into my heart, into its innermost chamber, and sought to warm thee by the warmth which thy presence made there!” (63-4). Hester Prynne has to concede it in a murmur, “I have greatly wronged thee” (64). With the exception of such moments, he is one of the men who have molded themselves into gender stereotype. Besides, this emotional part of Chillingworth is a matter of past that is lost.

As for Hester, after she is released from prison, the masculine impulses get activated in her, which encourage and enable her to think of living independently in a small thatched cottage remote from the town. She is bold and she also becomes a breadwinner. Her skill at the needle makes her economically and socially independent. The stoic fortitude which expects the man to accept poverty, disease,

persecution, slavery, or death cheerfully with the belief that all is for the best (Harris 138) is evident in her way of thinking:

Here, she said to herself, had been the scene of her guilt, and here should be the scene of her earthly punishment; and so, perchance, the torture of her daily shame would at length purge her soul and work out another purity than that she had lost; more saintlike, because the result of martyrdom. (Hawthorne 68)

In this reflection, there is determination and bold spirit to accept “punishment” and “the torture of daily shame” for the sake of “purity.” It is the voice of her stoic spirit.

Besides, her skill which is visible “on the ruff of the governor,” on the “scarfs” of “military men,” on the “band” of the minister, on the baby’s “little cap,” “in the coffins of the dead” (70) and so on enables her to be “the best” in her profession. As Harris argues, “Men find and create outlets to demonstrate their masculinity by being the best they can in a variety of arenas” (64). In this respect too, Hester’s masculinity is evident.

Her life in Boston is the life of a boy growing into a man with increasing patience and forgiveness. Harris claims, “It is a manly virtue to be stoical – strong, calm and unmoved by good or bad fortune” (138). Hester is manly from this perspective, which is obvious in the extract below:

Dames of elevated rank . . . were accustomed to distil drops of bitterness into her heart . . . by a coarser expression, that fell . . . like a rough blow upon an ulcerated wound Hester had schooled herself long and well; she never responded to these attacks . . . She was patient – a martyr, indeed – but she forebore to pray for her enemies, lest, in spite of her forgiving aspirations, the words of

blessing should stubbornly twist themselves into a curse. (Hawthorne 72)

It reflects the rationality and stoic fortitude in her – masculinity – and also femininity as she does not want her “words of blessing” “for her enemies” “twist themselves into a curse.” It implies that she is also feminine at the same time being “warm, gentle, and aware of the feelings of others” (Deaux 290).

An individual who is modest and patient turns out to be rebellious when his/her rights are violated. There the masculine impulses get in the full swing. This happens in the case of Hester when the governor Bellingham and Reverend Wilson try to convince her about their plan of having “a better and wiser guardianship” (84) for her three-year-old daughter Pearl. Hester reacts in a wild manner, bringing out other masculine traits such as “strong, protective, and decisive” (Tyson 85), apart from being a rebel to “defy authority” (Harris 142):

God gave her into my keeping, “repeated Hester Prynne, raising her voice almost to a shriek. “I will not give her up!” – And here, by a sudden impulse, she turned to the young clergyman, Mr. Dimmesdale, at whom, up to this moment, she had seemed hardly so much as once to direct her eyes. “Speak thou for me!” cried she . . . I will not lose the child! Speak for me! Thou knowest . . . what is in my heart, and what are a mother’s rights, and how stronger they are when that mother has but her child and the scarlet letter! Look thou to it! I will not lose the child! Look to it!” (Hawthorne 95)

In the given situation, the modesty is replaced with the fighting spirit of a mother and her passivity with activity. Consequently she is no more simply a caretaker of the child. She becomes the protective mother and a masculine woman. Darwin in his

Descent of Man discusses the “maternal instinct” as the part of “social instincts” – the capacity of human beings for sympathy and love – and comments that “a young and timid mother urged by the maternal instinct will, without a moment’s hesitation, run the greater danger for her own infant” (1:168). Hester as an individual happens to be as strong as any man and now as a mother woman proves to be much stronger than she is as a woman. It is the voice of an androgynous mother.

This outburst of Hester affects the feminine part in Arthur Dimmesdale. The narrator comments on it by saying, “the young minister at once came forward, pale, and holding his hand over his heart, as was his custom whenever his peculiarly nervous temperament was thrown into agitation” (Hawthorne 95-6). The “nervous temperament” “thrown into agitation” accounts for the feminine impulses in Arthur being activated momentarily. Mr. Dimmesdale argues on her behalf with a “sweet, tremulous but powerful” (96) voice. The adjectives “sweet” and “tremulous” point out the femininity and “powerful” the masculinity of Arthur. It is the voice of an androgynous father. The biological sex plays no role in variety of responses and reactions we make in different situations and circumstances. A modest behavior on other occasions tends to be wild suddenly revealing the aggressive part of masculinity when the individual goes through sensitive and volatile situation.

Hester’s active life is not limited to her daughter. She is quick to acknowledge her sisterhood (136) with the victims of fate. Her activities involve giving “her little substance to every demand of poverty,” making garments and food for “the bitter-hearted pauper,” serving the people during the time of “pestilence,” being “the rightful inmate” in the household “darkened by trouble” and so on (Hawthorne 136). Such an active involvement is the product of male part in her – animus – as Jung admits (masculine x). It goes with her female part – her nature “showed itself warm

and rich” (Hawthorne 137). Because of the perfect coordination between feminine and masculine impulses, she is “ordained a Sister of Mercy” (Hawthorne 137). The narrator comments:

She was self-ordained a Sister of Mercy; or, we may rather say, the world’s heavy hand so ordained her, when neither the world nor she looked forward to this result. The Letter was the symbol of her calling. Such helpfulness was found in her – so much power to do and power to sympathize – that many people refused to interpret the scarlet “A” by its original signification. They said that it meant “Able”; so strong was Hester Prynne, with a woman’s strength. (Hawthorne 137)

This extract works as the evidence to counter the patriarchal assumptions about women being weak, passive, dependent, subordinate and emotional and alludes to her androgynous potentiality – “the power to do and power to sympathize.” The “power to sympathize” is associated with the feminine impulse whereas the other one is with masculine impulse to be active.

A person can be passive in certain cases while being active in certain aspects. Hester continues to be passive in her relation with Arthur Dimmesdale until the time she gets “shocked at the condition” (Hawthorne 135) of the clergyman. Then she decides to be active so as to help him come out of the miserable situation. The narrator illustrates it:

She had witnessed the intense misery beneath which the minister struggled, or, to speak more accurately, had ceased to struggle. She saw that he stood on the verge of lunacy . . . a deadlier venom had been infused into it by the hand that proffered relief. A secret enemy had been continually by his side, under the semblance of a friend and

helper Hester could not but ask herself whether there had not originally been a defect of truth, courage and loyalty on her own part in allowing the minister to be thrown into a position where so much evil was to be foreboded, and nothing auspicious to be hoped She determined to redeem her error (Hawthorne 141)

She tends to be and she needs to be active in the case of Dimmesdale so that she can save him from the doom. The masculine impulses in her mobilize her – after being passive with Dimmesdale for seven years of time – to meet Roger Chillingworth eventually. Her task, which is only accomplished by the male protagonists, is to be the savior of Arthur Dimmesdale. She does her masculine part by being confident and strong in declaring to Chillingworth:

“I must reveal the secret,” answered Hester, firmly. “He must discern thee in thy true character. What may be the result I know not. But this long debt of confidence, due from me to him, whose bane and ruin I have been, shall at length be paid Nor do I . . . perceive such advantages in his living any longer a life of ghastly emptiness, that I shall stoop to implore thy mercy. Do with him as thou wilt! There is no good for him – no good for me – no good for thee! There is no good for little Pearl! There is no path to guide us out of this dismal maze!” (147)

The extract reveals a strong personality of Hester as a person with a powerful sense of logic and persuasion. She does not experience timidity, nor does she feel nervous or diffident. Even Chillingworth is obliged to acknowledge “Thou hadst great elements” (147) while being “unable to restrain a thrill of admiration” for her and for “a quality almost majestic in the despair” (147) of her expression. She asks him in the

end to “forgive, and leave his further retribution to the power that claims it” (148). She does not give up her efforts when he refuses to give up his desire for revenge against Arthur while saying – “Let the black flower blossom as it may” (148). She continues to be active in her determination to save Arthur. Hence these events clarify that passivity and activity are not associated with one’s biological sex. A [Wo]man tends to be active and passive according as the things concern him/her.

What is more, a person is certain to have an impressive personality when he strikes a perfect balance between masculine and feminine impulses. Roger Chillingworth’s personality undergoes the change for the worse because he loses control over the two-fold – masculinity and femininity – dimension. The narrator comments:

. . . the former aspect of an intellectual and studious man, calm and quiet, which was what she [Hester] best remembered in him, had altogether vanished It seemed to be his wish and purpose to mask this expression with a smile. In a word, old Roger Chillingworth was . . . transforming himself into a devil . . . by devoting himself, for seven years, to the constant analysis of a heart full of torture (144)

In other words, he has turned away from the constructive traits of masculinity such as the “aspect of an intellectual and studious man” and femininity such as the quality of being calm and “quiet” (Broverman 66-7).

The character of Pearl can be taken as a case study to show how a child kept away from the influence of patriarchal assumptions shows the androgynous potential in him/her. Pearl’s aspect is “imbued with a spell of infinite variety” and in this one child there are “many children” (Hawthorne 76). She is neither masculine nor

feminine but the amalgamation of both. So she is not made “amenable to rules” (76).

The narrator refers to the androgynous potential in Pearl:

Her nature appeared to possess depth, too, as well as variety. . . . In giving her existence, a great law had been broken, and the result was a being whose elements were perhaps beautiful and brilliant but all in disorder . . . the warfare of Hester’s spirit . . . was perpetuated in Pearl. She could recognize her wild, desperate, defiant mood, the flightiness of her temper (76-7)

“A great law” that “had been broken” refers to the breaking of a patriarchal law or rule that expects a daughter to be mild, not “wild” and to be obedient, not “defiant.” Pearl’s nature is contrary to patriarchal expectations and assumptions. Therefore it is a “disorder” for patriarchs. Pearl, prior to the working of the society in molding her as exclusively a feminine being, possesses a “peculiar look” that is “so intelligent, yet inexplicable, so perverse, sometimes so malicious, but generally accompanied by a wild flow of spirits” (77). She “would frown, and clench her little fist and harden her small features into a stern, unsympathizing look of discontent” (78). She is not fond of making acquaintance with other children. The narrator relates it:

Pearl saw the children of the settlement . . . gazed intently; but never sought to make acquaintance. If spoken to, she would not speak again. If the children gathered about her, as they sometimes did, Pearl would grow positively terrible in her puny wrath, snatching up stones to fling at them, with shrill, incoherent exclamations that made her mother tremble. . . . (79)

Such a behavior suggests the presence of masculinity in her. Pearl's aggressive behavior denotes the gender disruption. Her activities are contrary to traditional gender norms. She is more like a boy with full of masculinity inherent in her. At the same time occasional "rage of grief," sobbing out "her love for her mother in broken words," and her "intent on proving that she had a heart" (78) assure the presence of feminine impulses in her. She is neither exclusively masculine nor feminine, but the amalgamation of both – androgyny.

This kind of behavior on the part of Pearl illustrates and clarifies that in the patriarchal society individuals internalize gender norms and behave accordingly. Consequently, a man tends to be exclusively masculine and a woman exclusively feminine. It is a transformation from the real self into a social being. In the case of Pearl and Hester, these social conditioning/cultural transformations have not taken place because they live in seclusion. The narrator describes it:

All this enmity and passion Pearl inherited . . . out of Hester's heart. Mother and daughter stood together in the same circle of seclusion from human society; and in the nature of the child seemed to be perpetuated those unquiet elements that had distracted Hester Prynne before Pearl's birth, but had since begun to be soothed away by the softening influences of maternity. (80)

The reader can notice the maternity having the softening impact on Hester because at this point femininity becomes active, bringing a balance in her personality.

Similarly circumstances activate different traits of masculine and feminine impulses in a person. Same thing is going to happen in the case of Pearl. Four years later, at the age seven, Pearl is not same. Other instincts have been roused in her. The narrator illustrates this subtle change:

Perceiving a flock of beach birds that fed and fluttered along the shore, the naughty child picked up her apron full of pebbles, and, creeping from rock to rock after these small sea-fowl, displayed remarkable dexterity in pelting them. One little gray bird with a white breast, pearl was almost sure, had been hit by a pebble, and fluttered away with a broken wing. But then the elf-child sighed, and gave up her sport; because it grieved her to have done harm to a little being that was as wild as the sea breeze, or as wild as Pearl herself. (151)

This extract shows how the sight of birds at first stirs the masculine impulses in Pearl, prompting her to act like a hunter and then the sight of the bird with a broken wing stimulates her feminine impulses to regret, grieve and give up her sport. This suggests both impulses – masculine and feminine – act and counteract molding our personality all the times.

A total transformation awaits Pearl with the death of her biological father Arthur Dimmesdale towards the end of the novel. In the presence of Hester, Pearl Chillingworth and people of Boston, Dimmesdale makes the confession on the scaffold by tearing the “ministerial band,” revealing the scarlet letter “A” on his chest and sinking upon the scaffold. The pathetic sight and the moment of transformation are unfolded:

“dear little Pearl, wilt thou kiss me now? Thou wouldst not, yonder, in the forest! But now thou wilt!” Pearl kissed his lips. A spell was broken. The great scene of grief, in which the wild infant bore a part, had developed all her sympathies; and as her tears fell upon her father’s cheek, they were the pledge that she would grow up amid

human joy and sorrow, nor forever do battle with the world, but be a woman in it. (218)

This extract sounds like a declaration on behalf of Pearl that she will renounce the masculinity in her and stick to the femininity, thus molding herself into an “Angel of the House” – a complete feminine woman. It clarifies the fact that despite the androgynous potential in each individual, (s)he projects the self in accordance with the gender stereotype to fulfill the demands and expectations of the patriarchal society. In the conclusion, Pearl is believed to have been “not only alive, but married, and happy, and mindful of mother” (223). Thus she is expected to end up as a feminine daughter and a feminine wife. It is a social transformation. An individual with masculine and feminine potentials is reshaped in the stereotyped role of the female world. Her fate is limited to that of an angel in the house. She is deprived of the opportunity to utilize her potentials for the society and to be like her mother who is “looked upon with awe, yet with reverence too” (223).

In the case of Hester Prynne, the androgynous psyche/potentiality in her enables her to undergo the transformation from mere adulteress, into an independent being, bread-winner, philanthropist and an “Able” person. In addition to it, she emerges as an ideal thinker – a rational being – with a bright vision and prospectus for the future. The narrator relates it:

Women . . . came to Hester’s cottage, demanding why they were so wretched, and what remedy! Hester comforted and counseled them . . . assured them . . . that in Heaven’s own time, a new truth would be revealed, in order to establish the whole relation between man and woman on a surer ground of mutual happiness. . . . The angel and apostle of the coming revelation must be a woman, indeed, but lofty,

pure, and beautiful; and wise, moreover, not through the dusky grief, but the ethereal medium of joy; and showing how sacred love should make us happy . . . (223-4)

Hester emphasizes the perfect model of femininity with the wisdom (masculine trait) as being the eligible leader and prophet for the future. The above extract establishes Hester as a rational and compassionate being. Her vision of the future and her acts of comforting the victims of fate justify and reinforce the fact that she is androgynous with the masculine capability of reasoning and feminine impulse of being emotionally involved with them. In the earlier days, she was more rebellious. The masculinity in her was stronger than her femininity due to the hostile surroundings. The narrator elucidates it:

Indeed, the same dark question often rose in her mind . . . Was existence worth accepting, even to the happiest among them? . . . She discerns . . . such a hopeless task before her. As a first step, the whole system of society is to be torn down and built up new. Then, the *very nature of the opposite sex, or its long hereditary habit which has become like nature, is to be essentially modified* [my italics] before woman can be allowed to assume . . . a fair and suitable position. Finally . . . woman cannot take advantage of these preliminary reforms until she herself shall have undergone a still mightier change. . . . (140)

These thoughts enable us to explore into the mind of Hester Prynne and find out her intellectual and rational way of reasoning about the hereditary habit that has become like nature and revolutionary attitude about the need of building a new system of society. In her way of reasoning, we only witness the masculine impulses being dominant in her. The femininity – such dependence, modesty, passivity and weakness

– is not located. This vindicates that impulses never remain fixed and same for all the times. They tend to be fluid so as to respond appropriately to the ever changing circumstances. The whole novel repletes with instances that suggest the androgynous potential, the letter A signifies more than the literal meaning: adultery. It assumes significance more than what it is at its face value. People in Boston realize it and associate the letter with “Able” (137). It is the ambiguity caused by the situation. The situation tends to connect Letter “A” with “Able” and “Able” with Androgynous potentiality. The narrator comments on it:

The letter was the symbol of her calling. Such helpfulness was found in her – so much power to do and power to sympathize – that many people refused to interpret the scarlet Letter “A” by its original significance. They said that it meant “Able”; so strong was Hester Prynne, with a woman’s strength. (137)

If the letter “A” is the symbol of her calling, obviously her calling or trade lies in being helpful and able to be helpful. This “helpfulness” is the “power to do” which stands for masculine impulses – activity – and the “power to sympathize” which refers to feminine attribute, an emotional aspect of women. A person who has got both dimensions is Androgynous; [s]he is able; [s]he is strong with a woman’s rights. If “Able” is general term, “Androgynous” is the specific terms. On the base of it, Hester Prynne is “Able” and therefore, she is “Androgynous.” A youngest woman describes the scarlet letter “Not a stitch in that embroidered letter, but she has felt it in her heart” (46).

In the novel Letter “A” becomes the identity of a person as being “Able” or “Androgynous.” Hester refers to her daughter as the Scarlet Letter: “She is scarlet letter, only capable of being loved” (95). Apart from different interpretations, she

implies that her daughter is also “Able” or Androgynous which turns out to be so in course of the developments of events. Pearl unconsciously or subconsciously identifies with the mother by having the letter “A” made out of grass for her. The narrator describes it:

She [Pearl] inherited her mother’s gift for devising drapery and costume. As the last touch to her mermaid’s grab, Pearl took some eelgrass, and imitated, as best she could, on her own bosom, the decoration with which she was so familiar on her mother’s. A letter – the letter “A” – but freshly green, instead of scarlet! (151)

Pearl subconsciously identifies the self with the mother and she seems to suggest that she is like her mother – androgynous. This is what she is trying to point out at the preverbal stage. At the age of seven it manifests verbally, “Now thou art my mother indeed! And I’m thy Pearl!” (180). In the latter instance, she refuses to accept her mother in the forest where Hester Prynne has been with Arthur Dimmesdale for the begin of a new life until she (Hester) takes up the scarlet letter and fastens it again into her bosom. So the letter “A” is the identity of mother as an androgynous person. Without the letter on, she is just a woman without any potential or identity.

The letter is associated with Arthur Dimmesdale in the concealed form and with Hester in exposed form. Although both of them should be identified as “Androgynous” or “Able,” there lies a difference in their attitude towards the identity. Hester as a woman extremely acknowledges the fact that she is two-fold within: masculine and feminine. However, Dimmesdale conceals his identity till the moment of confession. Obviously being the member of patriarchal society, he prefers to have masculine gender as his identity. For a man, to be feminine is to be inferior. At the general level, a new woman feels proud to display the self as rational and eligible as

any man unlike the man who feels humiliated to expose the feminine part in him. For instance, when Arthur Dimmesdale, looking upward to the zenith in the company of Hester and Pearl at night, beholds the “appearance of an immense letter A” “marked out in lines of dull red light” (132) as a cosmic message for him to reveal his letter “A” to public – his power to love (feminine impulse) and power to be active (masculine impulse) – he ignores it by considering it as a movement of meteor “burning duskily through a veil of cloud” (132).

On the contrary, Hester as a masculine woman gives the strength to Arthur for running away to Europe to live together – while he confesses “I am powerless to go” (168) and grumbles “thou tellest of running a race to man whose knees are tottering beneath him!” (169) – and as a feminine woman she takes off the formal cap that has confined her hair to impart the “charm of softness to her features” (173). Although Arthur agrees to run away with her with “a kind of horror at her boldness” (170), he eventually prefers the spiritual life through confession and death. This implies that he is not ready to be influenced by his emotional aspect, femininity. His death is his last successful endeavour to suppress the feminine impulse – emotion – in him. Their behaviors in the given case enable the reader to perceive animus in Hester and anima in Arthur.

The very narrative exposes Hester as being strong due to the presence of animus in her and Arthur as weak showing the presence of anima in him on different occasions. For instance when Hester informs Dimmesdale about an enemy living with him under the same roof, the minister starts to “his feet gasping for breath and clutching at his heart” (164). Similarly when Hester reveals that Roger Chillingworth is her husband, his reaction is more hysterical than a woman behaves. The narrator describes it, “He sank down on the ground and buried his face in his hands” (165). He

asks her, “Be thou strong for me!” requesting her to “advise me what to do” (167).

When he is advised to sail across the sea as an escape, he answers, “I am powerless to go” (168). Hester points out a number of options for living while emphasizing, “There is happiness to be enjoyed” (168) and advises:

Preach! Write! Act! Do anything, save to lie down and die! Give up this name of Arthur Dimmesdale and make thyself another, and a high one Why shouldst thou tarry so much as one other day in the torments that have gnawed into thy life! – that have made thee feeble to will and to do! – that will leave thee powerless even to repent! Up, and away! (168-9)

As a response to this advice, Arthur cries, “thou tellest of running a race to a man whose knees are tottering beneath him! I must die here! There is not strength or courage left me to venture into the wide, strange, difficult world, alone!” (169). In this long conversation between Hester and Arthur we see a great contrast in them. Arthur gives the impression of being weak, timid, lacking confidence, emotional and so on. In other words, he sounds more feminine whereas Hester sounds more energetic, strong, bold, resourceful, and assertive and so on. In other words she turns up as the embodiment of masculinity. The narrator describes it in an elaborate way:

Hester Prynne, with a mind of native courage and activity . . . had habituated herself to such latitude of speculation as was altogether foreign to the clergyman. She had wandered without rule and guidance, in a moral wilderness Her intellect and heart had their home . . . in desert places, where she roamed as freely as the wild Indians in his woods The tendency of her fate and fortunes had been to set her free. The Scarlet Letter was her passport into regions where other

women dared not tread. Shame, Despair, Solitude! These had been her teachers – stern and wild ones – and they had made her strong

(Hawthorne 170)

This kind of portrayal projects Hester as a strong and highly experienced man or woman of masculinity and Arthur Dimmesdale as what Darwin asserted that “man was evolved woman” (qtd. in Russet 93).

Circumstances elicit either masculine or feminine responses. Arthur’s feminine response in the forest is the display of his vulnerable state. It is the result of facing the unexpected situation – Roger Chillingworth being Hester’s husband. This situation later influences and prepares Arthur for a masculine response of making a confession of his adultery in public. It is a daring act. This mind-set transforms him into an energetic being. As he proceeds for Election Sermon, “no feebleness of step” is perceived about him. With “energy” in “the gait and air” and “with an unaccustomed force” (Hawthorne 203), he undergoes the change giving the impression that he belongs to “men of uncommon intellect, who have grown morbid, possess this occasional power of mighty effort, into which they throw the life of many days, and then are lifeless for as many more” (203-4). Besides, his election sermon elevates him to a new height. According to the hearers, as reported by the narrator, never has “man spoken so wise, so high, so holy a spirit as he that spake this day” (211). The narrator further adds:

He stood, at this moment, on the very proudest eminence of superiority to which the gifts of intellect, rich lore, prevailing eloquence, and a reputation of whitest sanctity, could exalt a clergyman in New England’s earliest days, when the professional character was of itself a lofty pedestal. Such was the position which the minister occupied, as

he bowed his head forward on the cushions of the pulpit, at the close of his Election Sermon. (212)

It is the transcending movement of masculinity in Arthur and the expression “the gifts of intellect” refers to the masculine trait in him. This kind of frequent gender-switch between masculinity and femininity in the behavior of Arthur, Hester and Pearl demonstrates the fluidity in behavior, suggesting the androgynous personality as the true identity of these characters. Besides, in the matter of sexual choice, the novel undermines Darwin’s concept that “the primary selector is the man” (qtd. in Russet 80). Hawthorne suggests the possibility for both male and female to be active in the choice of sexual partner. Russet elaborates Darwin’s concept about sexual choice among human beings:

Given this reasoning and his obduracy about female choice in the face of the skepticism of his peers, it is interesting that Darwin awarded the power of sexual choice among human beings to males. Men had “gained the power of selection” because they were “more powerful in body and mind” than women. It was true, Darwin allowed, that even in savage societies woman has some limited freedom of choice: “They can tempt the men whom they prefer, and can sometimes reject those who they dislike, either before or after marriage.” But clearly the primary selector was the man. (qtd. in Russet 80)

In the novel, Roger Chillingworth was the selector of Hester Prynne despite being old, and ugly with a slight physical deformity. Arthur Dimmesdale is given the opportunity at the end to choose her as his companion for a new life. He is supposed to make a choice about it. In both cases, Hester Prynne was/is left with a passive role to accept what was/is decided by the male. Nevertheless, she plays the active role in

rejecting her husband Roger Chillingworth and he is left with passive role to accept with a grudge for what is done to him.

In the case of Arthur Dimmesdale, she again plays the active role before she is left without choice the passive role. She does her best in a way of prompting him to make a choice for a new life. She is full of energy and vitality in her task of persuading him to make the choice. She does it prior to being pushed into passivity of being helpless. Arthur Dimmesdale makes the choice actively about his spiritual life after having been passive in his relation with a woman [Hester] he loves. Thus if the male characters are found to play the active role in making sexual choice, the female character is given the space for her active role in some aspects.

Even the minor characters reveal androgynous potentials in them. The narrator's description of John Wilson as "a great scholar,"and "a man of kind and genial spirit"(55) highlights the masculine and feminine traits in him. John Wilson as a great scholar reveals a masculine trait "intelligence" (Millet 26) and his being a man of kind and genial spirit discloses his feminine trait "warm" (Deaux 290). Thus all male and female characters are found to be feminine in some aspects and masculine in some aspects on account of the androgynous potentiality/gender blending in them.

Thus by presenting the androgynous personalities, the novel undermines the patriarchal assumptions on gender roles. The achievements of Hester suggest that a woman in the society can confront the challenging situations and see herself as capable as a man only when she unleashes her masculine potentials. Likewise, only by responding to the feminine impulses within the self, a man can break the barrier between reason and emotion and bring them together like Arthur who acts as a responsible father to Pearl and lover to Hester Prynne and does justice to his religious commitment by making confession in public about his sin.

Uncle Tom's Cabin: Beyond Gender

Uncle Tom's Cabin (1852), an anti-slavery novel by Harriet Beecher Stowe, was the first American novel ever sold over a million copies. Stowe, through this novel, attacked the inhuman practice of slavery in America and destabilized the gender categories as staged in the domestic novels of the nineteenth century. She deviated from the binary oppositions that provided a fertile ground to Victorian middle-class gender ideology which represents men as active, independent, intellectual, strong and authoritative and women as passive, dependent, emotional, weak and submissive.

Since Stowe believes that woman is capable of ruling the world with her virtues, she has ignored to preserve the natural boundaries between masculinity and femininity. Her characters reveal their potentials in being masculine and feminine notwithstanding their biological sex. Apart from the qualities like purity, naturalness, and simplicity, the female protagonists of Stowe act in a way that is bold, logical, rational and, of course, independent. On the contrary, the male protagonists embrace passivity, innocence and purity. This clarifies that Stowe was also influenced by the argument of Margaret Fuller. So in the novel Stowe accepts the definition of woman popular at the mid century, recognizing the two “spheres” – one masculine and commercial and the other feminine and domestic (Ammons 163-4). Elizabeth Ammons illustrates it:

The architecture of the concluding chapter of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* underscores Stowe's vision, her wish that masculinity be defined along more feminine lines for the reformation of society. The final chapters provide three positive male models and, finally, one female model. Foremost is Tom, an ideal. Stowe presents his death as a Christlike

victory of the feminine principle over Satanic Simon Legree. Then she presents George Harris. She makes him an eloquent spokesman for the proud, free, blackman, whose understandable bitterness is tempered by his devotion to healing feminine values, such as Eliza's. His white counterpart . . . George Shelby . . . renounces his father as a model by emancipating the family's slaves, an action his mother has always favored. These three men – Tom, George Harris, George Shelby – illustrate Stowe's belief that the male of the species can be as beautiful morally as the female but only if old models of masculinity are radically revised. (176-7)

Nineteenth century was the time of such paradoxes. This kind of gender blending can be seen in the American religion too. Reynolds comments on it:

American religion became both more "feminine" and "masculine" during the nineteenth century. . . . It is also understandable that Beecher's definition of religion was essentially paradoxical: "The end, Manhood. The means, Truth. The Spirit, Love." Here the spirit is "feminine," reflecting the emotionalism which would impel Orestes Brownsun to mock Beecher's "religion of gush." But the end is "masculine," signaling Beecher's manliness and self-confident activity. (Reynolds 106)

Stowe's novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin* also carries the same attitude that combines femininity and masculinity in characters occasionally and violates the gender norms. It contradicts what Tennyson states in *The Princess* – "Man to command and woman to obey" (v 440) – by placing them in the reverse order on certain occasions. It also works contrary to Ruskin's conviction that "The man's power is active" and "she

[woman] is protected from all danger and temptation” (44). The given novel has included many instances where woman’s power is found to be active and man is protected from temptations. Thus it threatens the stability of conventional gender boundaries giving the impression that “gender does not necessarily follow from sex” (Butler173).

* * * *

Uncle Tom’s Cabin is about slave-owning American society. It is the time when the slave-owning culture has given birth to the race prejudice based on the belief that coloured race is “inferior to the white race, physically, intellectually, religiously, socially and morally” (Ellis 11). William Julius Wilson points out the outcome of this prejudice on coloured people living in America as slaves:

The slave was under constant supervision and efforts were consistently made to generate deferential and submissive behaviour. The enduring ritual of race etiquette, reinforced by the master at every turn, stipulated that proper behavior for blacks involved bowing when meeting the master, standing and showing great humility in his presence, accepting floggings . . . and approaching the mansion in the most self-effacing, humble and beseeching manner. Floggings and other modes of physical punishment were employed to ensure ritualistic obedience and deference to plantation to rules. (193)

This extract clarifies that slave owners have imposed and expected feminine behaviour in their slaves. Male slaves behaving in a feminine way project them in the light of androgyny. The androgynous potentiality in them prepares them to have a gender switch so that they can act in a feminine way. The society and the repressive system of slavery act as the stimuli for the slaves to show the androgynous response.

The protagonist of the given novel, known as Uncle Tom, represents the male slaves of the American society in the nineteenth century.

Uncle Tom's Cabin reads as a movement of characters – slaves – towards north and south from Kentucky giving the picture of slavery and attitude of people towards them in the nineteenth-century America. It revolves around the slaves George Harris, his wife Eliza and four-year-old son Harry – who as fugitives travel to north in disguise, reaching the secured place in Canada eventually – and Tom who is taken to south from Kentucky and sold to Augustine St. Clare in New Orleans and two years later to Simon Legree from Louisiana where he loses all the scope for freedom and dies. George Harris and Eliza Harris embrace the masculine spirit of being active and get the help from people who are inspired by Christianity and femininity. For Stowe, femininity implies:

unshakeable allegiance to Christian virtues of youth, hope, charity
mercy and self-sacrifice; purity in body and mind; ethical dependence
more on emotion than on reason; submission to mundane authority
except when it violates higher laws; and protection of the home as a
sacred and inviolable institution. (Ammons 164)

George Harris and Eliza Harris come across the people who are guided by the given Christian virtues. These people show the perfect blend of masculinity and femininity and this blend helps in creating a liberal atmosphere for the runaway slaves including George Harris and his family. This coordination between masculinity and femininity turn them [people] into abolitionists. Consequently, George Harris and Eliza Harris manage to get into Canada and gain complete freedom. On the contrary, Tom finds people in South being rigid about slaves and dehumanized by the practice of slavery. This dehumanization results from the loss of balance and coordination

between masculinity and femininity. Consequently after leading a secured life for two years in New Orleans in the pious atmosphere of Eva and Augustine St. Clare, Tom falls into the hands of Simon Legree – a monster – after the death of Eva and Augustine. For Simon, a slave is just a commodity meant to be sold and disposed. Tom loses his life in the hands of Simon who is provoked by the pious and ethically guided nature of the former.

Uncle Tom's Cabin is a critique of the values attached to the masculinity in the patriarchal society. It illustrates that exclusive masculinity in a male tempts him to be involved in aggressive and inhuman activities and only when it is combined with femininity, the man is able to take a step towards humanity. So the novel highlights the values of femininity by projecting the female characters – such as Mrs. Shelby, Mrs. Eliza, Eva, Miss. Ophelia and Mrs. Bird – as being more compassionate and sensible beings than the male characters. They are the embodiment of purity, morality and humanity. A woman without femininity – Marie St. Clare for instance – tends to be as inhuman as a man with exclusive masculinity such as Simon Legree.

Uncle Tom's Cabin, therefore, is an extensive and subtle illustration about the values of femininity and the need for amalgamating it with masculinity. While describing the nature of Mrs. Shelby, the narrator highlights the androgynous potentials in her by stating that “Mrs. Shelby was a woman of a high class, both intellectually and morally” (Stowe 11). The narrator adds further:

To that natural magnanimity and generosity of mind which one often marks as characteristic of the women of Kentucky, she added high moral and religious sensibility and principle, carried out with great energy and ability into practical results. Her husband . . . revered

and respected the consistency of hers, and stood, perhaps, a little in awe of her opinion. (Stowe 11)

The qualities referred in the extract are related with masculinity and femininity. That she is intellectual with opinions respected by her husband and that she “carried out with great energy” refer to the masculinity in her – intelligence and confidence – whereas “the natural magnanimity and generosity” point out the feminine impulses in her.

Besides, she is full of compassion. She is sensitive to the feelings of Eliza Harris, who is concerned as a mother about the possibility of her son being sold out to a slave trader Haley and comforts her, “Nonsense child! to be sure, I shouldn’t. What do you talk so far? I would as soon have one of my children sold” (11). It reveals the feminine part in her. Besides, she is masculine. Her masculinity in the form of rationality is obvious in her opinion that slavery is the “most accursed thing! – a curse to the master, and a curse to the slave!” (33). The way she tries to convince her husband against the sale of Tom by appealing to his sense of ethics indicates the depth of her reasoning: “What! Our Tom? – that good, faithful creature! – been your faithful servant from a boy! Oh, Mr. Shelby! – and you have promised him his freedom, too – you and I have spoken to him a hundred times of it” (32).

Throughout these activities she emerges as an influential personality which is contrary to her husband, Mr. Shelby who is “an average kind of man” (10). He is a gender stereotype. She tries her best in her argument to dissuade him from selling Tom and Harry. She sounds powerful in her argument. She appears to be neither weak, nor passive, nor modest in her efforts to motivate her husband:

I have talked with Eliza about her boy – her duty to him as a Christian mother, to watch over him, pray for him, and bring him up in a

Christian way; and now what can I say, if you tear him away, and sell him, soul and body, to a profane, unprincipled man, just to save a little money? I have told her that one soul is worth more than all the money in the world; and how will she believe me when she sees us turn round and sell her child? – sell him, perhaps, to a certain ruin of body and soul! (33)

Each expression shows the depth of her confidence and her effective reasoning is based on the grounds that Christian and spiritual values are more important than monetary values. Nowhere does she give the impression of being submissive and subordinate. Mr. Shelby is speechless to hear the argument to the extent of being helpless:

‘I’m sorry about it, Emily – indeed I am,’ said Mr. Shelby; and I respect your feelings, too, though I don’t pretend to share them to their full extent; but I tell you now solemnly, it’s of no use – I can’t help myself Either they must go, or all must I was in his [Haley’s] power, and had to do it. (33)

Besides, she is bold enough to be critical about ministers of the church. As a response to Mr. Shelby’s reference to Mr. B’s sermon, she argues:

‘I don’t want to hear such sermons; I never wish to hear Mr. B. in our church again. Ministers can’t help the evil, perhaps – can’t cure it, anymore than we can – but defend it! It always went against my common sense. And I think you didn’t think much of the sermon, either.’ (33)

These expressions reveal the confidence, independent spirit and the intellectuality of Mrs. Shelby. Her speech presents her as a dominant personality. Her critical attitude,

founded on her common sense, does not expose her as irrational. Besides, her outspokenness suggests that she is not born to be submissive essentially. All these things denote the presence of masculinity in her.

She even makes a decision of parting with her gold watch to save Eliza's child (34). All these things, one and the same time, expose her masculinity and femininity as an indication of her androgynous potential. When Mrs. Shelby learns that Eliza has run away with her son Harris, she [Mrs. Shelby] is bold enough to express her thanks to God in front of her husband, "The Lord be thanked" (39) and subtly encourages Sam to delay the search for Eliza and Harris:

Well, Sam, you are to go with Mr. Haley, to show him the road, and help him. Be careful of the horses, Sam; you know Jerry was a Little Lame last week; don't ride them too fast. Mrs. Shelby spoke the last words with a low voice, and strong emphasis. (43)

She is bold on one side to do something that is certain to displease her husband if he comes to know about it and on the other hand she is quick to make decision about what is to be done to save Eliza from the trouble. This is the masculine part in her. When she succeeds in delaying the search, she plays the final part of her planning in a feminine manner:

Mrs Shelby, who, greatly to her amusement, had overheard this conversation from the veranda, now resolved to do her part. She came forward, and, courteously expressing her concern for Haley's accident, pressed him to stay to dinner, saying that the cook should bring it on the table immediately. (45-6)

In all these activities, she is far from being exclusively feminine: passive, indecisive and docile. When Tom is being carried away, Mrs. Shelby in her helpless state too

does not give up her confidence, and determination. She comforts him with her encouraging words, “If I give you money it will only be taken away from you. But I tell you solemnly, and before God, that I will keep trace of you, and bring you back as soon as I command the money; and till then, trust in God!” (91). This confidence in her is the evidence about the presence of masculinity in her. Two years later Mrs. Shelby, having known through Tom’s letter to his wife Chloe about his enquiry for raising the money for his redemption, asks Mr. Shelby whether they should sell the farm and horses to raise the fund. The narrator comments on the significant aspects:

And Mr. Shelby, not knowing any other way of enforcing ideas, raised his voice; a mode of arguing very convenient and convincing, when a gentleman is discussing matters of business with his wife. Mrs. Shelby ceased talking, with something of a sigh. The fact was, that though her husband had stated she was a woman, she had a clean energetic, practical mind, and a force of character everyway superior to that of her husband (235)

The given extract illustrates her feminine behavior when “she ceased talking” and masculine trait by referring to her “clean energetic practical mind,” and “a force of character. . . superior to . . . her husband.”

She uses this practical mind by deciding to give permission to Chloe to make money by working as a confectioner in Louisville so that she [Chloe] can buy Tom’s freedom. Once she takes the masculine step of making decision, she also reveals her feminine trait by declaring to add certain amount of money to Chloe’s money as a sign of generosity. Thus Mrs. Shelby unfolds the complete personality – that is not lopsided – which is androgynous unlike her husband who only represents the gender stereotype. He serves as a foil to her well-developed androgynous personality.

At the end of the novel Mrs. Shelby is seen conducting the expressive [feminine] role at home and instrumental role [masculine] by managing business external to the home. The writer refers to it:

Mr. Shelby showed his confidence in his wife's ability, by appointing her sole executrix upon his estates; and thus immediately a large and complicated amount of business was brought upon her hands. Mrs. Shelby, with characteristic energy, applied herself to the work of straightening the entangled web of affairs . . . for Mrs. Shelby was determined that everything should be brought into tangible and recognisable shape. . . . (385)

This extract shows Mr. Shelby's faith in the masculine potentials of his wife as being "active, competitive . . . and skilled in business, worldly" (Broverman 66-7) and Mrs. Shelby's successful undertaking. This accounts for her androgynous personality. She accomplishes the feminine part by being "warm" and "gentle" (Deaux 291) on the one hand and also the masculine part by being "rational," and "protective" (Tyson 85) on the other hand.

In the case of Eliza Harris too, gender disruption is inevitable because of her androgynous character. A light-skinned and pretty Eliza – a slave of Mr. Shelby – presents herself as a woman of feminine impulses in the begin and turns out to be bold in the later period under the influence of masculine impulses within her. Initially, her feminine attributes are obvious in her reaction to the sudden appearance of her husband:

'George, is it you? How you frightened me! Well; I am so glad you's come! misses is gone to spend the afternoon; so come into my little room and we'll have the time all to ourselves.' Saying this, she drew

him into a neat little apartment ‘How glad I am! – Why don’t you smile? And look at Harry – how he grows!’ ‘Isn’t he beautiful!’ said Eliza, lifting his long curls and kissing him. (Stowe 15)

In this extract we only perceive the feminine traits of Eliza as a loving wife and loving mother. Her timidity in her exclamation “How you frightened me!” and her emotional quality seen in her love for her boy expressed through her words “look at Harry – how he grows” and acts like “lifting his long curls and kissing him” project her femininity as a mother and as an angel of the house.

Further on noticing George’s rebellious attitude towards his master, she does her best to comfort him in a feminine way. “Well,” said Eliza, mournfully, “I have always thought that I must obey my master and mistress, or I couldn’t be a Christian” (17). In this confession, she gives the impression of being obedient, virtuous and dependent – a feminine being completely. The narrator too is aware of it. He refers to her feminine response towards George Harris when he [George] declares that he won’t bear the authority of his master, while clenching his hand with a fierce frown. The narrator draws our attention to her timidity – the feminine attribute – and admits, “Eliza trembled, and was silent. She had never seen her husband in this mood before; and her gentle system of ethics seemed to bend like a reed in the surges of such passions” (17). She cannot imagine going against the master. At this stage she is nothing but the embodiment of femininity. She is perfectly fitted in the mold. Hence she continues to advise, “Oh, George, don’t do anything wicked; if you only trust in God, and try to do right, he’ll deliver you” (17). At this stage both of them remain as mere gender stereotypes. Soon she is going to get out of the mold while he remains unchanged throughout the novel.

It is a paradox in the case of Eliza that her femininity – maternal instinct – disrupts momentarily to unleash her masculine instinct. This maternal instinct is going to get her out of the mold of femininity. Her anxiety about her son Harry is evident in the following conversation:

Eliza started. ‘Oh, missis!’ she said raising her eyes; then bursting into tears, she sat down in a chair, and began sobbing. ‘Why, Eliza, child! what ails you?’ said her mistress. ‘Oh, missis, missis,’ said Eliza, ‘there’s been a trader talking with master in the parlour! I heard him!’ ‘Well, silly child, suppose there has? ‘Oh, missis, do you suppose mas’r would sell my Harry? And the poor creature threw herself into a chair, and sobbed convulsively. (10-11)

This anxiety on the part of a mother is a feminine aspect and a maternal instinct that urges “a young and timid mother” to “run the greater danger for her own infant” “without a moment’s hesitation” (Darwin 1: 168).

Eliza as a mother is about to face the danger with a bold heart after having learnt that her boy Harry is sold to Haley. The masculine impulses, which have been hitherto unfamiliar to her, are activated in her. So a feminine mother is momentarily transformed into masculine being with a determination to be protective of her son. The narrator describes it in the following way dramatically:

‘Poor boy! Poor fellow!’ said Eliza; they have sold you! But your mother will save you yet!’

No tear dropped over that pillow. In such straits as these the heart has no tears to give, it drops only blood, bleeding itself away in silence. She took a piece of paper and pencil, and wrote, hastily – ‘Oh, missis! dear missis! don’t think me ungrateful – don’t think hard of

me, anyway – I heard all you and master said tonight, I am going to try to save my boy – you will not blame me! God bless and reward you for all your kindness!’ Hastily folding and directing this, she went to a drawer and made up a little package of clothing for her boy, which she tied with a handkerchief firmly round her waist (Stowe 35)

Eliza at this instance is animated with a new spirit which has hitherto been unfamiliar to her. She is determined to save her child. Her activities never cease. She takes the boy in her arms and moves out in the night without noise. She informs Aunt Chloe about the sale of Harry and Uncle Tom and starts her journey at night toward the Ohio River. The narrator comments on her, “But stronger than all was maternal love, wrought into a paroxysm of frenzy by the near approach of a fearful danger” (47). She is both bold and timid because of the mixed sensations in her:

She trembles at the sound; every quaking leaf and fluttering shadow sent the blood backward to her heart, and quickened her footsteps. She wondered within herself at the strength that seemed to come upon her; for she felt the weight of her boy as if it had been a feather, and every flutter of fear seemed to increase the supernatural power that bore on her, while from her pale lips burst forth, in frequent ejaculations, the prayer to a Friend above, Lord, save me! (47)

This extract includes the wide range of experiences and feelings that represent masculinity and femininity in a person. The expressions like “trembled”, “flutter of fear”, “prayer” and “blood” being sent “to her heart” embody the femininity and “strength” and feeling “the weight of the boy as if it had been a feather” stand for masculinity. Both impulses are activated one and same time by the single event—the sale of her son. It is a moment of flux from masculine to feminine and vice versa in an

energizing way. Together they project the androgynous potentials in her. The narrator elaborates the feelings:

how the touch of these warm arms, the gentle breathings that came in her neck, seemed to add fire and spirit to her movements! It seemed to her as if strength poured into her in electric streams, from every gentle touch and movement of the sleeping, confiding child. Sublime is the dominion of the mind over the body, that, for a time, can make flesh and nerve impregnable and string the sinews like steel, so that weak become the mighty. (48)

The delicate touch and proximity with the boy arouses the feminine emotions in her which get connected with the masculine impulses transporting the being into a strong invulnerable personality. This extract shows the transformation from the vulnerable into invulnerable, from the feminine into androgynous suggesting fluidity and a world of flux. Her determination is noteworthy in what she says to her son, Harry, “mother can’t eat till you are safe! We must go on – on – till we come to the river” (49). A woman of the mild nature has become wild in her activities. This unfamiliar attributes in her have been roused by the urgent necessity that expects her to save her baby at any cost. The narrator reiterates that she is “still strong in heart” (49) as she, an hour before sunset, reaches the village of T –, by the Ohio river, weary and footsore. There is no ferry as the ice is beginning to break up. Haley, the slave trader, soon reaches the river bank. Now the masculine impulses are in full swing in her. They stimulate her to go ahead in the wild manner to save her son, Harris. The narrator describes this momentous event:

She caught her child, and sprang down the steps towards it [the river] . . . he [Haley] was after her like a hound after a deer. In that dizzy

movement, her feet to her scarce seemed to touch the ground, and a moment brought her to the water's edge. Right on behind they came; and, nerved with one wild cry and flying leap she vaulted sheer over the turbid current by the shore, onto the raft ice beyond. It was a desperate leap – impossible to anything but madness and despair The huge green fragment of ice on which she alighted pitched and creaked as her weight came on it With wild cries and desperate energy she leaped to another and still another cake; stumbling – leaping – slipping – springing upwards again! Her shoes are gone – her stockings cut from her feet while blood marked every step; but she saw nothing, felt nothing, till . . . she saw the Ohio side, and a man helping her up the bank. (56-7)

She has transcended the gender boundaries. Patriarchal assumptions of women as being soft, delicate, passive, weak, modest and submissive are far away from the daring act and personality of Eliza. The mold of femininity has shattered momentarily to make the mold of masculine woman/androgynous being. It is the singular instance of gender disruption. The man who has helped her out – Mr. Symmes – remarks on the daring act with a compliment, “Yer a brave gal, now, whoever ye are!” (57). In fact, she is not simply a brave girl but also a brave mother and a brave savior of her boy. This event illustrates that beneath the layer of femininity in women, there lies the heroic masculinity that gets activated only when it is absolutely necessary.

Eliza falls into the right hands and she preserves her (androgynous) traits by helping others in a similar situation. When the slave hunter Tom Loker gets wounded while chasing them, the feminine impulses in her prompt her to show compassion and say, “. . . do something for that poor man; he is groaning dreadfully” (186). George

Harris, who is more a gender stereotype than androgynous, gives the evidence of being soft on some occasions. He feels pity on Tom Loker and asks his fellow companion Phineas, “What shall you do with this poor fellow?” (188). Later they nurse him and Tom Loker is converted into an abolitionist. Tom Loker, who is fitted into the mold of masculinity, appears to be weak and helpless. The narrator refers to it, “Tom groaned, and shut his eyes. In men of his class, vigor and resolution are entirely a physical matter, and ooze out with the flowing of the blood; and the gigantic fellow really looked piteous in his helplessness” (187).

These characters have internalized the gender norms and project them more as gender stereotypes. Nevertheless, the cross gender traits manifest very now and then. For instance, George Harris’s hand – while taking the tickets and change at office in Sandusky, the town on the Ohio shore to catch the ferry for Canada – “trembled a little” but “he turned coolly around” (358). In the boat “he silently pressed the little hand [of Eliza] that lay trembling on his arm” (359). If the trembling stands for timidity associated with feminine impulses, both George Harris and Eliza Harris betray the same aspect that evidently assure the presence of feminine impulses in both of them.

It is significant to note that Eliza Harris dressed as a man with the hair cut to the size of a man’s and little Harry in the guise of a girl catch the ferry for Canada. The authorities posted in Sandusky, despite the descriptions of George and Eliza given, fail to recognize them. It suggests that although masculinity and femininity are psychological attributes, they are coupled with outward features such as the dresses, hair-styling and so on. It is ironical to note that Eliza Harris who is considered to be a man and masculine is, in fact, a woman and feminine. Likewise Harry who is mistaken as a girl is a boy within. It can be interpreted as a suggestion that we must

not evaluate the gender of the person on the base of the outward appearances and paraphernalia.

Mrs. Bird, who helps Eliza when the latter is on the run, also violates the gender norms. However, the narrator describes Mrs. Bird in such a way that she appears to be the cult of true womanhood. The narrator comments on her:

Mrs. Bird was a timid, blushing little woman, of about four feet in height, and with mild blue eyes, and a peach-blow complexion, and the gentlest, sweetest voice in the world; as for courage, a moderate-sized cock-turkey had been known to put her to rout at the very first gobble, and a stout house-dog of moderate capacity would bring her into subjection merely by show of his teeth. (74)

This extract simply exposes the feminine traits of Mrs. Bird such as being timid, mild, modest, gentle and sweet.

However, she is confident. The expression, as made by her on the law “forbidding people to help off the slaves,” “I would not give a fig for all your politics, generally, but I think this is something downright cruel and unchristian” (74) assures her assertive nature. She is bold enough to critique the Fugitive Slave Act 1850 with the declaration, “It’s a shameful, wicked, abominable law, and I’ll break it, for one, the first time I get a chance” (75).

Such dichotomized traits being present in a single person undermine the binary opposition set up between the sexes. Mrs. Bird is the angel in the house and at the same time she is critical about her husband that he voted for the law, “You ought to be ashamed, John!” (75). Though she is feminine, she sounds strong and assertive in her conviction: “Now, John, I don’t know anything about politics, but I can read

my Bible; and there I see that I must feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and comfort the desolate . . .” (75).

By raising the question against the law approved by men in the senate, she challenges the very assumptions of patriarchy that men are rational and intellectual. The narrator describes it:

On the present occasion, Mrs. Bird rose quickly, with very red cheeks, which quite improved her general appearance, and walked up to her husband, with quite a resolute air, and said, in a determined tone, Now, John, I want to know if you think such a law as that is right and Christian?” (75)

This question and her confidence seem to be challenging the patriarchal assumptions about women on the one hand and the legal system of the slave-owning society on the other hand.. Mrs. Bird proves to be a strong woman with a great compassion for the hungry, naked and the desolate.

Mr. Bird’s personality also contradicts the gender norms. Although he is a man, his nature provides evidence that is contrary to the gender stereotypes. The narrator asserts, “Now, if the truth must be told, our senator had the misfortune to be a man who had a particularly humane and accessible nature, and turning away anybody that was in trouble never had been his forte. . .” (75). The feminine trait of “sympathetic” (Malpas 72) nature in Mr. Bird prompts him to undertake the masculine task of escorting the runaway slave Eliza at night to the safer place of Van Trompe in the woods “seven miles up the creek” which “has to be crossed twice; and the second crossing is quite dangerous” (Stowe 81) and leave “ten-dollar bill” (87) in his hand for Eliza. This extract emphasizes the compassionate nature – feminine

attribute – of the senator. This humane and accessible nature of Mr. Bird coincides with his bold nature. The narrator describes it:

He was as bold as a lion about it [fugitive slave act] and ‘mightily convinced’ not only himself, but everybody that heard him; but then his idea of fugitive was only an idea of the letters that spell the word; or at the most . . . of a man with a stick and bundle The magic of the real presence of distress, the imploring human eye, the frail, trembling human hand, the despairing appeal of helpless agony, these he had never tried. He had never thought that a fugitive might be a helpless mother, a defenceless child (83-4)

This extract exposes the masculine personality of Mr. Bird as bold and capable of convincing others about the righteousness of the law. Besides it suggests that his humane nature has not been through the uncharted territory of pathetic sights. This implies that he would not have voted for the law as a senator if he had anticipated the distressing sights. The narrator is only suggesting that Mr. Bird is an ideal person because he has both masculine and feminine potentials.

Eliza’s history activates the feminine attribute – tender feelings – in him, which prompts him to get her to a safer place belonging to an abolitionist Van Trompe and leave “a ten-dollar bill” (87) for her. Mrs. Bird rightly evaluates him by saying to him, “Your heart is better than your head, in this case” (82). It implies that Mr. Bird is guided better by his heart and emotion rather than by his mind and reason in the case of Eliza. This kind of portrayal of Mr. Bird subverts conventional gender norms as it projects his androgynous personality.

In the case of Tom, Stowe displays shrewd political strategy in choosing to characterize her hero as a stereotypical Victorian heroine: pious, domestic, self-

sacrificing, and emotionally uninhabited in response to people and ethical questions (Ammons 172). However the passivity which the popular culture chooses to remember is not his dominant attribute; whenever possible Tom takes action (172). By being passive, pious, domestic and self-sacrificing Tom deviates from gender conformity and by displaying the strong character occasionally, he reveals his personality as being androgynous. The very androgynous potential in him enables him to adopt the feminine behavior and masculinity manifests as a response to the demands of the circumstances. So Stowe's protagonist tends to be "gentle, pious, chaste, domestic, long-suffering and self-sacrificing" (162). Uncle Tom, despite his reputation as an obsequious character, is designed to embody religious firmness by enduring the lash of Simon Legree for his refusal to punish a fellow slave (Reynolds 104), Tom "felt strong in God to meet death," as "the brave, true heart was firm on the eternal rock" (qtd. in Reynolds 104). Tom's gender switch as "heroine" and strong resistance towards the end clarify his personality as androgynous.

Uncle Tom's two fold personality – femininity and masculinity – can be traced out in the beginning and at the end. His feminine impulses are in full sway in the first part of the novel and masculine impulses get activated to the full in the second part. The gender disruption, followed by gender conformity establishes his androgynous personality as a whole. When he comes to know through Eliza that he has been sold to a trader along with her son Harry (Stowe 37), he is speechless, struck with passivity:

Tom had stood, during his speech with his hands raised, and his eyes dilated, like a man in a dream. Slowly and gradually, as its meaning came over him, he collapsed, rather than seated himself, on his old chair, and sunk his head down upon his knees. (Stowe 37)

His reaction is at a great contrast with that of Eliza who has been full of energy and vitality. There is no energetic outburst of fury on his part. Even when his wife Aunt Chloe prompts him to get away with Eliza, he refuses to do so, being faithful toward his master, which is a feminine trait. His passivity can be seen in his movement: “Tom slowly raised his head, and looked sorrowfully but quietly around” (37). He confesses:

Mas’r always found me on the spot – he always will. I never have broke trust, nor used my pass noways contrary to my word, and I never will. It’s better for me alone to go than to break up the place and sell all. Mas’r an’t to blame, Chloe; and he’ll take care of you and the poor – ’. . . . (37)

This confession clearly reveals the feminine self-abnegation or self-sacrifice to save his master from the downfall.

His weakness, his dependence on his master’s mercy, and his submissiveness can be witnessed in the tears that he sheds:

Here he turned to the rough trundle-bed full of little woolly heads, and broke fairly down. He leaned over the back of the chair, and covered his face with his large hands. Sobs, heavy, hoarse and loud, shook the chair, and great tears, sir, as you dropped into the coffin where lay your first-born son; such tears, woman, as you shed when you heard the cries of your dying babe: for sir, he was a man (37-8)

The tears of Tom surprise the narrator and reader too. The narrator’s surprise can be perceived in the expression “he was a man.” It implies that although he was a man, he was crying like a woman. At this instance, his feminine impulses are in full swing. It is an instance of gender subversion /gender transgression. He is just a

feminine man with full of emotion but no action. There is a great contrast between him and Eliza in connection with their reactions although both are victims of slavery and present transaction. In the case of Eliza, the narrator comments, “No tear dropped over that pillow. In such straits as these the heart has no tears to give, it drops only blood, bleeding itself away in silence” (35). Eliza at this instance is a masculine woman with no emotion but full of action. Both are guilty of gender transgression. Thus the conventional gender norms based on binary opposition are undermined.

The feminine impulses never remain the same. They get replaced by masculine impulses and thus it takes the form of fluidity. At the parting hour, Tom’s brave conduct enables him to comfort his wife, “Here you are safe; what comes will come only on me; and the Lord, He’ll help me-- I know He will” (88). This attitude impresses the narrator to comment, “Ah, brave, manly heart, smothering thine own sorrow to comfort thy beloved ones! Tom spoke with a thick utterance, and with a bitter choking in his throat – but he spoke brave and strong” (89). The given extract illustrates that the changing circumstances act and counteract upon the unknown impulses activating them to the full. So a feminine man a moment ago is now a masculine man. Things thus take a turn for fluidity/fluid movement between masculine and feminine responses. Even small details help us to see the fluid exchange of impulses. For instance, Aunt Chloe’s “tears seeming suddenly turned to sparks of fire” (92) at the sight of Haley and two sons of Tom, seeing their father in heavy pair of shackles and comprehending his destiny “clung to her [mother’s] gown, sobbing and groaning vehemently” (92). Such fleeting moments can be interpreted as the fluid movements between masculine and feminine impulses. In the case of Tom too, the images of what is strong and what is tender work together to give the impression that Tom’s masculinity and femininity are active in the same event. On the

occasion when Tom leaves his family and meets the boy and son of his master – George Shelby – on the way, the former acts in a feminine way by being tender: “I’s older, ye know, ‘said Tom, stroking the boy’s fine curly head with his large, strong hand, but speaking in a voice as tender as a woman’s” (95). It is a feminine act to stroke the boy’s hair and speak in a tender voice. At the same instance, Tom cannot help being “worldly” (Broverman 66-7) – a masculine trait – showing the experiences of his life through advice for George:

‘And now, Mas’r George,’ said Tom, ‘ye must be a good boy; ‘member many hearts is sot on ye. Al’ays keep close to yer mother. Don’t be getin’ into any of them foolish ways boys has, of getting too big to mind their mothers. Tell ye what, Mas’r George, the lord gives good many things twice over; but he don’t give mother but once. Ye’ll never see sich another woman, Mas’r Goerge, if ye live to be a hundred years old. So now, you hold on to her, and grow up, be a comfort to her(Stowe 95)

Even the thirteen-year old boy George Shelby shows the traits of masculinity and femininity in him. The emotional outburst of George Shelby by throwing “his arms tumultuously round his [uncle Tom’s] neck”, “sobbing” shows the presence of femininity in him. Besides, his masculinity prompts him to be critical of Haley: “I should think you’d be ashamed to spend all your life buying men and women and chaining like cattle! I should think you’d feel mean!” (95). Prior to that, he is bold enough to address Haley with “an air of superiority”, “Look here, now mister” (95). Thus even at the age of thirteen the androgynous potentials have fully developed in George Shelby, letting him feel emotional over Tom and bold to speak with a white adult in a critical way against him. Obviously it is another instance that proves that

gender is not biological. Uncle Tom's case suggests that a man can be as feminine as woman and as masculine as a man.

Haley's journey towards south presents a few instances which suggest that both sexes are susceptible to be influenced by feminine impulses. Albert, a fourteen-year-old slave, is left in tears (112) when he is separated from his sixty-year-old mother Hagar who is "trembling in every limb, held out her shaking hands towards him" (113). They are obligated to feel weak and emotional. These are feminine traits. Lucy, a slave and a mother of ten-month-old boy, is in tears when she is first separated from her husband and then from her child (118). Under the influence of feminine impulse of self-abnegation, she drowns herself to death (122).

In the earlier part of the novel, the instances of George Harris and Eliza Harris illustrate that both sexes are capable of experiencing masculine impulses. In the case of Tom too, this is going to happen. In the earlier part of the novel, it is evident that he was capable of being feminine in his impulsive behavior – sobs and tears (37) and now he is going to be masculine in his impulsive behavior. This happens when Evangeline – a six-year-old white girl from New Orleans – falls "sheer over the side of the boat into the water" of Mississippi (138). The narrator describes the rescue of the girl:

Tom was standing just under her on the lower deck, as she fell. He saw her strike the water, and sink, and was after her in a moment. A broad-chested, strong-armed fellow [Tom], it was nothing for him to keep afloat in the water, till, in a moment or two, the child rose to the surface, and he caught her in his arms, and, swimming with her to the boat-side, handed her up, all dripping, to the grasp of hundreds of

hands, which, as if they had all belonged to one man, were stretched eagerly out to receive her. (138)

The extract illustrates the masculine instinct of Tom to save, to rescue and to protect. This is a masculine instinct because it is formed out of confidence, courage, strength and capability to save the girl. Tom's masculine instinct turns up at an appropriate moment as a response to meet the emergency situation. At the level of impulses, he is similar to Eliza at the moment when she leaps onto the frozen river to save her son from the slave hunters. Both Eliza and Tom illustrate Bakan's concept of agency – the need to protect (Lazerson 21) – a masculine trait. Tom's decision to undertake such a responsibility is also a masculine quality in him. This event earns a place for him in Augustine St. Claire's plantation where he becomes an intimate slave and companion of Eva, a six-year-old daughter of his master Augustine.

In New Orleans, the six-year-old girl Eva also emerges as a full-fledged personality with a perfect balance of masculine and feminine impulses in her. Judged from the perspective of Bakan's concept of agency [masculinity] – the need to protect, expand and assert oneself –and concept of communion [femininity], tendency to unite with other beings (Lazerson 21), Eva's activities illustrate the presence of both dimensions in her. Her love for her parents, and all the slaves without racial discrimination is the outcome of her feminine impulse in her. "Throwing herself" on her mother's neck, "embracing her over and over again," flowing "from one [slave] to another, shaking hands and kissing," "throwing herself into her [Mammy's] arms," and kissing her repeatedly (Stowe 153) as well as her friendship with Tom stand for her tendency to unite with all the people around. Her kindness enables her to unite with all the slaves that can be witnessed in the case of Topsy, a slave girl of wild nature, who can't help stealing:

‘Poor Topsy, why need you steal? You’re going to be taken good care now. I’m sure I’d rather give you anything of mine, than have you steal it’ It was the first word of kindness the child had ever heard in her life; and the sweet tone and manner struck strangely on the wild, rude heart, and a sparkle of something like a tear shone in the keen glittering eye (Stowe 228)

Eva’s love for the mother has the touch of sentimentality – a feminine impulse. The narrator describes it, “She loved her mother because she was so loving a creature, and all the selfishness that she had seen in her only saddened and perplexed her; for she had a child’s implicit trust that her mother could not do wrong (Stowe 255). Apart from this feminine trait, Eva has the courage and stoic spirit to face and accept her death without getting panic. It is a manly virtue to be stoical—strong, calm and unmoved by good or bad fortunes (Harris 138). This masculine quality can be perceived in what she says to her father about her coming death:

‘No Papa,’ said Eva, putting it gently away, “don’t deceive yourself! I am not any better – I know it perfectly well; and I am going before long. I am not nervous – I am not low-spirited. If it were not for you, papa and my friends, I should be perfectly happy. I want to go – I long to go!” (Stowe 256)

In addition to this stoic fortitude, she also exhibits the aspect of agency in herself – the masculine need to protect. She asks her father to promise her that “Tom shall have his freedom” as soon as she is gone (dead). For other slaves too, she is protective and expects her father to do something:

Poor old Prue’s child was all that she had; and yet she had to hear it crying, and she couldn’t help it! Papa, these poor creatures love their

children as much as you do me. Oh, do something for them! There's poor Mammy loves her children; I've seen her crying when she talked about them. And Tom loves his children; and it's dreadful, Papa, that such things are happening, all the time. (Stowe 257)

This concern for protection is the masculine instinct. It is an instance of gender transgression. By unfolding both masculine and feminine impulses, Eva projects her androgynous personality. Topsy is another character whose nature is transparent. An eight or nine-year-old slave girl, she is bought by Augustine St. Clare for Ophelia to “educate and train in the way she should” (221). First she gives the impression of being submissive, giving response obediently, “Oh, yes mas'r,” (222). Later, she is found to be wild and full of activity. Patriarchal assumption of woman being passive is inapplicable in the case of Topsy because she is found to be active in various aspects such as stealing, telling lies and her talent for dancing, mimicry and so on. She contrives to snatch a pair of gloves and a ribbon, slipping them into her sleeves in a flash (226). The narrator describes the skill of Topsy in learning and other activities:

She (Topsy) learned her letters as if by magic, and was very soon able to read plain reading; but the sewing was a more difficult matter. The creature was as lithe as a cat and as active as a monkey, and the confinement of sewing was her abomination; so she broke her needles, threw slyly out of windows, or down the chink of the walls . . . Her motions were almost as quick as . . . conjurer . . . yet she [Ophelia] could not . . . detect her. Topsy was soon a noted character in the establishment. Her talent for every species of drollery, grimace, and mimicry – for dancing, tumbling, climbing, singing, whistling, imitating every sound that hit her fancy – seemed inexhaustible. In her

play-hours, she invariably had every child in the establishment at her heels, open-mouthed with admiration and wonder – not excepting Miss Eva (230)

All these activities subvert conventional gender norms that hold women as “passive” and “quiet” Broverman (66-7).

The wilderness of African race is in her that prevents her from being fitted into the category of femininity alone. Even at the moment of crying over the death of Eva – an outcome of feminine impulse – she can’t help being wild:

. . . Topsy came forward and laid her offering at the feet of the corpse; then suddenly, with a wild and bitter cry, she threw herself on the floor alongside the bed, and wept and moaned aloud. Miss Ophelia . . . tried to raise and silence her; but in vain. ‘Oh, miss Eva! Oh, Miss Eva! I wish I’s dead, too – I do!’ (276)

It is the manifestation of feminine impulse with the force of masculine wilderness.

What is Topsy in the raw comes up refined, graceful, and intelligent in Vermont, the hometown of Ophelia as the result of Miss Ophelia’s conscientious endeavor. The narrator describes her:

The child rapidly grew in grace . . . At the age of womanhood she was . . . baptized, and became a member of the Christian Church . . . showed so much intelligence, activity and zeal . . . that she was at last recommended . . . as a missionary to one of the stations in Africa; and . . . is now employed, in a safer and wholesome manner, in teaching children of her own country. (403)

The whole description of the given extract shows the smooth transition of Topsy from wild androgynous girl to a mild androgynous lady. Such a portrayal is the subversion

of conventional gender norms. The aspects of “intelligence, activity and zeal” and the state of being “employed” point out the masculine traits in her and her growth in “grace” assures the reader of her femininity.

The depiction of Augustine St. Clare’s character also disrupts the gender conformity. Alfred St. Clare, the twin brother of Augustine St. Clare, is said to call him “a woman sentimentalist” (215). Alfred obviously believes that Augustine is under the influence of the feminine impulses within him. The reader obtains the same impression when Augustine makes the comparison between him and Alfred, “He was active and observing, I dreamy and inactive” (208) and confesses, “there was a morbid sensitiveness and acuteness of feeling in me on all possible subjects” (208-9). He is not without emotions contrary to the expectations of patriarchy about males. While talking about the influence of his mother on him, he admits:

She had a great deal of genius of one sort and another, particularly in music; and she used to sit at her organ, playing fine old majestic music of the Catholic Church, and singing with a voice more like an angel than a mortal woman; and *I* would lay my head down on her lap, and cry, and dream, and feel – oh, immeasurably! – things that I had no language to say! (209)

Mother’s influence, evidently, has activated the feminine impulses in him letting him “cry” and “feel” the deep emotions. It is an instance of gender transgression.

In the matters of emotional involvement, he is in agreement with his mother. Whenever he quarrels with his brother Alfred over such matters, his father looks sternly on him (209). Obviously his father disapproves Augustine’s behavior as it deviates from gender norms. He elaborates the occasions of his emotional attachment with colored people:

‘I was a little fellow then, but I had the same love that I have now for all kinds of human things – a kind of passion for the study of humanity . . . I was found in the cabins and among the field-hands a great deal . . . and all sorts of complaints and grievances were breathed in my ear; and I told them to my mother, and we, between us, formed a sort of committee for a redress of grievances. We hindered and repressed a great deal of cruelty . . . (210)

These activities show both feminine and masculine side of Augustine St. Claire.

Being “sensitive to the feeling of others” (Broverman 66-7) is the feminine attribute in him that guides him to be attentive to “complaints and grievances.” The masculine trait in him and his mother prompts them to be active in organizing committees for solution. Thus Augustine St. Clare is an androgyne.

It is paradoxical to note that he was feminine as a boy and at the same time he was active, which was a masculine trait. Presently Augustine gives the impression of being passive/inactive and weak about the outrageous acts on slaves despite his compassion for the slaves. He confesses to Ophelia:

My dear cousin, I didn’t do it, and I can’t help; I would, if I could. If low-minded, brutal people will act like themselves, what am I to do? They have absolute control; they are irresponsible despots. There would be no use in interfering; there is no law . . . for such a case. The best we can do is to shut our eyes and ears, and let it alone. It’s the only resource left us. (204)

Such a confession presents Augustine as a man lacking confidence and determination to do what he wants to do. This weakness in him asserts the presence of feminine impulses in him being more active than masculine impulses.

Evidently the circumstances in the south, which are in favour of slavery, have activated the feminine instincts and deactivated the masculine part in him. This helplessness, diffidence and passivity come out as a kind of resignation. The following confession of Augustine clarifies it:

Of course, in a community so organized, what can a man of honourable and humane feelings do, but shut his eyes all he can, harden his heart? I can't buy every poor wretch I see. I can't turn knight-errant, and undertake to redress every individual case of wrong in such a city as this. The most I can do is to try and keep out of the way. (204)

The confession shows that a person responds to a stimulus and the response can be either feminine or masculine. It has nothing to do with a biological sex.

According as the situation, sometimes response tends to be masculine and sometimes feminine. For instance, Augustine St. Clare's masculine impulses tend to be active on one occasion enabling him to save the life of a slave Scipio – a powerful, gigantic fellow, a native-born African – who has turned into a fugitive, running wild. He explains the situation:

He [Scipio] ran and bounded like a buck, and kept the dogs well in the rear for sometime . . . then he . . . fought the dogs . . . killed three of them with only his naked fists, when a shot from a gun brought him down, and he fell, wounded and bleeding, almost at my feet. The poor fellow looked up at me with manhood and despair in his eye. I kept back the dogs and the party, as they came pressing up, and claimed him as my prisoner. It was all I could do to keep them from shooting him, in the flush of success; but I persisted in my bargain, and Alfred sold him to me. (217)

In the given extract, the reader finds Augustine being dominant, active, determined and strong in his dealings. He is more masculine than others. He is manly in every way and that makes him a saviour of Scipio's life. At this instance, he appears in a different light – more heroic in his outlook with his “manly courage” “protecting the weak” (Mosse 42).

Paradoxically, his masculinity works with his compassion – feminine impulse.

It is evident in what he says:

I took him [Scipio] to my own room, had a good bed made for him, dressed his wounds, and tended him myself, until he got fairly on his feet again. And, in process of time, I had free papers made out for him, and told him he might go where he liked. (Stowe 217-8)

At this instance it is difficult to decide that only masculinity or femininity is at work. Augustine appears here perfectly blended in terms of his gender – being masculine and feminine one and the same time. The way he takes care of Scipio – dressing and tending him – stands for his feminine traits and the decision he makes to free him with all papers duly prepared indicates the masculine part of him. Augustine's character is subversive of gender norms.

In the case of Scipio too, it is evident that the person within is neither exclusively masculine nor feminine but he is what the occasion/circumstances demand him to be. As a native-born African he is full of masculinity in the beginning – aggressive, strong, and disobedient. Augustine St. Clare elucidates the background:

Well, he was a powerful, gigantic fellow . . . and he appeared to have the rude instinct of freedom in him to an uncommon degree. He was a regular African lion. They called him Scipio. Nobody could do anything with him; and he was sold from overseer to overseer, till at

last Alfred bought him. . . . Well, one day he knocked down the overseer, and was fairly off into the swamps. (217)

Scipio, at this juncture, is the embodiment of masculinity. The restrictions of slavery prompt him to be aggressive, disobedient and rebel.

However, he is overpowered on the one hand and affected by the generous personality of Augustine St. Clare. Consequently he tends to be “submissive” (217). At this point he is feminine because he is faithful, obedient and self-sacrificing. Augustus illustrates it by saying that Scipio refuses to be free from slavery and willingly serves him till his death:

The foolish fellow [Scipio] tore the paper [document about his freedom from slavery] in two, and absolutely refused to leave me. I never had a braver, better fellow – trusty and true as steel. He embraced Christianity . . . and became as gentle as child I lost him the first Cholera season. In fact, he laid down his life for me. For I was sick, almost to death; when . . . everybody else fled, Scipio worked for me like a giant . . . brought me back into life again. But, poor fellow! He was taken, right after, and there was no saving him. (218)

During this period, feminine impulses were activated in him. The death was the result of his feminine impulse of self-abnegation. His act of tearing “the document” was the outcome of his masculine instinct of being “able to make decisions easily” (Broverman 66-7). Evidently Scipio with the two fold dimensions – masculinity and femininity – is androgynous.

Ophelia from Vermont is also found to have blended gender in her. The cousin of Augustine St. Clare is noted for her “sharp, decided and energetic” movements (Stowe 147). She is never “much of a talker” and her “words are

remarkably direct and to the purpose” (147). She is said to “have a clear, strong, active mind” with “the strongest principles of her being – conscientiousness” (148). All these qualities assert the masculinity in Ophelia. Other expressions like “lips compressed” (147), “stony grimness,” and “walking with impudent non-chalant freedom” associated with her highlight the masculinity in her. She also believes that “children always have to be whipped” (229), which is unfeminine and against the maternal instinct. However, her loving nature has the place of femininity secured in her. The narrator draws our attention to this aspect:

To tell the truth, then, Miss Ophelia loved him [Augustine St. Clare]. When a boy, it had been hers to teach him his catechism, mend his clothes, comb his hair, and bring him up generally in the way he should go; and her heart having a warm side to it . . . he succeeded very easily in persuading her that . . . she must go with him to take care of Eva, and keep everything from going to wreck and ruin during the frequent illness of his wife. The idea of a house without anybody to take care of it went to her heart; then she loved the lovely little girl (148-9)

This extract presents Ophelia – in the true cult of womanhood and domesticity – as the one who loves and cares. It emphasizes the femininity in her. Thus the blend of gender in her makes her an androgynous personality.

Then, Tom, sold as a slave to Simon Legree after the death of Augustine St. Clare, makes a bold appearance in Louisiana. It’s a complete switch from femininity to masculinity. Prior to this change, he “manifested a tenderness of feeling, a commiseration for his fellow-sufferers” (325) – a feminine attribute. It is going to be

combined with masculine attribute. This happens when he disobeys the command of Legree to flog a slave girl Lucy:

‘Yes, mas’r,’ said Tom, putting up his hand, to wipe the blood that trickled down his face. ‘I’m willing to work, night and day, and work while there’s life and breath in me; but this yer thing I can’t feel it right to do; and, mas’r, I never shall do it – never!’ (330)

It is the end of his submissiveness. There is a strong determination in his voice and a strong defiance. Paradoxically the very “tenderness of feeling” for “his fellow-sufferers” hardens him to be bold and drives him to defy his master Simon Legree. He gives the reason for his disobedience: “The poor crittur’s sick and feeble; it would be downright cruel, and it’s what I’ll never do, nor begin to. Mas’r, if you mean to kill me, kill me; but as to my raising my hand again anyone here, I never shall – I’ll die first!” (331).

This disobedience reflects his courage, a trait of masculinity. Tom shows the same spirit in disobedience when Cassy and Emmeline lay hiding in the attic from Simon Legree who pesters him to inform him about them. The narrator alludes to the brief conversation between them: “Speak!” thundered Legree, striking him furiously. “Do you know anything?” “I know, mas’r; but I can’t tell anything. I can die!” (382).

This kind of response on the part of Tom requires a great deal of courage which can be perceived in his declaration, “Do the worst you can, my troubles’ll be over soon; but if you don’t repent, yours won’t never end!” (382). In the midst of torture given to him by Legree through his black overseers Sambo and Quimbo, Tom manages to say, “Ye poor, miserable critter!” “there an’t no more ye can do! I forgive ye, with all my soul!” (383). This stoic spirit – “the strength to endure” (Harris 138) – and defiant attitude assert the presence of masculinity in him. These masculine and

feminine responses correlate with circumstances, not with his biological sex. His death to save Cassy and Emmeline is again the outcome of his feminine self-abnegation. By having the perfect blend of both genders, Tom emerges as a full-fledged personality with androgynous potential in him.

The fluidity of Tom's personality tends to be evident as the reader recalls the comments made on him as "good, steady, sensible fellow" (Stowe 4) by Mr. Shelby; "a noble -hearted faithful fellow" (Stowe 32) by Mrs. Shelby and "the most rebellious, saucy, impudent dog" (386) by Simon Legree. Beneath these comments lies the man with androgynous potential of a savior of Eva, Cassy and Emmeline and a martyr. If he had been submissive to Simon Legree as expected in the slave-owning society, he would have survived like other slaves. His failure to repress his masculine impulses is the cause of his death.

Cassy is another character noted for gender subversion and potentiality to go through the feminine and masculine impulses. She is a light-skinned slave and a mother separated from her daughter Eliza/Elsie and a son Henry. Her responses to rapid turn of events in her life happen to be feminine in some cases and masculine in some instances and both on certain occasions. When sold at the age of fourteen to a man whom she considers as the handsomest, she responds in a feminine way experiencing love towards him. Cassy recalls it, "In short, though he did not tell me he had paid two thousand dollars for me, and I was his property, I became his willingly, for I loved him . . . Oh, I did love that man! How I love him now, and always shall, while I breathe!" (336).

This confession reflects the feminine part of Cassy that she was emotional, submissive, and full of love. She was the true cult of womanhood and domesticity and a "good angel" of her lover as well as "faithful" (337), being dependent on him as a

beloved and as a mother of two children. Even as a slave of another person – Butler – she continued to be feminine in the sense of being timid, weak and dependent. It can be noticed in her desperate call for Butler to help when he sold her children, “I tried to beg and plead” and “I told him, and begged him to go and interfere” (339). He ignores her pleas and it triggers off her masculine impulses, projecting her as an aggressive and violent woman. Cassy recalls the event:

It seemed to me something in my head snapped at that moment. I felt dizzy and furious. I remember seeing a great sharp bowie-knife on the table; I remember something about catching it, and flying upon him! And then all grew dark, and I didn't know anymore (339)

It is a transformation from a feminine woman to an aggressive woman. There she stands as a masculine woman. In the words of Gray, “fluid hardens to solid” in “a world of flux” (137).

Later her aggressive instincts become stronger than her maternal instincts.

Cassy recalls her cruel act as a slave of Captain Stuart:

In the course of a year I had a son born. Oh, that child! – how I loved it! How just like my poor Henry the little thing looked! But I had made up my mind – yes, I had. I would never again let a child live to grow up! I took the little fellow in my arms, when he was two weeks old, and kissed him and cried over him; and then I gave him laudanum and held him close to my bosom, while he slept to death. How I mourned and cried over it! (Stowe 340)

The decision taken for infanticide is obviously extreme side of masculinity. It is an unfeminine act as a mother. The softness of the maternal instinct and weakness of the feminine culture accumulate in her personality something that is relatively much

harder and much stronger than what it was before. The deed is both tragic and heroic. It is heroic because it requires a lot of strength, bravery and determination to kill a baby so as to free him from the dehumanizing slavery.

The circumstances cause the transformation in her from the feminine lady and mother to a masculine woman. Cassy's confession reveals this change in her:

‘When I was a girl, I thought I was religious; I used to love God and prayer. Now, I am a lost soul, pursued by devils that torment me day and night; they keep pushing me on and on – and I’ll do it, too, some of these days.’ She said, clenching her hand (340)

Cassy, at this level, is a complex personality for anyone who judges a person on the base of patriarchal norms.

The narrator also notices the complexity of her behavior switching back and forth between masculinity and femininity. He comments on this aspect:

In a few moments, the frenzy fit seemed to pass off; she [Cassy] rose slowly, and seemed to collect herself. Can I do anything more for you, my poor fellow? She said, approaching where Tom lay; “shall I give you some more water?” There was a graceful and compassionate sweetness in her voice and manner, as she said this that formed a strange contrast with the former wildness. (341)

This extract clarifies that neither mild personality [femininity] nor wild behaviour [masculinity] remains fixed forever. Nor is it connected with the biological sex of the person. The androgynous potentials within a person respond in accordance with the circumstances giving stimulus to mild and wild responses. In the words of Gray, it is “a world of flux” where “fluid hardens to solid and solid rushes to fluid” (137).

Cassy – who is driven by circumstances through the stages such as feminine beloved, feminine mother, masculine woman and masculine mother – turns into a feminine mother and woman at the end with the prospect of reunion between her and her daughter Eliza. The narrator describes the change:

Poor Cassy! When she recovered [from the swoon], turned her face to the wall, and wept and sobbed like a child – perhaps, mother, you can tell what she was thinking of! Perhaps you cannot – but she felt as sure, in that hour, that God had mercy on her, and that she should see her daughter – as she did months after (Stowe 396)

The freedom from the dehumanizing slavery, and reunion with her daughter have soothing effect on her personality. The portrayal of such a complex and fluid personality as Cassy subverts the conventional gender norms that are based on very simple and fixed categories in accordance with the biological sex of the person.

The character of George Shelby is marked with clues that reinforce the concept of androgynous personality. When he reaches Red River with the intention of buying Tom back from Simon Legree, the sight of Tom in his last stage shakes him all over. His response towards Tom is feminine. The narrator draws our attention to the emotional part of the meeting between George Shelby and Tom:

When George entered the shed, he felt his head giddy and his heart sick. ‘Is it possible? – Is it possible?’ said he, kneeling down by him. ‘Uncle Tom! My poor – poor old friend!’ Something in the voice penetrated to the ear of the dying. He moved his head gently, smiled, and said – ‘Jesus can make a dying bed Feel soft as downy pillows are.’ Tears which did honor to his manly heart fell from the young man’s eyes, as he bent over his poor friend. (Stowe 386-7)

George feels emotional and sheds tears as a soft tribute for Tom. At this instance his feminine impulses are active, causing gender disruption. With Tom's death, George Shelby is back to his masculine impulse of "self-control" (Harris 108). It is a masculine instinct and Ian M. Harris claims, "Men are in control of their relationships, emotions, and job" (108). The narrator perceives it and points out, "Something in that dying scene had checked the natural fierceness of youthful passion" (Stowe 388). With the same spirit of control he gets the body of Tom into his wagon and with "a forced composure" (389) he declares his intention to Simon Legree for going "to the very first magistrate and expose" the latter (389). Simon Legree takes it very lightly while commenting, "After all, what a fuss, for a dead nigger!" (389). This comment is quick to trigger the sudden aggressive act on the part of George Shelby. The narrator describes it:

"The word was as a spark to a powder magazine. Prudence was never a cardinal virtue of the Kentucky boy. George turned, and, with one indignant blow, knocked Legree flat upon his face; and as he stood over him, blazing with wrath and defiance (389)

Within a short span of time George Shelby has been both feminine and masculine in his responses, striking the note of fluidity. It clarifies that he is exclusively neither masculine nor feminine. The reader witnesses the androgynous potential in George Shelby. Thus he also subverts the gender norms.

Thus in the case of male and female characters gender conformity breaks anytime when the characters are obligated to pass through a strange turn of events. Reading this novel through the perspective of gender brings all male and female as well as white and non-white characters under the same principle of gender disruption/subversion. The characters – such as Eliza, Tom, George Shelby, Cassy,

Augustine St. Clare, Ophelia and Mrs. George Shelby – of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* apparently undermine gender boundaries which are deployed in fairy tales and romances. As a text that dismantles the binary oppositions of gender ideology that delimited the men and women of the Victorian period, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is an apt companion piece to Beecher Stowe's own assumptions of an assertive artistic identity. Aligning her with rebellion against middle-class gender mores, Stowe challenges the gendered boundaries and shows that masculinity and femininity cannot be separated as the dichotomized categories. The given novel, instead, emphasizes the fluidity, which challenges the gendering of ideological web, through gender disruption and gender blending in characters.

Jane Eyre: Fluidity of Gender

In 1847, Charlotte Bronte published her first novel *Jane Eyre* which attracted the public interest as it was a significant departure from the contemporary novels that reinforced traditional gender norms. It was written in the same vein as the novels by her sisters – Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* (1847) and Anne Bronte's *The Tenant of Wildfell Hall* (1847). These novels are noted for gender transgression. According to Warhol, “many critics have read the Bronte's novels as critiques of strict Victorian division between masculinity and femininity; they have pointed to themes of cross-dressing, androgyny, and cross-gendered behavior in the texts of all three Bronte sisters” (861). Carolyn G. Heilbrun refers to the same aspect in Charlotte Bronte and her books:

No woman writers struggled as she struggled against the judgments of sexual polarization, nor resented them so fervently, nor so vividly expressed the pain they cost. The author of *Jane Eyre* was blamed for having no insight into “the truly feminine nature . . . the hold which a

daily round of simple duties and pure pleasures has on those who are content to practise them” at the same time as she was castigated for being the most unfeminine “in the annals of female authorship. Throughout there is a masculine power, breadth and shrewdness, combined with masculine hardness, coarseness and freedom of expression,” the contemporary reviewer announced. Charlotte Brontë’s books were repeatedly called “masculine,” blamed for qualities which, attractive in men, are despicable in women (78)

What Charlotte Brontë and of course her sisters did was to project the characters against traditional gender norms and gender conformity. For instance, Jane Eyre appears “feminine” “in her meek submission to the lover” whom “she calls ‘Master,’” and later she is found to be “in the distinctly ‘masculine’ position of inheriting a living before she becomes Mr. Rochester’s wife” (Warhol 868-9). Elaine Showalter elaborates the response of male critics:

As [Charlotte] Brontë explained, women had to build their heroes from imagination, male critics found these portraits . . . laughably deficient as representations of men. The *Dublin University Magazine* claimed that it “could have made some strictures upon the character of Mr. Rochester . . . bearing us out in an idea we have long entertained, that a female pen is inadequate to portray the character and the passions of a man.” By the 1850s the “woman’s man,” impossibly pious and desexed, or impossibly idle and oversexed, had become as familiar a figure in the feminine novel as the governess. (133)

Brontë was actually trying to strip her major characters of all gender stereotyped features in such a way that each character – male or female – should turn

up as a being with features of both genders. Martin's interpretation of Bronte's female heroines in terms of "feminine ambivalence" suggests the gender blending – androgyny – in her female protagonists:

Her heroines, it is true, demand equal rights. They ask that they be allowed to become active participants in the courtship ritual, and they clearly and unequivocally state that they are men's intellectual equals. However in the final analysis, we see these same rebellious and vocal heroines knuckling down to domesticity with all the passion they had used earlier to refute it. They further negate their earlier inspired speeches by turning worshipful and doglike eyes upon their husbands and abjectly addressing them as 'Master.' True, these husbands were of their own choosing and they fought for and with them, but finally, after demanding equality, they accepted subjugation. (qtd. in Peters 55)

This ambivalence is not exclusive to female protagonist. It can be witnessed in male characters such as Rochester. Such a portrayal highlights androgynous potentials and subverts established gender norms. Carla Kaplan's comment on Rochester's transformation is significant in this regard:

Rochester's partial transformation from being a domineering overpowering, possessive, and preemptory "master," to a "dependent," "powerless," "repentant," and tearful "Edward" is testimony to this potential for personal change. Underwriting such transformation is a hypothesis that identity is mutable, constructed, and, potentially at least, fluid and transformable. (20)

Both male and female protagonists in *Jane Eyre* subvert the gender norms by exposing the cross-gendered features in them. The gender binaries – masculinity and

efforts to save his mad wife. The novel ends with a bright prospect for the couples with a son being born and his eye-sight growing stronger.

The novel delivers a social message that an independent survival is possible for women only when they stop being feminine by being passive and dependent. As for men, the novel seems to point out that an independent man cannot help being emotional, passive and dependent occasionally. The full-fledged life is within the reach of every individual when s/he responds to his/her masculine and feminine responses in an appropriate way. In other words, the person should cease to be a gender stereotype so as to be androgynous to live a full-fledged life.

The most striking point about the novel is the portrayal of the female characters contrary to the conventional gender norms. These characters do not appear to be financially dependent on male characters. For instance Bessie and Miss Abbot work as servants at Gateshead and make an independent living. Similarly Miss Maria Temple works as superintendent of the School Lowood (Bronte 44) and Miss Scatcherd “teaches history and grammar” (Bronte 47) at Lowood. Miss Miller also works in the same school as “under-teacher” (40). Jane Eyre appears as a teacher and as a governess. Her cousins Diana and Mary too make a living as governesses (338). In the same way Miss Fairfax is a housekeeper at Thornfield Hall. Leah is a charwoman in the same place (160). Grace Poole, a seamstress working as a servant at Thornfield Hall (160), receives a high pay as the nursemaid and prison guard for insane Bertha Mason, the wife of the male protagonist Rochester. This kind of work makes these female characters independent. The conversation between Jane and a maid about Grace Poole clarifies it:

“She [Grace Poole] gets good wages, I guess?”

‘Yes,’ said Leah; ‘I wish I had as good; not that mine are to complain of –there’s no stinginess at Thornfield; but they’re not one-fifth of the sum Mrs. Poole receives. And she is laying by: she goes every quarter to the bank at Millcote. I should not wonder that she has saved enough to keep her independent if she liked to leave. . . . (161)

By working for their living, these female characters appear in the masculine light because “work ethic” is one of the male messages and “men are supposed to work for a living” (Harris 13). Work and producing income are the key requisites for being a man in most cultures (Barker 98). Work has often stood as the most fundamental foundation of masculine identity (Edwards 7). Thus by working and producing income, these characters transgress the gender norms.

Consequently, *Jane Eyre* is known as a novel of gender subversion. It undermines the traditional gender norms by exposing male and female characters in gendered behavior on some occasions and cross-gendered behavior on some other occasions. Thus they tend to act under masculine impulses and feminine impulses. Consequently a male character turns out to be feminine on some occasions and female characters disrupt the gender norms by being aggressive. Thus they come up as fluid characters. Jane Eyre, as a narrator, refuses to be submissive towards patriarchal assumptions by arguing against them:

Women are supposed to be very calm generally; but women feel just as men feel; they need exercise for their faculties, and a field for their efforts, as much as their brothers do; they suffer from rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer; and it is narrow-minded in their more privileged fellow-creatures to say that they ought to confine themselves to making puddings and knitting

stockings, to playing on the piano and embroidering bags. It is thoughtless to condemn them, or laugh at them, if they seek to do more or learn more than custom has pronounced necessary for their sex.

(106; ch. 12)

This kind of critical attitude on the part of Jane Eyre, a female protagonist, marks gender deviation because she is obviously bold in her critical outlook, disobedient of gender norms and far from being modest.

Not only the arguments but even actions that take place every now and then suggest the occasional gender disruptions. Jane Eyre –as a ten-year-old girl in the house of Mrs. Reed, as a teacher, as a governess and as a woman of independent means – transgresses the conventional gender norms. Jane Eyre as a ten-year-old girl in the house of her aunt Mrs. Reed at Gateshead momentarily gives the impression of being feminine when she as a narrator recalls the past, “every nerve I had feared him [her fourteen-year-old cousin John Reed], and every morsel of flesh on my bones shrunk when he came near. There were moments when I was bewildered by the terror he inspired” (6). She also confesses that she was “habitually obedient to John” (6). As she relates how he “bullied and punished me” (6), she emerges as a feminine figure, being obedient, dependent, timid, diffident and tolerant. If she continues to behave in that way consistently, she tends to be a gender stereotype. However, her repressed masculinity is bound to manifest as she reacts against the tyrannical behavior of John Reed. This happens when John Reed, displeased with her liberty to read his books, wounds her by flinging a volume at her. This activates the masculine impulses in her showing that she is capable of being wild, violent and aggressive like her cousin John Reed. Jane Eyre recalls the situation:

. . . the volume was flung, it hit me, and I fell, striking my head against the door and cutting it. The cut bled, the pain was sharp: my terror had passed its climax; other feelings succeeded. ‘Wicked and cruel boy!’ I said. ‘You are like a murderer – you are like a slave-driver – you are like the Roman emperors!’ (7)

It is the beginning of rebellion and a small imperceptible crack in the mold of femininity. Jane Eyre adds further to highlight her violent spirit:

He ran headlong at me; I felt him grasp my hair and my shoulder: he had closed with a desperate thing. I really saw in him tyrant – murderer. I felt a drop or two of blood from my head trickle down my neck, and was sensible of some pungent suffering: these sensations, for the time, predominated over fear. I don’t very well know what I did with my hands, but he called me ‘Rat! rat!’ We were parted: I heard the words – ‘Dear! dear! What a fury to fly at Master John!’ ‘Did ever anybody see such a picture of passion!’ (7)

It is the instance of her aggression – a masculine trait – that is unleashed as a reaction against John’s tyranny. Jane Eyre too confesses, “I resisted all the way: a new thing for me” (8). The new thing is the part of the androgynous nature that manifests as a reaction. It is a shocking conduct for the girl in the Victorian period.

The further instance of aggression on the part of Jane Eyre and its effect on others can be observed in the following conversations:

‘Hold her arms, Miss Abbot; she’s like a mad cat.’

‘For shame! For shame!’ cried the lady’s maid. ‘What shocking conduct, Miss Eyre, to strike a young gentleman, your benefactress’s son! Your young master.’ ‘Master! How is he my master? Am I a

servant?’ ‘No; you are less than a servant, for you do nothing for your keep. There sit down and think over your wickedness.’ They had got me . . . and had thrust me upon a stool; my impulse was to rise from it like a spring (8)

This is an instance of rebellion, an act of masculinity. To be a rebel is one of the male messages (Harris 13-4). Jane defies authority and becomes nonconformist as a rebel. Miss Abbot and Bessie are gender stereotypes. They expect her to “be humble” (Bronte 9). Jane Eyre at the moment is the embodiment of masculinity. She is neither modest, nor timid, nor weak. Now she gives the impression of being bold, strong and rebellious – masculine – as the result of her masculine impulses stimulated. The “impulse” to “rise from it like a spring” is not and cannot be feminine.

It is an instance – as “exclusive gender identity is the suppression of natural similarities” that “requires repression” of “masculine traits” in women and “feminine traits” in men (Rubin qtd. in Glover and Kaplan XXIV) – when repressed traits manifest momentarily. This event illustrates the hidden/suppressed potentials in every being – masculine or feminine – that tends to be activated according as the situation demands. Bessie and Miss Abbot perceive it while being critical about it:

‘She never did so before,’ at last said Bessie, turning to the Abigail.
 ‘But it was always in her,’ was the reply. ‘I’ve told missis often my opinion about the child She’s an underhand little thing; I never saw a girl of her age with so much cover.’ (Bronte 8)

Jane Eyre as a bold girl is not an everlasting transformation. It is just an outcome of momentary impulse of masculinity in her. Soon as she is locked in the Red Room as the punishment, she is seized with timidity. As the room is associated with the memories of Mr. Reed, her late uncle, fears and tears replace her masculine

boldness and rebellion. She recalls, “I grew by degrees cold as a stone, and then my courage sank” (12). Fearing that Mr. Reed’s spirit might rise before her in the dark chamber, she gets into a panic with tears. She remembers, “ I [Jane] wiped my tears and hushed my sobs, fearful lest any sign of violent grief might waken a preternatural voice to comfort me, or elicit from the gloom some haloed face bending over me with strange pity” (13). Jane Eyre is feminine at this instance. Watching a streak of light in the dark, she is agitated:

My heart beat thick – my head grew strong; a sound filled my ears,
which I deemed the rushing of the wings; something seemed near me; I
was oppressed, suffocated; endurance broke down; I rushed to the door
and shook the lock in desperate effort. (13)

She requests Bessie and Miss Abbot, “Take me out! Let me go into the nursery!” (14). She appeals to Mrs. Wood in a pathetic way: “Oh aunt, have pity! Forgive me! I cannot endure it – let me be punished some other way! I shall be killed if – . . .” (14). Jane Eyre on this occasion is the same feminine being of the Victorian period. She lacks courage, rational way of thinking, and confidence. Instead, she is being nervous, diffident, timid, nervous and emotional. This kind of gender switch from femininity to masculinity and vice versa vindicates the fluid personality of Jane Eyre, showing her as the wild cat and then as a terrified cat. Evidently it asserts the presence of androgynous personality in her.

The blended personality in her – masculinity and femininity – continues in a consistent way. Notwithstanding the fact that she is dependent and physically weak after the punishment in Red Room, she remains defiant and bold in her manners:

John . . . once attempted chastisement; but as I instantly turned against
him, roused by the same sentiment of deep ire and desperate revolt

which had stirred my corruption before, he thought it better to desist, and ran from me uttering execrations and vowing that I had burst his nose. I had indeed leveled at that prominent feature as hard a blow as my knuckles could inflict; and when I saw that either that or my look daunted him, I had the greatest inclination to follow up my advantage to purpose; but he was already with his mamma. (23; ch. 4)

This extract acts as instance of gender subversion in the case of Jane and John: Jane's bold behavior and John's act of running out of timidity transgress the gender norms and suggest fluidity in their gender behaviour.

If her weakness and dependence represent the feminine traits in her, her lack of modesty and submissiveness at present as well as her bold and defiant manners and way of thinking point out the masculine aspects in her. For instance, on hearing Mrs. Reed advise her son John, "I do not choose that either you or your sisters should associate with her" (23), she is bold enough to cry out loudly, "They are not fit to associate with me" (23). It's an "audacious declaration" (23). Thus, on the base of these instances, it can be pointed out that at this juncture she is neither exclusively feminine – being modest, submissive, emotional, gentle, mild and so on – nor masculine, being independent, rational, assertive, bold, aggressive and so on.

Gender transgression tends to be unavoidable in a provocative situation. Jane's defiant behavior activates both masculine and feminine impulses in Mrs. Reed. She is driven by aggressive instincts and timidity. The narrator adds:

. . . on hearing this strange and audacious declaration [of Jane], she [Mrs. Reed] ran nimbly up the stairs, swept me like a whirlwind into the nursery, and crushing me down on the edge of my crib, dared me in an emphatic voice to rise from that place or utter one syllable during

the remainder of the day. “What would Uncle Reed say to you if he were alive?” was my scarcely voluntary demand. . . . I say . . . as if . . . something spoke out of me over which I had no control.

‘What?’ said Mrs. Reed under her breath: her usually cold, composed grey eye became troubled with a look of fear; she took her hand from my arm, and gazed at me. . . . (23-4)

The extract shows Mrs. Reed’s masculine trait in her aggressive act of sweeping Jane “like a whirlwind into the nursery, and crushing” her (Jane) “down on the edge” of her crib. A moment after the aggressive act, the feminine trait – fear – overtakes her. Besides we notice that Jane as a ten-year-old girl is physically weak but mentally she is so strong that she defies her aunt Mrs. Reed with a teasing question, just to ignore her warning not to “utter one syllable” (23). Jane continues to be defiant despite being weak and dependent and Mrs. Reed’s gender and cross-gender traits manifest in a way of switching back and forth. A moment of fear is preceded and followed by aggression and it exposes the fluidity and androgyny in Mrs. Reed. The narrator Jane illustrates it:

“My Uncle Reed is in heaven, and can see all you do and think; and so can papa and mamma; they know how you shut me up all day long, and how you wish me dead.” Mrs. Reed soon recalled her spirits: she shook me most soundly; she boxed both my ears, and left me without a word. (24)

These are the instances of gender disruption. Charlotte Brontë’s confession “When I write about women, I am sure of my ground” (qtd. in Showalter 133) rules out the possibility of exaggeration in the portrayal of female characters and their gender transgression.

So in the case of Jane Eyre, gendered boundaries are going to be inactive and gender disruption is going to be frequent. Her retaliation with John Reed who is elder to her by four years is an instance of female gender deviation. It foreshadows Bertha – Rochester’s wife – who overpowers her husband. The toughness in these two characters – Jane and Bertha – constitutes gender deviation because toughness is always associated with male and his masculinity. Jane Eyre and Bertha challenge the binary understanding of gender and undermine hegemonic understanding of gender as natural. It facilitates the argument that masculine-coded gender traits do manifest in female bodies, which are able to show behaviors and mannerisms conventionally associated with femininity and masculinity. Likewise, the way John Reed and Rochester are overpowered by female counterparts strengthens the argument that feminine-coded gender traits also appear in male bodies that exhibit and embrace the behaviors of both genders. It allows the possibility that (fe)male body can perform both masculine and feminine gender roles.

For instance, Jane Eyre reflects in an aggressive way when Mrs. Reed – in the presence of Mr. Brocklehurst, an authority of Lowood School – points out that Jane’s worst fault is “the tendency to deceit” (30). The self-revelatory act of thinking in Jane shows her masculine impulses at work: “*Speak* I must; I had been trodden on severely, and must turn; but how? What strength had I to dart retaliation at my antagonist?” (Bronte 32).

This masculine inner-flow is at contrast with her instinct to care for a little hungry robin: “The remains of my breakfast of bread and milk stood on the table, and having crumbled a morsel of roll, I was tugging at the sash to put out the crumbs on the window–still. . .” (26). On both occasions, the mind responds to a stimulus and the response in the tone of rebellion is masculine and the response towards robin is

feminine. Thus Jane's personality, instead of being categorized as exclusively feminine or masculine, is marked for its fluidity.

Jane's growth into a fluid personality coincides with gender transgressions of other characters. Miss Scatcherd, a teacher at Lowood Institute, is noted for aggressive behavior, a cross-gendered trait. She "inflicted" on the neck of Helen Burns, a sick student, "a dozen strokes with the bunch of twigs" just because Helen Burns did not wash her hands that morning (50; chapt 6). It is a sadistic conduct for "sadism consists in the exercise of violence or power upon some other person or object" (Silverman 324). Freud associated sadism with masculinity (Malson 165). The pupil Helen Burns is also animated with a masculine "strength to endure" (Harris 138). The narrator describes the sadistic act of Miss Scatcherd:

This ominous tool she [Helen] presented to Miss Scatcherd with a respectful courtesy, then she quietly, and without being told, unloosed her pinafore, and the teacher instantly and sharply inflicted on her neck a dozen strokes with the bunch of twigs. Not a tear rose to Burns' eye . . . (50; chapt 6)

Miss Scatcherd's cruel act is an act of her masculine exposure. Helen's masculinity lies in her silent endurance. This masculinity of endurance is different from Jane Eyre's masculine way of rebellious thinking. She confesses it to Helen Burns: "If I were in your place I should dislike her; I should resist her. If she struck me with that rod, I should get it from her hand; I should break it under her nose" (52). Helen Burns's reasoning involves stoicism. She argues, "Yet it would be your duty to bear it, if you could not avoid it: it is weak and silly to say you *cannot bear* what it is fate to be required to bear" (52).

The narrator is puzzled to see such a power of endurance in her. Jane admits, “I heard her with wonder. I could not comprehend this doctrine of endurance” (52). This instance reveals that the hidden potentials – associated with femininity and masculinity – get activated at the right time. Then the gender transgression is inevitable and unavoidable. In *Helen Burns*, it manifests in the form of stoic fortitude which is a masculine attribute. One of the male messages is to be “stoic” and “ignore pain in your body,” “achieve even though it hurts” and “do not admit weakness” (Harris 13). In *Miss Scatcherd* it appears in the form of sadistic aggression and in *Jane Eyre* it comes up in the form of rebellion. Harris includes it as one of the male messages: “Rebel: Defy authority and be a non-conformist. Question and rebel against system” (13).

However, to be a rebel in the case of Jane does not imply the end of feminine impulses in her. They are quick to act out when the appropriate stimulus works on her. For instance, on the occasion when Mr. Brocklhurst declares in the presence of other pupils that Jane is a “liar” (Bronte 63) and she “repaid by an ingratitude” for the “kindness” and “generosity” of her “benefactress” –Mrs Reed-- “who adopted her in her orphan state” (Bronte 63), Jane’s “tears watered the boards” (64) and she “continued to weep aloud” (65). A bold girl with the heart of a rebel also has a soft corner to experience the feminine impulse and shed tears.

Helen Burns, whose death is imminent owing to her consumption, can be taken as a touch-stone to evaluate the gender traits of Miss Temple and Miss Scatcherd – teachers at Lowood School – and Jane Eyre. Miss Temple, embracing Jane and Helen Burns, feels strong compassion for Helen: “it was for her [Helen] she [Miss Temple] a second time breathed a sad sigh; for her she wiped a tear from her cheek” (70). The feminine impulse drives her to be emotional for Helen due to her

(Helen) approaching death. On the contrary, Miss. Scatcherd continues to be aggressive and sadistic even in such pathetic circumstances of Helen. At this occasion, on finding Helen Burns's untidy drawer, she inflicts a punishment which exposes Miss Scatcherd as a case of gender subversion:

Next morning, Miss Scatcherd wrote in conspicuous characters on a piece of pasteboard the word "Slattern," and bound it like a phylactery round Helen's large, mild, intelligent, and benign-looking forehead. She wore it till evening, patient, unresentful, regarding it as a deserved punishment. (70)

If Helen Burns with "mild" and "intelligent" "forehead" as well as patient outlook embodies androgynous spirit, Miss Scatcherd represents the sadistic part of the masculinity. Besides, dichotomy between Miss Temple and Miss Scatcherd as teachers is the dichotomy between feminine virtue and masculine vice. The same event rouse both impulses – masculine and feminine – in Jane one and the same time:

The moment Miss Scatcherd withdrew after afternoon school, I ran to Helen, tore it off, and thrust it into the fire; the fury of which she was incapable had been burning in my soul all day, and tears, hot and large, had continually been scalding my cheek; for the spectacle of her sad resignation gave me an intolerable pain at the heart. (70)

The way she "tore off" the pasteboard and the "fury" that kept "burning" in her "soul all day" represent the masculine part of aggression in her and the "tears" "scalding" her cheek and the pain at her heart stand for the feminine impulses in her. Thus one and the same time, she tends to be masculine and feminine.

In the case of Miss Temple's emotional involvement for Helen, there is gender conformity and as for Miss Scatcherd, there is gender subversion as she acts in

an aggressive way toward Helen without a sign of emotional attachment in her for Helen. As for Jane, both masculinity and femininity are at work one and the same time – a case of gender blending that asserts the androgynous personality. She embodies the fluidity in her responses.

In the later period, her blended personality develops in a consistent way. She works as a teacher for two years in the same school and as a governess in Thornfield Hall. Harris argues in the name of Work Ethic that “men are supposed to work for a living. . .” (13). From this point of view too, Jane Eyre exhibits the masculine attribute of being independent by working herself for a living. Masculinity in her can also be witnessed in the form of her activity as a pupil at school. Jane Eyre describes it:

During these eight years my life was uniform . . . it was not inactive. I had the means of an excellent education placed within my reach; a fondness for some of my studies and a desire to excel in all, together with a great delight in pleasing my teachers . . . urged me on. I availed myself fully of the advantages offered me. In time I rose to be the first girl of the first class; then I was invested with the office of teacher; which I discharged with zeal for two years (Bronte 80)

In this extract, Jane Eyre appears to be active, intelligent and in the end, an independent being. Harris refers to some qualities of classical man as male messages. One of them is “Be the best you can: Do your best. Do not accept being second” (Harris12). Jane proves to be the best. Another quality is to be “Scholar: Be the knowledgeable. . . . Value book learning. Read and study” (Harris13). Jane is found to have accomplished it too. Apart from that, she is capable of making decisions in an independent way – another masculine attribute. Now she decides to find another job

and she goes ahead with necessary things to be done such as advertising in the *shire Herald*:

A young lady accustomed to tuition . . . is desirous of meeting with a situation in a private family where the children are under fourteen She is qualified to teach the usual branches of a good English education, together with French, Drawing and Music (Bronte 83)

She posts the document in a due manner. The details given in the advertisement do not give the impression of Jane being modest, dependent and weak, unintelligent and incapable of working. Obviously Jane presently tends to be a case of gender subversion because she projects such attributes in her which are considered to be masculine from the perspective of conventional gender norms.

Jane as a governess at Thornfield Hall assures her personality as a masculine woman/ independent woman who is not at all passive while being at work. Being bold, she enjoys walking all alone in the evening till it is night. She confesses it in conversation with Rochester when she meets him on the way for the first time:

‘I should think you ought to be at home yourself,’ said he, ‘if you have a home in this neighborhood. Where do you come from?’

‘From just below; and I am not at all afraid of being out late when it is moonlight. I will run over to Hay for you with pleasure, if you wish it; indeed, I am going there to post a letter.’ (110-1; ch. 12)

Thus presently she is masculine as she is “not at all afraid of being out late when it is moonlight.”

Besides, when Rochester and his horse slip on the sheet of ice, Jane is there to help him, a perfect stranger to her till then. It is a reversal of the situation in romance. Rochester on horseback is not there to help a damsel/a lady but to receive help from a

lady. Here it is obvious that masculinity and femininity are not biologically determined. Gender tends to be fluid. She is bold; she is helpful but she is obedient. On the contrary Richard appears to be strong but he is weak in the given situation. Both of them act in a masculine and feminine way in the given situation:

‘Try to get hold of my horse’s bridle and lead him to me. You are not afraid?’ I should have been afraid to touch a horse when alone, but when told to do it I was disposed to obey. I put down my muff on the stile, and went up to the tall steed; I endeavored to catch the bridle . . . I made effort on effort, though in vain: meantime I was mortally afraid of its trampling forefeet. The traveler waited . . . and at last he laughed. ‘I see,’ he said; “the mountain will never be brought to Mohomet, so all you can do is to aid Mohomet to get to the mountain; I must beg of you to come here.’ I came. ‘Excuse me,’ he continued; ‘necessity compels me to make you useful.’ He laid a heavy hand on my shoulder, and, leaning on me with some stress, limped to his horse. Having once caught the bridle, he mastered it directly, and sprang to his saddle . . . ‘Now,’ said he, releasing his under lip from a hard bite, ‘Just hand me my whip; It lies there under the hedge.’ (111-2)

The above extract illustrates the fluidity of gender. It shows Jane, though timid, bold enough to try controlling the horse and help Rochester to get onto the horse. Obviously she reveals both feminine and masculine dimensions one and the same time. As for Rochester, he depends on her to get back onto the saddle. Momentarily he has to play the feminine role being dependent on Jane and once he is on the horse back, he is back to his masculine trait and spirit. Thus an individual is likely to play masculine and feminine roles in the same event. The circumstances

compel the person to get out of the mold of masculinity/femininity and do what is inevitable. The rigid gender conformity is not a practical solution. Rochester should seek the help and depend on her to resume the journey. Similarly Jane Eyre should come forward deviating from the gender norms to help for the sake of humanity. She is not supposed to be indifferent towards Rochester for the sake of maintaining the norms of feminine behavior.

Jane's present act of helping Rochester foreshadows her future act of saving his life from fire. At this instance too, the gender fluidity on the part of Jane Eyre and Rochester is consistent. Jane Eyre once again proves her masculinity by acting promptly to save him. This masculine act of Rochester's rescue from fire is preceded by moments that reflect her femininity in being emotional about Rochester: "If he does go, the challenge will be doleful. Suppose he should be absent spring, summer and autumn: how joyless sunshine and fine days will seem!" (Bronte 144). It is followed by her masculine deed of saving him from fire.

At first when she hears "a vague murmur" (144) at night, she reacts with her feminine impulses which are apparent in expressions: "my spirits were depressed," "my heart beat anxiously," and "my first impulse was to rise and fasten the bolt" (144). Soon her feminine trait of timidity is overtaken by the masculine behaviour. The masculine impulses, being set in motion, prompt her to come out of the chamber and witness the fire in Rochester's chamber and Rochester lying "stretched motionless in deep sleep" (145). This unforeseen event releases her from passivity and animates her with energy and action/activity:

'Wake! Wake!' I cried. I shook him . . . the smoke had stupefied him.
Not a moment could be lost: the very sheets were kindling. I rushed to
his basin and ewer . . . both was filled with water. I heaved them up,

deluged the bed and its occupant, flew back to my own room, brought my own water – jug, baptized the couch afresh, and, by God’s aid, succeeded in extinguishing the flames which were devouring it. (145)

This extract shows gender disruption on the part of Jane and Rochester. She is animated with activity whereas he is struck with passivity.

During the rush of this activity, Rochester is reduced to the feminine state: dependent and passive. The following extract shows the contrast:

Though it was now dark, I knew he was awake; because I heard him fulminating strange anathemas at finding himself lying in a pool of water. ‘Is there a flood?’ he cried. ‘No, sir,’ I answered; ‘but there has been a fire: get up, do; you are quenched now; I will fetch you a candle.’ (145)

If Jane Eyre transgresses the gender norms by being active, bold and energetic in the given situation, Rochester does the same by being passive, and weak. As a matter of fact, she plays the role of a man – a “tough guy” having stamina, neither crying nor backing down from the challenge (Harris 146).

These masculine potentials enable her to be a savior of Rochester. He also acknowledges it, “Why, you have saved my life – snatched me from a horrible and excruciating death!” (Brontë 147). At this instance Jane Eyre is like men who “take death defying risks to prove themselves and identify with war heroes” (Harris 13). Rochester also gives the impression of knowing her masculine part when in the guise of a gypsy woman and a fortune teller he points out the masculine trait on her forehead – sense of reason. He states that her brow professes to say, “I can live alone, if self-respect and circumstances require me so to do” (197). It refers to her will-

power to live in an independent way. It is one of the masculine traits. He also points out that she, as a person, is guided by reason:

The forehead declares, “Reason sits firm and holds the reins, and she will not let the feelings burst away and hurry her to wild chasms. The passions may range furiously, like true heathens, as they are; and the desires may imagine all sorts of vain things: but judgement shall still have the last word in every argument, and the casting vote in every decision. (Bronte 197)

The extract refers to the power of control in her over her feelings, passions and desires. It is the masculine quality because it is believed that “men are in control of their relationships, emotions, and job” (Harris 12). Presence of this quality in Jane Eyre is noted for gender transgression.

Even Rochester’s disguise as a gypsy woman “on a red cloak and a black bonnet” (Bronte 191) muttering “words to herself” (192) – as a fortune teller – in Thornfield Hall is a significant aspect in the matters of gender. It is a case of transvestism. Momentarily Rochester is a transvestite as he dresses like a person of the opposite sex. Richard Ekins and Dave King argues, “Children are pushed in one or other gender direction and consequently anything associated with the other gender has to be suppressed, particularly in the case of males. Transvestism is the expression of this suppressed femininity” (122-3). Hence Rochester’s appearance as a transvestite – for a limited time – implies the femininity in him that has been suppressed. However, on other occasions he is authoritative person giving instructions here and there as a masculine man.

On the occasion when Mr. Richard Mason is wounded in the hands of his sister Mad Bertha – Rochester’s wife – Rochester’s masculinity as an authoritative

person is fully in force. By taking quick decisions, passing instructions and getting active, he handles the situation. He bids Jane to fetch a sponge and salts (Bronte 204) and goes ahead with his activity. The narrator describes it, “He took the sponge, dipped it in, and moistered the corpse-like face; he asked for my smelling bottle, and applied it to the nostrils . . . opened the shirt of the wounded man . . . sponged away blood . . .” (Bronte 205). Further he engages Jane in the care of Richard Mason, rushes out and returns in less than two hours with a surgeon Carter. The following extract shows the authoritative behavior of Rochester as a mark of masculine identity:

‘Now, Carter, be on the alert,’ he said to this last:
 ‘I give you but half an hour for dressing the wound, fastening the bandages, getting the patient downstairs and all.’ ‘But is he fit to move, Sir?’ ‘No doubt of it; it is nothing serious; he is nervous, his spirits must be kept up. Come, set to work.’ (207-8)

Rochester even decides to administer a dose of something he has brought from Rome. The following extract projects Rochester as being strong, assertive and authoritative:

‘Drink, Richard: it will give you the heart you lack, for an hour or so.’
 ‘But will it hurt me – is it inflammatory?’
 ‘Drink! drink! drink!’
 Mr Mason obeyed, because it was evidently useless to resist
 Mr Rochester let him sit three minutes after he had swallowed the liquid; he then took his arm – ‘Now I am sure you can get on your feet,’ he said; ‘try.’ The patient rose. ‘Carter [surgeon], take him under the other shoulder. Be of good cheer, Richard; step out – that’s it!’
 (210)

In the present situation, Rochester acts in a masculine way by being authoritative, making decisions and giving instructions while Jane and Carter tend to be feminine, obeying him. The way she behaves currently is in accordance with the gender norms despite the fact Jane is independent, earning her bread as a governess and Rochester is emotionally dependent on her. Hence the gender conformity and gender transgression can be witnessed in the same context.

What is more, the external events also play a role in activating the gender and cross-gender behavior. The interruption of her wedding with Rochester – by the discovery that he is already married to Bertha, who is confined at Thornfield Hall – prompts her to act in a masculine way by taking decision to leave the place. It again exposes Jane’s determination and sense of self-reliance and Rochester’s weakness. A temporary gender switch in Jane is conspicuous in her confession, “I shook, I feared – but I resolved.” The words “shook” and “feared” project her femininity and “resolved” points out her masculinity. The narrator, Jane, recalls:

I laid my hand on the back of a chair for support: I shook, I feared – but I resolved. ‘One instant, Jane. Give one glance to my horrible life while you are gone. All happiness will be torn away with you. What then is left? . . . What shall I do, Jane? Where turn for a companion, and for some hope?’ ‘Do as I do: trust in God and yourself. Believe in heaven. Hope to meet again there.’ ‘Then you will not yield?’ ‘No.’ ‘Then you condemn me to live wretched, and to die accursed?’ (Bronte 312)

The above extract presents Jane as being strong, confident and determined and Rochester as weak, vulnerable and emotionally dependent on Jane. It is an instance of gender switch and gender transgression.

Masculine firmness in Jane and feminine weakness in Rochester can be witnessed in the following conversation too:

‘You are going, Jane?’

‘I am going, Sir.’

‘You are leaving me?’

‘Yes.’ ‘You will not come? You will not be my comforter, my rescuer?

My deep love, my wild woe, my frantic prayer, are all nothing to you?’

What unutterable pathos was in his voice! How hard it was to reiterate.

‘I am going.’

‘Jane!’

‘Mr Rochester!’

‘Withdraw, then – I consent; but . . . cast a glance on my suffering and think of me.’

He turned away; he threw himself on his face on the sofa.

‘Oh, Jane! my hope – my love – my life!’ broke in anguish from his lips. Then came a deep, strong sob. (314)

Rochester’s feminine impulses can be perceived in the above extract in the form of his weakness emotional involvement and dependence on Jane. The “strong sob” is the sign of his femininity.

This gender switch is temporary in the case of Jane because soon after, as she leaves the place, she is seized with the same weakness and emotional outburst as Rochester. She recalls: “I was weeping wildly . . . along my solitary way A weakness, beginning inwardly, extending to the limbs, seized me, and I fell; I lay on the ground some minutes, pressing my face to the wet turf. I had some fear . . . that here I should die. . .” (Bronte 317). At this instance, she sounds vulnerable and

emotional. “Weeping,” “fear” and “weakness” in the extract refer to the feminine aspect in her. This feminine outburst is soon overtaken by the stoic spirit of masculinity. Jane admits, “. . . but I was soon up, crawling forwards on my hands and knees, and then again raised to my feet – as eager and as determined as ever to reach the road” (317). The act of “raising” and “determined” to go further stand for the stoic spirit. Ian M. Harris defines it:

‘Stoic’ comes from Greek and refers to a specific philosophy of existence that states a man’s duty is to accept cheerfully whatever happens – poverty, disease, persecution, slavery, or even death – secure in the knowledge that all is for the best. It is a mainly virtue to be stoical – strong, calm and unmoved by good or bad fortune. Whether slave or emperor, the true stoic stands beyond hope or fear, believing that he has the strength to endure The ‘stoic’ message encourages men to control emotions and deny wounds. A stoic bears hardships with a stiff upper lip. (118)

Her lonely journey across the unknown territory between Thornfield Hall and Marsh End or Moor House unleashes her androgynous impulses. First of all, it brings out her feminine impulses that can be perceived in her act of “weeping wildly” as she walked along her solitary way, in her “weakness” and “fear” that she “should die” and in her “stormy, scalding, heart-wrung tears” as “poured” from her eyes (Bronte 317). Soon these impulses give way to her stoic way of enduring the harder experiences of life. The stoic attitude becomes conspicuous, as she travels for two days, in her thoughts “The burden must be carried . . . the suffering endured” (320) and “I must struggle on: strive to live and bend to toil like the rest” (321). It is evident that she can control her emotions, deny her wounds and bear her hardships with a stiff upper lip.

Her reflections – “I felt it would be degrading to faint with hunger”; “I felt sorely urged to weep; but . . . I retrained it” (321) and “I blamed none of those who repulsed me” (324) – expose her as a stoic person and thereby a masculine part of her androgynous personality.

This state of masculinity – stoic fortitude – ends when she finds shelter in Mars End / Moor House that belongs to St. John Rivers and his sisters, Diana and Mary. Her physical weakness obliges her to be dependent on St. John Rivers for a few weeks. St John Rivers assumes rightly that she does not want to be limited by gendered boundaries when he puts forward: “You would not like to be long dependent on our hospitality – you would wish, I see, to dispense as soon as may be with my sisters compassion, and above all, with my charity: you desire to be independent of us?” (344).

Obviously Jane rejects this feminine state of dependence by accepting the job of a school mistress for thirty pounds a year at a village school for girls. This initiates her life as an independent and intellectual woman. It is the life of masculinity and gender disruption. She confesses, “I taught the elements of grammar, geography, history and the finer kinds of needlework” (361). Such activities mark her as the transgressor of conventional gender norms. Miss Oliver, her host, is surprised to discover that Jane Eyre is not what a woman is expected to be in the patriarchy:

One evening . . . she discovered first two French books, a volume of Schiller, a German grammar and dictionary, and then my drawing materials and some sketches, including a pencil – head of a pretty little cherub – like girl . . . and sundry views from nature She was first transfixed with surprise, and then electrified with delight. (364)

Miss Oliver is surprised and transfixed because it is a matter of gender deviation as only men are found to be scholars and nature lovers. Ian M. Harris argues, “The category of standard bearer contains four male messages – ‘scholar’, ‘nature lover’, ‘be the best you can’, and ‘good samaritan’” (56). The above extract shows the first two qualities in *Jane Eyre*.

As for the third male message, ‘be the best you can’, men find and create outlets to demonstrate their masculinity by being the best they can in a variety of arenas (Harris 64). They hope their performance will impress others so that they can gain the respect of men (64). *Jane Eyre* has the same masculine quality of doing her best which earns her recognition in Morton. It can be perceived in what Jane admits:

I felt I became a favourite in the neighbourhood. Whenever I went out, I heard on all sides cordial salutations, and was welcomed with friendly smiles. To live amidst general regard, though it be but the regard of working people, is like ‘sitting’ in sunshine, calm and sweet’: serene inward feelings bud and bloom under the ray. (Bronte 362)

As for the male message to be a good Samaritan – “Do good deeds and acts. Put others’ need first. Set a good example” (12) – Harris states, “Males demonstrate their concern for others in a variety of ways that range from being kind to being involved in political causes” (67). They give to charities, volunteer at their children’s school, serve on boards, become deacons at church, and participate in politics (67). *Jane Eyre* has this quality of males by being kind to her cousins St John, Diana and Mary. When she inherits twenty thousand pounds from her uncle John in Madeira, she instantly decides:

Those who had saved my life, whom, till this hour, I had loved barrenly, I could now benefit Twenty thousand pounds share

equally, would be five thousand each – enough and to spare justice would be done – mutual happiness secured. (Bronte 381)

The narrator recalls asking St John: “‘Write to Diana and Mary tomorrow,’ I said, ‘and tell them to come home directly. Diana said they would both consider themselves rich with a thousand pounds, so with five thousand they will do very well’” (381). This kind of generous act demonstrates the masculine trait of being a “good samaritan” in her. It is blended with feminine instincts which prompt her to leave Morton and move towards Thornfield Hall. Her emotional involvement with Rochester – a feminine attribute – drives her away from Morton for Thornfield Hall. Thus fluidity is evident in her and Rochester too as considerable variation is noticed in their behavior.

The patterns of behavior in Rochester during the time of separation from Jane suggest the androgynous personality in him. His emotional attachment with Jane is witnessed in his confession to Jane, “Long as we have been parted, hot tears as I have wept over our separation” (Bronte 438). It implicates his femininity. At the same time, his masculine spirit does not fail to respond when his wife Bertha sets fire to Thornfield Hall. An eye-witness, the butler of Rochester’s father, describes it:

. . . he [Rochester] went up to the attics when all was burning above and below, and got the servants out of the beds and helped them down myself, and went back to get his mad wife out of her cell. And then they called out to him that she was on the roof, where she was standing, waving her arms above the battlements . . . She was a big woman. . . . I witnessed and several more witnessed, Mr Rochester ascend through the skylight onto the roof; we heard him call “Bertha!” we saw him approach her . . . (Bronte 424)

These activities demonstrate his courage, a masculine trait. It is a manly courage to save the inmates of the burning house. Guts Muth defines manly courage largely as chivalry, which “meant protecting the weak . . . as well as saving the victims of fire or accidents” (qtd. in Mosse 42).

This gender fluidity implicates the androgynous personality of Rochester. Presently, due to the same event, he is reduced to a dependent state: ‘blind and a cripple’ (Bronte 425). The following extract illustrates this state:

He descended the one step, and advanced slowly and gropingly towards the grass plot. Where was his darling stride now? Then he paused, as if he knew not which way to turn. He lifted his hand and opened his eyelids; gazed blank, and with a straining effort, on the sky (Bronte 427)

At this instance he appears to be the embodiment of passivity, giving the impression that he has been emasculated. Nevertheless, we feel the traces of masculinity in him when he behaves authoritatively. For instance, as Jane approaches him after a year of separation, he tries to be clear about the identity of the person [Jane] who informs him about Mary [servant] being in the kitchen:

He put out his hand with a quick gesture, but not seeing where I stood, he did not touch me. ‘Who is this? Who is this?’ he demanded, trying, as it seemed, to see with those sightless eyes – unavailing and distressing attempt! ‘Answer me – speak again!’ he ordered, imperiously and aloud. (Bronte 429)

This extract illustrates the masculine impulses being active – despite his blindness – in Rochester that expects her to obey what he says.

In the case of Jane Eyre, the situation is quite contrary. She is in a state where there can be independence and confidence – masculinity. She confesses to Rochester about it, “I told I am independent, sir, as well as rich: I am my own mistress” (Bronte 430). Her confident level sounds high as she admits what she can do and what she is: “Quite rich, sir. If you won’t let me live with you, I can build a house of my own close up to your door, and you may come and sit in my parlour when you want company of an evening” (430). Her economic prosperity enhances the level of confidence in her. Besides, she is bold enough to transgress the conventional gender norms by proposing him in an assertive manner:

I will be your neighbor, your nurse, your housekeeper. I find you lonely: I will be your companion – to read to you, to walk with you, to sit with you, to wait on you, to be eyes and hands to you. Cease to look so melancholy, my dear master; you shall not be left desolate, so long as I live. (431)

It is an instance of gender disruption. She speaks in the language of a man striking the note of assurance and at the same time placing the self in a subordinate position by addressing him as “master”. Obviously it is the language of the androgyne—being masculine and feminine at the same time. She too realizes it when she admits: “I felt like a little embarrassed. Perhaps I had too rashly overleaped conventionalities; and he, like St John, saw impropriety in my considerateness” (431). This feeling implicates the switch of confidence for diffidence and it assures the work of feminine impulses in her.

The strong man tends to be weak, and emotionally dependent as gender behaviour is a matter of circumstances. The following narrative reveals a range of delicate moods resulting from the vulnerable state of Rochester:

‘. . . if you wish me to love you, could you but see how much I do love you, you would be proud and content. All my heart is yours, sir: it belongs to you; and with you it would remain, were fate to exile the rest of me from your presence forever.’ Again, as he kissed me, painful thoughts darkened his aspect. ‘My seared vision! My crippled strength!’ he murmured regretfully. I caressed, in order to soothe him. . . . As he turned aside his face a minute I saw a tear slide from the sealed eyelid, and trickle down the manly cheek. (440)

The extract reveals the low level of confidence and emotional dimension in him despite the reunion with Jane. As he kisses Jane, he remembers his pathetic physical condition due to his “seared vision” and “crippled strength.” It brings out “a tear” which is a clue for the presence of femininity in him. “A tear” on the “manly cheek” is the image of masculinity blended with femininity.

When Jane Eyre admits, “The water stood in my eyes to hear this avowal of his dependence” (435), she sounds feminine. She concludes the same paragraph by declaring, “I dashed off the salt drops, and busied myself with preparing breakfast” (435). At this instance, she is found to be active, which is a masculine feature. Thus both characters consistently exhibit traditional gender features and cross-gender features, tending to be feminine on certain occasions and masculine on some occasions.

Despite the fact that Jane is in superior state owing to her inheritance of a large amount of money – five thousand pounds – and Rochester in an inferior state due to his blindness and being a cripple, she addresses him as “my master” (429) as an acknowledgement of his superior status, and voluntarily presents herself in a subordinate and submissive role. This kind of state suggests that there is a disparity /

contrast between being and becoming. If ‘being’ stands for androgynous potential, ‘becoming’ represents the gender stereotype.

It is an indication that “woman and men simultaneously conform to and resist gender stereotypes” (Maguire 1). Although individuals may present themselves as having a fixed and unified sense of what it means to be male or female, this is often a veneer, a masquerade and sexual identity – the psychological meaning each of us gives to being a woman or a man – is always fluid, and never exactly what it means (1). James Eli Adams, for instance, points out the attributes like “earnestness, independence, and self-discipline” (“Boundaries” 53) in Jane, which reinforce the concept of gender fluidity and contradict the traditional gender norms that assume women being dependent.

Bertha is another character of gender subversion. Her madness plays a very significant role in subverting gender norms. It releases her from the awareness of gender norms, which helps to bring her hidden / inner potentials into action. However it is a matter of speculation whether she is mad because she transgresses the gender norms or she transgresses because she is mad. As a matter of fact, she does not project herself as a Victorian woman having feminine virtues. She is found to be strong and aggressive. She tends to be driven by two aspects: violence and death drive. One is a masculine quality and another feminine quality. Tim Edwards argues:

From the point of view of common sense, for many people men’s propensity towards violence is a direct outcome of their maleness or in short their biology: men have always been more violent than women and always will be: it is their nature. (44)

In the case of Bertha too, we perceive that “women feel just as men feel” (Bronte 106). She also shows the propensity towards violence. On one occasion she

attacks her brother Richard Mason with her teeth. The doctor, while treating the wound, notices the flesh “torn as well as cut” (Bronte 208). He informs Rochester, “The wound was not done with a knife: there have been teeth here!” Richard Mason admits, “She worried me like a tigress, when Rochester got the knife from her” (Bronte 208). The way Bertha acts as aggressor undermines the patriarchal conviction about men being aggressive and woman being the victim of aggression. On another occasion, she exhibits the same violent spirit by targeting her husband, Rochester. Jane recalls witnessing the event:

‘Ware!’ cried Grace. The three gentlemen [Rochester, Richard Mason and a lawyer Briggs] retreated simultaneously. Mr Rochester flung me behind him: the lunatic [Bertha] sprang and grappled his throat viciously, and laid her teeth to his heek: they struggled. She was a big woman, in stature almost throttled him (Bronte 289)

This extract shows Bertha excessively strong, aggressive and violent as an evidence that gender is not biological. In these instances she subverts gender norms that present women as being weak, calm and timid.

Nevertheless, she also has the feminine quality: pure death drive. The pure death drive features in feminine masochism (Brennan 196). Freud associates masochism with femininity (Malson 165). Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar imply the same when they argue: “Self-starvation or anorexia nervosa, masochism, and suicide form a complex of psychoneurotic symptoms that is almost classically associated with female feelings of powerless and rage” (288). Bertha is subjected to ‘the pure death drive.’ Driven by the desire to commit suicide, she sets fire to Thornfield Hall and from the roof she plunges to her death. A witness, the butler of Rochester’s father, recalls as he informs Jane about the event:

They called out to him that she [Bertha] was on the roof, where she was standing, waving her arms above the battlements, and shouting out till they could hear her a mile off: I saw her and heard her with my own eyes I witnessed and several more witnessed, Mr Rochester ascend through the skylight on to the roof; we heard him call “Bertha!” We saw him approach her; and then, ma’am, she yelled and gave a spring, and the next minute she lay smashed on the pavement.

(Bronte 424)

The given extract shows Rochester driven by masculine instinct to save his wife Bertha and Bertha by the masochistic instinct. Hence apart from being masculine, she is also feminine.

Bertha’s madness helps in exposing the true potentials of her. These potentials remain suppressed in women as the patriarchy imposes conventional gender norms and obligates them to become what they are not – stereotype of femininity. Under the constraining circumstances they get out of the mold by acting contrary to conventional gender norms, face the criticism and withdraw into the mold while behaving in a moderate way. So is the case with men. Thus there is a contrast between what men and women are in the real sense and what they become. It is a contrast between “being” and “becoming.” Bertha’s aggression and suicide are not arbitrary acts and the matter of free-will but the outcome of the necessity and obligation under the principle of causality.

Thus every individual is capable of going through experiences – that have been dichotomized into masculinity and femininity – as a response to a stimulus. An individual tends to be masculine when his/her masculine impulses are stirred and feminine when feminine impulses are affected. Circumstances play the role in

activating and deactivating the impulses. People should respond to these circumstances in an adequate manner. A woman needs to be masculine to survive independently, apart from being feminine and man, while being masculine, should be feminine so as to be humane. Eventually this kind of situation leads to the end of sexism.

Adam Bede: Gender Blending

Adam Bede is the first novel of Mary Anne Evans published in 1859 under the pseudonym of George Eliot. The novel's point of departure lies in the portrayal of female protagonist Dinah Morris, who projects masculine gender as her identity throughout the novel by being active and independent as well as being a preacher and a worker and turns towards femininity as her identity at the end of the novel. Elaine J. Lawless argues that *Adam Bede* is about the silencing of the female voice:

The woman preacher in this novel begins with a public voice and an arresting, independent presence. By the end of the novel, she has been silenced, reverted to the initial position women usually hold, a position in which women experience themselves as mindless and voiceless and subject to the whims of external authority. (264)

Obviously it is a pessimistic point of transformation when Dinah Morris, the preacher, and an independent woman with an individual status and determination not to marry becomes a dependent and dutiful wife, mother, and daughter-in-law who finally gives her stance to become a Victorian woman and the cult of womanhood as well as femininity.

It signifies that individuals are obliged to give up their multiple and combined traits so as to live in conformity with traditional gender norms. However, the positive

aspect of the novel is that it exposes the androgynous potentials in her and other characters. Lawless comments on it:

From the first pages, the character of Dinah Morris is drawn as an independent, free spirit, who quietly demands her right to be a woman preacher and to travel about the country alone, living whenever she wants Townspeople . . . take notice when Dinah mounts a wooden cart and preaches to the crowd. They are taken aback by her easy stride, her clear clean grey eyes, her confidence; while they may disapprove of women preachers in general, they grudgingly approve of this one. (252-3)

Dinah's transformation from the independent state to a dependent one projects the realistic dimension of the patriarchal society where each individual with androgynous potential tends to be a gender stereotype. Sarah Gates also notices the dual roles as played by Dinah and comments on it:

Dinah is a "shepherd/ess," a trope I hope will express the gender conflict between the two contradictory positions she occupies: the Puritan preacher or Shepherd [an active masculine subject] and the unattainable pastoral shepherdess [a passive feminine object of desire]. (29)

Dinah's transformation into a submissive wife and mother assures her to a position in patriarchal society in accordance with gender conformity. Nancy Anne Marck points out, "Daryl Ogden identifies Hetty's transgression with her narcissism/exhibitionism, interpreting the novel's movement from female rebellion to conformity as Eliot's acceptance of a Victorian theory of domesticity . . ." (449). Most critics agree that the novel endorses the male-ordered society (448) and Marck argues

that patriarchy obliges Hetty and Dinah to mold themselves in accordance with gender norms:

Hetty and Dinah share a desire for independence and self-determination that is repeatedly quenched by the world of the novel, which forces both young women to confront motherhood and its power to limit female ambition to the fulfillment of male desire. (462)

Although George Eliot has attempted to present the realistic aspect of the society, she is often criticized for it. Kate Flint also reflects the critical attitude while pointing out the contrast between Eliot's superior intellectual powers and her conventional outlook:

This is one of the most disheartening moments in all of Eliot's writing. It is a moment, moreover, which encapsulates the problem that readers have grappled with since the nineteenth century: why should a woman who herself possessed extraordinary intellectual powers, who had a remarkably broad grasp of historical, philosophical, scientific, and literary issues and whose relationship with George Lewes transgressed Victorian convention, be so apparently conventional in many of her views? In particular, why do many of her views concerning women, and the choices faced by women in her writings, seem to lack the boldness that might be expected – even desired – of her?

(“George”159-160)

Obviously, George Eliot's “emphasis on the virtue of resignation” and her “slavish adherence” (160) to patriarchal system give an account of her faithful reproduction of reality which consists of disparity between ‘being’ and ‘becoming’. What Dinah Morris is in the beginning differs from what she tends to be in the end.

This is the difference between what she is in the true sense and what she is obliged to be. Kate Flint includes the list of examples:

They stretch from Patty, Amos Barton's daughter in the first of the *Scenes of Clerical Life*, who is given no existence beyond the role of being a pallid shadow of her mother, a support to her father in his old age, through Dinah Morris, the woman preacher in *Adam Bede*, who, having given up her vocation as a preacher settles into happy married life with Adam, to Armgart, George Eliot's rare portrayal of a gifted creative woman, who, losing the exquisite timbre of her singing voice after a long illness, retreats to the provinces where she will teach music and singing. She abandons public performance, as does Mirah, Daniel Deronda's eventual companion ("George" 160)

All these characters have masculine and feminine potentialities in them as in the writer George Eliot who "allowed both masculine and feminine traits to have sway within her personality" (Heilbrun 83). Carolyn G. Heilbrun argues:

Perhaps no individual whose life has been passed in the cultural center of her time has so embodied the "masculine" and "feminine" impulses conjoined. George Eliot's extraordinary qualifications both of "masculine" strength of mind and "feminine" sensibility have perhaps never been combined to better purpose. (82)

Her novels, including *Adam Bede*, are androgynous (83) and they include resistances to gendered stereotyping.

* * * *

Adam Bede acknowledges the presence of androgynous potentials in men women on one side and on the other side it suggests that in a society where culture is

determined to prove that women are inferior to men, an androgyny is not a virtue and a capable woman is obligated to repress her masculine potentials that enable her to be as successful as men. Dinah Morris, an androgynous female protagonist, does it despite her reputation as an effective preacher and a person with best human attributes in her possession. Besides, the novel expects the readers to wonder whether or not it is justifiable for men and women to repress their androgynous potentials and live in the traditional gender roles.

Adam Bede, published in 1859, tells the story of Dinah Morris and Hetty Sorrel, nieces of Mr. and Mrs. Poyser – and their ambitions. Dinah's ambition is to settle in life as a Methodist preacher and Hetty's ambition is to be the wife of an aristocrat, Arthur Donnithorne. However, Dinah is obligated to give up her ambition and live as a house wife and as a woman of domesticity whereas Hetty is left to suffer because of deviating from the conventional norms of the patriarchal society. Her loss of virginity, prior to marriage, is an act of deviation followed by her pregnancy. Therefore, she needs to suffer, which is indispensable in the patriarchal society. Simone de Beauvoir points out the importance of chastity for women in the patriarchal society:

Patriarchal civilization dedicated woman to chastity; it recognized more or less openly the right of the male to sexual freedom, while woman was restricted to marriage. The sexual act, if not sanctioned by the code, by a sacrament, is for her a fault, a fall, a defeat, a weakness; she should defend her virtue, her honour; if she 'yields', if she 'falls', she is scorned; whereas any blame visited upon her conqueror is mixed with admiration. (395)

Hetty's loss of virginity is the outcome of her boldness to act contrary to patriarchal expectations. The thought that Arthur "would marry her and make a lady of her" (Eliot 135) stimulates the masculine trait –boldness – in her to overlook the importance of virginity. The novel opens on the eighteenth of June, 1799 and introduces the male protagonist, Adam Bede, having qualities that project him as gender-stereotype and the female protagonist Dinah Morris in her cross-gender role. Adam, as one of the five workmen – carpenters – in the workshop of Mr. Jonathan Burge, "busy upon doors and window-frames and wainscoting" (Eliot 1), is noted for masculine identity because "work has often stood as the most fundamental foundation of masculine identity" (Edwards 7). As a "muscular man nearly six feet high, with a back so flat" (Eliot 2) he stands as one of the "tough guys" "who stand on their own feet and do not take any 'shit' from anybody" (Harris 146). For instance, when Wiry Ben, another workman, tries to tease Adam's brother Seth Bede by writing on a door "Seth Bede, the Methody, his work" (Eliot 3), Adam seizes the right shoulder of Ben saying, "Let it alone, or I'll shake the soul out o' your body" (Eliot 3). The narrator illustrates the aggressive nature – masculinity – in the following paragraph:

Ben shook in Adam's iron grasp, but, like a plucky small man as he was, he didn't mean to give in. With his left hand he snatched the brush from his powerless right, and made a movement as if he would perform the feat of writing with his left. In a moment Adam turned him round, seized his other shoulder, and, pushing him along, pinned him against the wall. (Eliot 3)

This event exposes Adam's masculinity as strong and aggressive. In the later events too, he represents masculinity by being active, independent and dominant.

The work ethic and a male gender-role message that “men are supposed to work for a living” (Harris 77) is so strong in him that “a deep flush of anger” (Eliot 34) passes over his face when he learns that his father Thias Bede has not completed the work of coffin:

“Aye, aye, Seth’s at no harm, mother, thee mayst be sure. But where’s father?” said Adam quickly, as he entered the house and glanced into the room on the left hand, which was used as a workshop. “Hasn’t he done the coffin for Tholer? There’s the stuff standing as I left it this morning.” (Eliot 33-4)

This kind of anger stands for masculinity in him because “men are more disposed to anger” (Barker 287). Although Adam represents the masculinity by acting in accordance with gender norms, in the later events he turns out to be soft and emotional that serves as the evidence for the presence of femininity in him.

A fight between Adam and Arthur at the Chase stables is a show of masculinity because it is the show of their courage and strength. This fight is similar to the duels of the past “fought for the sake of male honour” (Mosse 18). Ian M.Harris asserts that one of the male messages is that “men identify with war heroes” and “some men do commit acts of violence, acting like warriors in civilian society” (125). Hence when Adam witnesses Arthur kiss Hetty, the former decides to settle the question of honour through a fight, which establishes his identity as strong, brave and aggressive i.e, as a masculine man. The narrator describes it in detail:

“Go away, I tell you,” said Arthur, angrily, “or we shall both repent.”
 “No,” said Adam . . . “I swear I won’t go away without fighting you. Do you want provoking any more? I tell you you’re a coward and a scoundrel, and I despise you.”

The colour had all rushed back to Arthur's face; in a moment his right hand was clenched, and dealt a blow like lightning, which sent Adam staggering backward. His blood was as thoroughly up as Adam's now, and the two men, forgetting emotions . . . fought with the instinctive fierceness of panthers . . . and Arthur must sink under a well-planted blow of Adam's as a steel rod is broken by an iron bar. (Eliot 274)

This extract evidently shows that both men are masculine because both are aggressive. The expression "the two men . . . fought with instinctive fierceness of panthers" sounds like an acknowledgment of the narrator that men have instinctive fierceness of panthers. However, the expression "forgetting emotions" implicates that they do experience emotions which are momentarily forgotten. This implies that they are not without feminine trait – emotional. In fact, the consequence of the fight proves to be very significant because it activates feminine impulses in Adam. He is overcome by "the horror" (275) when he finds Arthur in an unconscious state giving the impression of being dead. When Arthur recovers from the unconsciousness, Adam speaks to him "tenderly" "with a trembling in his voice" (Eliot 275). His harshness is replaced with soft caring attitude, marking the fluidity. Adam's humble, obedient, compassionate gentle behavior – femininity – can be perceived in the conversation:

"Can you drink a drop out of your hand, sir?" said Adam kneeling down again to lift up Arthur's head. "No," said Arthur, "dip my cravat in and souse it on my head." The water seemed to do him some good, for he presently raised himself a little higher, resting on Adam's arm. "Do you feel any hurt inside, sir?" Adam asked again. "No – no hurt," said Arthur, still faintly, "but rather done."

After a while he said, "I suppose I fainted away when you knocked me down." "Yes, sir, thank God," said Adam. "I thought it was worse."
 "What! You thought you had done for me, eh? Come, help me on my legs." "I feel terribly shaky and dizzy," Arthur said, as he stood leaning on Adam's arm; "that blow of yours must have come against me like a battering-ram. I don't believe I can walk alone."

"Lean on me, sir; I'll get you along," said Adam. (Eliot 276)

This conversation shows that both characters have withdrawn their masculine instincts, replacing them with femininity. Arthur is reduced to the state of being dependent for the moment and Adam is shaken internally so as to be submissive, subordinate, kind and humble. At this point, both of them tend to be fluid in their behavior. What is more, Adam who has acted as a fighter turns into a nurse serving Arthur. Thus both characters show the signs of androgynous personality in them. Adam's present feminine behavior is the reminder of Carl Gustav Jung's claim, "No man is so entirely masculine that he has nothing feminine in him" (*Feminine* 87). According to him, the very masculine men have very soft emotional life, carefully guarded and hidden (87).

This kind of projection displaces masculine stereotypes of Western Literature. Consequently gender disruption happens to be frequent and evident. No individual can prevail as exclusively gender-stereotype. A person who is masculine on one occasion tends to be feminine on another occasion. For instance, on the occasion when Hetty has been arrested in Stoniton being charged with her child-murder, Adam searches for her in other places, and returns home in a state of agitation, anxiety and fear. The narrator describes it:

Adam was unable to speak. The strong man, accustomed to suppress the signs of sorrow, had felt his heart swell like a child's at this first approach of sympathy. He fell on Seth's neck and sobbed.

Seth was prepared for the worst now, for, even in his recollections of their boyhood, Adam had never sobbed before. (Eliot 365)

It is an instance of gender disruption because “men are less inclined to verbalize emotions” (Barker 287) and they are “in control of” their “emotions” (Harris 12). In the given situation, the act of sobbing projects him as weak and emotional. The traditional gender roles cast women as “weak” and “emotional” (Tyson 85). Adam, a masculine man with a muscular body, turns into a feminine man with sentimental outburst of sobs.

On another occasion, he is driven by both masculine and feminine instincts. This happens when he comes to know the truth from Mr. Irwine about Hetty being in prison. The narrator refers to the feminine outburst of Adam: “Then he burst out again, in a tone of appealing anguish, ‘I can't bear it . . . O God, it's too hard to lay upon me – it's too hard to think she's wicked’” (Eliot 374). This feminine reaction is immediately followed by an outburst of “anger” – a masculine trait (Barker 287) for Arthur. The narrator describes it:

He was silent again for a few moments, and then he said, with fierce abruptions, “I'll go to him – I'll bring him back – I'll make him go and look at her in her misery . . . he shan't escape wi' lies this time – I'll fetch him, I'll drag him myself.” (Eliot 374)

This kind of behavior shows him in the shoes of gender conformity. However, such a variation suggests the fluid personality and “a world of flux” where “fluid

hardens to solid, solid rushes to fluid” (Gray 137). How Adam reacts in a given situation is something connected with the intensity of the situation. His biological sex plays no role in it. He responds in an aggressive way when he faces the provoking situation and behaves in an emotional manner when he faces distressing situation. Thus he remains fluid in his behavior.

After the verdict for Hetty to “be hanged by the neck” (Eliot 398) till she be dead, he refuses to visit her in prison to bid farewell, being in the grips of emotions. The narrator describes this emotional moment, “Adam stood trembling, and at last sank down on his chair again” (Eliot 416). It denotes the lack of self-restraint and stoic fortitude that stand for masculinity. The matter is too sensitive for him to exercise his masculine traits.

The event – where Hetty and Adam meet for the last time in prison prior to the proceedings of Hetty’s sentence that is eventually commuted to transportation – is significant from the perspective of gender disruption in the case of Adam. Adam becomes emotional when Hetty apologizes to him, asking him to “forgive” her. He answers, “Yes, I forgive thee Hetty. I forgave thee long ago” (Eliot 420). Adam’s emotional outlet in the form of “a half-sob” (420) is the transgression of masculinity because “essentially, men are forbidden to play and show emotion” (Sawyer 26). Obviously he is endowed with emotional empathy which is seen as the province of women. On the contrary, Hetty emerges as strong person. This extracts below highlights the strong part of her character:

“And tell him [Arthur],” Hetty said, in rather a stronger voice, “tell him . . . for there’s nobody else to tell him . . . as I went after him and could not find him . . . and I hated him and cursed him once . . . but

Dinah says I should forgive him . . . and I try . . . for else God won't forgive me." (Eliot 420)

Hetty, at this instance, is far from being weak, timid and emotional. The narrator too points out this aspect with the expression "a stronger voice" meant for Hetty. It is a moment of gender deviation for her. Such a blurring of gender roles in the given instance questions the patriarchal assumptions about gender norms and signals the presence of androgynous potentials in every person including Adam and Hetty. The gender disruption in the case of Hetty and Dinah as well as Adam is the outcome of male part—"animus"—in women (Jung, *Masculine*, x) and female part—anima—in men (*Masculine* 151).

Hence there are occasions where feminine instincts are witnessed in Hetty. For instance, in course of giving evidence of a baby born to Hetty Sorrel in her [Sarah's] cottage, the middle aged woman Sarah Stone – a widow and a small shop-keeper in Stoniton – alludes to Hetty's weakness and helplessness. Stone admits:

The prisoner at the bar [Hetty] is the same young woman who came, looking ill and tired, with a basket on her arm, and asked for a lodging at my house And when I said I didn't take in lodgers, the prisoner [Hetty] began to cry, and said she was too tired to go anywhere else, and she only wanted a bed for one night. (394)

This extract illustrates the femininity of Hetty through the display of her weakness, tears and obligation to depend on Stone for shelter.

When another witness John Olding testifies of having seen a "little baby's hand" (396) – Hetty's baby – under a nut bush in an accusation that she has killed her baby and buried it, Hetty in the court is found to be "visibly trembling" (396). As the

judge passes the verdict against her as “Guilty” (398), the feminine weakness and timidity can be witnessed in her horrified reaction. The narrator describes it:

The blood rushed to Hetty’s face . . . there was a deep horror But at the words “and then to be hanged by the neck till you be dead,” a piercing shriek rang through the hall. It was Hetty’s shriek . . . she had fallen down in a fainting-fit, and was carried out of court. (398)

These are the moments when Hetty gives the impression of being vulnerable, and emotional. Thus, viewed from this perspective, she turns out to be the embodiment of femininity. Besides in her relation with Arthur from the time of seduction to impregnation and then the subsequent infanticide leading to her eventual punishment and death in the end, she remains passive, helpless, weak and emotional

Hetty’s passivity can be perceived in the initiation of her love with Arthur Donnithorne despite her day-dreaming to be a land-lady and wife of Arthur. In the diary he flirts with seventeen-year-old Hetty, asking her to promise him “two dances” (76) “on the thirteenth of July” (75) when his 21st birthday will be celebrated in his mansion, the chase. Hetty only drops “the prettiest little curtsy” and steals “a half-shy, half-coquettish glance” at him while saying, “Yes, thank you, Sir” (76). Arthur plays an active role in the later occasion too. He meets her in the wood during the time of afternoon while she is on her way back home from the chase where she visits on every Thursday to have lessons in lace and stocking-mending from Miss Donnithorne’s maid. The following extract shows Hetty’s femininity in the form of her weakness and emotion as Arthur starts flirting with her by asking:

“Perhaps Craig, the gardener, comes to take care of you?” A deep blush overspread Hetty’s face and neck. “I’m sure he doesn’t; I’m sure he never did; I wouldn’t let him; I don’t like him,” she said hastily, and

the tears of vexation had come so fast that before she had done speaking a bright drop rolled down her hot cheek. Then she felt ashamed to death that she was crying, and for one long instant her happiness was all gone. But in the next she felt an arm steal round her, and a gentle voice said, “Why, Hetty, what makes you cry? I didn’t mean to vex you Come, don’t cry; look at me, else I shall think you won’t forgive me.” (118)

The expressions “crying”, “tears” and “felt ashamed to death” are the manifestation of her feminine instincts. She remains submissive throughout the event.

When Arthur breaks away from her after having seduced and impregnated her, she literally accepts his decision without reacting in a bold manner at the injustice. This passivity, sense of helplessness and timidity in her prevail after she receives a letter from Arthur through Adam. Arthur asks her in the letter to “forgive” him and “try to forget everything” (303) “about him while stating,” “And since I cannot marry you, we must part – we must try not to feel like lovers any more” (302). Despite the fact that it is an extreme point of exploitation and betrayal, she fails to protest and react in a furious way. Instead she is left to be subdued by her feminine weakness, passivity and emotional outburst. The narrator describes it:

Slowly Hetty had read this letter; and when she looked up from it there was the reflection of a blanched face in the old dim glass – a white marble face . . . with something sadder than a child’s pain . . . she only felt that she was cold and sick and trembling The tears came this time – great rushing tears that blinded her and blotched the paper She had not the ideas that could make up the notion of that misery.

As she threw down the letter again, she caught sight of her face in the glass; it was reddened now, and wet with tears . . . She leaned forward on her elbows, and looked into those dark overflowing eyes and at the quivering mouth, and saw how the tears came thicker and thicker, and how the mouth became convulsed with sobs. (303)

The given extract reveals the feminine part and reaction of Hetty. Hetty's tears and sobs show her as vulnerable and submissive.

Later she agrees to get married with Adam. This reflects the passive aspect of Hetty. This kind of passivity ceases to be replaced by the sense of activity soon. Her masculine impulses are activated when she feels about the possible discovery of her pregnancy. The "effort of concealment," "irresistible dread" "toward a betrayal of her miserable secret" and "necessity" "pressing hard upon her" (333) prompt her to act in a masculine way by taking a decision to set for Windsor to meet Arthur. It requires her to undertake a long journey for seven days. Hetty's Journey to Windsor without escort is like a quest of Arthurian Knight for Holy Grail. Thus Hetty's personality is comprised of masculine and feminine potentials. Deanna K. Kreisel too acknowledges it in the following way:

Hetty, for all her overabundant womanliness, remains a strangely androgynous figure. Comely, coquettish and of course fertile, she is nevertheless utterly lacking in sympathy, generally, and maternal, and readerly, instincts, specifically. She is persistently figured both by the narrator and by her Aunt Poyser, the repository of feminine wisdom and ascerbic insight in the novel, as hard-hearted, uncaring, unfeminine. As Jill Matus has pointed out, Eliot carefully prepares the reader for Hetty's infanticide . . . by consistently describing Hetty as

utterly unmaternal: “Hetty hates nasty little lambs, hates hatching time, and finds the Poyser children ‘as bad as buzzing insects that will come teasing you on a hot day when you want to be quiet.’” For the mid-Victorian reader, of course, this characterization of Hetty as unmaternal is tantamount to calling her unfeminine, even unnatural. While her obsession with finery, display, and costume, her narcissistic self-love and self-containment and of course her remarkable beauty, all constitute practically a parody of high femininity, and her hard-heartedness and lack of maternal instinct simultaneously mark her as an universal creature: an admixture of masculine and feminine, androgyne. (561)

Another character noted for gender deviation is Dinah Morris. She is the female protagonist of the novel. Adam begins as a masculine being and evolves into androgyne by getting exposed to feminine instincts within whereas Dinah makes her appearance in the beginning with cross-gender traits and gradually takes a turn for gender conformity towards the end of the novel. Thus she too reveals masculine and feminine potentials in her, representing the androgyne.

Initially Dinah acts contrary to gender norms. She lives in Snowfield as an independent person, being active as a Methodist preacher and a “working woman” (98). Consequently, she deviates from the image of ‘Angel in the House’. Her refusal to live like other women of subordination is an attempt to resist the cult of Victorian womanhood. As a Biblical scholar and eloquent speaker, she appears to be a masculine woman. Like the men of her time she makes a living by working in a mill (98) and decides about her profession as a Methodist preacher. She refuses to be a passive recipient of Biblical knowledge, with a conviction:

God has called me to minister to others, not to have any joys or sorrows of my own, but to rejoice with them that do rejoice, and to weep with those that weep. He has called me to speak his word, and he has greatly owned my work

It has been given me to help, to comfort, and strengthen the little flock there (29)

Dinah's conviction is based on her confidence. At this juncture, Dinah is more a masculine woman than a feminine one.

To be a preacher in the eighteenth and nineteenth century was to be masculine as preaching was a masculine profession. By deciding to be and by being a preacher, Dinah takes a step against gender norms. Katherine A. Brekus states:

Most protestant churches in the early nineteenth century opposed female preaching on the grounds that it violated the Pauline injunction to "let your woman keep silence in churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law" (1 Corinthians 14: 34 – 35 KJV) . they also cited two other Pauline texts: "the head of woman is the man" (11:3b), and "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (1 Timothy 2: 11 – 12, KJV). As the General Assembly of the Presbyterians declared in 1832, "to teach and exhort, or to lead in prayer, in public and promiscuous assemblies, is forbidden to woman in the Holy Oracles." (21)

Viewed from this perspective, both preaching and speaking in public were considered the masculine activities. Hence what Dinah does in the village of Hayslope as a preacher is unfeminine.

The narrator draws our attention to Dinah's masculine traits of being a preacher and its impact on a stranger while she appears before the gathering in the second chapter to make a speech:

The stranger was struck with surprise as he saw her approach and mount the cart – surprise not so much at the feminine delicacy of her appearance, as at the total absence of self-consciousness in her demeanor But Dinah walked as simply as if she were going to market, and seemed as unconscious of her outward appearance as a little boy: there was no blush, no tremulousness (17)

This extract illustrates the confidence in Dinah. The feminine traits such as “self-consciousness”, “blush” and “tremulousness” are absent in her. The stranger's surprise is the outcome of seeing unexpected spectacle – a woman as a preacher. The expression – “A sweet woman,” the stranger said to himself, “but surely nature never meant her for a preacher” (18) – signifies the contrast that a sweet woman is feminine and preaching is a masculine task.

The stranger's identity is revealed as magistrate Colonel Townley (407) when Dinah visits the prison in Stoniton to meet Hetty. He tells Dinah, “I know you have a key to unlock the hearts” (407). It denotes the magical power of her speech and its effect on others. Obviously it is a rhetorical aspect associated with masculinity. Nan Johnson states in this regard: “At the start of the 19th century, the arts of rhetoric were undisputed province of the male professional classes” (3). As a preacher and a rhetorician, Dinah stands as a masculine woman.

The prejudice against women being public speakers was so strong in the nineteenth century that Almond H. Davis and Junia S. Mowry in their book *The Female Preacher* (1843) write about it in the following way:

And in fact one author in a recent article on this subject . . . says –
 “Having been familiar with these passages from my youth, I have
 never doubted for a moment, the unscrupulousness and impropriety of
 females becoming public exhorters, teachers and speakers –.” (12)

Thus by undertaking the task of preaching and rhetorics, Dinah merely projects her masculinity and challenges the patriarchy. The “clear” voice, the “moderate tone” (Eliot 18) in the begin and her strategy of establishing intimacy with her audience by her informal style of speech show her as being similar to a male professional speaker and preacher. The following extract shows her rhetorical skill:

Why, you and me, dear friends, are poor. We have been brought up in
 poor cottages and have been reared on oat-cake, and lived coarse; and
 we haven’t been to school, nor read books, and we don’t know much
 about anything but what happens just round us. (19)

In the above speech Dinah exhibits her skill in establishing intimacy with her audience by identifying herself with them.

The narrator comments on the quality and the effect of her speech to emphasize that she is the master of rhetorical skill:

Hitherto the traveler had been chained to the spot against his will by
 the charm of Dinah’s mellow treble tones, which had a variety of
 modulation like that of a fine instrument touched with the unconscious
 skill of musical instinct. The simple things she said seemed like
 novelties, as a melody strikes us with a new feeling when we hear it

sung by the pure voice of a boyish chorister; the quiet depth of conviction with which she spoke seemed in itself an evidence for the truth of her message. (21)

The effect of speech on the traveller, comparison of her speech with “a fine instrument” and “the pure voice of a boyish chorister” assert the masculinity of the speaker in the context of making public speech. Besides, “Being the best” is “extremely important gender message for men” (Harris 63) and “men find and create outlets to demonstrate their masculinity by being the best” (Harris 64). Dinah’s speech being the best is an instance of gender disruption.

Dinah as a preacher and public speaker is Dinah as a masculine woman. Her decision not to marry but to live a Methodist preacher is an attempt to resist the womanhood bestowed on her and live with her masculine potentials. She confesses it to Seth Bede as a reply to his proposal:

. . . Seth Bede, I thank you for your love towards me . . . but my heart is not free to marry. That is good for other women . . . He [God] has called me to speak his word . . . I see that our marriage is not God’s will – He draws my heart another way. I desire to live and die without husband or children. (Eliot 29)

The decision she takes shows that she is independent in making decisions. In either case – to be independent and to make decision – she deviates from gender norms as the patriarchy considers both acts as being masculine. At the same time, her present denial to play the role of woman as a wife is unfeminine. It also implies that presently she is the embodiment of masculinity.

Besides, the contrast highlighted between Dinah and Seth – while they are together during and after preaching – draws the reader’s attention towards their cross-

gender traits. For instance, as Dinah makes the bold appearance as a preacher, Seth Bede looks very weak and feminized in course of proposing to Dinah. The narrator illustrates it:

When Seth had once begun to urge his suit, he went on earnestly and almost hurriedly, lest Dinah should speak some decisive word before he had poured forth all the arguments he had prepared. His cheeks became flushed as he went on, his mild grey eyes filled with tears, and his voice trembled as he spoke the last sentence. (28 - 9)

This extract exposes the feminine side of Seth as an emotional, soft and sentimental being. Dinah stands strong and confident while Seth serves as a perfect foil to her by being feminine in his behavior. The narrator seems to have perceived the contrast when he comments, “I think his [Seth’s] blue linen handkerchief was very wet with tears long before he had made up his mind that it was time for him to set his face steadily homewards” (30 - 1). Thus evidently both Seth and Dinah disrupt the gender norms in the given instance. Such a portrayal undermines the gender norms.

Dinah’s dominant personality as a masculine woman can be witnessed during her visit to Adam’s house at the death of his father, Thias Bede. Adam’s mother Lisbeth mourning over the death of her husband “trembled and dared not look” (97) at her as Dinah speaks, “Dear sister, the lord has sent me to see if I can be a comfort to you” (97). Lisbeth even wonders whether it is “an angel” (98). Evidently Dinah’s successful commitment as a female preacher has got her an elevated status like an angel and supernatural being in the eyes of Lisbeth. Such a way of thinking about Dinah represents the attitude of patriarchal women who have “internalized the norms and values of patriarchy” (Tyson 85). It is inconceivable to them that a woman could be a preacher.

Another masculine quality of Dinah is to work for a living. She informs Mr. Irwine about it in course of giving details about Snowfield and the change that a cotton-mill has brought forth. There she admits, “I work in it myself, and have reason to be grateful, for thereby I have enough and to spare” (Eliot 79). Lisbeth also notices the traces of labor on Dinah’s hands and comments “Why, ye’re a working woman!” and Dinah answers, “Yes, I am Dinah Morris, and I work in the cotton-mill when I am at home” (98). This information establishes Dinah as a provider or breadwinner and independent individual. That Dinah works for her living is the evidence about the presence of masculine instincts in her because “it [work] is the very source of masculine identity” (Seidler, *Rediscovering* 151). Seidler argues, “As men, we had learnt to put our work first, because this was where our identity was formed. We expected our partners to accept this, since this was the source of the family’s income. This was also the source of our individual power . . .” (*Rediscovering* 166).

Obviously “this work” brings the sense of authority and independence to Dinah. She can be above the feelings of being weak and dependent. Lisbeth, Adam’s mother, serves as foil in the presence of Dinah because the former conforms to her gender norms by being weak, timid, subordinate and emotional. On the funeral occasion of Adam’s father –Thias Bede – this contrast can be perceived in the following extract where Lisbeth’s femininity is conspicuous:

Here Lisbeth began to cry and rock herself again; and Dinah said,
 “Yes, dear friend, your affection is great. It would be hardness of heart to say your trouble was not heavy to bear. God didn’t send me to you to make light of your sorrow, but to mourn with you, if you will let me.” (98 -9)

If Lisbeth acts under the feminine impulses by crying and rocking herself, Dinah appears to be strong, assertive and mature as a masculine woman.

While comforting Lisbeth about the loss of her husband, Dinah actively gets involved by cleaning the kitchen and points out the need for being practical and rational by alluding to King David's example out of the Old Testament. The way Dinah reasons is the evidence for the presence of a masculine potential –the quality of being “rational” (Tyson 85) – in her:

Do you remember what David did, when God took away his child from him? While the child was yet alive he fasted and prayed to God to spare it, and he would neither eat nor drink, but lay on the ground all night, beseeching God for the child. but when he knew it was dead, he rose up from the ground and washed and anointed himself, and changed his clothes, and ate and drank; and when they asked him how it was that he . . . left grieving . . . he said, “while the child was yet active, I fasted and wept; for I said, who can tell whether God will be gracious to me, that the child may live? But now he is dead, wherefore should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me.” (Eliot 101)

The gist of what Dinah intends to say is that one should be guided by reason rather than by emotion. Dinah is no less rational than any man who believes in such views. Seth, who is aware of her intellectuality and rational thinking, wants Adam to know “how much better she [Dinah] was than all other women” (106)

Dinah's femininity manifests during her stay with Adam Bede's family after the death of his father. This happens for the first time when she faces the male gaze of

Adam. This gaze activates feminine instinct in her and brings her androgynous potential to light:

For the first moment or two he [Adam] made no answer, but looked at her [Dinah] with the concentrated, examining glance which a man gives to an object in which he has suddenly begun to be interested. Dinah, for the first time in her life, felt *a* painful self-consciousness; there was something in the dark penetrating glance of this strong man so different from the mildness and timidity of his brother Seth. A faint blush came, which deepened as she wondered at it. (104)

The blush on her face is the indication that feminine impulses have been roused in her, making her an androgynous personality. Being unfamiliar with these impulses, Dinah is surprised to see the self blushing. Adam feels it and assures Seth of Dinah that “she’s made out o’ stuff with a finer grain” and she will never “fall short of” other women “in loving” (109 -10).

Obviously Adam is aware of such contrastive nature in man who does tough job on one side and gets nervous in the presence of a woman. His awareness is the awareness of androgynous potential in every person. Adam’s thoughts continue:

“God help the lad, and me too,” he thought, as he lifted the board.
 “We’re like enough to find life a tough job – hard work inside and out. It’s a strange thing to think of a man as can lift a chair with his teeth and walk fifty mile on end, trembling and turning hot and cold at only a look from one woman out of all the rest i’ the world. It’s a mystery we can give no account of; but no more we can of the sprouting o’ the seed, for that matter.” (110)

The mystery lies in the ignorance about the presence of androgynous potential in each being. The person, who is strong, trembles and turns “hot and cold” because he also happens to be emotional, soft and sensitive. If he is strong in one aspect, he tends to be weak in another aspect, striking a fluid personality. That fluid personality is androgynous. This personality is not exclusive to Adam and Seth. Even Dinah and other woman as well possess it. Dinah’s blush despite her tough way of living is the evidence of her androgynous personality.

Because of this very personality, in addition to being masculine in her day-to-day activities as a preacher and “a workin’ woman” (98), she cannot help being feminine on some occasions. For instance, on the occasion when Dinah happens to be with her aunt Mrs. Poyser at Hall Farm, Adam arrives there causing instinctive reaction in her. As he approaches Dinah to put out his hand to her, she lays down her work standing up “instinctively” with “a faint blush” dying away from her pale cheek as she puts her hand in his and looks up “at him timidly” (435).

This timidity and blush are the signs of femininity in her. Obviously she has a soft corner for Adam and his presence triggers feminine instincts in her. Lisbeth is aware of it as she tells Seth Bede, “I know she’s fond on him [Adam]” (451). That she is emotionally involved with Adam from her side becomes evident on another occasion. In the context where Mr. and Mrs. Poyser are critical toward Dinah for her decision to leave Hall Farm and live in Snowfield, Adam speaks on behalf of Dinah. That brings tears in her eyes. The narrator describes it:

Adam saw that Dinah was more disturbed than he had ever seen her . . .
 . . . and anxious to relieve her, if possible, he said, looking at her affectionately, “Nay, I can’t find fault with anything Dinah does. I believe her thoughts are better than our guesses . . . I wouldn’t cross

her, or make it hard to her by objecting. We owe her something different to that.”

As it happens, the words intended to relieve her were just too much for Dinah’s susceptible feelings at this moment. The tears came into the grey eyes too fast to be hidden and she got up hurriedly, meaning it to be understood that she was going to put on her bonnet.

(437)

“The tears” shows the weak, emotional and sentimental part of Dinah. It asserts the femininity in her. At the same time her efforts to conceal the tears “meaning it to be understood that she was going to put on her bonnet” reveal her masculinity. It reminds what Seidler admits, “The way in which we are brought up to identify our masculinity with self-control is that we learn to exert a form of domination over our emotions, feelings and desires” (48). It is the occasion where one and the same time Dinah’s masculine and feminine impulses are active. This instance along with her activities as a preacher and working woman exposes her androgynous potential.

Even on the occasion of the meeting of Adam and Dinah in Sloman’s End, Dinah’s combined gender traits are evident. She happens to be at this hamlet over the hill “to preach in a cottage” (484). It reveals her masculinity as a preacher and as an active person. When Adam approaches her, she is driven into her feminine self. “A look of yearning love” in her mild grey eyes and “the warm tears” (485) testify the emotional part of herself and her femininity.

The epilogue shows an end to what is an ideal part of Dinah – androgyny. Despite the presence of androgynous potential, she is found to have been transformed into the cult of Victorian womanhood. Presently she tends to “correspond to her matronly figure” (488), taking care of her children as a mother and always being “on

the lookout for Adam” (489) as a wife. She is no more a working woman and a Methodist preacher. She is submissive to the decision of the Second Wesleyan Conference that has forbidden women to preach. Dinah has become a “woman” in the sense of Simone de Beauvoir’s view “one is not born but rather becomes a woman” (295). Adam too approves it in her passive role toward the decision of the Conference in the following way:

She was right There’s no rules so wise but what it’s a pity for somebody or other. Most o’ the women do more harm nor good with their preaching – they’ve not got Dinah’s gift nor her sperrit – and she’s seen that, and she thought it right to set th’ example o’ submitting, for she’s not held from other sorts of teaching. And I agree with her, and approve o’ what she did. (Eliot 490)

Adam’s approval is the approval of a patriarch for a society that “teaches men they should dominate” and (teaches) “women they should be submissive” (Sawyer 25).

Thus Dinah represents women who, despite androgynous potential in them, adjust themselves in accordance with gender norms. It is a “woman’s destiny” (227; ch.22). The narrator comments on it in connection with Hetty Sorrel:

. . . it is painful to think that she is a woman, with a woman’s destiny before her – a woman spinning in young ignorance a light web of folly and vain hopes which may one day close round her and press upon her, a rancorous poisoned garment, changing all at once her fluttering, trivial butterfly sensations into a life of deep human anguish. (227-8)

“The rancorous poisoned garment” symbolically refers to patriarchal restrictions on women that deprive them of their rights to act in accordance with their (androgynous) potentials. Dinah with potentials to be a preacher and a working woman that enable

her to be an independent being and real self is reduced into a feminine woman and a dependent being. It is also a switch from active life into passive life.

It reminds the part of the verse-drama epigraph, written by Eliot and spoken by the 1st Gent, in her novel *Daniel Deronda*:

Our daughters must be wives,

And to be wives must be what men will choose:

Man's taste is woman's test. (qtd. in Flint, "George" 174)

What Dinah is now as a transformed being is the outcome of Adam's taste and she has successfully gone through the test of transformation.

As for Adam, he retains his masculinity as an independent person with active involvement in the workshop and as a bread-winner. At the same time, his masculinity is juxtaposed with his feminine instincts that manifest through his love and affection for his family and compassion for Arthur. Terry Eagleton considers that Adam is "an idealized figure" (171). Dinah acknowledges it by saying,

"Adam was greatly moved this morning at the thought of the change he should see in the poor young man from the sickness he [Arthur] has undergone, as well as the years which have changed us all. And the death of the poor wanderer [Hetty], when she was coming back to us, has been sorrow upon sorrow." (Eliot 489)

Adam evolves into a fluid personality out of gender-stereotype and Dinah is left behind in her endeavor to live up to the perceived social models of femininity. It is the reality of becoming out of the potentiality she is endowed with and out of what she is – the real self, the being, with androgynous potentials. Her survival in the Victorian period is dependent upon the elimination of her male roles.

Dinah's transformation from the state of independence, activity, and breadwinner to the state of dependence, passivity and caretaker is significant for various reasons. First of all, it clarifies that a person is androgynous. Dinah is androgynous because she projects her masculinity through her work as a preacher, teacher and worker throughout the novel and, at the end, she becomes feminine by being the angel of the house, taking care of her husband, Adam and their children. Secondly, it exposes the society's role to reinforce the traditional gender norms by discouraging women from being active. In the case of Dinah, the Second Wesleyan Conference forbids her and other women to be involved in preaching. What is more, it also highlights the fact that an individual adopts his/her gender identity as a masquerade that conceals the masculine/feminine part of the self. Dinah uses masculine gender identity in the beginning and later feminine gender identity. On both occasions, she exposes only part of the self. The whole/complete personality of a person never manifests and the personality traits of an individual continue to be silenced so long as we believe in dichotomized gender system.

Tess of the d'Urbervilles: Portrayal of Androgynous Characters

During the time between 1870s and 1890s, as Thomas Hardy was preoccupied with his writing of novels, he was intending to establish himself as a writer much ahead of his time by being critical to the contemporary ways of thinking. In a letter written to Florence Henniker in September 1893, he emphasized the need to be ahead of the time in matters of attitude and views:

I do sigh a little; over your position less than over your conventional views If you mean to make the world listen to you, you must say now what they will all be thinking and saying five and twenty five

years hence: if you do that you must offend your conventional friends.

(*The Collected Letters* 2:33)

Obviously Hardy offended the conventional reader with his advanced ideas included in the novel *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* published in 1891 with a subtitle "A Pure Woman Faithfully Presented" and other novels. In these novels, he blurs stereotypical roles of male and female characters to give the impression that it is improbable for them to fit into the binary categories of gender. Bathsheba Everdene of *Far From the Madding Crowd* (1874) is a strong, independent woman who resists becoming the property of a man (Eagleton 198). Similarly, male protagonist, Stephen Smith, of *A Pair of Blue Eyes* (1873) possesses feminine qualities and the female protagonist Elfride tells him that she loves him "because [he is] so docile and gentle" (qtd. in Green 530). Such a portrayal is contrary to gender norms and Hardy with such characters resists the patriarchal assumptions. Heilbrun points out this aspect in Hardy:

Hardy understood, better than most, the hideous strictures of a society which condemned his own greatest fictional works, but his magnificent women characters confront a life which ultimately defeats them and their courage.

We are certainly aware of a prodigious energy in his women, of stunted opportunity, and of a passion which seems to challenge the entire, limiting world. (69-70)

Hardy's characters are not shaped to satisfy the conventional reader. They foreshadow the (postmodern) gender fluidity. Showalter also stresses that Hardy understood the feminine self as 'the estranged and essential complement of the male self' (qtd. in Harvey 183). Besides Ruthven points out that the heroines of *Tess of the*

d'Urbervilles and *Jude the obscure* are not constrained by contemporary ideologies of female virtue and bourgeois marriage (32).

* * * *

Tess of the d'Urbervilles provides the reader with the most important insight into the personality of male and female protagonists with potential for masculinity and femininity. The novel suggests that the androgynous qualities, when activated in a person, lead to the better understanding between men and women. It also illustrates the suffering of these characters as the result of their failure to manipulate these potentials or impulses properly at an appropriate time. When Tess working for Alec's family in her mid-teens is about to be the victim of seduction in the hands of Alec, she remains feminine by being passive despite the fact that she despises him. Her aggressive instinct – her potential of being strong and violent to murder Alec – gets activated only in the end after she has passed through vicissitudes of life: a critical phase of her life as unwedded mother of Alec's child, her marriage with Angel Clare, separation from him owing to her past, her eventual submission to the will of Alec due to her miserable condition, and Angel's return to her with the expectation of being reunited with her. Her only flaw in the tragic experience of her life is her passivity and submissiveness –feminine traits – at the time when she is required to be masculine by being active and aggressive in a way of protecting the self from being seduced. Likewise, Angel's feminine instinct of being “sensitive to the feelings of others” and “able to express tender feelings” (Broverman 66-7) is set in motion when it is too late to save Tess from tragic end.

Her downfall begins when she seeks the job in the house of Alec. This leads to his seduction of her in the woods where her submissive nature affords little

protection to her. She is incapable of taking a firm stand against it despite her potentiality to do. The following conversation between Alec and Tess clarifies it:

“I didn’t understand your meaning till it was too late.”

“That’s what every woman says.”

“How can you dare to use such words!” she cried, turning impetuously upon him, her eyes flashing as the latent spirit (of which he was to see more someday) awoke in her. “My God, I could knock you out of the gig! Did it ever strike your mind that what every woman says some women may feel?” (Hardy, *Tess* 60)

This “latent spirit” that “awoke in her” is connected with her hidden masculine instinct of aggression. The expressions “I could knock you out of the gig” and “what every woman says some women may feel” represent the voice of aggression in her. It remains inactive at the moment of seduction. The parenthetical expression “of which he was to see more someday” for her “latent spirit” foreshadows her violent act of murdering him. The narrator is aware of her aggressive instinct and prepares the reader for it with this expression. As for Alec’s evil behavior, it is the outcome of his lopsided personality that has been formed through the suppression of his feminine sensibility. He is conditioned to be in masculine gender identity. It is evident in what he declares in their meeting years later:

. . . his voice hardened as his temper got the better of him . . . and he stepped across to her side and held her by the shoulders, so that she shook under his grasp: “Remember, my lady, I was your master once; I will be your master again. If you are any man’s wife you are mine!” (Hardy, *Tess* 261)

At this instance Alec is the masculinity embodied because he is engaged like stereotyped men in “achieving and enacting a dominant role” conforming to sex-role stereotypes that “say that men should be dominant” (Sawyer 25). However, his death in the hands of Tess testifies that he is as vulnerable as any woman.

With his death it is clarified that he is weaker than Tess who is said to have “the latent spirit of which he was to see more someday” (Hardy, *Tess* 60). He does see it “someday” which happens to be the last day of his life. The confession of Tess to her husband Clare – “He [Alec] heard me crying about you, and he bitterly taunted me; and called me by your foul name; and then I did it [killed him]” (304) – undermines the assumption that “men always have been more violent than women and always will be: it’s in their nature” (Edwards 44). Obviously when the masculine instinct of aggression is roused in her, driving her to be abruptly violent towards Alec, he is reduced to the status of vulnerable and weak person. It is an instance of gender subversion because the strong man is not strong enough to face the wrath of a weak woman. As for Angel Clare, he assumes masculine gender identity in the beginning and later develops as a man of combined gender traits – androgyny. On learning that his wife, Tess, has lost her chastity prior to the marriage, he decides to abandon her. It reflects the influence of masculine culture of the patriarchal society which holds that a woman “should defend her virtue, her honour; if she ‘yields’, if she ‘falls’, she is scorned” (Beauvoir 395). He acts in accordance with the norms of “patriarchal civilization” (395). At this instance his masculine traits such as being “independent”, “active” and “able to make decisions” (Boverman 66-7) are predominant. However, his feminine impulses get activated very soon after his experience in Brazil. Consequently his conventional way of thinking changes for the better, which is narrated in the following way:

He thought they wanted readjusting. Who was the moral man? Still more pertinently, who was the moral woman? The beauty or ugliness of a character lay not only in its achievements, but in its aims and impulses; its true history lay not among things done, but among things willed. (Hardy, *Tess* 267)

This extract reveals feminine attributes of being “sensitive to the feeling of others” and “able to express the tender feelings” (Broverman 66-7). Angel Clare at the moment is androgynous because both impulses – masculine and feminine – are active in him. He returns home and to her with a determination to reconcile with Tess. However, things get out of their control as it is too late for any reconciliation. The novel ends with Tess’s execution for her murder of Alec. The murder is the extreme point of masculine projection in her. In her case it is the aggression unleashed from within her.

Tess of the d’Urbervilles is the novel of resistance to cultural norms that support the assumptions about women as dependent, vulnerable and passive and men as independent, strong and active. The novel is potentially revolutionary since it projects the female protagonist – Tess – as active, independent as well as the breadwinner. Other female characters Marian, Izz Huett and Retty along with Tess give the impression of being the forerunners of New Woman as they participate in public life working with men to make a living. Like new woman, they manifest as energetic and independent, struggling against the constraints of Victorian norms of femininity.

Tess Durbeyfield disrupts the gender norms by refusing to be the angel in the house as being pure, submissive, dependent and modest. On the contrary, from the very beginning, she reveals the potentiality to be both masculine and feminine unlike

her mother. Even the small event testifies it. For instance, the sight of her father Jack Durbeyfield coming home drunk in a chaise “driven by a frizzle-headed brawny damsel” (Hardy, *Tess* 7) and the amusement it causes to viewers stimulates both masculine and feminine responses in her. The narrator describes it:

The clubbists tittered, except the girl called Tess – in whom a slow heat seemed to rise at the sense that her father was making himself foolish in their eyes. “He’s tired, that’s all,” she said hastily, “and he has got a lift home, because our own horse has to rest today.”

“Bless thy simplicity, Tess,” said her companions. “He’s got his market- nitch. Haw-haw!”

“Look here; I won’t walk another inch with you, if you say any jokes about him!” Tess cried, and the colour upon her cheeks spread over her face and neck. In a moment her eyes grew moist, and her glance dropped to the ground. (7)

Her “moist” eyes show her vulnerability as a feminine person and “a slow heat” and her quick reaction to jokes reveal her susceptibility to anger, which is a masculine impulse as “men are more disposed to anger and less to empathy” (Barker 287).

Soon she gains the control over the self as reported by the narrator, “By the time the spot was reached she had recovered her equanimity, and tapped her neighbor with her wand, and talked as usual” (Hardy, *Tess* 8). It is the evidence about the presence of masculinity in her because the self-control is a masculine quality. Victor J. Seidler too argues, “The way in which we are brought up to identify our masculinity with self- control is that we learn to exert a form of domination over our emotions, feelings and desires” (48). In this instance, Tess as a sixteen-year-old girl

with masculine and feminine instincts at work in her shows the potentiality for the growth as androgyne.

Tess is not an exception. Even “a frizzle-headed brawny damsel” (Hardy, *Tess* 7) driving a chase signifies that a masculine task [of driving a chase] can be accomplished by a woman and vice versa owing to the androgynous potentials in a man and a woman. Soon Tess is given the responsibility to undertake the masculine task of driving the family wagon to Casterbridge for the delivery of beehives to the retailers. She has to start the journey for the distance of twenty to thirty miles from Marlott at two o’ clock in the morning. It shows that she is capable of being active and bold although she agrees to do it on the condition that her ‘little’ brother Abraham should keep her company. She is not only bold but also confident. It is evident in what narrator describes:

Tess was not skillful in the management of a horse, but she thought that she could take upon herself the entire conduct of the load for the present, and allow Abraham to go to sleep if he wished to do so. She made him a sort of nest in front of the hives, in such a manner that he could not fall, and, taking the reins into her own hands, jogged on as before. (21)

This extract alone illustrates her androgynous potentiality. The way she prepares the nest for her little brother to sleep in a secured way reveals the work of feminine instincts in her as in women who “are seen as nurturing, child rearing and domestically inclined” (Barker 285). Similarly, “taking the reins into her own hands” despite being “not skillful in the management of a horse” accounts for the masculine instincts in her. These instincts are supposed to be present in men who “are greater risk-takers” (Barker 285).

The journey proves to be disastrous. The morning mail-cart drives into her wagon and the pointed shaft enters the breast of the horse – Prince – causing its death. The accident is the outcome of the wrong impulses being active in her. Once she takes the reins into her hands, she is supposed to be active. However she is overtaken by the passivity because her feminine impulses are stirred due to lack of experience in driving the wagon. The expressions “Tess fell more deeply into reverie than ever” (Hardy, *Tess* 21) and “Tess awoke from the sleep into which she, too, had fallen” (22) evidently suggest that she has been passive momentarily and she has not done anything to be alert and active. It is a tragic flaw to be weak and passive at the time when she needs to be cautious and active. The mail-cart man tells her, “you was on the wrong side” (22). Obviously she is on the wrong side because metaphorically the wrong (feminine) impulses are at work in her, prior to the accident.

This happens on other occasions as well. She fails to activate the right instincts. She is the victim of her own incapability to get the right instincts at work for the right results. For instance, after the accident, momentarily she is charged with activity in vain to stop the blood of the horse from “spouting in a stream, and falling with a hiss into the road” (22). States the narrator:

In her despair, Tess sprang forward and put her hand upon the hole, with the only result that she became splashed from face to skirt with crimson drops. Then she stood helplessly looking on. Prince also stood firm and motionless as long as he could; till he suddenly sank down in a heap. (22)

The way she ‘sprang’ forward shows that she is energetic. It is the masculine part of the self, the animus. The act of springing forward and putting her hand upon the hole to stop the blood is the masculine instinct to protect or save the life of the horse.

Besides it is a masculine instinct because she refuses to be passive and she does not experience fear to see the blood gushing out of the hole. If she had been guided by this instinct prior to the accident, the disaster could have been averted.

This event obligates Tess to think of taking the responsibility of the family by being a bread-winner/provider for her family. Obviously, this accident unleashes the masculine instincts in her, preparing her to undertake the men's responsibility of being the bread-winner as "men provide for and protect family members" (Harris 90). She agrees to work for Mrs. Durbeyfield in Trantridge as she feels she is responsible for the death of the bread-winner, the horse and, therefore, she must act as the substitute for the horse by being the bread-winner. The narrator draws our attention to this aspect:

"Well, as I killed the horse, mother," she said mournfully, "I suppose I ought to do something. I don't mind going and seeing her. But you must leave it to me about asking for help. And don't go thinking about her making a match for me – it is silly." (Hardy, *Tess* 25)

This extract illustrates how instincts are animated by some significant events. Gender disruption is the result when cross-gender traits are stirred. Gender conformity results from the suppression of such traits. As Tess responds to masculine instinct for being the provider, she tends to transgress the conventional gender norms. Hence the question of match-making by Mrs. Durbeyfield in Trantridge is "silly" and inconceivable as she has got out of Cinderella complex.

In order that she fulfill this responsibility, she keeps away from her family, working in Trantridge looking after the fowl for some time, as a harvester in Marlott, as a dairymaid in Talbothays and as a fieldworker in Flintcomb-Ash. On other occasions when she is out of work, she continues to provide for her family. For

instance, she sends twenty-five pounds out of fifty pounds given to her by Angel Clare, her husband, prior to separation (203). Later as her mother demands twenty pounds for thatching, new rafters and a new ceiling upstairs, she provides her mother with the given amount (214). What is more, at the hour of crisis followed by the death of her father and the obligation for her family to leave the property as they have “no further right to stay” (279) there, she surrenders the self to Alec in the end only to serve her masculine responsibility as a provider. She yields to his expectation as he [Alec] offers to help her family,

. . . there's the house, as you know it, and the garden. It can be whitewashed in a day, and your mother can live there quite comfortably; and I will put the children [Tess's brothers and sisters] to a good school. Really I ought to do something for you! (279-80)

If the instinct of being dependent on Alec is feminine, her act of providing for her family is masculine. Thus she is the provider of her family and also dependent being in the given circumstances. Tess, being androgyne, possesses both potentials in her.

Her obligation to be a provider for her family compels her to work like men. Her masculinity is evident in her work as “historically, work has often stood as the most fundamental foundation of masculine identity (Edwards 7)” and “work and producing income are the key requisites for being a man in most cultures” (Barker 98). By working she establishes her masculine identity because “it (the work) is the very source of masculine identity (Seidler 151).”

Besides, Tess is not engaged in doing the work that is exclusive to women. The work of a harvester is undertaken both by men and women. In Talbothays, Tess works as one of the milkers that “formed quite a little battalion of men and maids”

(Hardy, *Tess* 85). Thus the job of a milker is meant for both men and women. At work as a milker she is found to be as active as Angel Clare. Elucidates the narrator:

No sooner had the hour of three struck and whizzed, than she left her room and ran to the dairyman's door; then up the ladder to Angel's calling him in a loud whisper; then woke her fellow milkmaids. By the time that Tess was dressed Clare was downstairs and out in the humid air; the remaining maids and the dairyman usually gave themselves another turn on the pillow, and did not appear till a quarter of an hour later. (102)

In all these activities Tess transgresses the gender norms. At the end of the novel, by killing Alec, she projects her masculinity and her instinct to be violent. As a murderer of Alec, she disrupts the gender norms of the Victorian period. She subverts the image of a woman as tender, delicate, vulnerable, modest, submissive and passive. At the reunion with Angel, she confesses to Angel Clare, bringing into light her hidden aggressive instincts in the following conversation:

“Angel,” she said, as if waiting for this; “do you know what I have been running after you for? To tell you that I have killed him!” A pitiful white smile lit her face as she spoke.

“What!” said he, thinking . . . that she was in some delirium.

“I have done it – I don't know how,” she continued.

“Still, I owed it to you, and to myself.” (303)

It is an instance that enables the reader to see that a woman can be aggressive and violent as men in a trying situation. A sensitive aspect is likely to bring the aggression into force. In the case of Tess, the act of murder exposes Tess as a masculine woman because violence is masculine. Tim Edwards argues in this regard

on the base of the available evidence that violent acts are the acts committed by men so much that it is axiomatic to conclude that violence is masculine:

. . . the vast majority of violent acts across the world, past and present, are committed by men. From pub brawls to building bombs, and from forced prison buggery to battered wives, the problem seems to be men: men swearing, men punching, men kicking, men smashing, men bashing, men destroying things, other men, women, themselves, even the world. Little wonder then that the answer to the question ‘Is violence masculine?’ is commonly a resounding ‘Yes’. Even when women thump men or other women, throw pans across the room in frustration, or take part in more formalized crimes of violence, there seems to be very little that is ‘feminine’ about it. (39)

When Tess is viewed from the perspective of this extract, she is undoubtedly masculine because she is violent. Her aggressive instinct is spotted earlier. While working at Flintcomb-Ash Farm as a field worker, she has an unexpected encounter with Alec, a preacher now. He starts following her with a renewed passion for her. Being irritated to see Alec follow her, she strikes on his face with gloves. The narrator relates the event:

One of her leather gloves, which she had taken off to eat her skimmer-cake, lay in her lap, and without the slightest warning she passionately swung the glove by the gauntlet directly in his face. It was heavy . . . and it struck him flat on the mouth A scarlet ooze appeared where her blow had alighted, and in a moment the blood began dropping from his mouth upon the straw. (Hardy, *Tess* 260-1)

This extract assures the masculine part of her character and foreshadows the murder of Alec in her hands. It also exposes her susceptibility to the violation of gender norms. What is more, this aggressive act is immediately followed by her stoic attitude which suggests that she has “the strength to endure” and “deny wounds” (Harris 138). Reports the narrator:

. . . she sank down again. “Now punish me!” she said, turning up her eyes to him with the hopeless defiance of sparrow’s gaze before its captor twists its neck. “Whip me, crush me; you need not mind those people under the rick. I shall not cry out. Once victim, always victim: that’s the law.” (Hardy, *Tess* 261)

This extract exposes another masculine trait in her. Harris claims that it is a manly virtue to be stoical (138). Her defiant expressions “Whip me, crush me” and “I shall not cry out” reveal her strength to “ignore the pain” (138) as a stoic.

On an earlier occasion too, the reader finds the gender switch in her from femininity to masculinity, suggesting the fluidity in her personality. When her baby, born out of seduction, is found to be “dying” “quietly and painlessly” (Hardy, *Tess* 73) she is struck with grief over the approaching death of her baby. Initially her reaction is feminine. She starts crying “O merciful God, have pity, have pity upon my poor baby!” (73). Soon she gains self-control and acts in a masculine way. She accomplishes the masculine task of the priest by baptizing the baby in accordance with Christian ceremony. It fills her heart with confidence and her face with a glow. Thus she exhibits a fluid personality as the result of blended gender traits. In other words, she is transformed into an androgyne. The narrator relates it:

Then their sister [Tess], with much augmented confidence in the efficacy of this sacrament, poured forth from the bottom of her heart

the thanks-giving that follows, uttering it boldly and triumphantly . . . the ecstasy of faith apotheosized her; it set upon her face a glowing irradiation She did not look like Sissy to them now, but as a being large, towering and awful, a divine personage with whom they had nothing in common. (74-5)

The extract shows the outcome of self-control. Self-control is a masculine quality by which “we learn to exhibit a form of domination over our emotion” (Seidler, *Rediscovering* 48). The self-control brings to her “augmented confidence” and “ecstasy of faith” letting her look like a divine personage.

Moreover, she turns bold enough to defy a vicar – when he refuses to give her baby a Christian burial – with a declaration, “Then I don’t like you” and “I’ll never come to your church no more!” (Hardy, *Tess* 76). In all these occasions, her masculinity is predominant. For instance, while working as a harvester in the field at Marlott, prior to the death of the baby, she suckles her baby in the presence of other harvesters (70). In the Victorian society it is a bold act for any girl to be an unwedded mother and then suckle the baby before others. She is androgyne in the given instance because her masculine trait of boldness is combined with the nurturing, self-sacrificing role of the mother. Besides, the act of defying the vicar and the act of suckling the baby as an unwedded mother of the Victorian period expose her manly trait as a rebel who is supposed to “defy authority and be a non-conformist” (Harris 142).

In many instances, apart from masculinity, her femininity is conspicuous. Emotion is a key element in every definition of femininity (Glover and Cora Kaplan 15). Tess’s emotional involvement with Clare is the feminine part of her life. In the words of Izz Huett, “nobody could love” him [Clare] more than Tess because “she

would have laid down her life for” him (Hardy, *Tess* 212). It implies the feminine instinct of self-effacement/ self-abnegation. Angel Clare is also aware of it. The extract given below clarifies her feminine part and her emotional attachment with him.

“Tess, you are not a bit cheerful this evening – not at all as you used to be. Those harridans on the panels upstairs have unsettled you. I am sorry I brought you here. I wonder if you really love me after all?”

He knew that she did, and the words had no serious intent; but she was surcharged with emotion, and winced like a wounded animal. Though she tried not to shed tears she could not help showing one or two. (171)

It is an emotional moment for Tess, prior to confession of her past to him.

The confession causes separation. The separation affects her so emotionally that, in the presence of her mother, she bursts into sobs. She acts in that way because presently she is neither a rebel to “defy authority” (Harris 142) nor a stoic to “control emotions” (138). Instead she is a feminine being and a true wife “who would have laid her life” (Hardy, *Tess* 212) for her husband Clare. The narrator elaborates it:

“Mother –” Tess went across to Joan Durbeyfield, laid her face upon the matron’s bosom, and burst into sobs. “I don’t know how to tell ‘ee, mother! . . . You said to me, and wrote to me that I was not to tell him. But I did tell him – I couldn’t help it – and he went away!”

“O you little fool . . . you little fool!”

Tess was convulsed with weeping . . . she gasped through her sobs.
(201)

The extract shows that she is completely possessed by her feminine traits of being emotional and weak.

Her feelings toward Angel are so deep-rooted that his return from Brazil with an intention of getting reunited with her and his obligation to leave her as she lives with Alec strikes her with intense grief, driving her hysterical. Her deep emotional involvement with Clare becomes expressive in her “low note of moaning,” “Oh – oh – oh!” followed by “a silence,” “then a heavy sigh” and again, “Oh – oh – oh!” (300). In “the tone of a soliloquy rather than an exclamation, and a dirge rather than a soliloquy” (300), she continues to moan in distress and desperation in the presence of Alex:

“And he is dying – he looks as if he is dying . . . and my sin will kill him and not kill me! . . . O you have torn my life all in pieces . . . made me be what I prayed you in pity not to make me be again!My own true husband will never never – O God – I can’t bear this! I cannot!” (301)

The feelings of Tess are so intense and so strong that even incomplete expression “My own true husband will never never” is more meaningful and more expressive because of the emotional intensity involved. In this state Tess turns out to be the embodiment of emotion, which is “a key element in every definition of femininity” (Glover and Cora Kaplan 15).

Her love for Angel Clare is the cause of her hatred for Alec and of his [Alec’s] murder. She confesses it to Angel, “Yes. He heard me crying about you, and he bitterly taunted me; and called you by a foul name; and then I did it: my heart could not bear it: he had nagged me about you before – and then I dressed myself, and came away to find you.” (Hardy, *Tess* 304). Alec’s act of taunting Clare and the use

of foul name for him [Angel] causes a gender switch in her from femininity to masculinity, from love for Clare to aggression and violence for Alec. Her love in the sense of self-abnegation is evident in this confession. Her love for Clare is her weakness and cause for her tragic end. So Tess as a wife of Clare and Tess as a murderer of Alec represent in her two divergent aspects of androgynous personality of a human being.

On other occasions too, her femininity can be perceived. She is passive and submissive when Alec seduces her prior to her marriage and after marriage. She is driven to be dependent on Alec's financial support. She can't but choose to be obedient to Angel Clare when he instructs her, "Until I come to you it will be better that you should not try to come to me" (198). Even the narrator notices this dimension and comments on it as if it is the only choice left for Tess:

The severity of the decree seemed deadly to Tess: she saw his view of her clearly enough: he [Clare] could regard her in no other light than that of one who had practiced gross deceit upon him. Yet could a woman who had done even what she had done deserve all this? But she could contest the point with him no further. She simply repeated after him his own words

"Until you come to me I must not try to come to you."

"Just so."

"May I write to you?"

"O yes – if you are ill, or want anything at all"

"I agree to the conditions, Angel . . . don't make it more than I can bear!" (198-9)

Although there is a subtle warning at the end of this extract, the sense of obedience on the part of Tess can be conspicuous in the extract. Apart from that, Tess sounds gentle and polite in her response to Clare.

When her personality is evaluated in totality, she manifests as an androgyne combining strength and tenderness, boldness and vulnerability, active initiative and passive receptivity. Her strength lies in her struggle to survive as a breadwinner and her tenderness [lies] in her feelings and emotions. Her active initiative is witnessed in taking responsibility for her family and passive receptivity as a victim of exploitation. Hardy “challenged the sexual ideology of his time in creating” a character like Tess Durbeyfield (Ruthven 11).

Angel Clare is another case of gender subversion because he is another androgyne in the novel. However androgynous potentials are transparent in Tess from the very begin. In the case of Angel Clare, the influence of patriarchal gender norms is distinct until he leaves for Brazil after separation from Tess. After that, especially after his return from Brazil, he evinces androgynous traits. Initially he acts in a way of gender conformity, being dominant, active, strong and independent.

In connection with the nature of men, Darwin “recited a familiar Victorian Litany. Men excelled in courage, pugnacity, energy, and preeminently in the higher intellectual faculties of abstraction, reason, and imagination” (qtd. in Russet 40). Angel Clare represents these men so far as these traits are concerned. Different instances in the novel reveal these qualities. The narrator, through the expository method of representation, introduces Angel Clare through one of the girls working in Talbothays. According to it, he is found to be active, “learning milking” (Hardy, *Tess* 88), and “learning farming in all its branches” (89). The information that “he has

learnt sheep-farming at another place, and he's now mastering dairy work" (Hardy 89) projects him as a man of activity. The narrator reinforces the same aspect:

He was the youngest son of his father, a poor parson at the other end of the country, and had arrived at Talbothays Dairy as a six months' pupil, after going the round of some other farms, his object being to acquire a practical skill in the various processes of farming, with a view either to the colonies, or the tenure of a home farm, as circumstances might decide. (89)

Besides, Angel Clare, being masculine, is intellectual and independent in his choice about his career. Therefore he refuses to be a minister of the gospel although his brothers and father are engaged in church as priests. The following extract shows Angel as an independent and intellectual being:

"Look into this book, my boy," he [Angel's father] said.

"What do you know about it?"

"I ordered it," said Angel simply.

"What for?"

"To read."

"How can you think of reading it?"

"How can I? Why – it is a system of philosophy. There is no more moral, or even religious work published."

"Yes – moral enough; I don't deny that. But religious! – and for you, who intend to be a minister of the gospel!"

"Since you have alluded to the matter, father," said the son, with anxious thought upon his face, "I should like to say, once and for all,

that I should prefer not to take orders. I fear I could not conscientiously do so.” (90)

The above extract exposes the masculine qualities of Angel as independent in his spirit. He is not submissive. Besides he is bold enough to defend his decision and take a step against the wish of his father. Thus, Angel, at this point, is the gender stereotype.

Besides, the reader witnesses him as a man of energy. When the lane to Mellstock is flooded at certain places, he offers to help Marian, Izz Huett, Retty and Tess who are stuck up on the way to church by carrying each one of them in his arms through the pool. He is confident about his energy to say, “I’ll carry you through the pool – every Jill of you” (Hardy, *Tess* 112). He does carry them all through the pool to the bank on the other side and thus, in a way of reminding Darwin’s Victorian litany, represents men who “excelled in . . . energy. . .” (qtd. in Russet 40).

To be strong and pugnacious is another masculine trait in the Victorian period. Angel Clare’s masculinity lies in his being strong so as to be pugnacious. On the occasion when Tess and Angel visit a small town for shopping, prior to wedding and return to the inn in the evening, one of two men makes some indecent remarks which prompt Clare to strike “the man on the chin with full force of his fist, sending him staggering backwards into the passage” (Hardy, *Tess* 163). This act projects Clare as a person who tends to be pugnacious and aggressive. A moment later, the man apologizes for it and Angel Clare gives him five shillings to “plaster the blow.” Both of them bid “each other a pacific good-night” (163) as they part. These two acts of Clare strike two different chords that indicate two antithetical traits in him. If one is masculine, another trait is not at all masculine.

Often, men present themselves as ‘rational’ and ‘reasonable’ (Seidler 15) and reason has been defined in opposition to nature and so to our emotions, feelings, needs and desires (15). Angel Clare exercises the reason – a masculine trait – and remains unaffected by the tears of Tess. In the chapter thirty six, Angel Clare decides to separate from Tess after her confession of her past. States the narrator:

She broke into sobs and turned her back to him. It would almost have won round any man but Angel Clare. Within the remoter depth of his constitution, so gentle and affectionate as he was in general, there lay hidden a hard logical deposit, like a vein of metal in a soft loam It had blocked his acceptance of Church; it blocked his acceptance of Tess. (Hardy, *Tess* 189)

This extract highlights the masculine part of Angel. The “hard logical deposit” and “vein of metal” allude to reason which enables Clare to be invulnerable to emotions. He is not going to be affected by tears as his sense of reason is stronger than any other man. This reason enforces him to reject both church and Tess. The “gentle and affectionate” part of Clare refers to the feminine part in him. It is only an upper layer with hard logical deposit hidden beneath. It reverses the image of things like shell and bone marrow having hard surface with soft substance encased. “A vein of metal in a soft loam” projects Angel Clare as a soft-looking person with a strong sense of reason within.

The part of Victorian litany recited by Darwin is about the aspect that men excel in the higher intellectual faculties of abstraction, reason and imagination. That Angel Clare is a man from this perspective is evident in the event of his transformation from the man of reason to a man of emotions, from a moralist to a humanist and from a patriarchal man to an androgyne. As the result of his trying experience in Brazil, he begins to think of his relation with Tess from a different

perspective. He becomes skeptical about the moral values of the patriarchal society.

The narrator relates the circumstances that have caused the transformation:

During this time of absence he had mentally aged a dozen years. . . .
 Having long discredited the old systems of mysticism he now began to discredit the old appraisements of morality. He thought they wanted readjusting. Who was the moral man? Still more pertinently, who was the moral woman? The beauty or ugliness of a character lay not only in its achievements, but in its aims and impulses; its true history lay not among things done, but among things willed. How, then, about Tess? Viewing her in these lights a regret for his hasty judgment began to oppress him. (267-8)

Besides, an English companion, on learning the past of Clare, tells him that “he [Clare] was wrong in coming away from her” (268). Remorse is the outcome of his experience in Brazil. His very sense of logic affects him to think of Tess in the positive light. The narrator adds:

The cursory remarks of the large-minded stranger, of whom he knew absolutely nothing beyond a commonplace name, were sublimed by his death, and influenced Clare more than all the reasoned ethics of the philosophers. His own parochialism made him ashamed by its contrast A remorse struck into him. The words of Izz Huett . . . came back to him Did she love him more than Tess did? No, she had replied; Tess would lay down her life for him: and she [Izz] herself could do no more. (268-9)

His regret and remorse signify the initiation of feminine impulses in him. Now they are fully activated and Angel is transformed into androgyne. Prior to his visit to

Brazil, these impulses were momentarily activated, “his eyes were full of tears” (207) for the first time when his mother, commenting about the perfect woman being a working woman, said, “Well, I wish I could have seen her [Tess], Angel. Since she is pure and chaste she would have been refined enough for me” (207). Obviously he suppressed these impulses.

Presently what Chris Barker states that “men are more disposed to anger and less to empathy” (287) is not applicable to Angel Clare because now he is more disposed to empathy and less to anger. For instance, after the mother’s wish to see his wife with a comment that she was “pure and chaste” (207), “his eyes were full of tears” (207). A moment later “he almost talked to her [Tess] in his anger, as if she had been in the room” (208). In the past he was a slave to conventionally. States the narrator,

This night the woman of his belittling deprecations was thinking how great and good her husband was With all his attempted independence of judgement this advanced and well-meaning young man . . . was yet the slave to custom and conventionality when surprised back into his early teachings. No prophet had told him, and he was not prophet enough to tell himself, that essentially this young wife of his was as deserving of the praise of King Lemuel as any other woman endowed with the dislike of evil (208)

Obviously in the past he was less disposed to empathy because he was a slave to conventional gender norms. His anger for Tess was the evidence for it.

Now, after his return from Brazil, his anger is replaced with desperate feelings for Tess. The letter of Tess accusing him of his cruel treatment of her – “I can never, never forgive you! You are cruel, cruel indeed It is all injustice I have

received at your hands!” (290) – does not rouse the masculine response in him. He feels “it is quite true” fearing “perhaps she will never be reconciled to me” (290). He also wonders why he has not judged Tess more constructively than biographically, by the will rather than by the deed (292). Obviously the time has turned the tables on him, reducing him to a vulnerable state. Consequently he is transformed into a feminine man.

Angel Clare’s passive attitude and emotion are clearly perceptible when he meets Tess while she lives with Alec in Sandbourne. He pleads her to “forgive” him “for going away” and continues to speak in the soft manner when Tess is heard saying, “Don’t come close to me, Angel! No – you must not. Keep away!” (298). The depth of his emotional involvement with Tess can be noticed in his question asked to her, “But don’t you love me, my dear wife, because I have been so pulled down by illness?” (298). A bit later he becomes speechless, passive and unassertive on hearing her say, “He [Alec] was very kind to me, and to mother, and to all of us after father’s death” and “He [Alec] has won me back – to him” (299). The narrator describes Angel’s reaction stating, “Clare looked at her keenly, then gathering her meaning flagged like one plague-stricken, and his glance sank: it fell on her hands, which once rosy, were now white and more delicate” (299). He behaves like the one who has been emasculated. He only responds, “Ah – it is my fault.” The narrator elaborates Angel’s unassertive and passive behavior:

But he could not get on. Speech was an inexpressive as silence. But he had a vague consciousness of one thing, though it was not clear to him till later; that his original Tess had spiritually ceased to recognize the body before him as hers – allowing it to drift

A few instant passed, and he found that Tess was gone. His face grew colder and more shrunken as he stood, concentrated on the moment; and a minute or two after he found himself in the street, walking along, he did not know whither. (299)

Such a dull and passive reaction of Angel runs counter to the violent reaction of Tess that culminates in the murder of Alec. Both characters at this instance subvert the gender norms by reversing their gender traits. Moreover, Angel Clare's reaction as a husband witnessing the adultery and seduction of his wife is contrary to the predominant masculine spirit of the nineteenth century and the culture of duels then.

Nineteenth century was the time when "the duel was fought for the sake of male honor" which "entailed an ideal of manliness" (Mosse 18). Courage and daring were some of the virtues that a man must possess; officers and students, politicians and businessmen, as well as Jews used the duel to disprove their unmanly, cowardly stereotype (18-9). George L. Mosse further adds:

Dueling and fencing – a necessary skill for fighting duels – were now regarded as a school for character. Just so, a general uneasiness that had not existed before informed some of those who resorted to duels, even in Germany. For example, the cuckolded husband in Theodor Fantane's novel *Effi Briest* (1895), who has just killed his wife's seducer in a duel, has bouts of conscience in spite of the fact that he repeats to himself constantly that "everything happened as it was bound to happen." (21-2)

Viewed from this perspective Clare does nothing to follow the trend of fighting a duel, despite being a cuckolded husband. He does not seem to bother about things like male honor, ideal of manliness, courage and daring. He is now the embodiment of

passivity and a feminine man. Thus Angel Clare subverts the conventional gender norms because he fails to suppress the androgynous potentials in him so as to shape him in accordance with the traditional gender ideology.

What is more, male and female protagonists of the novel *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* are developed on the concept of androgyny. Consequently Darwin's argument about sexual choice being exercised by male alone among human beings comes out as a fallacy because the reader witnesses this privilege exercised equally by male and female protagonists along with the antagonist. Cynthia Eagle Russett states:

. . . it is interesting that Darwin awarded the power of sexual choice among human beings to the males. Men had "gained the power of selection" because they were "more powerful in body and mind" than women. It was true, Darwin allowed, that even in savage societies women had some limited freedom of choice: "They can tempt the men whom they prefer, and can sometimes reject those whom they dislike, either before or after marriage." But clearly the primary selector was man. (80)

It is true in the case of Clare and Alec whereas in the case of Tess it turns out to be a fallacy. Angel Clare exercises the power of selection, sexual choice, because he is powerful in body and mind. He is a primary selector in the sense he chooses Tess out of four – Retty, Marian, Izz Huett and, of course, Tess herself – before she chooses him. Later, before going to Brazil, it is noticed that he is about to use the power of sexual choice in the case of Izz. He informs her that he has separated from his wife and asks her [Izz] if she will go with him. The narrator illustrates it through the conversation:

I may not be able to love you; but – will you go with me instead of her?” “You truly wish me to go?”

“I do. I have been badly used enough to wish for relief. And you at least love me disinterestedly.”

“Yes – I will go,” said Izz after a pause.

“You will?” “You know what it means, Izz?”

“It means that I shall live with you for the time you are over there – that’s good enough for me.”

“Remember, you are not to trust me in morals now. But I ought to remind you that it will be wrong – doing in the eyes of civilization – western civilization, that is to say.”

“I don’t mind . . . and there’s no other way.” (Hardy, *Tess* 211)

Angel is the primary selector in the above conversation and Izz Huett is only left with a choice for giving her consent. Soon he changes his decision after knowing through her that no one could love him more than Tess. Later, after months of time, owing to his realization about the true worth of Tess he decides to have Tess back as his wife for the rest of his life. In all these instances, Angel Clare as a man decides to choose his sexual partner.

In the case of Alec too, the power of selecting the sexual partner lies with him because as a man he is powerful physically, mentally and, of course, financially. Hence he manages to seduce Tess before and after her marriage with Angel. Alec wins her back by helping her family on the financial ground. Thus Darwin’s argument about the man as the primary selector materializes in the case of Angel and Alec.

However, Darwin’s assumption goes wrong in the case of Tess. Tess, despite being a woman, exercises the power of selection in the later part of the novel. This

happens when she is required to make a choice between Angel Clare and Alec. After she begins to live with Alec as his sexual partner, Angel Clare visits her with an appeal to forgive him and accept the reunion with him. There she exercises her power of sexual choice. First she chooses Alec on the grounds that “it is too late” (298). “Waving her hand” impatiently she says, “Too late, too late!” and adds, “Don’t come close to me, Angel! No – you must not. Keep away” (298). A bit later she chooses Angel Clare by killing Alec, although it is meant only for a short period. At this instance she proves to be more powerful than Angel Clare by being capable of killing a strong man like Alec.

Being androgynous, Tess as a woman proves to be no less powerful than Angel and Alec as men. She subverts the conventional gender norms by being as strong as Angel and Alec and Hardy subverts Darwin’s assumption that men are “more powerful in body and mind than women” (Russet 80) by projecting Tess as powerful and enabling her to exercise the power of sexual choice in the case of Alec and Clare and be the selector in either case.

The final part of the novel, after the reunion of Tess and Angel Clare, is quite significant from the perspective of androgyny. Presently both of them are free from gender norms, making their appearance as androgynies. “Tenderness” is “absolutely dominant in Clare at last” (Hardy, *Tess* 304), which is the evidence for the presence of femininity and he declares, “I will not desert you; I will protect you by every means in my power, dearest love, whatever you may have done or not have done!” (304). It is the declaration of a masculine man. Now Clare is a full-fledged androgyne. The last six days that they [Tess and Clare] spend together prior to her execution for the murder of Alec show her [feminine] agony expressed with “a suppressed sob” (311) over the impossibility of the prospect of meeting after they “are dead” (311) and her

saturated feelings of “happiness” (312). It also reveals the stoic spirit, a masculine trait, of Tess as she surrenders to the authorities saying, “I am ready” (313).

The novel *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* does what Hardy wants Florence Henniker – his friend, a novelist and a short-story writer – and others to do by saying things presently what people will be thinking and saying three decades later. Through gender subversion and projection of androgynous potentials in male and female protagonists, Hardy challenges the conventional way of thinking about gender and suggests the possibility for gender fluidity and multiplicity in our identity. The death of Tess symbolically signifies the death of every androgynous personality in the patriarchal society as the result of obligation to live in gender conformity.

In conclusion, it is imperative to acknowledge that these findings cannot be quoted as sweeping generalizations for anything connected with androgyny and, to urge that there should be consistent investigation and research about how these dual traits develop, what difference they bring to society, what it is that makes a character androgynous, what it’s social implication, how androgynous individual characters systematically maintain and modify their perceptions, whether androgyny represents the full potentials of the sexes, whether the elimination of gender assignments could progress toward real humanization and whether androgyny can bring significant transformations in the social world and be conducive to a renovation of the social fabric.

CHAPTER IV

GENDER STEREOTYPES

It is the fact that since birth, children in patriarchal culture are molded into gender stereotypes so that they can accomplish their future social roles. Thus gender is socially determined. Consequently males are associated with masculine gender and females with feminine gender. Being subject to gender stereotypes, their individualities will take the shape accordingly. Men are endowed with authority over women. They are stereotyped as violent, intelligent, independent, strong and active whereas their female counterparts are conditioned to be placid, emotional, dependent, weak, domestic, docile and passive.

The traits which differentiate a social group from people in general are “more likely to be judged as stereotypical than traits which are less differentiating” (Ford and Tonander 373). A stereotype, as defined by Ashmore and Del Boca, is “a structured set of beliefs about the personal attributes of a group of people” (qtd. in Deaux 290). Kay Deaux points out:

Gender stereotypes have traditionally been defined in terms of the presence or absence of specific personality traits. Most commonly, a distinction has been made between expressive traits, viewed as more characteristics of women, and instrumental traits seen as more characteristics of men. Thus, women are typically viewed as being warm, gentle, and aware of the feelings of others, while men are described by traits such as independent, dominant, and assertive. (290)

Throughout the world these stereotypes prevail, demanding and expecting how each gender should behave, dress, think and talk.

The nineteenth century literature paradoxically questions and reinforces this gender ideology. In the case of Hester in *The Scarlet Letter*, the ideology is questioned by letting her out of the house and placing her in the public sphere as an independent woman being the breadwinner. On the contrary, her husband is projected in accordance with gender norms. Similarly, in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Tess's mother – Mrs. Joan Durbeyfield – conforms to gender norms by being inseparable from the home. She is largely – if not entirely – removed from the public sphere and enclosed in the safety of her husband's home. She just plays the role of an ideal woman by being the good wife to Jack Durbeyfield and good mother to Tess and other children. She is gracefully adept at household duties and motherhood. On the contrary, Tess breaks this gender norm by being in the workplace. She turns out to be a New Woman identified as self-supporting and independent. If Dinah Morris in *Adam Bede* shows the potentials of New Woman, Adam's mother – Lisbeth – behaves in conformity to the domestic ideals of the Victorian era. She embodies the traditional concept of middle class femininity. She is shown in the passive role, enclosed in the home of her husband and then in the home of sons.

Both Mrs. Joan Durbeyfield in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and Mrs. Lisbeth in *Adam Bede* appear to be domestically industrious, like other Victorian women who manage to clothe and feed their children while remaining sturdy and cheerful themselves. Their job together is to raise their children and take care of their small house. Therefore, they serve as the model of Victorian femininity with domestic skills in hand. They prove to be patient, loving, non-assertive, selfless, controlled and inherently nurturing. Both of them refuse to come out of their shell of dependence and passivity and the so-called image of an angel of the house even when their husbands die, exposing them to their fates. Mrs. Joan Durbeyfield, at the death of her husband

Mr Jack Durbeyfield, continues to depend on her elder daughter Tess and Mrs. Lisbeth, at the of her husband Thias Bede, accepts her feminine role of mother till the end of her life. They exemplify mothering behavior, a mantra that evokes connotations similar to the Angel in the House. Mrs. Bird and Mrs. Shelby from *Uncle Tom's Cabin* also represent the same image by being kind and generous to others and fulfilling their duties to the best of their abilities. They continue to be good wives and mother figures. However, their critical attitude toward slavery, their active involvement in helping slaves and their rational way of thinking against slavery save them from being mere gender stereotypes.

As for the male characters, Roger Chillingworth of *The Scarlet Letter*, George Shelby of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Alec of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Arthur Donnithorne of *Adam Bede* and John Reed as well as St. John of *Jane Eyre* reflect the stereotypical traits of males. They behave in a way that asserts the superiority of males over females. They are characterized as dominant. If George Shelby is authoritative enough to make decisions without consulting his wife Mrs. Shelby, John Reed as a boy proves to be violent and aggressive. Alec strives throughout the novel to possess Tess before and after her marriage with Angel Clare. Possession is an element to establish his dominance over Tess. He asserts his control over her with his financial assistance to her family. All these characters have been portrayed in accordance with the stereotypical gender roles. Therefore, they reinforce the commonly assumed idea that men are tougher than women and women are softer and more vulnerable than men.

Roger Chillingworth, the major character of *The Scarlet Letter*, is noted for his adherence to a masculine idea of activity, independence and intelligence. His medical profession befits him for public sphere. The same profession prompts him to explore

for knowledge in medicine. Throughout the novel he is actively involved in his search for medicine and the guilty lover of his wife Hester Prynne. His rational thinking guides him to exclude Hester from the scheme of his revenge and leave his fortune for her daughter Pearl in the event of his death. The narrator too perceives the masculinity in him which he (the narrator) describes in the following way:

He was small in stature, with a furrowed visage which . . . could hardly be termed aged. There was a remarkable intelligence in his features, as of a person who had so cultivated his mental part that it could not fail to mould the physical to itself, and become manifest by unmistakable tokens. (Hawthorne 51)

This description highlights the intelligence and the mental power of Chillingworth. Obviously it is a masculine quality.

The face of Chillingworth bears the evidence for his masculinity because it is marked for its intellectuality. The narrator alludes to Chillingworth's face noted for intellectuality and maturity as an assertion of his masculine gender stereotype. This happens as Hester recalls her past while being exposed to humiliation on the scaffold. The narrator refers to it in the following description:

She saw her own face, glowing with girlish beauty, and illuminating all the interior of the dusky mirror in which she had been wont to gaze at it. There she beheld another countenance, of a man well stricken in years, a pale, thin, scholar-like visage, with eyes dim and bleared by the lamplight that had served them to pore over many ponderous books. Yet those same bleared optics and a strange, penetrating power . . . read the human soul (50)

This extract marks the contrast between Hester's "girlish beauty" gazed by her in the "dusky mirror" and Chillingworth's "scholar-like visage" with eyes to pore over books. This contrast can be explained in terms of Hester's femininity and Chillingworth's masculinity connected with his intellectuality and maturity. The "penetrating power" to "read human soul" refers to the mental power, maturity and psychological insight in Chillingworth. These things project him as gender stereotype.

In the same occasion, the narrator notices another masculine trait and highlights it – Chillingworth's power of control over the self and his wife. When Chillingworth recognizes his wife on the scaffold, being punished for her adultery with a Scarlet Letter A on her, he is horrified momentarily and soon controls the self:

A writhing horror twisted itself across his features, like a snake gliding swiftly over them, and making one little pause. . . . His face darkened with some powerful emotion, which, nevertheless, he so instantaneously controlled by an effort of his will, that, save at a single moment, its expression might have passed for calmness. After a brief space, the convulsion grew almost imperceptible, and finally subsided into the depths of his nature. When he found the eyes of Hester Prynne fastened on his own, and saw that she appeared to recognize him, he slowly and calmly raised his finger, made a gesture with it in the air, and laid it on his lips. (52)

This extract illustrates his power to control his emotions and his authority over her. With a dignity he brings both under control. A "gesture" on the part of Chillingworth is sufficient to silence her. It asserts his dominant nature.

His rationality is obvious in his assurance to Hester in the prison that he will not avenge himself on her innocent baby. Hester is also convinced about it although initially she repels “the offered medicine” (61). He admits it:

“Foolish woman!” responded the physician, half coldly, half soothingly. “What should ail me, to harm this misbegotten and miserable babe? The medicine is potent for good; and were it my child – yea, mine own, as well as thine! – I could do no better for it.” (61)

This assurance vindicates that he is guided by reason rather than by passion.

His rationality enables him to confess to Hester that he is equally guilty about the relation between them. He confesses when Hester murmurs that she has greatly wronged him:

“We have wronged each other,” answered he. “Mine was the first wrong, when I betrayed thy budding youth into a false and unnatural relation with my decay. Therefore, as a man who has not thought and philosophized in vain, I seek no vengeance, plot no evil against thee. Between thee and me, the scale hangs fairly balanced”(64)

This confession establishes his personality as a man of logic and reason. The way he reasons between his wrongful deed and her wrongful deed with the judgement that “the scale hangs fairly balanced” exemplifies his rationality.

What is more, he remains dominant and assertive in his relation with her and expects her to obey him by keeping his identity a secret. He is a gender stereotype in this regard too because “men are described by traits such as . . . dominant and assertive” (Deaux 290). He instructs her:

“One thing, thou that wast my wife, I would enjoin upon thee” continued the scholar. “Thou hast kept the secret of thy paramour.

Keep, likewise, mine! There are none in this land that know me.
 Breathe not, to any human soul, that thou didst ever call me husband. .
 . .Thou and thine, Hester Prynne, belong to me . . . betray me not! ”

(Hawthorne 65)

This extract shows his authority over her. The expression "Thou and thine . . . belong to me" reinforces his sense of possession over her. It is evidence that he is molded into a complete gender stereotype.

The feminine trait of being “warm” (Deaux 290) is a matter of past in his case, which is evident in his confession to Hester, “I drew thee into my heart, into its innermost chamber, and sought to warm thee by the warmth which thy presence made there” (Hawthorne 63-4). Presently he is a full-fledged gender stereotype. It is the outcome of his patriarchal upbringing that can be perceived in his admission, “My heart was a habitation large enough for many guests, but lonely and chill, and without a household fire” (63). Now he is the man shaped into the mold of masculinity in accordance with the expectations of the society.

A minor character Governor Bellingham in *The Scarlet Letter* is described in a way what people in a patriarchal society think men are like and believe men should be like. He is a public figure and noted for his authoritative personality. The following description of Bellingham points out the instrumental traits of masculine gender:

Here, to witness the scene which we are describing, sat Governor Bellingham himself, with four sergeants about his chair, bearing halberds, as a guard of honor. He wore a dark feather in his hat, a border of embroidery on his cloak, and a black velvet tunic beneath; a gentleman advanced in years, with a hard experience written in his wrinkles. He was not ill fitted to be the head. . . . (54)

This description presents him as the stereotype of a ruler and a person of authority. Apparently it projects his masculinity. The expressions "guard of honor," "a hard experience" and "the head" in the given extract create the masculine appearance around him, showing him as a "leader" (Broverman 66-7) and a "dominant" (Deaux 290) figure. He is the embodiment of patriarchy whereas other masculine gender stereotyped characters of the novel are followers of the patriarchal conventions.

Uncle Tom's Cabin also includes some instances of gender stereotypes despite the fact that it abounds with events of gender disruption and reversal of gender roles. Mr. Shelby represents the masculine gender. He is endowed with qualities that assert his masculinity. He is a patriarch and expects everyone in the household to look up to him as the head and obey his instructions. His decision to sell Tom and Harry to the slave trader Haley without consulting his wife signifies his patriarchal authority in the household. The following conversation between Mr. and Mrs. Shelby shows that Mr. Shelby is not impressed to hear a question raised against his decision:

Oh, Mr Shelby! – and you have promised him [Tom] his freedom, too— you and I have spoken to him a hundred times of it. Well, I can believe anything now; I can believe now that you could sell little Harry, poor Eliza's only child!' said Mrs. Shelby, in a tone between grief and indignation.

'Well, since you must know all, it's so. I have agreed to sell Tom and Henry both; and I don't know why I am to be rated as if I were a monster for doing what everyone does every day.' (Stowe 32)

This acknowledgement on the part of Mr. Shelby establishes his identity as a man of authority, which is one of the stereotypes of man in the patriarchal society. This

extract reveals the presence of masculine traits, “dominant and assertive” (Deaux290) in him.

His stereotypical behavior and attitude manifest on another occasion too. Haley – the slave trader – hearing about Eliza's escape with her son Harry complains against Mr. Shelby in the name of fair dealing. It provokes Mr. Shelby to challenge him for a duel. This vindicates Shelby as a man of aggression. The following conversation illustrates it:

'I did expect fair dealing in this matter, I confess,' said Haley. 'Well sir,' said Mr. Shelby, turning sharply round upon him, 'what am I to understand by that remark? If any man calls my honour in question, I have but one answer for him.'

The trader cowered at this and in a somewhat lower tone said that 'it was a plaguy hard on a fellow, that had made a fair bargain, to be gulled that way'. (Stowe 40)

Mr. Shelby's insinuation for a duel –“I have but one answer for him” – with Haley shows that he is ready to reclaim his masculine identity through fighting. It reflects Shelby's masculine personality traits as a man susceptible to “aggression” and “force” (Millet 26).

What is more, he also gives the impression of being possessive and protective of his wife when Haley speaks of her in a light manner. When Mrs. Shelby leaves the room occupied by Haley and Shelby, Haley makes a comment on it. Shelby reacts instantly voicing his objection. The conversation below illustrates it:

'Old lady don't like your humble servant, over and above,' said Haley, with an uneasy effort to be very familiar.

'I am not accustomed to hear my wife spoken of with such freedom,' said Mr. Shelby, dryly.

'Beg pardon; of course, only a joke, you know,' said Haley, forcing a laugh.

'Some jokes are less agreeable than others,' rejoined Shelby. (Stowe 40-1)

At this instance, Shelby serves the gender stereotype of husband endowed with the responsibility of protecting her honour. It is an act of “manly courage” defined as “chivalry” and it “meant protecting the weak and speaking the truth” (Guts Muth qtd. in Mosse 42).

Henrique is another male character nourished under the patriarchal culture to be a future patriarch. He is a twelve-year-old nephew of Augustine St. Clare, exhibiting some of the qualities that expose him as the gender stereotype in the making. The narrator introduces him as “eldest son of Alfred” and “a noble, dark-eyed, princely boy, full of vivacity and spirit” (Stowe 246), highlighting the masculinity of the boy with masculine gender nouns “son” and “boy.” His behavior shows that he is learning the ways of patriarchal society by putting himself into the mold of masculine gender stereotype. Dominant nature, aggression and anger appear to be the part of his nature. For instance, he loses his temper with his slave Dodo when he notices dirt on his horse and reacts in a manner that befits masculine gender stereotype. The following conversation illustrates:

'What is this, Dodo, you little lazy dog! you haven't rubbed my horse down this morning.'

'Yes, mas'r' said Dodo, submissively; 'he got that dust on his own self.'

"You rascal, shut your mouth!" said Henrique, violently raising his riding-whip. 'How dare you speak?' (Stowe 246)

This conversation reveals that both boys have adopted the manners of the slave-owning society. Dodo has learnt to behave in a submissive – feminine – way like other slaves and Henrique has molded the self in the dominant fashion of a slave owner. Men in most western cultures are not supposed to show any emotion in public life other than anger, except in certain ritually defined circumstances, because anger is masculine power at its most impressive (Middleton qtd. in Seidler, "Pain" 115).

Henrique's violent temper as a boy establishes him as a stereotyped man of the future.

The act of punishing the slave Dodo illustrates it:

Henrique struck him across the face with his riding-whip and, seizing one of his arms, forced him on to his knees, and beat him till he was out of breath. 'There, you impudent dog! Now will you learn not to answer back when I speak to you? Take the horse back, and clean him properly. I'll teach you your place!' (246)

This instance gives the impression of Henrique as angry, aggressive, dominant and conscious of his authority. There is no touch of sympathy in him. In short, he is the replica of masculine gender stereotype. However, he lacks the quality of chivalry, found in Mr. Shelby, meant for protecting the weak and rational way of thinking traced in Mr. Chillingworth.

Boys, like Henrique, are bound to act like Simon Legree provided that they all grow through the same mold of hegemonic masculinity. Simon Legree is the owner of a plantation on the Red River in Louisiana and master of Tom. He represents men in western cultures as a masculine gender stereotype. Henrique's behavior with Dodo foreshadows Legree's behavior with Tom. On the occasion when Cassy and

Emmeline, the slaves of Legree, go into hiding, Simon Legree lets out his anger on Tom demanding him for the information, threatening to kill him if he (Tom) does not reveal where Cassy and Emmeline are. The following extract illustrates the anger, the masculine rage, of Legree:

'Well, Tom!' said Legree, walking up, and seizing him grimly by the collar of his coat, and speaking through his teeth, in a paroxysm of determined rage, 'do you know I've made up my mind to kill you?'
It's very likely, mas'r', said Tom, calmly.

'I *have*,' said Legree, with grim, terrible calmness, ' *done - just - that - thing*, Tom, unless you tell me what you know about these yer gals!' Tom stood silent.

'D'ye hear!' said Legree, stamping, with a roar like that of an incensed lion. 'Speak!' (Stowe 382)

Legree's behavior exemplifies the consequences of lacking the feminine traits of “being warm, gentle, and aware of the feeling of others” (Deaux 290) in him. The outcome of such masculinity is excessive cruelty.

Legree's act of “striking him [Tom] furiously” while declaring, “now I'll *conquer you or kill you!*” (Stowe 382) and the “shocking” “scenes of blood and cruelty” (383) for the sake of female slaves Cassy and Emmeline illustrate the racial domination and the western conception of manhood. Paul Hoch argues that the relationship between sexism and racism is the key to the chauvinist mind and to the tendency for men to oppress women and members of cultures they presume to be inferior (Murphy 13). For the retentionist of slavery, Legree is “the white hero” achieving “his manhood, first and foremost, by winning victory over the ‘dark beast’”

(Hoch 94). Cassy is aware of the strength of the slave-holder in the south. She tries to warm Tom about it earlier:

'It's no use, my poor fellow!' she broke out, at last, 'it's of no use, this you've been trying to do. You were a brave fellow – you had the right on your side; but it's all in vain, and out of the question, for you to struggle. You are in the devil's hands; he [Simon Legree] is the strongest, and you must give up!' (Stowe 333)

That he is strong reinforces the assumption that he is the masculine gender stereotype. It also implies that the institution of slavery in the South is strong as the slave holders are strong like Simon. He is the negative image and the product of implementing the patriarchal assumptions in the slave-owning society at the expense of human as well as ethical values.

However, he is not a full-fledged gender stereotype. Hearing a hymn at midnight in his “dreary old house,” “large drops of sweat” stand on “his forehead” and “his heart” beats “heavy and thick with fear” (346). It denotes the presence of feminine trait – the timidity.

Lucy, a slave, is another gender stereotype in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. The patriarchal and slave-owning society of the South in the nineteenth-century America has successfully molded this colored woman and a mother of ten-month old-boy into what the traditional gender roles cast woman – “emotional, weak, nurturing and submissive” (Tyson 85). Although she is the counterpart of Eliza, she does nothing in a way that projects her masculine impulses so as to save the self and the baby from the slave-owning society. Eliza leaps into water to accomplish the masculine task of being protective of her child whereas Lucy leaps into water to fulfill the feminine task of “self-annihilation” (Showalter 250).

On learning about her sale and separation from her husband, Lucy reacts momentarily saying, "I don't believe mas'r would cheat me so; it can't be true" (Stowe 117). When the evidence of her sale is produced to her, she is reduced into a passive and submissive state, by "suddenly growing calm" (118). The falling of "one tear after another" reveals her emotional and helpless state. Later when she learns that her child is also sold, her reaction is limited to "the wild look of anguish and utter despair" (121). The sale of her baby fails to stir her masculine impulses. With "a smothered sob or cry" (122), she remains paralyzed, passive, and vulnerable, which is the projection of her femininity as noticed in her pathetic movements such as "she only groaned" (122), she "buried her head in her cloak" (121) and "her slack hands fell lifeless by her side" (121). At midnight she ends her life by plunging into the water of Mississippi. It is again a feminine act and what Showalter points out, "Suicide becomes grotesquely fantasized female weapon, a way of cheating men out of dominance" (250) and an "art of self-annihilation" (250). The absence of masculine traits in her, which results from the repressive system of slavery, racism and sexism, transforms her into a full-fledged stereotype of vulnerable femininity.

Another novel *Jane Eyre*, which subverts the traditional gender through the gender blending activities of the protagonist Jane Eyre, consists of some characters like John Reed, and St. John who behave in conformity to gender norms, being more gender stereotyped. John Reed, fourteen-year old boy of Gateshead Hall and the cousin of Jane Eyre, is aggressive and dominant. His sense of authority is conspicuous when he corrects Jane Eyre's query "What do you want?" by instructing her to say "What do you want, Master Reed?" (Bronte 5). His upbringing in accordance with patriarchal gender norms is obvious in what Jane Eyre admits:

John had not much affection for his mother and sisters, and an antipathy to me. He bullied and punished me; not two or three times in the week, nor once or twice in a day, but continually: every nerve I had feared him, and every morsel of flesh on my bones shrank when he came near. (Bronte 6)

The extract shows the absence of traits such as “being warm, gentle, and aware of the feelings of others” (Deaux 290) which are viewed as the feminine features. The act of bullying and punishing Jane frequently is the masculine trait – aggression. It is approved by the patriarchal society because it is in conformity with his biological sex and patriarchal assumptions. Jane Eyre alludes to it by saying that “the servants did not like to offend their young master by taking my part against him, and Mrs. Reed was blind and deaf on the subject” (Bronte 6). It is a sign of approval.

On another occasion too, John acts in a violent manner, which is in conformity of gender norms: “Men are more disposed to anger and less to empathy” (Barker 287). He loses his temper to see Jane reading his book. While shouting that she has no business to take their books, he flings the book at her. Jane recalls it, “. . . the volume was flung, it hit me, and I fell, striking my head against the door and cutting it. The cut bled, the pain was sharp: my terror had passed its climax; other feelings succeeded” (Bronte 7). This time Jane reacts. She recalls John running headlong towards her, “I don't know very well what I did with my hands, but he called me 'Rat! rat!' and bellowed out loud” (Bronte 7). Strangely enough, only Jane is accused and punished for it. Jane remembers:

'Dear! dear! What a fury to fly at master John!'

'Did ever anybody see such a picture of passion!'

Then Mrs. Reed subjoined: 'Take her away to the red-room, and lock

her in there.' Four hands were immediately laid upon me, and I was borne upstairs. (7)

This extract clarifies that the society and the families do their best in reinforcing the gender stereotypes. John is encouraged to be stereotypical of masculine gender and Jane is discouraged from behaving in a wild manner. She should be feminine. John is obviously striving to conform to the prescribed gender roles of masculinity and his mother Mrs. Reed, her maid Miss Abbot and John's sisters Eliza as well as Georgiana consider it normal.

However, John fails to be a full-fledged gender stereotype as he grows. He becomes neither independent nor a provider nor “emotionally stoic” (Tyson 87). His mother is reported to have “helped him out [of jail] twice” (Bronte 217). According to Leaven, the coachman of Mrs. Reed, John “wanted missis to give up all to him. Missis refused . . . they say he killed himself” (217). John’s tragic end testifies that “patriarchal gender roles are destructive for men as well as for women” (Tyson 87). His suicide is the outcome of his failure to meet the patriarchal assumptions and his failure is the evidence that masculinity is not the offshoot of male-sex alone.

Helen Burns, Jane's companion in Lowood School, gives the impression of a feminine gender stereotype in the making out of androgynous being. She projects herself in such a way that is perfectly gender appropriate— she is soft, gentle and obedient. Despite the severe beatings in the hands of a teacher Miss Scatcherd, she remains calm and quiet. It is paradoxical in the sense that she exhibits the feminine traits by being quiet, passive and obedient and also she displays the masculine trait of being stoic by showing the “strength to endure” and “ignore pain” (Harris 138). Jane recalls the first impression of Helen on her, "What a smile! I remember it now, and I know that it was the effluence of fine intellect, of true courage; it lit up her marked

lineaments, her thin face, her sunken grey eye, like a reflection from the aspect of an angle" (64). The description is also paradoxical. "Fine intellect" and "true courage" stand for the masculinity and "a reflection from the aspect of an angel" refers to her femininity. Despite the presence of stereotyped and counterstereotyped traits in her, Helen Burns molds herself into a perfect feminine being. She is a stereotype in the making and Lowood School "disciplines its inmates by attempting to destroy their individuality" (Showalter 117) so as to "create the intensely spiritualized creature the Victorians idealized as the Angel in the House" (117). So Helen is mentally prepared to behave like a feminine being. For instance, she acts more like a mother comforting Jane on the occasion when Mr. Brucklehurst calls Jane 'a liar' accusing her of 'ingratitude' for Mrs. Reed's generosity' (Bronte 63). Jane relates, "Helen had calmed me" and further adds, "Resting my head on Helen's shoulder, I put my arms round her waist; she drew me to her, and we reposed in silence" (66). This intimacy between them reveals emotional aspect in both of them, evidently suggesting their feminine trait.

Besides, Helen Burns's femininity can be perceived in her obedient nature. Her stay at Lowood School is an act of obedience toward her parents. Hence she is determined to stay at the school and get education despite the severity of Miss. Scatchered and alienated surroundings. The conversation between Jane and Helen illustrates it:

'What is your name beside Burns?'

'Helen.'

'Do you come a long way from here?'

'I come from a place farther north; quite on the borders of Scotland.'

"Will you ever go back?'

'I hope so; but nobody can be sure of the future.'

'You must wish to leave Lowood?'

'No: why should I? I was sent to Lowood to get an education; and it would be of no use going away until I have attained that object.' (51-2)

At this instance, Helen displays a feminine gender trait of being obedient since “traditional gender roles cast . . . women as . . . submissive” (Tyson 85).

Miss. Scatcherd behaves like a patriarchal agent, determined to shape Helen into a submissive girl so as to transform her into a feminine gender stereotype. Hence she constantly targets Helen as if it is a part of patriarchal training. Jane recalls how Miss. Scatcherd pesters Helen:

'Burns (such it seems was her name: the girls here were all called by their surnames, as boys are elsewhere), Burns, you are standing on the side of your shoe, turn your toes out immediately.' 'Burns, you poke your chin most unpleasantly; draw it in.' 'Burns, I insist on your holding your head up; I will not have you before me in that attitude. . . .' (49-50)

In all these occasions Burns is supposed to obey silently and behave in accordance with gender norms.

The training given to Helen in molding the self into a submissive girl is successful to such an extent that she fetches a rod for Miss Scatcherd to punish her. She does it as if it is a part of training. Although she is going to be punished for no reason at all, she accepts it as a “duty to bear it” and as a “fate to be required to bear” (Bronte 52). Obviously she implies to say that it is a feminine duty and fate to suffer. Jane relates the event:

When I returned to my seat, that lady [Miss Scatcherd] was just delivering an order, of which I did not catch the import; but Burns immediately left the class, and going into the small inner room where the books were kept, returned in a half minute, carrying in her hand a bundle of twigs tied together at one hand. This ominous tool she presented to Miss Scatcherd with a respectful courtesy; then she quietly and without being told, unloosed her pinafore, and the teacher instantly and sharply inflicted on her neck a dozen strokes with the bunch of twigs. Not a tear rose to Burn's eye . . . not a feature of pensive face altered its ordinary expression.

'Hardened girl!' exclaimed Miss. Scatcherd; nothing can correct you of your slatternly habits: carry the rod away.' Burns obeyed . . . (50)

The strong sense of obedience is deeply inculcated in her. It is a part of training in transforming her into a feminine gender stereotype. Paradoxically, it is a masculine act to “ignore pain” (Harris 13).

This punishment is preceded by Miss. Scatcherd's routine of asking questions and Helen's instant answers. Instead of being impressed with Helen for her correct answers, Miss Scatcherd decides to punish her. This act of punishment is significant because it shows Miss Schatcherd's role as a patriarchal woman who expects children's behavior to be in conformity with their sex role stereotype. At the moment, she is trying to inculcate feminine behavior in Helen. Obviously she is not impressed with the answers given by Helen as it implicates the masculine trait of her – intelligence. Jane Eyre describes it in detail:

A chapter having been read through twice, the books were closed and the girls examined. The lesson had comprised part of the reign of

Charles I, and there were sundry questions about tonnage, and poundage, and ship-money, which most of them appeared unable to answer; still every little difficulty was solved instantly when it reached Burns: her memory seemed to have retained the substance of the whole lesson, and she was ready with answers on every point. I kept expecting that Miss Scatcherd would praise her attention; but, instead of that, she suddenly cried out– 'You dirty disagreeable girl! you have never cleaned your nails this morning!' (50)

Cleaning the nails so that they (nails) look appealing is the feminine activity. Miss Scatcherd's fury with Helen signifies her disapproval of counterstereotypic traits in girls including Helen. Evidently Miss. Scatcherd expects girls, including Helen, to internalize “the feminine values” “exalted” by “the Victorians” (Showalter 7).

Owing to such reactions on the part of Miss Scatcherd, Helen's androgynous potentials are altered for the sake of femininity. For instance, when Helen is engaged in conversation with Jane, a monitor threatens her so that she remains submissive. The conversation below illustrates it:

'Helen Burns, if you don't go and put your drawer in order, and fold your work this minute, I'll tell Miss Scatcherd to come and look at it!'

Helen sighed as her reverie fled, and getting up, obeyed the monitor without reply as without delay. (55)

In the novel *Adam Bede* too, the gender stereotyped features can be witnessed in Adam's mother Lisbeth and Arthur Donnithorne. As for Hetty, she is an “androgynous figure” (Kreisel 561) having an “obsession with finery, display, and costume, her narcissistic self-love and self-containment” that constitute femininity and “hard-heartedness and lack of maternal instinct” (Kreisel 561) that mark

masculinity. However, in comparison to other androgynous female protagonists such as her cousin Dinah Morris, Jane from *Jane Eyre*, Tess from *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Hester Prynne from *The Scarlet Letter*, and Eliza Harris from *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Hetty makes an inferior appearance which is close to feminine gender stereotype – “emotional (irrational), weak” and “submissive” (Tyson 85). These female protagonists surpass Hetty in masculine activities. She comes forth neither independent like Hester and Jane nor aggressive like Jane and Tess nor violent like Cassy and Tess nor bold like Eliza nor strong like Bertha nor intelligent like Jane and Dinah. The tragedy in the life of Hetty results from the lack of qualities found in them. There would not have been a tragic experience in her life, if she had deviated from the traditional gender conformity like Hester Prynne, the protagonist of *The Scarlet Letter*, by making an independent living as a mother with her illegitimate child and by reacting in a masculine boldness when Arthur wrote a letter to her, announcing the end of their relation.

Being an orphan, socially and economically she is obligated to depend on her aunt Mrs. Poyser. Likewise, emotionally she is inclined to count on Arthur Donnithorne's decision to be his wife without being aware of the fact that Arthur is not mentally prepared for it. She happens to be helpless and speechless when Arthur in a letter asks her to "forgive" and "try to forget everything" (Eliot 303) about him with a confession, "And since I cannot marry you, we must part – we must try not to feel like lovers any more" (302). Her tears represent her weakness and emotional part of her femininity. The narrator comments:

The tears came this time – great rushing tears that blinded her and blotched the paper. She felt nothing. . . . She had not the ideas that could make up the notion of that misery.

As she threw down the letter again, she caught sight of her face in the glass; it was reddened now, and wet with tears . . . She leaned forward . . . looked into those dark overflowing eyes and at the quivering mouth, and saw how the tears came thicker and thicker, and how the mouth became convulsed with sobs. (303)

In addition to this emotional trait of femininity, she is also passive. The act of her being exploited through seduction and impregnation – a great injustice bestowed on a teenage girl – does not prompt her to fight for her rights despite the fact “the unwed mother is a scandal to the community, and illegitimate birth is a stain on the child” (Beauvoir 705). She simply accepts his decision for separation and Adam's proposal in a submissive manner. The narrator illustrates her response to Adam's proposal:

He [Adam] leaned towards her and took her hand, as he said: "I could afford to be married now, Hetty – I could make a wife comfortable; but I shall never want to be married if you won't have me."

Hetty looked up at him and smiled through her tears, as she had done to Arthur that first evening in the wood. . . . (327)

Arthur and Adam take decisions about her life and she plays a very passive role in it. Her response to Arthur's decision to break away from her is as passive as her response to Adam's proposal.

Her journey to Windsor is a momentary break from her passivity and stereotyped behavior. She endeavors to be active in her search from Arthur so that there can be a solution to her state of pregnancy. However, the birth of her baby paralyzes her activity and its accidental death lodges her in prison, a patriarchal

society in miniature and in a state of dependence and vulnerability. The narrator illustrates it on the occasion of Adam's visit in the prison:

She was clinging close to Dinah; her cheek was against Dinah's. It seemed as if her last faint strength and hope lay in that contact, and the pitying love that shone out from Dinah's face looked like a visible pledge of the invisible Mercy.

When the sad eyes met – when Hetty and Adam looked at each other – she felt the change in him too. . . . She trembled more as she looked at him.

"Speak to him, Hetty," Dinah said; "tell him what is in your heart."

Hetty obeyed her, like a little child.

"Adam . . . I'm very sorry . . . I behaved very wrong to you . . . will you forgive me . . . before I die?" (420)

This extract exposes her traits of femininity such as emotional part, timidity, and submissive nature. Both the society and the prison have reduced the androgynous lady to a stereotype based on her sex.

A comparative study of Hetty Sorrel and Hester Prynne clarifies the difference. At Arthur Donnithorne's desertion, she is desperate to agree for marriage with Adam. She has neither courage nor confidence to think of visiting Arthur with a view to convincing him for the marriage or elopement unlike Hester Prynne who does her best to convince Dimmesdale for elopement into Europe. What is more, Hester is bold enough to bear the child, face the trial and live at the outskirts of the same society without being dependent on anyone for her survival. In the case of Hetty, she is so weak that she thinks of committing suicide and discarding the baby impulsively. In

her confession to Dinah, she exhibits her weak personality and desperateness over the baby:

"But I thought perhaps it wouldn't die – there might somebody find it. I didn't kill it – I didn't kill it myself. I put it down there and covered it up, and when I came back it was gone. . . . Dinah . . . I didn't know where to go . . . and I tried to kill myself before, and I couldn't. Oh, I tried so to drown myself in the pool, and I couldn't. I went to Windsor – I ran away – did you know? I went to find him, as he might take care of me; and he was gone; and then I didn't know what to do. I daredn't go back home again – I couldn't bear it. (412)

Such behaviour indicates the absence of masculine traits found in other androgynous female protagonists, Tess and Hester, who face the dreadful society with their illegitimate children.

Adam Bede's mother, Lisbeth Bede, is another character behaving in accordance with gender conformity. She evolves as a stereotyped woman being “emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive” (Tyson 85). The narrator points out, “she loves her son with the love of a woman to whom her first born has come late in her life” (33). As she speaks, she reflects “a fond anxious mother's voice” (33). It is the concern of a mother for her children. The narrator points it out:

It is such a fond anxious mother's voice that you hear, as Lisbeth says,
 "Well, my lad, it's gone seven by th' clock. Thee't allays stay till the
 last child's born. Thee wants thy supper. I'll warrand. Where's Seth?
 Gone arter some o's chapellin', I reckon?" (33)

Lisbeth, in the given extract, stands for the Victorian motherhood. Adam is no more than a boy despite his blooming youth.

Besides, being a mother figure and an angel of the house, she is as emotional as any woman is expected to be. The angry outburst of Adam over his father's negligent delay in making coffin and his subsequent irritant behavior bring tears in her eyes:

Lisbeth sat down on the chopping bench and began to cry, and by the time she had cried enough to make her voice very piteous, she burst out into words.

"Nay, my lad, my lad, thee wouldstna go away an' break thy mother's heart, an' leave thy feyther to ruin. . . . I shanna rest i' my grave if I donna see thee at th' last; ah' how's they to let thee know as I'm a dyin', if thee't gone a-workin' i' distant parts, an' Seth belike gone arter thee, and thy feyther not able to hold a pen for's hand shakin'. . . thee was a baby at the breast. " Lisbeth's voice became louder, and choked with sobs – a sort of wail. . . . (34-5)

The extract reveals Lisbeth as the representative of Victorian women who are concerned about children as mothers and about husbands as wives.

Her happiness depends upon her children and husband. She is the embodiment of motherhood. George Henry Lewes considers maternity as “the grand function of woman” (qtd. in Showalter 68). Her maternal love for Adam is obvious in the following extract:

Lisbeth . . . always sat opposite to him [Adam] and watched him, till she could rest no longer without going up to him and giving him a caress, to call his attention to her. This morning he was reading the Gospel . . . and Lisbeth had been standing close by him for some minutes, stroking his hair. . . . (Eliot 454)

The extract shows Lisbeth's dedication towards her son and maternal love as stereotypical behavior of women who “are mainly occupied by the cares, the duties, the enjoyments and the sufferings of maternity” (Lewes qtd. in Showalter 69).

In addition to it, she also possesses feminine trait – timidity. Seth is also aware of it that "Lisbeth had been very timid about speaking to him [Adam] on matters of feeling" (Eliot 453). The narrator also acknowledges it by stating that "Seth was right in believing that Lisbeth would be held in restraint by timidity" (Eliot 453). While trying to draw the attention of Adam towards Dinah, Lisbeth indicating the angel seated on the great stone admits:

"That's her – that's Dinah."

Adam smiled, and, looking more intently at the angle's face, said, "It is a bit like her; but Dinah's prettier, I think."

"Well, then, if thee think'st her so pretty, why aren't fond on her?"

Adam looked up in surprise. "Why, mother, dost think I don't set store by Dinah?"

“Nay, said Lisbeth, frightened at her own courage. . . . (454-5)

The courage followed by fright at her own courage suggests that she is aware of the limits of gender stereotype and that courage is not a recommendable trait for women.

Arthur is also portrayed in the light of traditional gender norms. His designation as captain in the army emphasizes his masculinity and assures of his involvement in the public sphere. His rank as a captain endows him with power over his subordinates and a dominant attitude. His confession before Adam – "I could hit out better than most men at Oxford, and yet I believe you would knock me into next week if I were to have a battle with you." (149-150) – suggests that Arthur is strong in

comparison with other men although Adam is likely to be stronger than him. It also alludes to Arthur's instinctive inclination to fight, an act of aggression.

Besides, the text provides the clues that he is not without the masculine trait – anger. Over his decision to appoint Adam as a steward for his estate Chase Farm, he is unimpressed with his grandfather and complains against him before Mr. Irwine:

He's [grandfather] got some project or other about letting the Chase Farm and bargaining for a supply of milk and butter for the house. But I ask no question about it – it makes me too angry. I believe, he means to do all the business himself, and have nothing in the shape of a steward. It's amazing what energy he has, though."(234)

His confession – that his grandfather's act of “bargaining” for milk and butter makes him angry – testifies that he is like other men who are “disposed to anger” (Barker 287). On another occasion captain Arthur is reported to get angry if Adam refuses to dine with him upstairs with the large tenants. The narrator points out that Mr. Mills, the butler, “assured him [Adam] that captain Donnithorne had given particular orders about it, and would be very angry if Adam was not there” (235). Although it is a casual remark about Arthur's angry nature, it is an attempt of reinforcement for his masculinity and masculine trait.

Arthur's gender conformity is evident in his being rational even when he is in love with Hetty. He gives the impression that he is guided by reason rather than by emotion/love. Although the narrator is also convinced that Arthur is “getting in love with Hetty” and “ready to pitch everything else” for “this delicious feeling” (119), he is also conscious about the rational part in Arthur. The narrator's following comment signifies it:

It was no use blinking the fact now – they would get too fond of each other, if he went on taking notice of her – and what would come out of it? He should have to go away in a few weeks, and the poor little thing would be miserable. He must not see her alone again; he must keep out of her way. (119)

It clarifies that only Hetty has to suffer and Arthur is free from the influence of love as he is a rational being. His resolution not to “see her alone again” and “keep out of her way” is the evidence of his rationality. Although his resolution becomes shaky due to his desire to “see Hetty again” (120), he continues to reason, “No gentleman, out of a ballad, could marry a farmer’s niece. There must be an end to the whole thing at once. It was too foolish” (124).

Further Arthur is susceptible to aggression, which is another masculine trait. For instance, Adam provokes him for a fight when he (Adam) discovers the relation between Arthur and Hetty. Although Arthur tries to avoid the fight in the beginning, Adam’s reference to him as “a coward and a scoundrel” instigates him to react in a masculine way:

The colour had all rushed back to Arthur's face; in a moment his right hand was clenched, and dealt a blow like lightning, which sent Adam staggering backward. His blood was as thoroughly up as Adam's now, and the two men, forgetting the emotions that had gone before, fought with the instinctive fierceness of panthers in the deepening twilight darkened by the trees. (274)

The expression "instinctive fierceness of panthers" implies the masculinity in them. The aggression, as shown by Arthur, asserts the masculine part in him. All these traits establish him as the masculine gender stereotype.

The most significant accomplishment of Arthur as a man is his successful endeavor to procure an official reprieve for Hetty's execution. As a result of his effort, Hetty's sentence is commuted to deportation. Such a deed or activity is an instance of "a manly courage defined as chivalry" "which meant protecting the weak . . . as well as saving the victims of fire or accidents" (Guts Muth qtd. in Mosse 42). The narrator illustrates the deed:

It was a shout of sudden excitement at the appearance of a horseman cleaving the crowd at full gallop. The horse is hot and distressed, but answers to the desperate spurring; the rider looks as if his eyes were glazed by madness, and he saw nothing but what was unseen by others. See, he has something in his hand – he is holding it up as if it were a signal.

The Sheriff knows him: it is Arthur Donnithorne, carrying in his hand a hard-won release from death. (422)

The act of riding and bringing a reprieve for Hetty shows Arthur in the light of masculine activity and exposes him as a man of action and a saviour. Thus Arthur's role is in accordance with cultural ideals and norms. At this point, his masculine image as a saviour proves to be antithetical to the masculine image of Mr. Simon Legree as a destroyer. If the former stands for rationality and remorse, the latter represents irrationality and misguided masculinity.

Such stereotypical characters can also be located in Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. Mrs. Joan Durbeyfield, the mother of Tess, is one of them. She serves as the epitome of Victorian womanhood. She conforms to gender role standards by being dependent, passive and domestic. Being the stereotype of mother, she is left among her children, taking care of them. The expressions – "There stood her mother

amid the group of children" (Hardy, *Tess* 11), "being engaged in the aforesaid business of rocking her youngest child" and "burdened with a family" (12) meant for Mrs. Joan Durbeyfield – create her image as mother and demonstrate her femininity. It is the society's approved role for women. For instance, as a mother she is concerned about her daughter and the prospect of Tess's marriage with Alec and as a wife she is anxious about her husband Mr. Jack Durbeyfield. The following extract illustrates the emotional dimension of Mrs. Joan:

"It would have been something like a story to come back with, if you had!" continued Mrs. Durbeyfield, ready to burst into tears of vexation. "After all the talk about you and him [Alec] which has reached us here, who would have expected it to end like this! Why didn't ye think of doing some good for your family instead O' thinking only of yourself? See how I've got to teave and slave, and your poor weak father with his heart clogged like a dripping-pan. I did hope for something to come out o' this! To see what a pretty pair you and he made that day when you drove away together four months ago! See what he [Alec] has given us – all, as we thought, because we were his kin. But if he is not, it must have been done because of his love for 'ee. And yet you've not got him to marry!" (63-4)

The extract reflects the anxiety of a mother who cannot do anything on her own except depending on the prospect of her daughter's marriage in a rich family so that there can be some financial relief to her family.

She cannot think of activating the self so as to support her family by being a breadwinner. She abides by the society's notion of separate spheres. Consequently she remains dependent. The text provides evidence:

. . . she [Tess] took twenty five of the fifty pounds Clare had given her, and handed the sum over to her mother . . . saying that it was a slight return for the trouble and humiliation she had brought upon them in years past. . . . With this assertion of her dignity she bade them farewell; and after that there were lively doings in the Durbeyfield household for some time, on the strength of Tess's bounty. . . . (203)

In the later part of the novel too, Mrs. Joan continues to be passive and dependent. The cultural norms of gender prove to be extremely obligatory for her to follow. Consequently by confining the self to the sphere of domesticity, she tries to make a living and take care of the family by depending on the income of Tess. The narrator refers to it:

When her [Tess's] money had almost gone a letter from her mother reached her. Joan stated that they were in a dreadful difficulty: the autumn rains had gone through the thatch of the house, which required entire renewal; but this could not be done because the previous thatching had never been paid for. New rafters, and a new ceiling upstairs, also were required, which, with the previous bill, would amount to a sum of twenty pounds. As her husband was a man of means, and had doubtless returned by this time, could she not send them the money?

Tess had thirty pounds coming to her almost immediately from Angel's bankers; and the case being deplorable, as soon as the sum was received she sent the twenty as requested. (214)

This extract serves as evidence for Mrs. Joan's passivity and dependency, which are the traits approved by the norms of the society. She is molded into a feminine gender

stereotype. The traditional gender-based norms have conditioned her to be docile, dependent, passive and emotional.

Alec Durbeyfield, on the other hand, turns out to be a stereotypical male endowed with aggressiveness, sense of authority over women, independence and activity. The narrator's allusion to his "bold rolling eye" and "the touches of barbarism in his contours" (28) assures the readers of his masculine gender stereotype. He is bold enough to address Tess as "my beauty" (28) at their first meeting in Trantridge in his query, "well, my beauty, what can I do for you?"(28). In the meeting years later, he is dominant enough to declare to her in her marital status, "Remember, my lady, I was your master once; I will be your master again. If you are any man's wife you are mine!" (261). This projects him as strong, dominant and aggressive.

His daring attitude is witnessed on another occasion when Tess is obliged to take lift in his gig. As Tess is on her way to Trantridge to take up her job at the fowl-farm of Alec, he meets her on the way, offering her lift in his gig. In course of his conversation, his daring attitude becomes apparent as he talks about his control over his wild horse, Tib. The following dialogue illustrates it:

"Why this mare. I fancy she looked round at me in a very grim way just then – didn't you notice it?"

"Don't try to frighten me sir," said Tess stiffly.

"Well, I don't. If any living man can manage this horse I can – I won't say any living man can do it – but if such has the power, I am he."

"Why do you have such a horse?"

"Ah – well . . . Tib has killed one chap; and just after I bought her she nearly killed me. And then, take me word for it, I nearly killed her. But

she's touchy still, very touchy; one's life is hardly safe behind her sometimes. (39)

This extract also reveals Alec's masculine instinct to control. Having been taught to strive for perfection, to work hard, and to succeed in life, men think they can get what they want by controlling others (Harris 108).

He drives the gig at a tremendous speed to prove his control over the horse. It also serves as a strategy to establish his authority over Tess. The narrator illustrates it:

D'Urberville turned his face to her as they rocked, and said in a playful raillery: "Now then: put your arms round my waist again as you did before, my beauty."

"Never!" said Tess independently, holding on as well as she could without touching him.

"Let me put one little kiss on those holmberry lips. Tess; or even on that warmed cheek, and I'll stop on my honour, I will!" (Hardy, *Tess* 40)

Controlling the horse is a gesture for his desire to control Tess. It foreshadows his seduction of her. The strategy of Alec succeeds instantly as he is permitted to kiss: "He was inexorable, and she sat still, and d' Urberville gave her the kiss of mastery" (40). His strategy to establish his authority over women is linked with his financial assistance to them. He acts as a provider. He does this in the case of Tess, before and after her marriage with Angel Clare, to win her. It is a successful strategy based on his knowledge that the duty of men in the working and middle class families is "to work" and "to provide money for our families, who depend on us" and "in return we expect our families to love us and to nourish us, our wives to take care of us" (Hopes and Dreams 83). Alec, by being the provider, plays the role of a male

member of her family – the role of a husband. The following extract illustrates it as a strategy for seduction of Tess prior to her marriage with Clare:

He took a few steps away from her, but returning said, "By the bye,

Tess; your father has a new cob today.

Somebody gave it to him."

"Somebody? You!"

D' Urberville nodded.

"O how very good of you that is!" She exclaimed with a painful sense of the awkwardness of having to thank him just then.

"And the children have some toys."

"I didn't know – you ever sent them anything!" she murmured. . . .

(Hardy, *Tess* 56)

To be a provider or a breadwinner is a masculine trait. Alec has used this trait as a strategy to seduce her before and after her marriage. He wins her back by providing her family with bread and butter.

At the time when she is broke and her husband Clare has left her in her financial crisis, Alec convinces her against her waiting for Angel and assures her of his financial assistance. Alec argues:

"Wait – what for? For that nice husband, no doubt. Now look here, Tess, I know what men are, and, bearing in mind the grounds of your separation, I am quite positive he will never make it up with you. Now; though I have been your enemy, I am your friend, even if you won't believe it. Come to this cottage of mine. We'll get up a regular colony of fowls, and your mother can attend to them excellently; and the children can go to school." (280)

Alec is quite convinced that he will succeed in winning her back with his assurance for providing her family with bread and shelter. Tess's instant query is the sign of his success. She asks him, "How do I know that you would do all this? Your views may change – and then – we should be – my mother would be – homeless again" (280).

Alec gets what he wants by exercising his power over Tess as a provider and establishes his mastery over her for the time being. Tess has to be submissive towards him because “men who provide . . . expect to be obeyed” (Harris 108). In this regard he is the hunter and she is the hunted. Tess is like his horse, Tib, which he has eventually controlled. He proves that “men are in control of their relationships” (Harris108). Tess makes the confession before her husband:

"I waited and waited for you," she went on, her tones suddenly resuming their fluty pathos. "But you did not come. And I wrote to you; and you did not come.

. . . He [Alec] was very kind to me, and to mother, and to all of us after father's death. He –"

"I don't understand?"

"He has won me back-- to him." (Hardy, *Tess* 298-9)

Alec is obviously conditioned into masculine gender personality. Consequently he is also capable of being active. The quality of being active, another trait of masculinity, appears in him through his commitment to clerical duties. As such, he is involved in preaching from place to place. Alec admits it as a confession before Tess:

The first months of my ministry have been spent in the north of England among strangers, where I preferred to make my earliest clumsy attempts, so as to acquire courage before undergoing that

severest of all tests of one's sincerity, addressing those who have known one, and have been one's companions in the days of darkness.

(242)

Thus Alec's behavior throughout the novel conforms to masculine gender stereotype. Such a behavior is the result of socialization. Chris Haywood and Mairtin Mac an Ghaill point out, "Through socialization, sex role theorists argue, males and females are conditioned into appropriate roles of behavior" (7). He loses Tess by being masculine in a way of being dominant and controlling her. This rigidity prevents him from perceiving and acknowledging her emotional longing for her husband in her desperate "murmur of unspeakable despair" (Hardy, *Tess* 300). His failure to respond to her feelings with compassion is the result of repressing his feminine impulses in him. Consequently, he loses her and his life in her hand. On the contrary, Angel Clare as a husband loses her initially by looking for her purity in her body and wins her back by responding to his androgynous potentials and finding purity in her mind. Alec fails to have this kind of fluidity between masculine and feminine potentials. Other characters, as referred in this chapter, behave in accordance with the gender norms because socially they are encouraged to shape themselves in the mold of their gender stereotypes as a response to patriarchal assumptions. This conformity is maintained at the loss of what is natural – the androgyny.

Thus "notions of masculine and feminine are produced and naturalized" (Butler, *Undoing* 42). Consequently masculinity is regarded as the nature of men and femininity as the nature of women. J.S. Mill argues, "What is now called the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing –the result of forced repression in some directions, unnatural stimulation in others" (38-9). It implies that the concept of gender identity is an artificial thing.

CHAPTER V

GENDER AS MASQUERADE

The predominant aspect of the novels *The Scarlet Letter*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Adam Bede*, *Jane Eyre* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* is the endeavor of the leading characters to deviate infrequently from the traditional gender norms. This infrequent switching of the characters' genders exposes their androgynous potentials and reveals that their genders serve only as masquerades. Such a portrayal of the characters is predisposed to anti-essentialist concepts about gender.

Rubin argues that "exclusive gender identity is the suppression of natural similarities" (qtd. in Glover xxiv). Gender identity is the matter of shaping the self in accordance with the traditional gender norms. This shaping of appearance becomes a masquerade that conceals the true-self. Marie Maguire argues:

Although individuals may present themselves as having a fixed and unified sense of what it means to be male or female, this is often a veneer, a masquerade. Sexual identity – the psychological meaning each of us gives to being a woman or a man – is always fluid, and never exactly what it seems. (1)

What seems on the surface is the outcome of suppression and repression of unwanted traits that both men and women have in them. Gayle Rubin explains:

The idea that men and women are more different from one another than either is from anything else must come from somewhere other than nature. . . . Far from being an expression of natural differences, exclusive gender is the suppression of natural similarities. It requires repression: in men, of whatever is the local version of 'feminine' traits; in women, of the local definition of 'masculine' traits. The division of

the sexes has the effect of repressing some of the personality characteristics of virtually everyone, men and women. (qtd. in Glover XXIV)

Hence the gender becomes the masquerade that conceals what is suppressed and repressed. Butler in *Gender Troubles* argues in the same vein that "gender is a construction that regularly conceals its genesis" (178). It is the result of patriarchal indoctrination that enforces ideologically laden binaries: male / female, independent / dependent, rational / emotional and so on.

Elaine Showalter implies the same when she argues that "[W]omanliness' is the putting on of veils, only 'masquerading in feminine guise'" (qtd. in Doniger 200). According to Doniger, every woman since Pandora has masqueraded as herself, concealing within the deceptive superficial image of a woman the true nature of a woman (200). Joan Riviere in her paper "Womanliness as Masquerade" writes that womanliness "could be assumed and worn as a mask, both to hide the possession of masculinity and to avert the reprisals expected if she was found to possess it" (qtd. in Homer 100). Butler implicates the same aspect in her suggestion that masquerade might construct this exaggerated femininity in order to disguise bisexual possibilities that threaten the assumed heterosexual basis of the masquerade (qtd. in Doniger 200). Simone de Beauvoir's argument that "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" (295) implies that the feminine being is created by the civilization out of the little girl who up to "the age of twelve" "is as strong as her brothers, and" who "shows the same mental powers" (295). J. S. Mill strikes the same chord by stating "What is now called the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing" (38).

Anne Cranny - Francis et al point out, "To some extent, patriarchal femininity and masculinity are masquerades in which both sexes adopt a role which covers over

the ambivalence and anxiety of subjectivity and sexual identity" (167-8). Stoltenberg contends that "the authentic self' is buried under the corrupt ethics of sexual difference" (qtd. in Ashe 98). Victor J. Seidler argues in the context of masculinity for men that "bourgeois culture, and our protestant inheritance, teach us to hide our natures, to think of them as wicked" and that "we do our best to distance ourselves from our feelings and desires, lest they threaten the relationships we have set up with others" (85) and that as men, "we often learn to lock our hurt and vulnerability deep inside ourselves" (143). Cixous argues for resisting the opposition between man and woman so that the multiplicity inherent in all identities can be explored (qtd. in Malpas 72). She proposes "a notion of bisexuality which is not simply a description of sexual practice, but rather calls for the recognition of the multiplicity of drives and desires within any subject and their irreducibility to straightforward binary logic" (73). Cixous argues:

Bisexuality – that is to say the location within oneself of the presence of both sexes, evident and insistent in different ways according to the individual, the nonexclusion of difference or of a sex, and starting with this 'permission' one gives oneself, the multiplication of desire's inscription on every part of the body and the other body To say that woman is bisexual is an apparently paradoxical way of displacing and reviving the question of difference. (qtd. in Malpas 72)

These arguments and concepts clarify that the gender is a masquerade, "assuming false appearance" (Tseelon 2) and the leading characters of the novels as mentioned in the begin of this chapter appear with their masquerades that slip out of the place every now and then, revealing other traits that are concealed and suggesting the fluidity and multiplicity in each individual.

The leading characters of the novels *The Scarlet Letter*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Adam Bede*, *Jane Eyre* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* conceal their androgynous potentials by projecting a masculine or feminine gender alone as their identity. As the narrative of each novel unfolds the events, the characters make their appearance in chosen gender roles that serve as their masquerades. It gives an occasion to witness the masculinity beneath the feminine masquerade and femininity beneath the masculine masquerade. Gradually as the concealed gender traits manifest occasionally, the characters show the contrast between their true-selves (androgynous) and the projected images in the form of gender identity.

Tom, the male protagonist of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, puzzles the reader by his feminine behavior at the initial part of the narrative. The repressive system of slavery, racism, the faith of his master Mr. Shelby in him as “a good, steady, sensible, pious fellow” (Stowe 4) and the liberal atmosphere surrounding Tom due to “good-natured and kindly” (10) master Mr. Shelby and “natural magnanimity and generosity” (11) of Mrs. Shelby make it safer and more convenient for Tom to project his femininity as a gender identity and masquerade. Besides, it is the behaviour in accordance with the slave owning society of America in the nineteenth century. Hence the news of his being sold as a slave to the slave trader Haley does not elicit any active form of rebellion from him. He receives the news from Eliza with a passive outlook and emotional outburst. The narrator remarks:

He leaned over the back of the chair, and covered his face with his large hands. Sobs, heavy, hoarse and loud, shook the chair, and great tears fell through his fingers on the floor – just such tears, sir, as you dropped into the coffin where lay your first-born son; such tears,

woman, as you shed when you heard the cries of your dying babe. . . .

(Stowe 38)

At this instance, Tom uses his femininity as a masquerade to conceal the presence of masculinity in him. The submissiveness, laughter, and fluent talking, displayed by Negroes are nothing but a mask behind which they conceal their true selves (Myrdal 41-2). Likewise, momentarily the authentic self of Tom, who is bold enough to disobey his future master Simon Legree, "I never shall do it" (330), remains concealed under his feminine masquerade.

The hidden masculinity of Tom is occasionally witnessed. For instance, on the occasion of his sailing in a boat so as "to be sold to somebody" (137) "some sudden movement" of the boat causes a white girl (Eva) to lose "her balance" and fall "sheer over the side of the boat into the water" (138) and there the masculine part of Tom appears briefly through his timely decision and activity of plunging into the Mississippi water to rescue her. By this act, he shows that he is capable of "manly courage" defined "as chivalry, which meant protecting the weak and speaking the truth, as well as saving the victims of fire or accidents" (Guts Muth qtd. in Mosse 42). The narrator describes the event:

Tom was standing just under her on the lower deck, as she fell. He saw her strike the water, and sink, and was after her in a moment. A broad-chested, strong-armed fellow, it was nothing for him to keep afloat in the water, till, in a moment or two, the child rose to the surface, and he caught her in his arms, and, swimming with her to the boat-side, handed her up. . . . (Stowe 138)

This act asserts the masculinity in Tom in the form of savior instinct, confidence and capability of making decision at an appropriate moment. Eva happens to be the victim

of accident and saving her life is a chivalrous act on the part of Tom.

Even as a slave of Simon Legree, his feminine masquerade continues with "a tenderness of feeling, a commiseration for his fellow-sufferers" (Stowe 325). This masquerade shatters once and for all when he acts in a bold manner by refusing to obey the command of his master to flog a fellow slave Lucy. This refusal indicates the presence of "manly courage" of "speaking the truth" (Mosse 42), rational and independent way of thinking and a capability of making decisions. At the same time, it shows the masculine spirit of rebel in him that enables him to "defy authority" (Harris 142). The extract below illustrates the masculine traits in Tom:

'And now,' said Legree, 'come here, you Tom. You see, I telled ye . . . ye jest take this yer gal and flog her; ye've seen enough on't to know how.'

'I beg mas'r's pardon,' said Tom; hopes mas'r won't set me at that. It's what I an't used to – never did – and can't do, no way possible.'

'Ye'll larn a pretty smart chance of things ye never did know, before I've done with ye!' said Legree, taking up cow-hide, and striking Tom a heavy blow across the cheek, and following up the infliction by a shower of blows.

'There!' he said, as he stopped to rest; 'now will ye tell me ye can't do it?'

'Yes, mas'r,' said Tom, putting up his hand, to wipe the blood 'I'm willin' to work, night and day, and work while there's life and breath in me; but this yer thing I can't feel it right to do; and mas'r, I never shall do it – never!' (Stowe 330)

This extract clarifies that Tom is not going to be submissive for all the times. At the same time the expression “this yer thing I can't feel it right” establishes him as a man of ethics and his decision exposes the rational part of his personality, which has been concealed beneath the masquerade of feminine gender identity of Tom so far. It also illustrates what Harris says, “Some rebel because they are concerned about justice” (142). Besides, this very sense of ethics in him causes the crack in his feminine masquerade. It turns out to be his tragic flaw and the bane of his existence because it discourages him from running away from Kentucky like Eliza on the one side and ,on the other hand, stimulates him to “defy authority” as a rebel (Harris 142) in the case of his master Simon Legree and expose his masculinity. It is unfortunate for Tom that he is found to possess masculinity, which is unacceptable to the slave-owning society of nineteenth century America, and consequently he is exposed to the reprisals or punishment. The purpose of masquerade, according to Joan Riviere, is “to avert reprisals” if the person is “found to possess” the unacceptable gender traits (qtd. in Homer 100). If Tom had managed to have the feminine masquerade by being passive and obedient consistently, he would have averted the reprisals for his masculine exposure.

In the case of Eliza Harris, a light-skinned slave of Mr. Shelby and mother of Harry, her feminine gender acts as masquerade concealing her masculine personality. Her feminine instincts project her as a loving wife and mother. After hearing the slave trader's offer for her boy, her maternal instincts drive her to Mrs. Shelby "bursting into tears", and "sobbing" (Stowe 10). This emotionality is the feminine part of Eliza as a mother. As a wife, she advises her husband George Harris to be obedient when he declares his intention to run away for freedom (Stowe 17). In all these occasions she remains completely feminine. Her masculinity remains concealed in herself. Now her

masculine instincts to be “strong and protective” (Tyson 85) break through her feminine masquerade when she learns that her son Harry – a boy – has been sold to the slave trader Haley. This masculine part of Eliza propels her into action. Her hidden masculinity is let out. The given extract illustrates the determination of Eliza to save her son:

'Poor boy! Poor fellow!' said Eliza; 'they have sold you! but your mother will save you yet!'

No tear dropped over that pillow. In such straits as these the heart has no tears to give, it drops only blood, bleeding itself away in silence.

(35)

The absence of tears implies the absence of feminine reaction and also an indication that her masculinity is activated, paving the way for action.

She takes a decision to get her son into safety. She is bold and strong enough to walk throughout the night towards Ohio River. On the bank of Ohio as she watches the slave-hunters nearing the river, she takes extraordinarily bold decision of making a leap onto the frozen river with her son. All these acts account for her masculine traits. The narrator describes it:

Right on behind they came; and, nerved with strength such as God gives only to the desperate, with one wild cry and flying leap she vaulted sheer over the turbid current by the shore, onto the raft of ice beyond. It was a desperate leap – impossible to anything but madness and despair . . . she did it.

The huge green fragment of ice on which she alighted pitched and creaked With wild cries and desperate energy she leaped to another and still to another cake; stumbling – leaping – slipping –

springing upwards again! Her shoes are gone – her stockings cut from her feet while blood marked every step; but she saw nothing, felt nothing, till dimly, as in a dream, she saw the Ohio side, and a man helping her up the bank.

'Yer a brave gal, now, whoever ye ar!' said the man with an oath. (57)

Eliza's movements on the half frozen river and other activities show that she is not less than what “traditional gender roles cast men as . . . strong, protective, and decisive” (Tyson 85). Although she is obligated to conform to her feminine gender stereotype, using it as a masquerade that conceals the cross-gender traits and potentialities, these traits break loose very now and then under the constraining circumstances. On other occasions, Eliza continues to appear in her feminine masquerade because gender is “an obligatory masquerade” (Beasley 24) and “transgression” on the part of a woman is “punished by exclusion or by a violence that sometimes proves fatal” (Scott 578).

The identity of Arthur Dimmesdale, the protagonist of *The Scarlet Letter*, as the minister of the church and the puritanic authority, is based on the masculine masquerade. His preoccupation with religious activities as the minister of the church is in accordance with the scheme of masculinity. However his love for Hester, the sinful act of adultery and the consequent agony he has gone through show the influence of feminine impulses that remain hidden beneath his masculine masquerade. Obviously in his case too, gender functions as “an obligatory masquerade” (Beasley 24). He is like other male members of the patriarchal society, who are guided “to disdain . . . [their] emotions, feelings, dependence and desires. . .” (Seidler, *Rediscovering* 130).

The narrative highlights his place in the society while he sits in judgment on Hester Prynne's adultery. It focuses on his status in public sphere. It is the status bestowed on a man for being a man. It stands for a person's manhood. In the case of Arthur, it acts as a masculine masquerade serving him by concealing his delicate personality within. The following description of Arthur gives prominence to his masculinity:

. . . a young clergyman who had come from one of the great English universities, bringing all the learning of the age into our wild forestland. His eloquence and religious fervor had already given the earnest of high eminence in his profession. He was a person of very striking aspect with a white, lofty and impending brow

(Hawthorne 56)

The description highlights the intellectual dimension – the masculine aspect of Arthur. That he is the man of a profession with “high eminence” reinforces the conviction about his masculinity. Besides, “his eloquence” – masculine attribute – establishes him as a public speaker. All these qualities construct the masculine appearance for Arthur.

This masculine appearance or masquerade of Arthur Dimmesdale is in accordance with expectations of the patriarchal society. However, some feminine traits are blended in him with his masculine personality. The narrator, obviously, perceives the blend of these dichotomized traits in Arthur when he describes Arthur:

He was a person of a very striking aspect, with a white, lofty, and impending brow, large, brown, melancholy eyes, and a mouth which, unless when he forcibly compressed it, was apt to be tremulous, expressing both nervous sensibility and a vast power of self-restraint. Notwithstanding his high native gifts and scholarlike attainments, there

was an air about this young minister – an apprehensive, a startled, a half-frightened look. . . . (Hawthorne 56)

This description ends the concept of gender polarities. The expressions “a person of a very striking aspect,” “a vast power of self-restraint,” and “his high native gifts and scholarlike attainments” reinforce Arthur's masculinity whereas the expressions “melancholy eyes,” “a mouth . . . apt to be tremulous,” “nervous sensibility” and “an apprehensive, a startled, a half-frightened look” point out the feminine presence in him.

The hidden presence of femininity beneath his masculine masquerade is unveiled in the form of self-infliction, a masochistic behavior. Being repulsed by his life of falsehood, he indulges in the morbid forms of penance, masochist. The narrator describes it:

His inward trouble drove him to practices more in accordance with the old, corrupted faith of Rome than with the better light of the church in which he had been born and bred. In Mr. Dimmesdale's secret closet, under lock and key, there was a bloody scourge. Oftentimes, this protestant and puritan divine had plied it on his own shoulders, laughing bitterly at himself the while, and smiting so much the more pitilessly because of that bitter laugh. It was his custom . . . to fast . . . in order to purify the body . . . until his knees trembled beneath him as an act of penance. He kept vigils, likewise, night after night, sometimes in utter darkness (Hawthorne 122-3)

This “mechanism of self-punishment” (Beauvoir 418) is a type of masochism and “masochism, according to some psychoanalysts, is one of woman's characteristics” (418). This masochistic behavior is concealed from the eyes of the society. His

masculine masquerade proves to be an effective device in the act of concealing the disturbing presence of feminine traits in him.

The evidence for this feminine act of self-punishment remains hidden from the world beneath his masculine masquerade. It is the evidence of his emotional attachment with Hester and his remorse. Arthur conceals another evidence of remorse about his emotional involvement beneath his vestment. "Most of the spectators" testify it as "*a scarlet letter*" "imprinted in the flesh" and for some the letter is a mark of "penance," "a hedious torture on himself" (Hawthorne 219). Others believe that it is "the awful symbol," "the effect of ever active tooth of remorse, gnawing from the inmost heart outwardly and at last manifesting Heaven's judgement by the visible presence of the letter" (219). Despite the difference in interpretations, there can be no disagreement in interpreting it as the mark of assurance about the presence of femininity in Arthur because it is the outcome of his delicate and emotional attachment with Hester. Arthur tries to hide it from the people by using his religious personality, his masculine traits, as a masquerade. He unveils it only before his death by tearing away "the ministerial band from before his breast" (217). Obviously, the fear of God alone that can be perceived in his interjection "I fear! I fear!" (218) obligates him to expose the feminine man beneath the masculine masquerade.

Tess, the female protagonist of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, is similar to Uncle Tom because she too uses the cross-gender traits as her gender identity and as the masquerade. The death of Prince, the horse and bread-winner, obligates her to put on the masculine masquerade. The horse being dead, family's haggling business is disorganized. As she considers herself responsible for the death, she decides to be the bread-winner. She confesses it to her mother, "Well, as I killed a horse," I suppose I ought to do some thing" (Hardy, *Tess* 25). Therefore, she uses her masculinity as a

masquerade to conceal her feminine traits. She projects and activates her masculine personality by working as a fowl-keeper at d' Urberville mansion, as a harvester at her village Marlott after becoming a mother of her illegitimate child, as a dairymaid at Talbothay's Dairy and as a working woman at Flintcomb-Ash. Besides, like other men of the patriarchal society, she turns out to be a breadwinner for her family.

However, beneath this masquerade of masculinity, she has the presence of feminine traits such as being weak and emotional. In the woods of Trantridge, Alec – the owner of d'Urberville – arouses her feminine sensibilities by informing her of his financial assistance to her family that her "father has a new cob today" and "the children [Tess's brothers and sisters] have some toys" (Hardy 56). The narrator illustrates the impact of Alec's strategy:

“Tessy – don’t you love me ever so little now?”

"I'm grateful," she reluctantly admitted. "But I fear I do not –" The sudden vision of his passion for herself as a factor in this result so distressed her that, beginning with one slow tear, and then following with another, she wept outright.

“Don’t cry, dear, dear one! Now sit down here, and wait till I come.” She passively sat down . . . and shivered. . . . (Hardy, *Tess* 56)

The tears assert the presence of femininity in her. Soon she is overtaken by her femininity making her weak, submissive and helpless. The adverb “passively” denotes the passivity –feminine trait – in her behavior.

Alec uses the occasion as an opportunity to seduce her. Despite the projection of masculinity by being a breadwinner and independent being, she remains vulnerable within. The narrator describes it while highlighting the impact of femininity on her:

"Tess!" said d' Urberville.

There was no answer. . . . D' Urberville stooped; and heard a gentle regular breathing. He knelt, and bent lower, till her breath warmed his face, and in a moment his cheek was in contact with hers. She was sleeping soundly, and upon her eyelashes there lingered tears. (57)

The consequence of the seduction is the birth of a baby that transforms Tess into a mother with her maternal instinct activated. The masculine masquerade ceases to exist for the time being because her maternal instincts – feminine potentials – are roused. In other words, as a mother by taking care of the baby, she acts in a feminine way and by undertaking the “outdoor work in her native village” (69) as a harvester she tends to be masculine. However, after the death of the baby, she retrieves the masculine masquerade by getting back to work as a dairymaid at Talbothays and as a breadwinner. As usual she conceals her feminine traits beneath her masculine masquerade. Yet the presence of Angel Clare in the farm activates her femininity by making her modest and fragile. So when Angel Clare clasps her in his arms on one occasion all of a sudden, she yields "to his embrace with unreflecting inevitableness" (118). The narrator adds, "Having seen that it was really her lover who had advanced, and no one else, her lips parted and she sank upon him in her momentary joy, with something very like an ecstatic cry" (118). She is overwhelmed with emotion and her eyes begin to fill, which prompts Angel to ask "Why do you cry, my darling?" (119). The tears, the embodiment of her feminine impulses, reveal what she is within.

Her feminine-self remains unconcealed during her relation with Clare, their intimacy, her marriage with him and separation from him. Her selfless love, self-sacrificing nature and devotion towards Angel activate her love to the full. These aspects drive her to confess her past with Alec, resulting into separation. After this tragic event, she is back in her track of masculinity trying to be unflagging provider/

breadwinner of her family. With “fortitude” and with “her eyebrows” (219) “snipped . . . off” – an attempt to look less feminine – she goes ahead “with the heavy and coarse pursuit” (220) working “on arable land” (220). It is the “work of such roughness” (220) that she gives the impression of being a full-fledged masculine being.

As a working woman in Flintcomb-Ash (223), she is “set hacking” (223) the swede-field with her companion Marian. Her femininity remains completely concealed beneath her masculine masquerade. The narrator admits:

They [Tess and Marian] worked on hour after hour, unconscious of the forlorn aspect they bore in the landscape, not thinking of the justice or injustice of their lot. . . . In the afternoon the rain came . . . Marian said they need not work anymore. But if they did not work they would not be paid; so they worked on. (224)

The way Tess works on and on makes it difficult for the reader to speculate that Tess is still weak; that her masculine gender identity is not her complete-self; that it is only a masquerade and she tends to expose her femininity any time, being driven by dependent sensibility. Soon this masculine masquerade starts breaking. This happens after her father's death, and subsequent as well as additional financial burden on her followed by Alec's renewed efforts for winning her back through his assurance to help her and her family. Consequently she yields to his temptation and surrenders the self to a feminine way of living by being passive and dependent upon him. She confesses it to Angel, "He [Alec] was very kind to me, and to mother, and to all of us after father's death" (299). Eventually, Tess discards the masquerade and becomes the true-self, the very authentic-self – androgyne – for the last six days spent with Clare prior to her execution for the murder of Alec because she is free from every kind of obligation/pressure that is likely to affect her true identity. A “suppressed sob” of Tess

on realizing that they (Angel Clare and Tess) are unlikely to “meet after” they “are dead” (311) assures her femininity and her surrender to authorities for execution in a mechanical way, saying, “I am ready” shows her stoic spirit, a masculine trait.

Her tragic end is the result of her choice to play the masculine role as a breadwinner. If she had adopted the femininity as her masquerade and shaped as well as molded herself in accordance with the Victorian ideal of true womanhood by being submissive, fragile and passive, she would not have been driven into a vicious circle of seduction, impregnation, unhappy marriage, separation, poverty, obligation to be a mistress of the seducer, and his murder in her hand followed by her tragic end through execution.

Dina Morris, the female protagonist of *Adam Bede*, is similar to Tess in the sense that she too goes ahead with a masculine gender identity as a masquerade that conceals the presence of her femininity. However, in the later part of the novel, she gives up the masquerade for the life of a wife and a mother. At the end of the novel, she projects her femininity as a masquerade that conceals her masculine potentials. Thus, despite being masculine and feminine due to her androgynous personality, she exposes only the part of the self and conceals the other.

Her identity, for the most part of the narrative, is based on her work as a local preacher and as a worker in the mill. In the nineteenth century, these two activities were undertaken by men. Her personality, initially, appears to be in favor of masculine gender. She is independent on account of her being a worker at the mill. As the result of being a local preacher, worker and teacher she tends to be active. These activities give the impression that she is masculine. Thus she projects her masculinity as a masquerade and feminine qualities manifest only towards the end of the novel. There is a “total absence of self-consciousness in her demeanor” (Eliot 17) when she

makes her appearance as a preacher. It implies the assertive nature without any sign of embarrassment. There is neither modesty nor any fear in her appearance. She appears like a man in a women's disguise. The narrator illustrates this aspect:

The stranger was struck with surprise as he saw her approach and mount the cart . . . Dinah walked as simply as if she were going to market, and seemed as unconscious of her outward appearance as a little boy: there was no blush, no tremulousness . . . no casting up or down the eyelids. . . . (17)

She is determined to dedicate her life for the public service, which befits a man in the nineteenth century atmosphere. This strong sense of dedication and her religious fervour are the factors that prompt her to adopt the masculinity as her gender identity and as a masquerade. She confesses it in response to Seth Bede's proposal for marriage:

. . . my heart is not free to marry. That is good for other women and it is . . . a blessed thing to be a wife and mother; but 'as God has distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every man, so let him walk.' God has called me to minister to others, not to have any joys or sorrows of my own, but to rejoice with them that do rejoice, and to weep with those that weep. (29)

Her decision not to be a wife and mother is the denial to undertake the task of womanhood to serve the husband and the task of motherhood to serve the children.

Besides, her confession "I desire to live and die without husband and children" (29) neutralizes her sex as female so that her task alone tends to be conspicuous. Since her task is masculine, she creates the image of masculinity around her. For instance,

as a preacher, she is not conscious of her sex. The conversation between Mr. Irwine and Dinah illustrates it:

“And you never feel any embarrassment from the sense of your youth – that you are a lovely young woman on whom men's eyes are fixed?” he said aloud.

"No, I have no room for such feelings, and I don't believe the people ever take notice about that. I think, sir, when God makes His presence felt through us, we are like the burning bush: Moses never took any heed what sort of bush it was – he only saw the brightness of the Lord. (81)

The extract reveals her biblical knowledge, her confidence and her lack of self-consciousness which help her expose her masculine projection as a masquerade.

Even the prison atmosphere does not cause fear in her. When she arrives at Stoniton prison to meet Hetty and spend the whole night with her, Colonel Townley is surprised to see her bold appearance and asks her “What! Have you courage to stay all night in the prison?”(406). Whatever the answer, the question asked by Colonel clarifies the fact that he fails to associate her with timidity on the grounds of sexual ideology. A woman is expected to be timid, a feminine attribute. Thus she is noted for her masculine masquerade.

The presence of femininity beneath her masculine masquerade is open to perception only when she is found in the act of shedding tears. These tears assure the presence of femininity in her. The feminine impulses become active in her in the context where Dinah as a guest in the house of Mr. Poyser meets Adam and "a faint blush" appears on her face as she looks "up at him timidly" (435). There she declares her intention of going back to Snowfield and Mr. and Mrs. Poyser object to it. Adam

admits in a way of giving relief to her, “ I should ha' been thankful for her to stay among us, but if she thinks well to go, I wouldn't cross her, or make it hard to her by objecting. We owe her something different to that” (437). These words bring tears in her eyes as obviously they have stirred her feminine impulses beneath her masculine masquerade. The narrative points it out:

As it often happens, the words intended to relieve her were just too much for Dinah's susceptible feelings at this moment. The tears came down into the grey eyes too fast to be hidden, and she got up hurriedly, meaning it be understood that she was going to put on her bonnet.

(437)

Tears provide the evidence about the presence of a delicate heart beneath her masculine masquerade. What is more, the way she gets “up hurriedly, meaning it to be understood” that she is “going to put on her bonnet” clarifies that she does not want anyone to discover her feminine side. Obviously, she intends to be identified as masculine. On another occasion when Adam proposes her, her feminine part becomes more conspicuous. The narrative illustrates it:

Dinah's lips became pale, like her cheeks, and she trembled violently under the shock of painful joy. Her hands were cold as death between Adam's. She could not draw them away, because he held them fast.

The tears were trembling in Dinah's eyes and they fell before she could answer. (462)

The “trembling” and “tears” reveal the feminine part in Dinah, which has been concealed since the time she appeared in the narrative. Obviously what is concealed is on the way of becoming conspicuous and vice versa toward the end of the novel.

Eventually the circumstances obligate her to abandon her masculine masquerade and accept her femininity as a masquerade. The end of the novel shows the drastic transformation of Dinah from a public personality and potential being into the Victorian ideal of true womanhood. Obviously it is caused by her marriage with Adam on the one hand and, on the other hand, by the act of the (Second Wesleyan) “Conference” that “has forbid the women preaching” (490). The marriage obligates her to quit her job as a worker in the mill and the Conference does not permit her to be a Methodist preacher as a public service. Consequently, she has to give up her life as an independent and active woman of resources to become the angel of the house with an obligation to be dependent and passive. As a mother of two children – Lisbeth and Addy – and as a wife of Adam, she creates the image of a self-sacrificing and nurturing woman. Now femininity tends to be her masquerade that conceals her masculine potentials to be independent and active. The eloquent speaker and ambitious preacher of the past is content in her feminine role saying, “Run, Lisbeth [daughter], run to meet Aunt Poyser. Come in, Adam, and rest; it has been a hard day for thee” (491).

The gender identity of Mr. Rochester, the male protagonist of *Jane Eyre*, initially gives the impression of being formed in accordance with the norms of gender conformity when the narrator admits that his (Rochester's) face is “masculine,” “dark, strong and stern” (Bronte 112). In another place, he is described as a man with “a dark face,” “stern features and a heavy brow” (110). Soon his masculine gender becomes a masquerade because it conceals his feminine traits such as passivity, dependence and weakness. In his case too, the gender is “an obligatory masquerade” (Beasley 24). Being the member of the Victorian society, he cannot be free from the influence of sexual ideology emphasized in the lines “Man for the field and woman for the hearth”

(V. 437) and “Man to command and woman to obey” (V. 440) of Tennyson’s poem *The Princess*.

The narrator, Jane Eyre, recalls the picture of Rochester in her first encounter as “a lion-like creature with long hair and a huge head” while being “a rider” on “a tall steed” (109). These expressions instantly associate him with masculinity. Such an impression is only momentary. As the rider and the horse have slipped on the sheet of ice, Jane Eyre notices that Mr. Rochester is not strong enough to handle the situation all by himself. His weakness obligates him to seek help from Jane, which can be perceived in the conversation:

'I cannot commission you to fetch help,' he said; 'but you may help me a little yourself, if you will be so kind.'

'Yes, Sir.'

'You have not an umbrella that I can use as a stick?'

'No.'

'Try to get hold of my horse's bridle and lead him to me. You are not afraid?' (111)

The act of receiving the help implies the passivity, a feminine act and the act of giving the help is the masculine act.

In the given situation, Mr. Rochester's passivity is apparent and evidently Rochester’s masculinity serves as a masquerade by concealing the feminine traits. What is more, Jane Eyre's reasoning also suggests that giving help is an “active thing” (112). She explains, “My help had been needed and claimed; I had given it: I was pleased to have done something; trivial, transitory though the deed was, it was yet an active thing, and I was weary of an existence all passive” (112). This event suggests that in a crucial situation, Mr. Rochester's helplessness – femininity – becomes

apparent beneath the masculine masquerade. However, his physical appearance described as “a good figure in the athletic sense of the term,” “his grim mouth, chin and jaw” (116) and his authoritative manner delineate his masculinity. The following extract, evidently, points out:

'Is Miss Eyre there?' now demanded the master [Rochester], half rising from his seat to look round to the door, near which I still stood.

'Ah! well, come forward; be seated here.' He drew a chair near his own. 'I am not fond of the prattle of children,' he continued; 'for, old bachelor as I am, I have no pleasant associations connected with their lisp. It would be intolerable to me to pass a whole evening tete-a-tete with a brat. Don't draw that chair farther off, Miss Eyre, sit down exactly where I placed it - if you please, that is. Confound these civilities! I continually forget them. (126)

By declaring about his indifferent attitude towards children through expressions “I am not fond of the prattle of children,” “I have no pleasant associations with their lisp” and so on, he is trying to be unfeminine so as to assert the presence of masculinity and deny the feminine impulses in him. Besides, his authoritative way of giving instruction and talking to Jane shows his assertive nature. His masculine personality is evident in the given extract.

However, in a moment of crisis his masculinity ceases to work, leaving him in a vulnerable situation. For instance, on the occasion when his bed and curtains are on fire, he lies stretched motionless and helpless in deep sleep and Jane Eyre has to rush to get him out of the danger. Jane Eyre recalls her action and his passivity:

'Wake! wake!' I cried. I shook him, but he only murmured and turned: the smoke had stupefied him. Not a moment could be lost: the very

sheets were kindling. I rushed to his basin and ewer; fortunately, one was wide and the other deep, and both were filled with water. I heaved them up . . . succeeded in extinguishing the flames which were devouring it. The hiss of the quenched element, the breakage of the pitcher which I had flung from my hand when I had emptied it, and, above all, the splash of the shower - bath I had liberally bestowed, roused Mr. Rochester at last. (145)

The expression "I shook him, but he only murmured and turned" reflects him as passive and his senseless state in fire suggests that he is vulnerable. The passivity and vulnerability of Mr. Rochester in the given situation expose his cross-gender traits beneath masculine projection. His inactivity unveils his concealed femininity.

Besides, Rochester admits his vulnerability and passivity to Jane, "Why, you have saved my life – snatched me from a horrible and excruciating death!" (147). He further adds, "You have saved my life: I have a pleasure in owing you so immense a debt" (147). It implies that she is the saviour and he is the vulnerable victim. Thus the contrast between his masculine image and feminine inaction during the time of crisis serves as evidence that his masculinity functions merely as a masquerade by concealing the presence of feminine traits.

On other occasions too, Rochester's femininity is spotted. The feminine delicacy of Mr. Rochester can be witnessed in his confession to Jane at the moment of their reunion, "Long as we have been parted, hot tears as I have wept over our separation. . . "(439). The tears he has wept over the separation underscore the presence of femininity in him. Mr. Rochester manages to conceal it under the masculine masquerade.

Rochester's disguise as a gypsy woman – a fortune teller – can be interpreted as the projection of his repressed femininity. Momentarily the disguise serves as a feminine masquerade to conceal his identity as a man and as what he is. This act of impersonation suggests the experience of doubleness.

Efrat Tseelon states, "One became the other in an act of impersonation or engaged in different forms of self-presentation: the experience of doubleness, the alienation of inner from the outer" (29). By impersonating the gypsy woman, Mr. Rochester unveils his experience of doubleness, by becoming the other. Although at the moment the disguise acts as a feminine masquerade, on other occasions Rochester conceals his feminine experience under the masculine image of the self because he is one of the Victorian men guided by the sexual ideology as reflected in the line "Man to command and woman to obey" (V.440) from Tennyson's poem "The Princess"

Thus the gender identity as revealed by both male and female characters is nothing but a masquerade that conceals the true identity of the person as an androgynous being. Femininity of Uncle Tom and Eliza in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, Arthur Dimmesdale's masculinity in *The Scarlet Letter*, Dinah's masculine image in *Adam Bede* and the masculine projection of Tess in *Tess of the* , which serve as their gender identities, turn out to be their masquerades to conceal the presence of the gender or cross-gender traits. Above all, the so-called traditional gender identity serves as a screen, concealing the androgynous personality in each individual and protecting each individual from the patriarchal society that insists on dichotomized gender norms.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION: THE EFFECTS OF DESTABLIZING GENDER

This dissertation aimed to present a hypothesis that, despite the fact that a person presents himself or herself in a particular gender identity as masculine or feminine, his/her true self is androgynous having the potentiality to respond in a feminine and masculine way according as the situation demands. This suggests the potentiality of a person for fluidity and multiplicity. Hence if the true self is 'Being', the gender identity projected by the person is 'Becoming'. The difference between 'Being' and 'Becoming' is the difference between what a person's true-self is and what a person becomes. Consequently the projected gender identity tends to be a masquerade that conceals the potentials of another gender.

This dissertation has included the theoretical perspectives of different scholars. These perspectives focus on the relation between sex and gender, gender conformity, gender disruption, androgyny and masquerade. They give a complete picture of what a gender is and can be in connection with androgyny and masquerade. The aim here is to show that patriarchal culture imposes masculine gender identity on men and feminine gender identity on women although androgynous personality is the true identity of each man and woman. The frequent gender disruptions testify that the unacceptable gender traits are in a suppressed state and the so-called gender is only a masquerade.

The dissertation has offered some instances of gender disruption and gender conformity in American and English literature of nineteenth century. Some specific works of the renowned writers and poets of the nineteenth century have been analyzed from the perspective of gender ideology to find out whether they have reinforced or undermined the traditional gender norms. The objective here is to show that the

nineteenth century American and English literature provides ample evidence for androgynous potentials in a person, consistent endeavors to maintain gender conformity in accordance with traditional gender norms, and occasional gender disruptions on the part of men and women.

The dissertation has explained how the five novels from the nineteenth century American and English literature— *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *The Scarlet Letter*, *Jane Eyre*, *Adam Bede* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* – undermine the patriarchal assumptions about gender roles by exposing the potentials of male and female protagonists for gender blending. These characters consciously or unconsciously resist the demands of patriarchy for gender conformity and emerge as androgynies acting in defiance of patriarchal culture. However, some major and minor characters other than the protagonists have been assessed to point out that they successfully assume their gender roles in accordance with patriarchal expectations. As such they prove to be patriarchal men and women who want to preserve the very fabric of social, cultural and traditional values that govern their roles in the patriarchal society. Their failure to go beyond the boundaries of gender norms establishes them as gender stereotypes.

The five novels discussed here demonstrate that gender identity is a masquerade. The characters projecting the masculine or feminine gender as an identity are witnessed to have concealed the presence of cross-gender traits in them. Consequently, the given gender identity functions as a masquerade that prevents the society from perceiving the repressed gender traits in him/her until the given traits flash to the surface in a trying situation.

My research has led me to conclude that, apart from biological difference, there is no categorical difference between male and female characters in connection with gender. The so –called gender is found to be only skin-deep and therefore a

masquerade. If it is taken in terms of behavior, it exists in isolation with one's biological sex. My research finds out that in the given novels femininity is not exclusive to women, nor is masculinity to men. A woman can be manly apart from being womanly and a man can be womanly apart from being manly. Depending on circumstances they act differently on different occasions, switching from manliness to womanliness and from womanliness to manliness. Consequently, it suggests the androgynous potentiality in them and the multiplicity as well as fluidity of identity in them.

In the novel *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, Tess's survival as a bread-winner for her family, her aggression with Alec and her act of violence against him expose her manliness. However, her love and self-sacrificing devotion towards her husband Angel Clare assert her womanliness. Likewise Hester Prynne, the female protagonist of *The Scarlet Letter*, survives in a puritanical society without depending either on her husband Chillingworth or lover Arthur for her means of subsistence. Her inner resources enable her to be independent, thereby, to be masculine. However, as a mother of Pearl and as a charitable person she remains feminine. Jane Eyre, the female protagonist of *Jane Eyre*, proves to be intellectual and independent as a teacher and as a governess. This aspect establishes her as manly whereas her sentimental love for Rochester and her submissive behavior towards him at the end of the novel reflect her womanliness. In the same way Eliza, a female slave and protagonist of the slave narrative in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, shocks the readers with her giant leap over the half-frozen river Ohio to save her child from being sold. Her daring deeds to get her son into a safer place from the slave hunters expose the masculine part of her as protective and strong. However, on other occasions, she remains feminine to the extent of showing mercy to the wounded slave hunter Tom

Loker. The female protagonist of *Adam Bede*, Dinah Morris as a successful preacher and a mill-worker, is as manly as any man. However, towards the end of the novel, as a mother of two children and wife of Adam, she projects her womanliness. These female protagonists tend to be in favor of multiplicity and fluidity by being masculine on some specific occasions and feminine on other occasions. Thus they are both manly and womanly. Their femaleness functions as a cloak over their androgynous personalities which contradict the conventional assumptions that women are feminine. It is the situation that determines what they should be at the given instance.

In the same way, the male protagonists of these novels give the evidence that asserts the multiplicity in their behavior. Angel Clare, the male protagonist of the novel of *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*, acts in a masculine way as a lover and an authoritative husband by taking a decision about his relation with her and living separately from her. However, towards the end of the novel, he tends to be passive and dependent on her decision to be with him. Such a fluid transition from masculine state to feminine indicates his potentiality for multiplicity and fluidity in personality. Even the antagonist Alec shows the manly qualities through his dominant nature and aggressive behavior with Tess on the one side and on the other side his eventual vulnerability before Tess's violent act against him exposes the femininity in him. Basically he gives the impression of being a gender stereotype. Likewise Rochester, the male protagonist of *Jane Eyre*, plays the masculine role in front of Jane and other characters, which befits him as the master of Thornfield Hall. However, as a lover, he tends to be feminine by being weak and submissive. Adam, the male protagonist of *Adam Bede*, is feminine so far as his sentimental love for Hetty is concerned. However, his aggression with Arthur Donnithorne through a duel with him points out his masculinity. Likewise, Augustine St. Clare's passivity in *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in

reacting against slavery and his emotional attachment with his daughter project him as a feminine man and father. On the contrary, his occasional acts of independent decisions point out his masculinity. Therefore, these male characters cannot be categorized as exclusively masculine. Such a multiplicity contradicts the binary categorization of men and women as manly and womanly. Both male and female characters break away from their gender identities momentarily under the straining circumstances to reveal their androgynous potentialities. Such instances subvert the fallacy of patriarchy that “cast men as rational, strong, protective, and decisive . . . [and] women as emotional (irrational), weak, nurturing, and submissive” (Tyson 85).

I believe that these five novels provide a miniature of nineteenth century society of individuals who transgress or conform to the gender norms. Hopefully, this study can serve as a point of initiation for other research projects in the near future. A significant study could be a work of comparison between the Eastern and Western literary works about the state of gender in them. Another option is the examination of classical epics of different cultures for analyzing the gender and cross-gender roles played by male and female characters. One more option is to look into the colonialist literature and war novels to study and find out how imperialism and wars shape(d) the gender norms and play(ed) the role for the division of gender roles in the society. Such a study leads to the awareness about gender as a system of possibilities. Besides, critics of English and American literature currently focus on the role of either women or men, showing the differences in treatment given to them. Obviously more focus needs to be given to the similarity in the portrayal of male and female characters so that it can be perceived that gender is absent at least in limited situations. One area for this is to examine how male and female characters react when they are emotionally involved. This does not imply that other moments are

insignificant, but the point is that during the emotional moments both male and female characters become impulsive and act in a manner that shows they do not differ in their intrinsic nature. On those occasions, gender ceases to exist and critics can evaluate such moments to point out the absence of gender.

As a matter of fact, my dissertation has been confined to androgynous potentials within individual, instances of gender disruption as well as gender conformity and gender as a masquerade. Admittedly, I have not been able to explore in the literary works how one's class, race, religion and culture in addition to one's sex, apart from colonial atmosphere, play the role in forming and reinforcing the notion of gender. Therefore, there is possibility for the future research to deal with these aspects and explore the unknown.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, James Eli. "The Boundaries of Social Intercourse." *A Concise Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Francis O' Gorman. New Delhi: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 40-70.
- . *A History of Victorian Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.
- Ammons, Elizabeth. "Heroines in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*." *American Literature* 49.2 (1977): 161-179. Web. 6 June 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.
- Archer, John, and John Llyod. *Sex and Gender*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
- Ashe, Fidel. *The New Politics of Masculinity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Auerbach, Nina. *Woman and the Demon: The Life of a Victorian Myth*. London: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2008.
- Barker, Gary T. *Dying to be Men*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Bazin, Nancy Topping, and Alma Freeman. "The Androgynous Vision." *Women's Studies* 2.2 (1974): 85-215.
- Beasley, Chris. *Gender and Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers*. London: Sage Publications, 2005.
- Beauvoir, de Simone. *The Second Sex*. Trans and Ed. H. M. Parshley. London: Vintage, 1997.
- Bem, Sandra. *The Lenses of Gender*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

- . "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42.2 (1974): 155-62.
- . "On the Utility of Alternative Procedures for Assessing Psychological androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 45.2 (1977): 196-205.
- Bender, Bert. "The Teeth of Desire: The Awakening and The Descent of Man." *American Literature* 63.3 (Sept 1991): 459-73. Web. 6 June 2010 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable>>.
- Bentley, Nancy. "Literary Forms and Mass Culture, 1860-1890." *The Cambridge History of American Literature: Prose Writing, 1860-1920*. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2005. 65-286.
- Bird, Phyllis. "Images of Women in the Old Testament." *Religion and Sexism*. Ed. Rosemary Radford Ruether. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974. 41-88.
- Braudy, Leo. *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and Changing Nature of Masculinity*. New York: Vintage Books, 2005.
- Breakus, Catherine A. "Female Preaching in Early Nineteenth-Century America." *Women and Church*. Web. 5 Sept. 2012. <<http://www.baylor.edu/content/services/document.php/98759.pdf>>.
- Brennan, Teresa. *The Interpretation of the Flesh: Freud and Femininity*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Brenner O. C., and Greenhaus J. H. "Managerial Status, Sex and Selected Personality Characteristics." *Southern Management Association* (1979):107-13.
- Bristow, Joseph. *Sexuality*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Bronte, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. New Delhi: UBSPD, 2005.

- Brovermn, Inge K., et al. "Sex-Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal." *A Journal of Social Issues* 28.2 (1972): 59-78.
- Browning, Elizabeth Barret. "The Romaunt of the Page." Web. 11 Nov 2013.
<<http://www.expressivethoughts.org/romanticism-poetry-by-elizabeth-barret-browning/the-romaunt-of-the-page.htm>>.
- Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- . *Gender Troubles*. New York and London: Routledge, 1999.
- . *Undoing Gender*. New York and London: Routledge, 2004.
- Byron, George Gordon, Lord. "Don Juan." Web. 11 Nov. 2013.
<<http://www.online-literature.com/byron/don-juan/>>.
- Carr, Clynn. "Tom Boy Resistance and Conformity: Agency in Social Psychological Gender Theory." *Gender and Society* 12.5 (October 1998): 528-53.
- Ceniza, Sherry. "Gender." *A Companion to Walt Whitman*. Ed. Donald D. Kummings. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. 180-196.
- Chopin, Kate. *The Awakening and Other Short Stories*. San Diego: Icon International, Inc., 2005.
- . "The Story of an Hour." *Single Scene Short Stories*. Ed. Margaret Bishop. London: Gibbs Smith. n. p. 99-102.
- Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.
- Cooper, James Fenimore. *The Last of the Mohicans*. Leipzig: Alphonse Durr, 1856.
- Carrigan, Tim, et al. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Ed. Rachel Adams and David Sauran. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002. 99-118.
- Cranny- Francis, Anne, et al. *Gender Studies: Terms and Debates*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Cummings, Maria Susanna. *The Lamplighter*. Boston: John P. Jewelt & Company, 1855.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1888.

Dauphin, Cecile, et al. "Women's Culture and Women's Power: Issues in French Women's History." *Feminism and History*. Ed. Joan Wallach Scott. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. 568-96.

Davis, Almond H., and Junia S Mowry. *The Female Preacher*. Boston: A. B. Kiddler, 7 Cornhill, 1843.

Deaux, Kay. "Psychological Constructions of Masculinity and Femininity." *Masculinity/Femininity: Basic Perspectives*. Ed. June Machover Reinisch, Leonard A. Rosenblum, and Stephanie A. Sanders. Vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987. 289-303.

Dever, Carolyn. "Everywhere and Nowhere: Sexuality in the Victorian Novel." *A Concise Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Francis O' Gorman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 156-179.

Diamond, Michael J. "Masculinity and its Discontents: Making Room for his 'Mother' Inside the Male – An Essential Achievement for Identity." *Heterosexual Healthy Male Masculinities*. Ed. Bruce Reis and Robert Grossmark. New York: Routledge, 2009. 231-51.

Dickinson, Emily. "I'm Nobody! Who are you?" Web. 8 Nov 2013.

<<http://www.poemhunter.com/poem/i-m-nobody-who-are-you/>>.

Doniger, Wendy. *The Woman Who Pretended to be Who she was: Myths of Self-Imitation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Eagan, Ken Jr. "The Adulteress in the Market-Place: Hawthorne and *The Scarlet Letter*." *Studies in the Novel*. 27.1(1995): 26-41. JSTOR. Web. 5 June 2010.

- Eagleton, Terry. *The English Novel: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- Edwards, Tim. *Cultures of Masculinity*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Ekins, Richard and Dave King. *The Transgender Phenomenon*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2006.
- Ellis, George W. "The Psychology of American race Prejudice." *Racism*. Ed. Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001.10-7.
- Eliot, George. *Adam Bede*. New Delhi: Peacock Books, 2001.
- Fishkin, Shelly Fishner. "Mark Twain and Women." *The Cambridge Companion to Mark Twain*. Ed. Forrest G. Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 52-73.
- Flint, Kate. "George Eliot and Gender." *The Cambridge Companion to George Eliot*. Ed. George Levine. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. 159-180.
- . "Seeing Is Believing: Visuality and Victorian Fiction." *A Concise Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Francis O' Gorman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 25- 46.
- . "The Middle Novels: Chuzzlewit, Dombey and Copperfield." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 39-48.
- Fogel, Gerald I. "Inferiority and Inner Central Space in Men: What Else Can Be Lost in Castration?" *Heterosexual Masculinities*. Ed. Bruce Reis and Robert Grossmark. New York: Routledge, 2009. 23-54.
- Foster, Shirley. "Elizabeth Gaskell's Shorter Pieces." *The Cambridge Companion to Elizabeth Gaskell*. Ed. Jill. L. Matus. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.108-130.

- Freud, Sigmund. "Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction between the Sexes." *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Ed. Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- Fuller, Sarah Margaret. *Woman in the Nineteenth Century*. Boston: Brown, Taggard and Chase, 1860.
- Ford, T., and Tonander, G. "The Role of Differentiation between Groups and Social Identity in Stereotype Formation." *Social Psychological Quarterly* 61.4 (1998): 372-384.
- Gagne, Patrica, and Richard Tewksbury. "Knowledge and Power, Body and Self: An Analysis of Knowledge Systems and the Transgendered Self." *The Sociological Quarterly*. 40.1(1993): 59-83.
- Gates, Sarah. "The Sound of the Scythe Being Whetted: Gender, Genre, and Realism in *Adam Bede*." *Studies in the Novel* 30.1 (1998): 20-34.
- Garofalo, Daniela. *Manly Leaders in Nineteenth Century British Literature*. New York: State University of New York Press, 2008.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Glover, David, and Cora Kaplan. *Genders*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Goldstein, Joshua S. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Goodland, Lauren M. E. "Toward a Victorianist's Theory of Androgynous Experiment." *Victorian Studies* (2005): 215-229.
- Gray, Richard. *A History of American Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

- Green, Laura. "'Strange [In]difference of Sex': Thomas Hardy, the Victorian Man of Letters, and the Temptations of Androgyny." *Victorian Studies* 38.4 (1995):523-549. Web. 2 June 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.
- Halberstam, Judith. "An Introduction to Female Masculinity." *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Ed. Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2002. 355-372.
- . *Female Masculinity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1998.
- Hagen, R.L., and Kahn, A. "Discrimination against Competent Woman." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 5 (1975): 362-76.
- Hardy, Thomas. *The Collected Letters of Thomas Hardy*. Eds. Richard Little Purdy and Michael Milligate. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978-84.
- . *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1991.
- Harris, Ian M. *Messages Men Hear*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd., 2005.
- Harvey, Geoffrey. *The Complete Critical Guide to Thomas Hardy*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. *The Scarlet Letter*. New Delhi: Peacock Books, 2003.
- Haywood, Chris, and Mairtin Mac an Ghaill. *Men and Masculinities*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003.
- Heilbrun, Carolyn G. *Toward a Recognition of Androgyny*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1993.
- Herbert, Walter. "Nathaniel Hawthorne, Una Hawthorne, and the Cultural Construction of Gender." *PMLA* 103. 3(1988): 285-297. Web. 5 June 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.

Hoch, Paul. "White Hero Black Beast: Racism, Sexism and the Mask of Masculinity."

Feminism and Masculinities. Ed. Peter F. Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University press, 2004. 93- 107.

Homer, Sean. *Jacques Lacan*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

"Hopes and Dreams: Creating a Men's Politics." *Feminism and Masculinities*. Ed.

Peter F. Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University press, 2004. 80-92.

Hooks, Bell. *Ain't a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. London: Pluto Press, 1990.

Howe, Julia Ward. "Battle Hymn of the Republic." Web. 11 Nov 2013.

<http://www.womenhistory.about.com/library/etext/bl_howe_hymn.htm/>.

Hunter College Women's Studies Collective. *Women's Realities, Women's Choices*.

New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Jaffe, Audrey. "Cranford and Ruth." *The Cambridge Companion to Elizabeth Gaskell*.

Ed. Jill. L. Matus. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 46-58.

Jackson, Helen Hunt. "A Woman's Battle." Web. 25 Oct 2012

<<http://www.readbookonline.net/readonline/>>.

Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*.

Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002.

Jung, Carl Gustav. *Aspects of Feminine*. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. London and New York:

Routledge, 2009.

---. *Aspects of Masculine*. Trans. R. F. C. Hull. London and New York: Routledge,

2009.

Kaplan, Alexander G., and Joan P. Bean. "Beyond Sex Role Stereotypes: Readings."

Toward a Psychology of Androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976.

Kaplan, Carla. "Girl Talk: *Jane Eyre* and the Romance of Women's Narration."

Novel: A Forum on Fiction 30. 1 (1996): 5-31. Web. 5 June 2010.

<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.

Keegan, Abigail F. *Byron's Othered Self and Voice*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.

Killingworth, Jimmie M. *The Cambridge Introduction to Walt Whitman*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Kreisel, Deanna K. "Incognito, Intervention, and Dismemberment in *Adam Bede*."

ELH 70. 2 (2003): 541-574. Web. 3 June 2010.

<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.

Krishnaraj, Maithreyi. "Androgyny: An Alternative to Gender Polarity?" *Economic*

and Political Weekly, 31.16/17 (April 20-27 1996): 9-14.

Kucich, John. "Collins and Victorian Masculinity." *The Cambridge Companion to*

Wilkie Collins. Ed. Jenny Bourne Taylors. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 125-38.

Kulick, Don. "The Gender of Brazilian Transgendered Prostitute." *The Masculinity*

Studies Reader. Ed. Rachel Adams and David Savran. Malden: Blackwell publishers, 2002. 389-407.

Lang, Amy Schrager. "Class and the Strategies of Sympathy." *The Cultures of*

Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in Nineteenth Century America. Ed. Shirley Samuels. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. 128-142.

Larson, Kerry C. "Song of Myself." *A Companion to Walt Whitman*. Ed. Donald D.

Kummings. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006. 471-83.

Lawless, Elaine J. "The Silencing of the Preacher Woman: The Muted Message of

George Eliot's *Adam Bede*." *Woman's Studies* 18. 2-3 (1990): 249-68.

Lazerson, Judith. "Psychological Androgyny, Sex, Stereotyping, and Mental Health."

Diss. University of British Columbia, 1981.

Lenning, Alkeline Van, et al. "Is Womanliness Nothing but a Masquerade?"

Masquerade and Identities. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.83-100.

Lucal, Betsy. "What It Means to Gendered Me: Life on the Boundaries of a

Dichotomous Gender System." *Gender and Society*. 13. 6 (December 1991):

781-97.

Maguire, Marie. *Men, Women, Passion and Power: Gender Issues in Psychotherapy*.

2nd ed. Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2004.

Malpas, Simon. *The Postmodern*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007.

Malson, Helen. *Thin Woman*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

Marck, Nancy Anne. "Narrative Transference and Female Narcissism: The Social

Message of *Adam Bede*." *Studies in the Novel* 35.4 (2003): 447-70.

Matus, Jill L. "Mary Barton and North and South." *The Cambridge Companion to*

Elizabeth Gaskell. Ed. Jill. L. Matus. New York: Cambridge University Press,

2007. 27-45.

Mayer, Holly A. "Bearing Arms, Bearing Burdens: Women Warriors, Camp

Followers and Home-Front Heroines of the American Revolution." *Gender,*

War, and Politics: Transatlantic Perspectives, 1775-1830. Ed. Karen

Hagemann, Cisela Mettele and Jane Rendall. London: Palgrave Macmillan,

2010.169-87.

Mead, Margaret. "Sex and Temperament." *Women's Realities, Women's Choices: An*

Introduction to Women's Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

136.

- Milder, Robert. "Beautiful Illusions: Hawthorne and the Site of Moral Law." *Nathaniel Hawthorne Review* 33. 2 (2007): 1-23.
- Mill, J.S. *The Subjection of Women*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1869.
- Millet, Kate. *Sexual Politics*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000.
- Mizruchi, Susan L. "Becoming Multicultural: Culture, Economy, and the Novel, 1860-1920." *The Cambridge History of American Literature: Prose Writing, 1860-1920*. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch. Vol.3. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005. 413-739.
- Mosse, George L. *The Image of Man: the Creation of Modern Masculinity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Mullen, Harryette. "Runaway Tongue: Resistant Orality in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Our Nig*, *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*, and *Beloved*." *The Cultures of Sentiment: Race, Gender, and Sentimentality in Nineteenth Century America*. Ed. Shirley Seamus. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992. 244-64.
- Murphy, Peter F. "Introduction." *Feminism and Masculinities*. Ed. Peter F. Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 1-21.
- Myrdal, Gunnar. "An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy." *Racism*. Ed. Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001. 35-48.
- Nan, Johnson. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois UP, 2002.
- Osofsky, Joy D. and Howard J. Osofsky. "Androgyny as a Life Style." *The Family Coordinator* 21. 4 (Oct 1972): 411- 18.
- Peters, John G. "We Stood at God's Feet, Equal: Equality, Subversion and Religion in *Jane Eyre*." *Bronte Studies* 29.1 (2004): 53-64.

- Peterson, Linda H. "Elizabeth Gaskell's *The Life of Charlotte Bronte*." *The Cambridge Companion to Elizabeth Gaskell*. Ed. Jill L. Matus. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 59-74.
- Philaretou, Andreas G. "An Analysis of Masculine Socialization and Male Sexuality." Diss. The Virginia Polytechnic and State University, 2001.
- Pykett, Lyn. "Collins and the Sensation Novel." *The Cambridge Companion to Wilkie Collins*. Ed. Jenny Bourne Taylors. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 50-64.
- Regan, Stephen. Introduction. *The Nineteenth-Century Novel: A Critical Reader*. Ed. Stephen Regan. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. 1-10.
- Rey, Patricia Del. "Apologetics and Androgyny: The Past and the Future." *Frontiers* 3.1 (1978): 8-10.
- Reynaud, Emmanuel. "Holy Virility: The Social Construction of Masculinity." *Feminism and Masculinities*. Ed. Peter F. Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 136- 48.
- Reynolds, David S. "The Feminization Controversy: Sexual Stereotypes and the Paradoxes of Piety in Nineteenth Century America." *The New England Quarterly* 53. 1 (1980): 96-106. Web. 6 June 2010.
<<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.
- Richardson, Angelique. "'The Difference between Human Beings': Biology in the Victorian Novel." *A Concise Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. Francis O' Gorman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 202-31.
- Rothenberg, Paula. "The Construction, Deconstruction and Reconstruction of Difference." *Hypatia* 5.1(1990): 42- 57.

Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex."

Feminism and History. Ed. Joan Wallach Scott. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. 105-51.

Rule, Philip C. "The Function of Allusion in *Jane Eyre*." *Modern Language Studies*

15. 4 (1985): 165-71. Web. 5 June 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.

Ruskin, John. *Sesame and Lillies*. N.P.: Dodo Press, n.d.

Russet, Cynthia Eagle. *Science Sexual: The Victorian Construction of Womanhood*.

London: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Ruthven, K.K. *Feminist Literary Studies: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press, 1990.

Saunders, Clare Broome. *Women Writers and Nineteenth Century Medievalism*. New

York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2009.

Savran, David. *Taking it Like a Man*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Sawyer, Jack. "On Male Liberation." *Feminism and Masculinities*. Ed. Peter F.

Murphy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. 25-7.

Schmitt, Cannon. "'The Sun and Moon Were Made to Give Them Light': Empire in

the Victorian Novel." *A Concise Companion to Victorian Novel*. Ed. Francis O' Gorman. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005. 4-24.

Scott, Joan Wallach. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *Feminism*

and History. Ed. Joan Wallach Scott. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. 152- 80.

Seidler, Victor J. "Pain and Politics." *The New Politics of Masculinity*. Ed. Fidelma

Ashe. London and New York : Routledge, 2007. 109-122.

---. *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*. London and New

York: Routledge, 1989.

- Shaw, Marion. "Sylvia's Lovers and Other Historical Fiction." *The Cambridge Companion to Gaskell*. Ed. Jill. L. Matus. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 75-89.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Bronte to Lessing*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1977.
- Silverman, Kaja. *Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York and London: Routledge, 1992.
- Sjoberg, Laura, and Sandra Via. "Introduction." *Gender, War, and Militarism*. Ed. Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via. England: Praeger, 2010.1-13.
- Snowdon, Charles. "The 'Nature' of Sex Differences: Myths of Male and Female." *Feminism and Evolutionary Biology: Boundaries, Intersections and Frontiers*. Ed. P.A. Gowaty. New York: Chapman and Hall, 1997. 276- 93.
- Spellman, Elizabeth V. "Woman as Body: Ancient and Contemporary Views." *Feminist Theory and the Body: A Reader*. Ed. Janet Price and Margrit Shildrick. New York: Routledge, 1999. 32-41.
- Stoneman, Patsy. "Gaskell, Gender and the Family." *The Cambridge Companion to Elizabeth Gaskell*. Ed. Jill. L. Matus. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 131-147.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Edition Limited.1995.
- Tanner, Tony. *The Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression*. Baltimore: John Hopkins UP, 1981.
- Taylor, Jenny Bourne. "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to Wilkie Collins*. Ed. Jenny Bourne Taylors. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 1-6.

- Tennyson, Alfred Lord. *In Memoriam*. Web. 8 Nov 2013. <<http://www.online-literature.com/donne/718/>>.
- . *The Princess*. Web. 8 Nov 2013. <<http://classiclitabout.com/library.com/bl-etexts/atennyson/bl-aten-princess.htm/>>.
- Thompson, Andrew. *The Empire Strikes Back? The Impact of Imperialism on Britain from the Mid-Nineteenth Century*. London: Pearson Longman, 2005.
- Tomc, Sandra. "A Change of Art, Hawthorne, and the Service of Love." *Nineteenth-century Literature* 56. 4 (2002): 466-494. Web. 5 June 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.
- Tseelon, Efrat. "Introduction: Masquerade and Identities." *Masquerade and Identities*. Ed. Efrat Tseelon. London and New York: Routledge, 2001. 1-17.
- Tyson, Lois. *A Critical Theory Today*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Warhol, Robyn R. "Double Gender, Double Genre in *Jane Eyre* and *Villette*." *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 36. 4 (Autumn 1996): 857-875. Web. 26 April 2013. <<http://jstor.org/stable/>>.
- Waters, Catherine. "Gender, Family, and Domestic Ideology." *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*. Ed. John O. Jordan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 120-35.
- White, Craig. *Student Companion to James Fenimore Cooper*. London: Greenland Press, 2006.
- Wilson, William Julius. "The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions." *Racism*. Ed. Ellis Cashmore and James Jennings. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2001. 188-208.

Wolosky, Shira. "Poetry and Public Discourse, 1820-1910." *The Cambridge History of American Literature: Nineteenth Century Poetry, 1800-1910*. Ed. Sacvan Bercovitch. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.147-480.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1929.

Zizek, Slavoz. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. 2nd ed. London: Verso, 1989.

Zuckert, Catherine H. "The Political Thought of Nathaniel Hawthorne." *Polity* 13. 2 (1980): 163-83. Web. 8 June 2010. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/>>.