MASCULINITIES IN QUEER TEMPORALITIES

FROM GEORGE ELIOT TO VIRGINIA WOOLF

A Dissertation

by

HYERA KIM

Submitted to the Office of Graduate and Professional Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Chair of Committee,	Claudia Nelson
Committee Members,	David McWhirter
	Mary Ann O'Farrell
	Melanie C. Hawthorne
Head of Department,	Maura Ives

August 2019

Major Subject: English

ABSTRACT

Studies of masculinities have challenged the monolithic concept of masculinity as patriarchy by examining men's diverse experiences in different historical periods. Studies of Victorian masculinities as sub-division of the field also have probed different and often marginalized experiences of Victorian men and thus have destabilized the unitary concept of Victorian patriarchy. In spite of the contribution to the deconstruction of the monolithic masculinity, studies of (Victorian) masculinities have shown limitation on account of the paradigmatic discipline of historicization. Although the exploration of the historically diverse experiences of men has proved pluralities of masculinities, its reliance on the historical approach seems past tense study, and therefore, it seems to only echo with the men in the past. This dissertation aims to remap current historical approaches in studies of (Victorian) masculinities by drawing upon the notion of queer temporality recently discussed in queer theorists. Specifically, this dissertation complicates the prevalent notion of time – which consists of past, present, and future – by speculating on the complex function of memory. Adding complexities of time in the form of queer temporality to current historical methodology of studies of (Victorian) masculinities, this dissertation aims to shift the seemingly past tense studies to present tense one. This work includes George Eliot's two Victorian texts and Rudyard Kipling, Henry James, and Virginia Woolf's post-Victorian texts. By making a dialogue between different epochs and by evoking a dialectics of masculinities, this dissertation most importantly aims to lead readers to ponder on masculinities as the matter of mode of being in the present rather than as the historical experiences in the past.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to sincerely thank my committee chair, Dr. Nelson, and my committee members, Dr. McWhirter, Dr. O'Farrell, and Dr. Hawthorne, for their guidance and encouragement throughout writing this dissertation.

I also want to say tremendous thank my family and friends for supporting me through the years of studying abroad.

Finally, thanks to Professor Lee (Chonbuk National University) and Professor Bonfiglio (Sogang University) who initially led and motivated me to study further during my undergraduate and master years.

CONTRIBUTORS AND FUNDING SOURCES

Contributors

This work was supervised by a dissertation committee consisting of Professor Nelson, Professor McWhirter, and Professor O'Farrell of the Department of English, and Professor Hawthorne of the Department of International Studies.

Funding Sources

The graduate study was supported by an assistantship and a dissertation fellowship from Texas A&M University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation started with thoughts of time. On one of the hottest days in Texas in 2014, I felt that I was stuck in a memory that I had experienced in a different time and space. According to clock time, it was a busy moment in the fall semester when everyone seemed to be moving ahead purposefully. I was walking on the way to purchase some textbooks, but my senses were not with the present time, as my past memories kept hovering over me and prevented me from going forward. On the one hand, I was in 2014 in clock time. On the other hand, my senses were still focused on a time before 2014. At that moment, I felt that I was not living in the present, but that I was captured in the past; my present time in “reality” seemed more surreal than the past memories. That was one of the intense moments that led me to speculate on whether time moves forward; to what extent reality can reflect on a perception of progressive time; and, if the past hovers upon and grasps me, how I can live with the past in the present reality.

This experience led my research interest, masculinity, in a specific direction with the issue of time and memory. Each chapter of this dissertation deals with the issue of masculinity, yet it more specifically grapples with male figures who are ensnared in confusing gender identities, trapped between past and present. For instance, since his memory cannot depart from his traumatic past in Lantern Yard, George Eliot's Silas Marner seems like a weaving spider rather than a living being. Likewise, in Henry James's "The Beast in the Jungle," after May Bartram's death, protagonist John Marcher

feels acute frustration of his "egotism" (70) and cannot move forward. The first and foremost matter that these male characters encounter is failure to engage in the present due to their past memory. Accordingly, the ways in which this dissertation participates in current discussions of masculinity are interlinked to the matter of past and present temporality in the form of memory.

Previously, studies of (Victorian) masculinities have employed historical contextualization as a main methodology in exploring and developing the discussions of male gender identities in broader realm of gender studies. For instance, Natasha Anand outlines that Victorian masculinity – as an offshoot of studies of masculinities – has been initially influenced by feminism's understanding of men as a unified category (108), has problematized the unified notion of a monolithic masculinity, and has developed the idea of plural masculinities. Under the central tenet of plural masculinities, critics could explore a new channel, the experiences of the "marginal and minority of men" (108) in the Victorian era.

In spite of the developments in the discussions of masculinities, however, current studies of Victorian masculinities have shown the limitations of the methodology of historical contextualization. As masculinity has been explored in a given historical period, ever more diverse historical periods have contributed to engendering critics' understanding of masculinities at once more various and more marginalized. This approach has been meaningful and useful in destabilizing a previously dominant perception, that of masculinity as transhistorical patriarchy. However, although the perspective that masculinity is best understood as a social, cultural representation that

changes over time has helped critics deconstruct the supposed ahistoricity of patriarchy, it seems to bring about a methodological fixation in its reliance on a single given historical period. At a certain point, the analysis of male gender identity sometimes seems reduced to the larger realm of history. Consequently, in some cases, the analysis of masculinity inadvertently disregards a quintessential matter, a mode of being: how to live in one's gender identity.

To strengthen the idea of the mode of being in an attempt to develop current studies of (Victorian) masculinities, the issue of temporality should not be dismissed. In terms of Marner's masculinity, again, critics could choose to see Marner's peculiar motherhood, his nurturing of his adopted daughter, Eppie, in the domestic realm, as Eliot's resistance to designated female and male gender roles grounded in the Victorian ideology of separate spheres. In this case, critics have contextualized Marner within the problematic separate spheres ideology and have revealed its impacts on gender identity during the Victorian era. However, Marner's gender identity in his life with Eppie involves more than a resistance to conventional understandings of motherhood in the Victorian context, as the novel is concerned with how he reconciles with his traumatic past—a past in which he initially adhered to a normative gender identity. Eppie functions as Marner's savior from his traumatic past and redirects the dormant consciousness of the weaving spider to full consciousness in the present. From this perspective, the matter of how Marner has become awakened from his dormancy to take on a new gender identity as caregiver for his daughter is crucially related to how he engages in the different temporalities of his past and present. If we approach Marner

with regard to the issues of time, therefore, his gender identity as male mother is associated not only with Eliot's rejection of a problematic gender dualism but also, more profoundly, with his new mode of being.

Kate Haffey notes that queer theorists, "over the past fifteen years, have directed significant critical attention to issues of time" (158). Queer theorists hold that gender identity and temporality are interlinked, "from the life schedules deemed healthy for child-rearing to the bildungsroman structure that charts the passing of time as a progression from childhood through adolescence to mature heterosexual adulthood" (158). Based on this perspective, queer theorists engender the concept of a queer temporality that "stands in clear opposition to [the] normative time frames" (158). E. L. McCallum and Mikko Tuhkanen, too, introduce "[q]ueer theory's involvement with time" (6) in *Queer Times, Queer Becomings*. Defining queerness as something that "has always been marked by its untimely relation to socially shared temporal phases," McCallum and Tuhkanen explain that temporality in queer theory "is not that of *chronos*, of linear time whose very name mythically signals lineage … rather, the contingencies of the queer might be closer to the time of *kairos*, the moment of opportunity" (italics in original 8-9). Understanding queer temporality in a non-linear way, McCallum and Tuhkanen challenge forced gender identities constructed in the "biopolitical schedule of reproductive heterosexuality" (5). Through the idea of queer temporality, therefore, McCallum and Tuhkanen urge us to "think existence not in terms of being, of what exists, but of becoming, or the being of becoming – that we consider 'the fundamental mobility of life' … life 'as fundamental becoming'" (3). Along the line

of thought laid out by such theorists as Haffey, McCallum, and Tuhkanen, in this dissertation, although I employ historical context in examining masculinities from Eliot to Virginia Woolf, I draw upon the queer theorists' notion of queer temporality in its relation to a mode of being (or becoming, to use McCallum and Tuhkanen's term).

In each chapter, I trace a central male character's process of becoming in re/shaping and de/constructing his gender identity through the passage of time, and pay attention to how these figures' queer engagements in time – which gives them a new mode of living – result in divergence from the dominant narrative of heteronormativity. I consider the following texts: James's "The Beast in the Jungle" (1903), Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927), Rudyard Kipling's *Puck of Pook's Hill* (1906), and Eliot's *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe* (1861) and *The Mill on the Floss* (1860). Even though my primary concern is Victorian masculinity, this dissertation includes not only Victorian literature (Eliot) but also post-Victorian literature (James, Kipling, and Woolf). Although James, Kipling, and Woolf are not regarded as Victorian, their approaches to masculinity in non-linear time respond to Eliot's approaches to male gender identities at the peak of the Victorian era. Tracing these authors' conversation across different times, this dissertation further aims to suggest a new literary map in which Victorian and non-Victorian are connected in the combined themes of masculinity and temporality, which (at least as a combination) have not yet been fully visited by previous critics.

Chapter Outline

This dissertation contains four chapters excluding the introduction and conclusion. In ordering the chapters, I place Woolf and Kipling in the first two chapters and Eliot in the

final two chapters. By examining the texts in a non-chronological way, I aim to put the discussions of masculinities in different temporalities between the chapters in dialogue. In chapter one, "Queering Victorian Patriarchy for Post-Victorian Masculinity in Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*," I examine how Woolf renders her own version of "constellatory" temporality as well as how she revisits Victorian patriarchy in the frame of "constellatory" temporality. I probe Woolf's concept of history first to understand her queer temporal arrangement, as Woolf's history is essentially interlinked with her arrangement of temporality in the story. In *Virginia Woolf, Modernity and History*, Angeliki Spiropoulou finds a connection between Woolf and Walter Benjamin, the German philosophical thinker and literary critic, in the matters of history and temporality. According to Spiropoulou, "Benjamin put the 'constellatory' method at the heart of his own historiographical theory and project, in that it breaks with historicism's causal connection between consecutive historical moments and replaces it with deliberate associations between the present and selected moments of the past in order to draw attention to certain aspects of history politically relevant to the present" (3-4). So within Benjamin's "constellatory" method, temporality is not linear, but reaches across a wide collection of points due to the past's interventions in the present. Spiropoulou applies Benjamin's constellatory temporality to Woolf's concept of history, arguing that Woolf's time, like Benjamin's, does not work in the linear way. In this frame, history needs to be reconsidered as constellation rather than linearity, as it crosses the borders of different temporal epochs.

In *To the Lighthouse*, Woolf reflects on the Victorian patriarchy through the representative Victorian male figure, Mr. Ramsay. To reconfigure Mr. Ramsay's patriarchal masculinity, Woolf reorders the single, linear temporality – which has been employed for the Victorian heterosexual reproductivity – and revisits Mr. Ramsay later in different times through memory. In the chapter titled "The Window," while Mr. Ramsay represents the tyrannical and patriarchal Victorian husband, Mrs. Ramsay as a wife stands as an example of the Angel in the House. If Woolf minutely describes the Ramsays' day in the stereotyped Victorian marriage relationship in "The Window," she reconsiders the conventional gender roles in "The Lighthouse." In "The Lighthouse," Lily Briscoe – a young, single painter who does not want to conform to the Victorian gendered norm for females by marrying – revisits her past memories of Mr. and Mrs. Ramsay (among others) during some particular moments depicted in "The Window." In revisiting past memories, Briscoe most vividly refashions her impressions of Mr. Ramsay as "like a work of art" (160). Through Briscoe's art-like recollection across the different temporalities, Woolf does not focus on presenting a specific alternative image of Victorian masculinity. Rather, Woolf strenuously tries to show how a masculinity constructed according to conventional gender norms can be reconfigured by how it is remembered later in different times. Shedding light on the significance of how to remember masculinity through the passage of time, Woolf evokes a sense of fluidity of masculinity in time. Therefore, in *To the Lighthouse* Woolf renders her own version of queer temporality, a constellatory intersection between the past and present temporalities

in the form of memory, in order to deform a previously dominant Victorian patriarchy, and to form the sense of fluidity in masculinity in time.

In chapter two, " Wounded Masculinity in the Shadow of the Past in Rudyard Kipling's *Puck of Pook's Hill*," I pay attention to the ways in which Kipling renders a shadow figure that comes and goes between the two sides of past and present. The story begins at an ambiguous time, "Midsummer Eve, when the shadows [are] growing," not "Midsummer Night itself" (9). Exploring the imaginary function of the story's initial setting, the evening when the growing shadow makes reality refracted – or, rather, the refracted reality in the shadow may suggest another type of real that is evoked only at the particular moment of evening – I argue that Kipling renders a magical, queer realm in which the shadow figures come and go across different temporalities of past and present in their memory. I further contend that, while the British Empire is deprived of the right of writing its history as the subject, Kipling's shadow figures from the past – Sir Richard Dalyngridge and Saxon Hugh, men wounded through old England's adventures – become the narrators, tell an alternative history, and as the haunting specters from the past intervene in the British Empire's present, its imperialism. Interweaving the perspectives together, I claim that in *Puck* Kipling makes use of the shadow as a metaphor that renders the refracted reality at the double-sided border between past and present in order to reveal that another, unseen history of the wounded past and men has been being written, and that the wounded history as the shadow of the present coexists with the imperial history.

In chapter three, "The Spectral Masculinity in George Eliot's *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe*," I examine Silas's masculinity played out between his traumatic past in Lantern Yard and his transformation (with Eppie later) in Raveloe. On the one hand, for Marner Lantern Yard (the industrial and urban environment that he occupied as a young man) signifies the past, yet what his past has been was supposed to be the powerful present of the Industrial Revolution. On the other hand, Marner's agriculture-based village life in Raveloe is the present in Eliot's narration, yet it is soon to be the buried past under the overwhelming current of industrialism. So the ways in which Eliot develops the story from Lantern Yard as the past and Raveloe as the present go against the dominant current of the times. With regard to the implication of the reversal of the dominant flow of times, Marner's masculinity needs to be more rigorously scrutinized with a careful attention to the temporal entanglement. Unraveling the temporal entanglement between Marner's past and present, I argue that Eliot does not just look back on Marner's Lantern Yard past to criticize the Victorian gender norm in her present times. Rather, she more profoundly creates a confrontational past and present by rendering Marner's being as a form of questioning between the two temporalities. Doing so, Eliot presents Marner's memory of the past as a queer spectrality, which constantly (re-)shapes his present life with Eppie, and which enables him to "[counter] the teleological drive of heteroreproductive futurity," as Carla Freccero puts it, by making him a queer father (or, mother). Based on the perspective above, I conclude that Marner's masculinity should not be read as a mere rejection of the Victorian gendered norms, but as a critical collage in which the issues of temporality and masculinity are

enmeshed in such a way that they render the haunting spectrality of the past. This spectrality functions to intervene in the problematic present of the binary gender norm in the Victorian period.

Finally, in chapter four, "Masculinity in Temporal Hybrid between Childhood and Adulthood in George Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss,*" I first examine Eliot's queer concept of past and present – in which the past (the childhood) virtually coexists with the present (the adulthood) in the form of memory – in an attempt to challenge the progressively linear temporality that represents the dominant industrial current along with its impacts on individuals' gender identities. Based on Eliot's way of queering the linear temporality, I argue that Tom's masculinity should be understood in terms of the temporal hybridity, the past's coexistence with the present. Although Tom shows a teleological trajectory to achieve industrial manhood is to a certain degree a reflection of industrialism's influence on male (and female) gender roles, right before his death he encounters a revelatory moment that evokes his forgotten childhood memories when he lives according to animalistic impulse and love for his sister, Maggie. Tracing the trajectory of the construction of Tom's teleological masculinity and how it becomes disrupted after his return to childhood memory at the ending, I conclude that Eliot invents the temporal hybridity – in which the childhood memory is grafted onto the adulthood as a way of queering linear temporality – as a shrewd means of destabilizing the teleological narrative of adult masculinity.

Prior to the analyses of the main chapters, I use James's "The Beast in the Jungle" as a case study below, as this short story provides an overall frame in which masculinity

and queer temporality are enmeshed due to not following the normative trajectory. In the case study, I first explore Marcher and his acquaintance May Bartram with regard to the notion of queer temporality, which is implied in their failure to remember their past meeting. Focusing on how these characters fail to agree upon the details of their encounter in the past, and interpreting Marcher and Bartram's past as imagination, I argue that in this story the usual sense of timeliness in the past temporality becomes lost, invalidated, and thus meaningless. Alongside such invalidation of memory and insistence upon the meaninglessness of the sense of timeliness in the past temporality, I contend that what James attempts to render is Marcher and Bartram's being present together. Rather than constructing the present as part of a linear time, James renders the present as a purely present moment, and thereby emphasizes the characters' being present rather than placing their relation in the heteronormative temporality. Exploring how the Jamesean past and present work in "The Beast in the Jungle" and using Jamesean queer temporality as an overall frame for the remainder of this dissertation, I trace how each male character from Eliot to Woolf diverges from, challenges, and invalidates the temporality of heterosexual normativity.

A Preliminary Case Study in Henry James's "The Beast in the Jungle"

When Eric Haralson examines Lambert Strether, the male protagonist in *The Ambassadors*, in terms of his "changed and queer" masculinity within Anglo-American culture at the fin de siècle, he points out the complex circumstances – "A rising women's movement," "an increasingly visible homosexual subculture," "a consequent blurring of gender boundaries," "a society beset by divorce and recreational sex," and "a falling

birthrate among middle-class whites" (110) – affecting shifting masculinity in both the United States and England. Based on those epochal changes, Haralson analyzes Strether's masculinity by considering his job as an obscure editor whose position is funded by a lady, his heterosocial relations with women, and his homosocial intimacy with men. In comparison with Strether's case, in which the narration provides many hints of his gender identity, James deprives John Marcher, the male protagonist in "The Beast in the Jungle," of any socio-cultural gender markers such as race, occupation, or class. Rather, James isolates Marcher from the socio-cultural context in which non/standard gender markers are supposed to be counted or denied. In spite of the lack of information on these points, however, there is a noticeable characteristic in Marcher, his hypersensitive consciousness of the (metaphorical) beast. Throughout the story, James continuously, gravitationally keeps tracking Marcher's dread of, or obsession with, the beast, which he refers to as "it." Due to James's dogged focus on Marcher's nervous consciousness of his "it," attending to his hypersensitivity about his secret can be one way to explore his gender identity.

In "Nervous Sensibility and Ideals of Manliness" Jane Wood contends that Frederick Fairlie in Wilkie Collins's *The Woman in White* represents a "drawing-room sensibility … [which] had become an anachronism in an industrial economy where a more muscular manliness was required to meet the demands of the family, the nation, and beyond that, the empire" (71-2). Examining male characters in literary texts and male mental disorders in medical cases during the mid and late Victorian periods, Wood asserts that men's hypersensibility resulted from the socio-cultural pressure that required

an ideal manliness of "bodily vigour and mental toughness" based on the middle-class industrial economy (73). If we consider Marcher's hypersensitive consciousness of the beast in the story, Wood's examination of the hypersensitivity in men can be read as a background for his nervous consciousness of the "it." In this sense, Marcher's obsession with his beastly secret might represent the problematic masculinity caused by the normative male gender norm of "muscular manliness" (71). Yet what James more profoundly deals with is not just the representation of problematic masculinity through hypersensitive men; rather, he imagines a different type of masculinity through Marcher's sensitivity. James specifically grapples with how Marcher's consciousness of the "it" works, and inserts the law of "Time" (53) – which embeds a certain contingency in time – into his sense of the "it." Through the contingency embedded within the law of time, James imbues Marcher's consciousness of his "it" with contingency as well. As a result, even though Marcher remains conscious of the secret, his secret works as what Leo Bersani calls "a free-floating pronominal signifier" (22) according to the contingent concerns in different temporal stages, particularly his years-long relation with May Bartram, his wanderings in Asia, and his visit to Bartram's grave after his journey. Prior to the main chapters, in this shorter case study, I examine Marcher's consciousness of the "it" with emphasis on "it"s working in the contingencies in time. I further suggest Marcher's consciousness of the "it" in time as a figure for James's own envisioning of a different type of masculinity. To understand Marcher's masculinity, although this section assumes the historical context of hypersensitivity of men (examined by Wood), it views the male figure's hypersensitive consciousness of his "it" as James's inventive medium to

allow him to imagine a different masculinity rather than just adding yet another representation of the problematic masculinity.

So as to track Marcher's consciousness of the "it" in time, I explore the queer temporality that exists between Marcher and his acquaintance May Bartram, which is initially implied in their failure to remember their past meeting. Focusing on how these characters fail to agree upon the details of their encounter in the past, I argue that James deals with the matters in the past temporality in the imaginary realm in order to rearrange and invalidate the usual sense of timeliness, the linear temporality that supports the middle-class marriage-centered fe/male gender conventions. By portraying the past temporality as imaginary, James disturbs the linear temporality that designates certain temporal phases such as marriage or having family as the conditions of heterosexual masculinity, and individualizes Marcher's temporal stages in order to allow him to follow not the normative, linear, heterosexual temporality, but rather his own contingent temporality in which things do not work in a linear, teleological way but unexpectedly or accidently. In order for Marcher to do this, James establishes the idea of contingency in time. Through this lens, although Marcher's hyperconsciousness of the "it" may imply his own concern over the socio-culturally legitimate masculinity, James's inserted element of the contingency of time into his sense of the "it" shows how he leads Marcher to slip out of the linear temporality and the prescriptions within it. Through the perspectives above, the examination of Jamesian queer temporality will be employed as a backdrop for both contingency in time and the consequent contingency in Marcher's consciousness.

After the introduction to the discussions of queer temporality in recent queer studies, this case study moves on to how Marcher's consciousness of the "it" floats contingently in different situations and temporalities. Finally, in exploring the last part of the story, I compare when Marcher wanders in Asia and when he comes back to Bartram's grave in order to argue for the contingency in Marcher's consciousness, which leads his gender identity to be "an open page" (68) in which any determined, definite, or substantial identity is suspended.

Temporality and Past

In summarizing recent discussion by queer theoritsts, E. L. McCallum and Mikko Tuhkanen mention "[q]ueer theory's involvement with time" – queer temporality – and its further "questions of becoming" (8). McCallum and Tuhkanen state,

> Queer theory's involvement with time signals its persistent speculation in questions of becoming as the processes of unforeseeable change. With the notion of queerness strategically and critically posited not as an identity or a substantive mode of being but as a way of becoming, temporality is necessarily already bound up in the queer. This temporality … is not that of *chronos*, of linear time whose very name mythically signals lineage … ; rather, the contingencies of the queer might be closer to the time of *kairos*, the moment of opportunity. (italics in original 8-9)

Through the key concepts "questions of becoming," "queerness," "temporality," and non-linear time, the passage emphasizes queering the linear temporality (because of its prescriptiveness) as well as the importance of the "contingencies" in the queer time of

"*kairos*" as the "moment of opportunity" (9). Basing my line of thought on McCallum and Tuhkanen's conceptualization of queer temporality, I draw upon their discussion of how a queer becoming can be invented in the queer, non-linear temporality, and argue that, through Marcher, James shows his own way of employing queer temporality in an attempt to destabilize the prescriptive narrativity of masculinity in the designated timeline.

In the story, in the couple's first meeting at Weatherend we are given to understand that Marcher's secret comes from the past, as Bartram reminds him that he divulged to her his "it" "nearly ten" (35) years ago. Bartram says to Marcher: "It's dreadful to bring a person back at any time to what he was ten years before. If you've lived away from *it*, … so much the better" (italics added 37). The "it" has not occurred at Weatherend, then, but emerged long before even their first encounter in Italy. Ever since this moment, Marcher – who has forgotten what he might have said to her and barely even remembers her – is intensely conscious of his "it" and tries to find out how his secret affects his fate throughout the story. Because Marcher's sensitivity here seems to gravitate toward the "it," it is easy for readers to be possessed by the "it" as well. Yet, if the "it" works as a centripetal axis not only for Marcher but also for readers, James provides yet another interpretive device that keeps disturbing the centripetal orbit of the "it" in Marcher and Bartram's bafflement regarding their memories of what transpired ten years earlier.

James first describes how Marcher recognizes Bartram. Marcher – who "need[s] some straying apart to feel in a proper relation with [the crowd at Weatherend]" (33) –

sees and dimly recognizes her; she is "a reminder, yet not quite a remembrance" (34). Bartram, the tantalizing reminder, causes Marcher to feel "something of which he had lost the beginning" (34). James further notes of Marcher's struggle to remember Bartram: "[H]e had … devoted more imagination to her … [she] *was* there on harder terms than any one; she was there as a consequence of things suffered, … and she remembered him very much as she was remembered" (italics in original 34). Whereas Marcher seems to try to remember Bartram, James simultaneously hints that he "devote[s] more imagination to her" (34). In other words, it is Marcher's imaginary realm that makes him believe that he remembers Bartram rather than a true memory of her. The subsequent dialogue between Marcher and Bartram becomes more crucial, as it more vividly reveals the aspects of the imaginary past – which could invalidate the fixed ground of the "it" – in their memory. If what has happened between Marcher and Bartram is vague, imaginary, the "it" becomes unstable and loses its fixed ground due to "it"s separateness from the factual sense of past memory.

Marcher and Bartram "at last thus came to speech," as he says to her, "I met you years and years ago in Rome. I remember all about it" (34-35). Yet Marcher's attempt to show his remembrance of Bartam fails, as she corrects his memory: "It hadn't been at Rome – it had been Naples; and it hadn't been eight years before – it had been more nearly ten" (35). As she puts it, Marcher "*really* didn't remember the least thing about her" (Italics in original 35). Furthermore, while Bartram casts herself as the authority able to correct Marcher's memory, the following narration allows us to doubt her correction of the past memory as well:

> They lingered together still, … and both neglecting the house, just waiting as to see if a memory or two more wouldn't again breathe on them. It hadn't taken them many minutes, after all, to put down on the table, like the cards of a pack, those that constituted their respective hands; only what came out was that the pack was unfortunately not perfect – that the past, invoked, invited, encouraged, could give them, naturally, no more than it had. (36)

In using the simile that "the cards of [their] pack" are "unfortunately not perfect," James implies that for neither Marcher nor Bartram does memory work perfectly, and he thus highlights the limits of their past, which by this point in their lives has "no more than it had" (36). The phrase "no more than it had" is not concerned with whether or not the memory is correct; rather, by emphasizing what is lacking rather than what is present, it is a deliberate bridle on the credibility of recollection. James's treatment of the past memory is complicated. The lack of credibility of recollection and the failure to remember what has happened between Marcher and Bartram are indirectly related to the matter of the truth of the "it." If the two figures' memories of the past are not clear, their remembrance of the "it" becomes unclear as well. This further implies that the failure of the detailed remembrance of the "it" may evoke a type of memory that is not fixed, as James's emphasis on the imperfect memory of the past disrupts the valid ground on which a certain, fixed meaning of the "it" is built. Marcher's consciousness of his "it" is more visible through his year-long relation with Bartram in London. Prior to Marcher's entry into the stage, what James sets up at the beginning of the story is the non-locatable memory of the past, which accordingly presents the "it"s meaning as non-locatable. On

account of James's unsettling the valid past, Marcher's "it" is non-locatable from the first moment in the story. Based on this line of thought, it is possible to contend that although Marcher's consciousness of "it" can hover over a certain point in a centripetal way, his "it" may never find the fixed meaning.

Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick has probed the meaning of Marcher's "it," and interprets his secret as homosexual panic. Contextualizing the story "at the threshold of the new century" when homosexuality was regarded as a "thematics of absence" (201), Sedgwick concludes that Marcher has a secret of sexuality. In the story, as Bartram alludes to "it" (37), Marcher keeps asking what "it" is. Bartram reminds him, "You said you had had from your earliest time, as the deepest thing within you, the sense of being kept for something rare and strange, possibly prodigious and terrible, that was sooner or later to happen to you" (39). As Sedgwick contextualizes the unspeakability of male homosexuality during James's era, she relates Bartram's reminder of Marcher's "it" to his homosexual panic. While Sedgwick's examination is based on the crucial, historical background of the unspeakable male homosexuality, however, she might dismiss how James himself understands his times. Given James's depictions of the continuous failure to remember the past between Marcher and Bartram, James does not seem interested in representing the gender issues of his times. As I noted of the historical consciousness of the hypersensitive men in the introduction to this case study, Marcher's hypersensitivity about his "it" can be understood as the problematic outcome caused by the ideal manliness. If we take this perspective, as Sedgwick does, Marcher's "it" is related to male gender issues during the late Victorian era. Yet in fact, through the continuously

failed remembrance of the past in which Marcher's "it" is invoked, James suspends any specific meaning of the "it." Through Marcher's and Bartram's trying to recollect their past, James presents the "it" as something that can be (re)visited yet never fully grasped.

Marcher's Consciousness of "it"

Like Sedgwick, Marcher and Bartram also have attempted to locate the secret of Marcher's "it" in their long-time relationship. Yet what they show – particularly in Marcher's case – is the free-floating "it" that works contingently according to the free-floating concerns in his consciousness. Based on my earlier discussion of the non-locatable "it" in the Jamesian past temporality in which what has happened is never locatable, in this section I examine how Marcher's consciousness keeps revisiting his "it" through his relationship with Bartram, and doing so, I aim to reveal how his tracking of the "it" works contingently according to each set of different, immediate concerns.

In part II of the story, Marcher and Bartram try to find out the meaning of their extraordinary relationship (43), differentiating their relation from the conventional fe/male relationship in the world. The narrator provides comments on Marcher's relation with her, positing,

> All this naturally was a sign of how much he [Marcher] took the intercourse itself for granted. There was nothing more to be done about *that*. It simply existed; had sprung into being with her first penetrating question to him in the autumn light there at Weatherend. The real form it should have taken on the basis that stood out large was the form of their marrying. But the devil in this was that the very basis itself put marrying out of the question. His conviction, his

> apprehension, his obsession, in short, wasn't a privilege he could invite a woman to share; and that consequence of it was precisely what was the matter with him. (italics in original 43)

In this passage, insinuating the cultural consciousness of the marriage imperative during his era, James implies that Marcher does not share the culture of marriage. Along with Marcher's sense of the relation, James also describes Bartram's side of her understanding of the relation: she has her own "wonderful way of making it [Marcher's secret] seem, as such, the secret of her own life too" (45). In "the stupid world [which] never more than half-discovered" their relation, Bartram mingles and adjusts "the apertures" of her eyes, and she has achieved all of the ways with vision. In her perception of her relation with Marcher, Bartram can "let [the] association give shape and colour to her own existence" (45). If Marcher's "conviction, his apprehension, his obsession" of the "it" prevents him from sharing a relationship with women, Bartram's sense of her intimacy with Marcher seems different due to her own imaginative vision of their relation. This is to say, the "it" carries different meanings for Marcher and Bartram. If the "it" elicits a preclusion of marriage from Marcher, the same "it" evokes an "indescribable art" in perceiving the relation for Bartram.

Yet their inconsistent opinions in terms of their intimacy lead to another question, whether Marcher is a "heroic" "man of courage" who is not afraid of the beast-like secret (49). This is to say, even though the "it" has started with the question of the meaning of the relation between Marcher and Bartram, the "it" subtly floats toward a different concern, whether Marcher is a "man of courage" (49). Because of this shift

from one concern to another concern, it is hard to capture on which point the "it" fixedly stands. What readers can grasp at best is that Marcher's consciousness of the "it" sometimes hovers at a certain point, yet it soon afterwards floats through the situations that he just has engaged with. To understand the "it"s operation in Marcher's consciousness, Bersani's comments on the "it" are helpful. When Bersani argues that Marcher is "the embodiment of a refusal of all embodiment," he interprets Marcher's "it" as "a free-floating pronominal signifier"; "Then there is the vaguely comprehensive 'it' – favored by James here and elsewhere – used to allude to the general state of affairs with which the narration has just been concerned, that is, more or less to everything and to nothing in particular" (22-3). As Bersani puts it, James leads Marcher's "it" to everywhere where his consciousness of the "it" is concerned. In the conversation with Bartram, Marcher's consciousness of "it" has begun with locating the meaning of their relation, yet it soon has led him to the questioning of his heroic courage. Marcher's consciousness of the "it" in this sense never focalizes on a certain, definite point, yet the "it" hovers around, or floats through, certain timely moments or situations with which the "it" has just been concerned in the narration. If this makes sense, it is possible to interpret that the narrative centers on Marcher's consciousness in which his "it" engages with each different, immediate, concerns in different (micro-) temporalities.

If in part II of the story James shows how Marcher's consciousness of the "it" floats according to the situations, in part III James develops the "it"s contingent working within Marcher's consciousness, which is invoked by the law of time. James in part III mentions Marcher's sense of "the growth of a dread of losing [Bartram] by some

catastrophe – some catastrophe that yet wouldn't at all be *the* catastrophe" (italics in original 51). In part I James's narrator identifies the future moment when the beast comes out as "the catastrophe" (40). James in part III brings up "the catastrophe" again (40), yet he changes "the catastrophe" to "*the* catastrophe" in order to differentiate the previous "catastrophe" then from the present "catastrophe" now (italics in original 51). If previously "the catastrophe" means the beast's coming out, with which Marcher has been obsessed, then the latter "*the* catastrophe" means his losing Bartram, with which he is preoccupied now. Marcher's obsessed consciousness of the "it" is working in both earlier and later temporalities, yet the "it" elicits different meanings for him. What this deliberate floatation from the former to the latter shows is the ways in which the "it" contingently works in Marcher's consciousness through different, immediate concerns in "Time" (53).

In the next moment of the transition from "*the* catastrophe" to "the catastrophe," drawing upon the issue of time, the narrator informs us that "he [Marcher] had never till within these last few months been so false to his conviction as not to hold that what was to come to him had *time*" (italics added 53). The narrator's emphasis on time goes on: "Since it was in Time that he was to have met his fate, so it was in Time that his fate was to have acted. … It all hung together; they were subject, he and the great vagueness, to an equal and indivisible law" (53-54). Parts I and II of the story deal with Marcher's secret, the "crouching beast in the jungle" (43-44). During Marcher's and Bartram's long relation, the crouching beast in the jungle seems to work in their locating the meaning of their relationship. Juxtaposed with the narrative that gravitates toward Marcher's secret,

however, James repeatedly suggests that the specificity of the crouching beast keeps floating according to the different situations, conversations, and temporal stages. In part III, the narrator puts emphasis on the floating "it" through the transition of the beast from his supposed unique and terrifying fate to his dread of losing Bartram; and the narrator develops the idea of the floating "it" by drawing upon the law of time to which Marcher's fate is subject. With all these implications, in part III, James evinces how Marcher's consciousness of the "it" is working by the contingent concerns embedded in the "equal and indivisible law" of time. Marcher's consciousness of the "it," indeed, works with all these elements in "The Beast in the Jungle." Briefly put, even though the "it" seems to work in a centripetal way, and thus seems to embody a certain meaning at a certain fixed point, James keeps blurring the potential for fixity. As a result, Marcher is able to avoid identifying himself with any fixed way.

Marcher's Identity as "Open Page"

James continues to follow Marcher's consciousness after Bartram's death in the last part of the story. Yet if James so far has shown the gravitational pull of Marcher's consciousness toward the "it" as "more or less to everything and to nothing in particular" (Bersani 23), James in the last part of the story describes how Marcher's consciousness of the "it" seems to temporarily disappear. Perhaps, in the last part, one of the strongest emotions that the reader might feel is Marcher's "pang" at the cemetery, reminding us of his loss of Bartram (69). At the grave, Marcher encounters a man, "a middle-aged man apparently, in mourning" (68). Looking at the mourning man and feeling a "pang," Marcher experiences a sudden awareness that "[n]o passion had ever touched him, for

this was what passion meant" (69). As this "illumination had begun … what he presently stood there gazing at was the sounded *void* of his life" (italics added 70). In this last scene, Marcher's pang from his feeling a "void" in his life seems due to his recognition that "*she* [Bartram] was what he had missed" (italics in original 70).

Nevertheless, right before this scene, James gives a hint of the flip side of the "void," Marcher's "open page" (68). In fact, the last part begins with Marcher wandering around "the depths of Asia" (66), feeling the world differently in comparison to his past with Bartram. Previously, Marcher has considered his life extraordinary due to the lurking beast that is supposed to come out sooner or later. In the last part, however, James describes how Marcher in the East loses "a distinction": "the things he saw couldn't help being common when he had become common to look at them"; "[h]e was simply now one of them himself" (66-67). Marcher "had lived, *in spite of himself*, into his change of feeling, and in wandering over the earth had wandered … from the circumference to the centre of his desert" (italics added 67). The narrator's comment that Marcher feels a changed sense of the world from "the circumference to the centre of his desert" "in spite of himself" is important. James here differentiates Marcher's new sense of belonging to the world from the "himself" who has been obsessed with the beast, which has prevented him from belonging to the world before. If we remind ourselves of Marcher's unconventional relationship with Bartram in the early stage of the story, his relationship with her brings about his sense of extraordinariness in the world. Regarding this extraordinary relation between Marcher and Bartram, which causes their inability to belong to the world, Marcher in the descriptions above shows changes.

In the passage below James pushes forward Marcher's change in comparison with his previous obsession with the "it":

> It's accordingly not false to say that he reached his goal with a certain elation and stood there again with a certain assurance. The creature beneath the sod *knew* of his rare experience, so that, strangely now, the place had lost for him its mere blankness of expression. It met him in mildness – not, as before, in mockery; it wore for him the air of conscious greeting that we find, after absence, in things that had closely belonged to us and which seem to confess of themselves to the connexion. … He had not come back this time with the vanity of that question, his former worrying "what, *what*?" now practically so spent. (italics in original 67)

Marcher's crucial change in the passage is not to identify what "the creature beneath the sod" is, which is presumably connected with the beast beneath the surface, but to grasp that "the creature" sends a mild greeting to him so that he can feel a sense of belonging to, or "connexion" with the world (67). At the same time, Marcher's former long-time question – what is hidden in his life – by now is "practically" expired (67). Subsequently, Marcher's changes regarding living in the world, a new belongingness and connection, are accompanied by the cessation of his questioning "[t]he creature beneath the sod" (67).

James puts a further, subtle retouch on Marcher's long-term question, as he "would none the less never again so cut himself off from the spot" (67). This time Marcher's "periodical returns" to his question work "in the oddest way, [as] a positive

resource" (67). According to James, "What it all amounted to, oddly enough, was that in his finally so simplified world this garden of death gave him the few square feet of earth on which he could still most live. It was as if, being nothing anywhere else for any one, nothing even for himself, he were just everything here" (68). The result of this change is that Marcher "could scan like an open page" (68). Through both Marcher's newly emerging sense of belonging to the world and his being "like an open page" (68), James displays Marcher's peculiar approach to belonging, which contradictorily coexists with being nowhere. This is a unique moment in that James uses the word "identity" for the first and last time in the story. As James puts it, "Thus in short he [Marcher] settled to live – feeding all on the sense that he once *had* lived, and dependent on it not along for a support but for an identity" (italics in original 68).

To contextualize the matter of Marcher's identity, Jane Wood's analysis is helpful here. Wood analyzes the ideal of middle-class manliness, "bound up with the ideas of family and nation," the backdrop to the problematic masculinity of the hypersensitive man in the late Victorian era. From Wood's comments, it is possible to conjecture that men might have been forced to identify their gender identity with "family and nation." In comparison with such historical male gender identifications with either family or nation, James presents Marcher's identity as deprived of the normative identifications of family or nation, when he depicts it as an "open page" (68).

Previous critics such as Hugh Stevens and Leland S. Person have examined the issue of identity in James as well. In terms of the complexities of identity in James's writing, Stevens points out that "there is no easy alignment of sex, gender and sexuality.

James's presentations of sexuality are quite radical in scope, but do not involve a division between 'conformist' and 'subversive' sexual identities: rather the very construction of sexual identity according to a fixed object-choice is put into question" (5). Although Stevens puts emphasis on the matter of sexual identity, his grounding thought regarding the uneasy "alignment of sex, gender and sexuality" in James's writing opens up and develops the ideas of identities in terms of gender issues more specifically. Like the question of sexual identity that is "always there, but *as* a question, the question of the *possibility* of a sexual identity (or sexual *identities*)" (italics in original 5), the matter of gender identity might be presented as a question that cannot be fixed on any certain point in James's writing. Seen in this light, James's presentation of "identity" through Marcher's contradictory belonging to nowhere yet everywhere as "an open page" (68) raises a critical question about the ways in which the notion of male gender identity has been employed in the late Victorian era. James does not directly criticize the normative male gender; rather, he more profoundly redefines and reimagines masculinity as "an open page" (68) in order to suggest a new type of masculinity for which any determined, definite, or substantial identity is not fixed but suspended.

Additionally, in his "Introduction: Henry James and the Plural Terms of Masculinity," Person examines James's "vexed question of masculinity that he pursued from the beginning to the end of his career" (2). Introducing the influence of the French novelist George Sand on James, Person explains that, on the one hand, Sand suggests to James "the possibility that gender and sexuality are fluid – in suspense – subject not only to deconstruction but also to improvisation" (2-3). On the other hand, Sand forces James

to "suspend his idea of the masculine: in other words, to interrogate a monolithic masculinity and to accept the possibility of a plurality of masculinities from which he might continually improvise his own" (4). With regard to Person's explanation of James' suspension of gender identity, his presentation of Marcher's "identity" as "an open page" (68) can be one way to suspend the socially constructed male gender identities centered on the values of family and nation.

To comprehend Marcher's masculinity, to grasp his "it" would be first and foremost important. In dealing with Marcher along with his "it," however, James deprives him of any social markers that can hint at his gender identity; at the same time, James also prevents the "it" from being signified. James makes Marcher's "it" keep hovering around certain (seemingly meaningful) points, yet he never allows the "it" to fully stay on these given points. Rather than pursuing certain embodied meaning for the "it," James makes Marcher's consciousness of the "it" float contingently, directed by the law of time. Indeed, James's construction of the queer temporal setting – in which the memory of the past is unfixable – supports Marcher's contingently working consciousness of the "it." In the temporal setting, James inserts unfixability – thereby contingency – into Marcher's memory of the past at the beginning of the story as well as his consciousness of the "it." Based on the unfixable memory in the past temporality at the beginning of the story, James can lead Marcher's consciousness of the "it" in the contingent way worked by the unexpected temporal concerns. Doing so, James profoundly portrays Marcher's contingently working consciousness through the contingent concerns in time. What the readers meet at the end of the story is James's

envisioning masculinity as an "open page" (68) on account of the law of time that involves contingencies within it. Although Sedgwick specifies Marcher's "it" as homosexual panic grounded in the late Victorian context, Marcher's "it" cannot be an interpretive endpoint, as the "it" contingently works in Marcher's floating consciousness. Therefore, even though Marcher's masculinity would consider cultural awareness of normative masculinity, his "identity" is responding to "Time" in a fundamental way. This identification with "Time" evokes contingencies, as Marcher encounters certain inadvertent, accidental situations through the different temporal stages.

Marcher's "pang" appears after James's implicative reference to Marcher's "identity." James notes that Marcher's changed sense of living, his new awareness of the greeting from the world, has moved him "quite in another direction" accidentally (68). This accidental turn happens when Marcher encounters the middle-aged, mourning man (68). This lamenting man reminds Marcher of his loss of Bartram; and this reminder leads him to feel a "pang" and "void" due to his re-awakened sense of what Bartram has meant to him (69-70). Marcher's encounter with the mourning man and the ensuing bitterness remind both Marcher and readers of Bartram, his previous dread of losing her, and the beast. Yet if we go back to Marcher's wandering in Asia only a little while earlier, the three issues – Bartram, his dread, and the beast have disappeared, although this absence is temporary. This means that the accidental encounter with the man at the cemetery at the ending not only directs both Marcher and the reader toward the issues of the old days but also makes them dismiss Marcher's changed sense of life right before that scene.

Can we, though, understand from this ending that the story of Marcher's bitter failure to fall in love with Bartram resulted from his obsession with the beast? On the one hand, Marcher's "pang" from his failure to respond adequately to his loss of Bartram, his awareness of a "void" in his life, and the always-already surrounding beast are the main issues in the story. On the other hand, James simultaneously juxtaposes with these issues throughout the story Marcher's floating consciousness worked by the contingencies in time. Considering Marcher's floating "it," which happens in an unexpected way, what James eventually invents is a queer masculinity in which identity is identified with everywhere or nowhere. Whereas normative males are identified with the values of family and nation embedded in the hegemonic middle-class-centered temporality, Marcher's masculinity is not concerned with the standardized temporal phases, as his identity as "an open page" (68) is not supposed to be identified with the normative identifications. Accordingly, Marcher does not follow the normative linear, heterosexual temporal phases; rather, he follows Jamesian queer temporality, in which contingency in time is the law.

To sum up this discussion, providing the reader with no information regarding markers such as race, marriage, or class, James in "The Beast in the Jungle" isolates Marcher from the hegemonic temporality in which the standardized, acknowledged masculinities are supposed to follow. James more profoundly inserts contingency in time into Marcher's floating consciousness of "it" in order for him not to fix his identity. In this Jamesian queer temporality worked by contingencies, the socially legitimate gender

identifications embedded in heterosexual temporality lose their validity, as Marcher is unable to join in the given, conventional temporality.

Rather than suggesting a subversive or resistant masculinity that challenges the normative masculine gender ideals, James retouches what surrounds gender norms, the linear temporality as well as normative masculinity within it. In order to critique the expected male gender identity, James suggests the unexpected, contingent law of queer temporality, in which male gender identification can be contingent and fluid in time as well. Through Marcher, who is interwoven with Jamesian queer temporality, what James eventually presents is his own version of masculinity, one that is functional only in queer temporality and thus becomes dysfunctional in the hegemonic, linear temporality. As James's Marcher has shown in this preliminary case study how masculinity in queer temporality does not follow the normative temporal trajectory that has been established for the teleological futurity of heteronormativity, the remainder of this dissertation traces the non-normative trajectory in Woolf, Kipling, and Eliot.

CHAPTER II

QUEERING VICTORIAN PATRIARCHY FOR POST-VICTORIAN MASCULINITY IN VIRGINIA WOOLF'S *TO THE LIGHTHOUSE*

As most critics assume, it is impossible to think about Virginia Woolf's works without feminism. Laura Marcus writes that the "relationship between Virginia Woolf and feminism, feminism and Virginia Woolf is … a symbiotic one" (209). Regarding feminism as the main issue in Woolf's oeuvre, Marcus holds that feminism encapsulates not just "explicit feminist politics but [also Woolf's] concerns and fascination with gender identities" (209). As Marcus's point of view suggests, the issue of gender identities in *To the Lighthouse* (1927) – Woolf's most autobiographical novel – has been discussed within the context of Woolf's feminist ideas for several decades. For instance, Beverly Ann Schlack's "Fathers in General: The Patriarchy in Virginia Woolf's Fiction" (1984) and Jane Marcus's *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy* (1987) are indicative of how the novel has been examined from a feminist standpoint, as they mainly critique patriarchy. By understanding Mrs. Ramsay as the representation of the Angel in the House, the victim of Victorian patriarchy, and Mr. Ramsay as "the despotic husband full-blown" and "a tyrant" (Schlack 57), Schlack and Marcus view patriarchy as antithetical to the ideas of feminism.

However, considering recent developments within the study of (Victorian) masculinities can open up and broaden the spectrum of understanding of maleness in *To*

the Lighthouse.[1] In "Theorizing Men and Men's Theorizing: Mapping the Trajectory of the Development of Victorian Masculinity Studies," Natasha Anand summarizes "how the trajectory of both literary and historical scholarship has moved from the traditional focus on a unitary, homogeneous, and culturally sanctioned form of Victorian masculinity [Victorian patriarchy] to the plurality of Victorian masculinities" (107). Starting from Raewyn Connell's "theory of hegemonic masculinity," Anand introduces "a series of dominant as well as subordinate masculinities" (107). Anand's overview of diversities in Victorian masculinities shows how recent developments within studies of masculinities complicate a model of patriarchy that has been understood as *the* universal masculinity.

In light of work such as Anand's, in this chapter I examine Mr. Ramsay's gender identity: how his status as a traditional Victorian patriarch becomes destabilized, how Woolf traces the buried memories of him based on her own memory of father, and how she eventually renders the altered Mr. Ramsay as a vision of the post-Victorian era at the ending of the novel. I start with Mr. Ramsay as the representation of Victorian patriarchy in the first chapter, "The Window," and trace some of the subtle yet profound moments in which he forgets his patriarchal preoccupations in the last chapter, "The Lighthouse." Doing so, in order to weave these fragmented, forgetting moments into the thematic frame of Woolf's vision of masculinity in her attempt at finding a different realm – queer temporality – for her vision, I employ the middle chapter, "Time Passes," as a bridge to

[1] Schlack and Marcus do not use the term "masculinity," but only refer to Victorian patriarchy in terms of Mr. Ramsay's gender identity; so their perspectives are in line with feminist contexts in the 1980s rather than more recent study of masculinities in the 1990s.

shift the Victorian temporal regime to a different temporality that functions to queer the previous one. I argue that Woolf envisions a new type of masculinity by using the changed Mr. Ramsay as an exemplification of post-Victorian masculinity, even while she simultaneously relies on her memory of her father, Leslie Stephen (1832-1904).

Even though the middle section is the shortest one in the novel, the central ideas about time in the section have profound importance throughout my analysis of Mr. Ramsay and his change. I employ ideas of queer temporality discussed in recent work by queer theorists as the theoretical lens to explore aspects of Mr. Ramsay's masculinity that have not yet been explored. In "Theorizing Queer Temporalities," when Elizabeth Freeman asks "how and why the rubric of temporality" (177) has become important, other recent queer theorists have responded that the importance may lie in its relation to the evocation of a certain queerness. The discussants have shown their own approaches to temporality: Carolyn Dinshaw views the matter of temporality in terms of "the relationship of past to present" (177); Christopher Nealon aspires to a new temporality in critiquing "History-with-a-capital-H" (179); Judith Halberstam understands queer time as a turning "away from the narrative coherence" and "a critique of the social scripts" (182). Even though the discussants have differently approached the issue of temporality, their focal point is to problematize the "linear, teleological, reproductive, future oriented" (186) narrative – namely, bourgeois heteronormativity – as well as the dominant notions of gender embedded within it. Briefly put, the queer theorists have tried to conceptualize queer temporality as an attempt to envision queer genders that deviate from the dominant narrative.

In the novel, crucial to her re-imagining of Mr. Ramsay's masculinity, Woolf disrupts the continuity of the traditional Victorian patriarchy by inserting queer temporality – cosmic time – into the mid-section of her narrative, "Time Passes." In a nutshell, Woolf renders Mr. Ramsay as the representation of Victorian patriarchy in "The Window," queers the Victorian time to challenge the historical continuity of the patriarchy through a different type of temporality in "Time Passes," and, in the last chapter, suggests Mr. Ramsay's queer masculinity as a potential outcome of what queer temporality powerfully bring about for the post-Victorian masculinity.

Mr. Ramsay as Victorian Patriarch in "The Window"

Ben Griffin's examination of the background of Victorian domesticity, which is indissociable from patriarchy, can help us grasp how Victorian gender norms have shaped Mr. Ramsay's character in the novel. According to Griffin, three historical situations – "the American War of Independence," "The shock of the French Revolution and the trauma of the war," and "the evangelical revival of the late eighteenth century" (39) – produced anxieties about the (in)stability of the nation, with the result that the British came to be preoccupied with "the fear of household discord" (38) and therefore with household harmony, as they viewed domestic harmony as the base of the national security. In the midst of these anxieties, certain prescriptions for domestic harmony became urgent, and Victorian domestic ideology was the main means of constructing, supporting, and protecting that harmony. In Griffin's understanding of Victorian domestic patriarchy, the core, internal logic is that male authority should be reconciled with "the ideal of marital unity" – which refers "not to a partnership of equals but to a

couple united under one will – that of the husband" (46). Hence the key elements in Victorian domestic patriarchy are male authority, household harmony, and the wife's submission to her husband's wishes; correspondingly, these culturally legitimized elements of Victorian patriarchy have shaped Mr. Ramsay in the story.

At the beginning of the story, readers readily notice Mr. Ramsay's domineering character. Woolf begins the novel with an impressive scene in which Mr. Ramsay elicits "extremes of emotion … in his children's breasts by his mere presence" (4). In this scene, young James Ramsay manifests "an extraordinary joy" when anticipating the expedition to the lighthouse, and Mrs. Ramsay responds to her son's expectation by saying, "Yes, of course [we can go], if [the weather is] fine tomorrow" (3). Mr. Ramsay, however, pours cold water on James's hope by predicting that "it won't be fine" (4). At this moment, James thinks that he "would have gashed a hole in his father's breast and killed him" if he "there [had] been an axe handy, or a poker, any weapon" (4). Later on we come to realize how Mr. Ramsay's brief pronouncement that "it won't be fine" symbolically indicates his domineering authority as father, husband, and philosopher in the novel. Woolf's placement of James's intense hatred of his father at the beginning of the story is, indeed, a symbolic sign of the Victorian domestic patriarchy grounded in the Victorian male gender tradition; as Gabrielle McIntire argues, it can be read as a powerful "indictment of patterns of male domination within the family as well as of the whole system of cultural patriarchy" (86).

Following this symbolic indictment, Woolf presents in "The Window" a series of patriarchal moments in order to expose the extant narrative of Victorian patriarchy; in

many of these moments, Woolf changes the focalizer of the response to Mr. Ramsay from James to a female figure, particularly Lily, a young, single painter who also feels antipathy to Mr. Ramsay. In Lily's first appearance, she muses on the essence of Mr. Ramsay's being, concluding that "he is petty, selfish, vain, egotistical; he is spoilt; he is a tyrant; he wears Mrs. Ramsay to death" (24). Woolf as the narrator still more trenchantly points out how Mr. Ramsay's "fatal sterility of the male" is desperately in need of his wife's "sympathy," particularly in terms of his authority and intellectuality (37). It is perhaps due to his desperate need of sympathy that Mrs. Ramsay's "habit of sternness" and her secret "remoteness" pain Mr. Ramsay, as he may feel that his wife is eluding his desire to possess her entirely.

For Lily, what most characterizes Mr. Ramsay is his demand for sympathy, or emotional support, from Mrs. Ramsay. As the narrator notes, "since [Mrs. Ramsay is] a woman, all day long with this and that; one wanting this, another that; the children were growing up; she often felt she was nothing but a sponge sopped full of human emotions" (32). But of all the family members, Mr. Ramsay most intensely absorbs Mrs. Ramsay's emotional energy for sympathy. In the weather episode, Mrs. Ramsay shows "extra irrationality" to Mr. Ramsay by asking how he knows that there would not be "the slightest possible chance that they could go to the Lighthouse tomorrow" (31). Feeling that his wife does not welcome his remark, Mr. Ramsay has "ridden through the valley of death, been shattered and shivered," and eventually mentions "'Damn you'" (31-2).

The reason why Mr. Ramsay is in need of women's sympathy is related to his inner insecurity. For instance, the very next moment following the description of Mrs.

Ramsay as "a sponge sopped full of human emotions," the lens turns to Mr. Ramsay's "splendid mind" as an intellectual, remarking, "For if thought is like the keyboard of a piano, divided into so many notes, or like the alphabet is ranged in twenty-six letters all in order, then his splendid mind had no sort of difficulty in running over those letters one by one, firmly and accurately, until it had reached, say, the letter Q. He reached Q. Very few people in the whole of England ever reach Q" (33). Mr. Ramsay's "splendid mind" in its relation to the alphabetical system reflects his distinct level of intellectual ability – but also his own sense of his limitations. If "Q" is Mr. Ramsay's current status of achievement, presumably "R" is supposed to be his next stage; in this sense, then, "Z" would be the highest achievement, which "is only reached once by one man in a generation" (34). Feeling stuck at "Q," Mr. Ramsay responds by dividing men in general into two classes:

> [H]e could see … that obvious distinction between the two classes of men; on the one hand the steady goers of superhuman strength who, plodding and persevering, repeat the whole alphabet in order, twenty-six letters in all, from start to finish; on the other the gifted, the inspired who, miraculously, lump all the letters together in one flash – the way of genius. He had not genius; he laid no claim to that: but he had, or might have had, the power to repeat every letter of the alphabet from A to Z accurately in order. (34-5)

By identifying himself as no “genius,” Mr. Ramsay reveals his anxiety that he might never reach the level of "Z," whether in “one flash” or even, less impressively, by “plodding.” This obsession with intellectual achievement coincides with Woolf's own

memory of her father, Leslie Stephen. In *Moments of Being* (henceforth *Moments*) Woolf tells us that her father was not "a man of genius" but "'[o]nly a good second class mind,'" as he once told her. Woolf explains that "[t]his frustrated desire to be a man of genius, and the knowledge that he was in truth not in the first flight … are qualities that break up the fine steel engraving of the typical Cambridge intellectual" (110). As Woolf's memory of her father's fear coincides with Mr. Ramsay's anxiety, it is possible to conjecture that Mr. Ramsay's anxiety over (not) being a genius reflects Woolf's memory of her father's frustration caused by the conventional standard for intellectual fame in the late nineteenth century, which was also "supported by the great men of the time" (*Moments* 109).

Biographical critics of both Woolf's father and Woolf herself have noted the insecurity evident in his life. In "Concealment and Disclosure in Sir Leslie Stephen's 'Mausoleum Book,'" Virginia R. Hyman probes into multiple fears and concerns of Woolf's father. Reading *Mausoleum Book* (1977), Hyman examines the "'inner struggles" (122) concealed under Stephen's literary enterprise. According to Hyman, Woolf's father had three primary inner concerns: he was anxious about his "posthumous reputation [as] a literary man" (123), about how other people might evaluate his "domestic behavior" as someone who had failed to notice "the seriousness of [Julia Stephen's] condition" (124-5), and, most deeply, about "his own morbidity" (127). From his childhood onward, Woolf's father had been "the most sensitive" of men (Mitchell Leaska, qtd 20), which developed as "morbidity" (Hyman 127) in adulthood. Given this perception of his own precarious mental condition, Hyman argues, Woolf's father

experienced profound fears that he would collapse without Julia's support (128). This emphasis on "inner struggles" enables us to conjecture that Woolf's father considered that his authority as father, husband, and literary man would be tenuous, precarious, and unstable without others' sympathy, and moreover that Woolf delineates Mr. Ramsay both as the representative of her father and as a deceptively imposing man whose vulnerable identity cannot help but being supported by someone's sympathy. From the broader perspective offered by Griffin, although Victorian domestic patriarchy assumes male authority over the household as the most fundamental component of masculine identity, this authority has its own critical paradox, as it is not able to authorize itself.

In "The Window" the critical points of the contradictory, patriarchal masculinity on display in Mr. Ramsay are symbolically reflected in Lily's drawing. When thinking about the unfairness in "the universal law" of marriage and "her own exemption from" it (50), Lily comes across a question. Looking at her canvas, Lily thinks that it is a matter of "how to connect this mass on the right hand with that on the left. She might do it by bringing the line of the branch across; or break the vacancy in the foreground by an object (James perhaps) so. But the danger was that by doing that the unity of the whole might be broken" (53). Leaska mentions the influence of Roger Fry on Woolf in relation to Woolf's depiction of Lily's "problems with space" (13). By suggesting that Woolf "was slowly becoming influenced by Roger Fry's preoccupation with expressive structural relations in painting," Leaska points out the relation between the French painter Paul Cézanne and Lily. According to Leaska, Fry's comments on Cézanne's achievement of architectural balance in *Maisons au bord de la Marne* [Banks of the

Marne], in which the "'grassy bank is almost uniform and featureless. Behind, a tree divides the composition in half with the rigid vertical of its trunk,'" exactly reflect Lily's decision to "move the tree to the middle' that matters – nothing else'" (Leaska 13).

But underneath Lily's aesthetic musings on her painting, which Leaska foregrounds, lies something more profound in terms of gender. Lily's decision to move the tree may indicate a potential way of solving her question about "the unity of the whole" (53), in which "the whole" ultimately refers to the relation between the sexes. In several different scenes in "The Window" that make use of stream-of-consciousness narration, Lily keeps thinking about the problem with space. After initially bringing up the matter of "how to connect" the right and left in her painting, Lily encounters this question again in the dinner scene, when she senses that Mrs. Ramsay has made a misjudgment in pitying William Bankes. At this moment, in "a flash [Lily] saw her picture, and thought, Yes, I shall put the tree further in the middle; then I shall avoid that awkward space. That's what I shall do. That's what has been puzzling me. She took up the salt cellar and put it down again on a flower in the pattern in the table-cloth, so as to remind herself to move the tree" (84-5). Immediately thereafter, Woolf describes Charles Tansley as inwardly yet furiously complaining about "the [silly] women's fault"; "Women made civilisation impossible with all their 'charm,' all their silliness" (85). Feeling Tansley's inward grumbling, remembering him saying that "Women can't write," and determining that she "must make" her work, Lily thinks again, "I must move the tree to the middle" (86). Through the two brief reminders of the moving tree, Woolf shows that Lily is trying to find a way of harmonizing the space between right and left, which

figuratively means the space between male and female, as those tree moments are when she subtly captures a certain chasm between the sexes.

To broaden my point, then: the question of "the unity of the whole" emerges when Lily encounters certain unfairnesses in conventional gender norms. Lily meditates on Mr. Ramsay's tyrannical unjustness (46) as well as Mrs. Ramsay's "highhandedness" in believing that all women "must marry" (48). Witnessing unfairness in "the symbols of marriage, husband and wife" through the Ramsay couple (72), Lily thinks that the conventional marital unity is problematic and ponders what type of unity needs to be pursued in male/female relations. At the moment when Lily fixes upon moving the tree as a resolution of the problem of space in her drawing, she becomes critical of the "misjudgments" (based on the conventional notion of marital unity) in Mrs. Ramsay's pitying Bankes, perhaps due to his status as widower. And her final determination – moving "the tree to the middle" – is made when she encounters Tansley's judgment, "Women can't write, women can't paint" (86), grounded in the Victorian gender norm in which women are expected to be the Angel in the middle-class household rather than working for pay.

Yet despite the unjustness inherent in the norm of Victorian marriage, the vision of "the unity of the whole" exists underneath the unique communion that Lily has with Bankes, who "had shared with her something profoundly intimate" (53). In fact, if Lily were to allow anyone to see her picture, it would be Bankes. Lily is usually alarmed at someone's watching her painting, as "her brush quivered" at such moments (17), and she speculates that if "Mr. Tansley, Paul Rayley, Minta Doyle, or practically anybody else"

looked at her picture, she would "turn her canvas upon the grass" (18). If it is Bankes who stands beside her, however, Lily would not turn her canvas. In terms of the relation between Lily and Bankes,

> They had rooms in the village, and so, walking in, walking out, parting late on door-mats, had said little things about the soup, about the children, about one thing and another which made them allies; so that when he stood beside her now in his judicial way … she just stood there. He just stood there. Her shoes were excellent, he observed. They allowed the toes their natural expansion. Lodging in the same house with her, he had noticed too, how orderly she was, up before breakfast and off to paint, he believed, alone; poor, presumably, and without the complexion or the allurement of Miss Doyle certainly, but with a good sense which made her in his eyes superior to that young lady. (18)

Although there seems nothing out of the ordinary in Bankes, who is an old widowed botanist (18), in the relation between the two of them, he is the “special” person who recognizes Lily's specialties; correspondingly, he is the one who makes her special, too. For instance, Bankes notices how Lily's shoes are "excellent" (18) in the sense that the shoes allow for her toes' "natural expansion." While this detail seems ordinary on the surface, it is suggestive in Lily's case, as she seeks her own "natural expansion" under the surface through her painting. What Bankes captures in Lily's "excellent" shoes is her own excellence – her aspiration toward an expansion that is ahead of her time. Bankes and Lily are not legitimately tied by marriage, but there is "something profoundly intimate" (53) between the two figures.

Although such intimacy seems more legitimately natural in the marital unity of the Ramsays, Woolf seems to depict a crack, never to be sutured and apparently inflicted by the inequalities stemming from patriarchal mores, between them. Woolf describes Mrs. Ramsay's pleasure in a rare solitary moment, when she "could be herself, by herself" (62). When Mrs. Ramsay is able to be "herself," she feels a "sense of unlimited resources"; "Her horizon seemed to her limitless. There were all the places she had not seen … she felt herself pushing aside the thick leather curtain of a church in Rome. This core of darkness could go anywhere, for no one saw it. They could not stop it, she thought, exulting. There was freedom, there was peace, there was, most welcome of all … a resting on a platform of stability" (62-3). In comparison with the moment quoted above in which she feels like "a sponge sopped full of human emotions" when in company with her family (32), the solitary Mrs. Ramsay experiences her own limitlessness, which enables her to reach "freedom" and "peace" (62). Predictably, it is Mr. Ramsay who interrupts Mrs. Ramsay's free moment, as he conceives of his wife's immersion in herself as a problem; he does "not like to see her look so sad" (68). The difference in perception marks a divergence between Mr. Ramsay and Mrs. Ramsay; as Woolf puts it, "they could not share that" (68). In contrast to her depiction of the intimacy between Bankes and Lily, in which "something profoundly intimate" has been inserted into the non-marital relation, Woolf illuminates a certain profound cacophony in "the [Victorian] symbols of marriage, husband and wife" (72) represented by the Ramsays together. In this way, Woolf critiques the Victorian convention in which the husband is supposed to be the authority figure and the wife is expected to be the Angel

and the possession of the husband; simultaneously, through the person of Mr. Ramsay in “The Window,” Woolf also indicts Victorian patriarchal masculinity.

Through the subtle yet profound crack between the Ramsay couple and Lily's musing on the space, Woolf in "The Window" may render her own questioning: through or in what type of space can the two sexes exist as "the unity of the whole" (53) that embraces a "natural expansion" (18) for each other's. Jack Halberstam *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives* explores the functions of queerness evoked in the matters of time and space, as he associates the term with "alternative relations to time and space" involved in a "new life narrative" (2). Providing an example of "queer rendering of time and space" in the examination of "*The Hours*, Michael Cunningham's beautiful rewriting of Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*" (2), Halberstam argues that "[w]hile Woolf … knows that Clarissa must come to her senses [of the marriage-centered heterosexuality] … Cunningham turns Clarissa away from the seemingly inexorable march of narrative time toward marriage (death) and uses not consummation but the kiss [with a girl] as the gateway to alternative outcomes" (3). Halberstam here indicates that the moment of the kiss creates "havoc" (3) as an outlet of departure from conventional marriage temporality, and leads to an alternative time. What Cunningham further grapples with, according to Halberstam, is the contestation of histories between the traditional marriage history and the new, alternative history that intervenes in, and breaks with, the privileged history. This is to say, the kiss is the outlet that opens up the queer time and place in which a different mode of life and being can be imagined.

In "The Window" Woolf may attempt to find her own outlet that can create Halberstam's sense of havoc – which breaks with the Victorian conventional temporal regime – by reflecting on the profound chasm between the marital couple on the one side and the solitary Mrs. Ramsay (with her limitlessness, freedom, and peace) and the potential of Lily's "natural expansion" (18) on the other. If the marital cacophony of the Ramsay couple is the realistic mirror of the Victorian marriage system, Lily's musings on the space that pursues "the unity of the whole" (53) may indicate Woolf's searching for the queer space that can write a different temporality in which alternative modes of life, gender identity, or anything other than the by-products of the Victorian marriage-centered temporal regime can be rendered.

Queer Temporality in "Time Passes"

As the title of Paul Sheehan's article "Time as Protagonist in *To the Lighthouse*" notes, the issue of time is significant in the novel's second chapter, "Time Passes." Placing Woolf in the stream of "the modernist overhaul of narrative temporality," Sheehan argues that Woolf "launches a new temporal regime" as "resistance to the hegemony of clock-time" (47) and makes time a subject or "protagonist." If Woolf showcases the Ramsays and Lily as the main characters in "The Window," and therefore appears to be writing a story about human affairs, in "Time Passes" she changes the subject from the human to time. In this way Woolf alters the novel's temporality from Victorian time, in which the gendered norms of the Angel in the House and the tyranny of patriarchy are embedded, to a new type of temporality, "[c]osmic time" or "natural time" (Sheehan 53). Contemplating the significance of time and temporality in "Time Passes," in this section

I follow Sheehan in examining how Woolf creates a new temporal space in which time becomes the protagonist and the human becomes secondary. However, whereas Sheehan pays primary attention to the dynamics of time itself, I put more importance on Woolf's use of time as queer temporality in the Victorian context: how Woolf's queer time in "Time Passes" disturbs and intervenes in the continuum of the Victorian human time in order to envision the post-Victorian masculinity in "The Lighthouse." If the previous examination of "The Window" focuses on the historical background of Victorian patriarchy as the initial evocation of the urgency of queer temporality, in the "Time Passes" section I am more indebted to the theoretical lens of queer temporality as discussed in recent works of queer theory. I connect the explorations of the implications, and the powerful effects, of the queer temporality to the contention that Woolf through the newly inserted queer temporality invalidates the conventional Victorian time, which embeds the Victorian domestic patriarchy.

In *Queer Times, Queer Becomings*, E. L. McCallum and Mikko Tuhkanen speculate on an alternative mode of being to the prescribed narrative. McCallum and Tuhkanen capture the idea that encompasses Michel Foucault, Henri Bergson, Gilles Deleuze, and Friedrich Nietzsche together, and articulate that the philosophers "require that we think existence not in terms of being, of what exists, but of becoming, or the being of becoming – that we consider 'the fundamental mobility of life'" (2-3). Viewing life not as a static being but as (the process of) fundamental becoming, McCallum and Tuhkanen relate the nature of permanent "vagaries" (3) of becoming engendered in queer temporality against the scripted temporality within the privileged ideology. McCallum

and Tuhkanen's approach demonstrates that queer temporality functions to queer the artificial social constructs scripted in the normative narrative. In the story, if we find the meaning of queer temporality in its critical function of queering the prescribed narrative, it is possible to locate queer temporality in Woolf's insertion of a different temporality – what we saw Sheehan refer to as "[c]osmic time" or "natural time" – into "Time Passes" so as to showcase a different temporal regime in which the Victorian domestic patriarchy becomes no longer valuable.

Woolf starts her second chapter with a reference to "the lamps [that] were all extinguished" (125) so that "immense darkness" erases the human world; "there was scarcely anything left of body or mind by which one could say, 'This is he' or 'This is she'" (126). Simultaneously, "nothingness" emerges, extinguishing "some random light" and "little airs"; what is left is only the "steadfast" darkness (126) that seems to reset the temporality of the universe out of the void. In this world of darkness and nothingness human beings exist in brackets, as in a brief passage that Woolf uses to comment on Mr. Carmichael: "[Here Mr. Carmichael, who was reading Virgil, blew out his candle. It was midnight]" (127). In comparison with her constant attention to what human characters do and think in "The Window," Woolf in "Time Passes" treats human beings or human affairs as insignificant.

Woolf further describes how humans' questions and their pursuit of answers become meaningless, useless, and invalid in the world of darkness, which now is "full of wind and destruction" (128). She remarks that "the sea tosses itself and breaks itself, and should any sleeper fancying that he might find on the beach an answer to his doubts, a

sharer of his solitude, throw off his bedclothes and go down by himself to walk on the sand … it would appear that it is useless in such confusion to ask the night those questions as to what, and why, and wherefore, which tempt the sleeper from his bed to seek an answer" (128). Perhaps this imaginary sleeper in search of answers is Mr. Ramsay, who feels confused and frustrated after Mrs. Ramsay's death, as we discover in the following bracketed sentence: "[Mr. Ramsay, stumbling along a passage one dark morning, stretched his arms out, but *Mrs. Ramsay having died* rather suddenly the night before, his arms, though stretched out, remained empty]" (italics added 128). The nothingness of the darkness cannot be filled by human quest, and it has been portrayed only as emptiness.

Through the darkness and the bracketing of human experiences, Woolf parallels two distinct worlds of non/human time. Since "other times scales [natural and geological times] have taken over" (53) in "Time Passes," "the periodic cycles of everyday life" (Sheehan 50) become meaningless. When the realist narrative is centered on human life, it takes place in human everyday time. Yet such human-centered time (including changes within it) becomes meaningless if the narrative centers on a different thing, such as darkness. As darkness does not follow human time, what happens to humans becomes inconsequential. That could be why Woolf in "Time Passes" uses brackets to note human affairs that would normally receive considerable emphasis: Mrs. Ramsay dies (128); Prue Ramsay marries and dies (131-2); Andrew is killed in the war (133); Mr. Carmichael has published poems (134).

Along with the eclipsing time of darkness, what I want to do is to give a particular emphasis on the implicit yet subversive potential within the nonhuman temporality. The rapidity with which Woolf passes over human events in "Time Passes" implies a queer approach to human landmarks, a rejection of the priorities associated with the Victorian worldview poignantly represented in the novel's first section. Halberstam provides an example of queer time in Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (1953): interpreting the clowns' performance of waiting as a type of "defamiliarization of time spent" (*In a Queer Time and Space* 7), Halberstam argues that it deforms capitalist temporality, which requires a fixed timeline in terms of getting a job, getting married, and having children. In Halberstam's view, Beckett's waiting evokes a queer time that invalidates the capitalist-centered clock time. Employing Halberstam's discussion of queer time's invalidation of the dominant temporality, I conclude that Woolf in "Time Passes" invents the nonhuman time that consists of darkness, emptiness, and nothingness and strategically places it after "The Window," a section set in Victorian time, so as to nullify previous Victorian regulations such as the expected gendered norms and timeline. Such reconfiguration of temporality from the Victorian time to the nonhuman time in "Time Passes" as a transition to the last chapter, "The Lighthouse." Whereas the Victorian human time has been turned on in "The Window," it has been completely turned off in "Time Passes." Through this break of human time, now the reader can refreshingly redirect her eyes to the last chapter, as Lily "set[s] her clean canvas" (149) on the easel again.

Post-Victorian Masculinity after the Corridor of Time in "The Lighthouse"

While exploring Woolf's notion of history, Angeliki Spiropoulou describes Woolf as "an innovative modernist who broke with past traditions" (1). Spiropoulou here may point to the literary tradition, but it is equally valid to consider Woolf's criticism of Victorian domestic patriarchy as another element of the "past traditions" that she is attacking, initially through her portrait of the Ramsays in "The Window." In this section I argue that Woolf not only criticizes but also (more profoundly) revises Victorian past traditions of the Victorian patriarchy in "The Lighthouse" by positioning herself as a post-Victorian who envisions the future of Victorian masculinity. Previously, Steve Ellis has argued for Woolf's "Post-Victorianism" (2) by exploring "Woolf's complex relation to her familial [Victorian] past" (3). Finding both "'passionate hatred" and "an attitude of admiration" for the Victorian era in Woolf's works (4), he provides "an analysis of the comparison and evaluation of the Victorian and the modern that Woolf constantly undertakes in her work" (7). In Ellis's examination of Woolf as post-Victorian, *To the Lighthouse* "opens the way for a more critical … understanding of the Victorian legacy in [Woolf's] writing of the 1930s" (9). In line with Ellis's view of Woolf, I pay particular attention to Woolf's vision of post-Victorian masculinity by probing into Lily's visionary revision of Mr. Ramsay's character. Woolf has begun the novel by evaluating the Victorian tradition of domestic patriarchy in "The Window," and, depicting after a ten-year-long corridor in "Time Passes," she moves onto the visions for the post-Victorian masculinity in "The Lighthouse."

Spiropoulou highlights Woolf's experimentation with history as a means of "critique and redemption of/from the present" (2-3). According to her, Woolf criticizes "official historiography for its exclusionist and silencing effect and simultaneously develops an alternative historiography which would do justice to the oppressed and the defeated, mainly women and other 'outsiders' to authority" (3). Spiropoulou further articulates that Woolf's critical approach to official history leads her to revise "received notions about … the past, and about the pattern of history, its temporality and directionality" (3). As previous feminist critics such as Phyllis Rose have pointed out, Woolf's most scathing criticism addresses Victorian domestic patriarchy through Mr. Ramsay, and her criticism is based on the memory of her father's patriarchal tyranny. As Woolf herself says, living in her father's household "was like being shut-up in the same cage with a wild beast" (*Moments* 116).[2]

Yet there is more to be said about, or something else to be said about, Woolf's memory of her father in her representation of Mr. Ramsay in *To the Lighthouse* than what previous feminist critics have captured. Woolf's memories of her father are not all negative. She records other aspects of her father before Julia's death, writing, for instance, "He must have been an attractive man at fifty.… There was a Leslie Stephen who played his part normally, without any oddity or outburst, in drawing rooms and dining rooms and committees … a man of that well to do sociable late Victorian world" (*Moments* 113-4). Marion Dell and Marion Whybrow note that "Virginia held a special place in [her father's] heart. As Leaska's comments also prove, Woolf was the most

[2] To criticize Woolf's father's despotism, Rose provides several relevant quotations – "His life would have entirely ended mine"; "What would have happened? No writing, no books" – from Woolf's diary.

beloved daughter for her father (51); and, it was she who raided his library for books and satisfied his need for admiration and affection" (55). Dell, Whybrow, and Leaska show aspects of Woolf's father that are not tyrannical, despotic, and domineering. In the final section of her novel, Woolf draws on the fragmented memories of her father's other aspects, revisiting and revising the memory of the patriarchal father portrayed in Mr. Ramsay in the first section. In "The Lighthouse," therefore, Woolf retouches her critique of Victorian patriarchal masculinity in order to redirect the deep-rooted Victorian patriarchy to a different masculinity.

Like the beginning scene of "The Window," "The Lighthouse" starts with a preparation for the expedition to the lighthouse, but now a different mood prevails. After a brief mention of Mrs. Ramsay's death and the changed atmosphere of the house, this time "Mr. Ramsay, Cam, and James" (145) are preparing for the expedition on an "extraordinarily queer" morning (146). Unlike the joyful expectation surrounding the expedition as originally planned, "Cam was not ready and James was not ready and Nancy had forgotten to order the sandwiches and Mr. Ramsay had lost his temper and banged out of the room" (145). Nobody wants the expedition, and the three of them reveal their doubts about it in betraying self-questions such as "What's the use of going now?" (146).

Woolf's observation of Mr. Ramsay continues through Lily. While Lily has returned to the house, she has not yet finished the picture that originally raised the question of "the unity of the whole" (53). Having just started her work again and looking at the picture, she notices Mr. Ramsay's presence; she thinks, "Let him be fifty feet

away, let him not even speak to you, let him not even see you, he permeated, he prevailed, he imposed himself" (149). Recognizing Mr. Ramsay in the same light in which she has viewed him before, Lily feels the same anger: "That man … never gave; that man took … Mrs. Ramsay had given" (149). Yet she now meets an unexpected insight, which leads her to view him differently. She sees in his "solitary figure the immense pressure of his concentrated woe; his age; his frailty; his desolation," and she notices that "his boot-laces [are] untied" (153). At this moment, she exclaims, "What beautiful boots!" (153) rather than directly sympathizing with Mr. Ramsay's desolate loneliness. Although Lily feels shame at her inability to give Mr. Ramsay the conventionally feminine sympathy that he evidently wants, he responds unexpectedly to her praise of the boots. Instead of giving one of his usual "sudden roars of ill-temper," Mr. Ramsay smiles, and his "infirmities [fall] from him" (153). This description may imply that even though Woolf records her memory of her tyrannical father through the representation of the patriarchal Mr. Ramsay in "The Window," in "The Lighthouse" she tries to evoke moments when he loses the patriarchal authority, exhibiting the softer side that Dell, Whybrow, and Leaska point out.

In *Moments*, trying to remember past days, Woolf concludes that her father's dual identity as father and writer makes him "a strange character" (107). Woolf records that she still feels "old frustrated fury," that furious "rage alternate[s] with love"; she calls this reaction "ambivalence" (108). She then enumerates the elements that constitute the ambivalence that she feels toward her father. At first, Woolf likens her father to a "steel engraving – a violent temper" (*Moments* 109). She notes that "nobody could control [her

father] … he was spoilt as a child; because of his nervous delicacy; and that delicacy excused his extreme irritability" (*Moments* 109). Along with his characteristic ill temper, Woolf emphasizes that her father "took it for granted that his wife or sister would accept his apology, that he was exempt, because of his genius, from the laws of good society" (*Moments* 110). The second element of Woolf's memory of her father has to do with the sociable father in the drawing room, "London Library meetings," or "dinner at Oxford or at Cambridge" (*Moments* 114). If the first sentiment of the tyranny is from Woolf's memory of her father, the sociable father as another sentiment is more associated with Woolf's imaginative creation, as she notes that she "cannot conceive [of her] father in evening dress" in drawing rooms or dining rooms.

Woolf's last sketch is of her father as the writer. When Woolf reads her father's books, she feels that she is acquiring "a critical grasp on him" by "always find[ing] something to fill out; to correct; to stiffen [her] fluid vision" (115). Woolf emphasizes that she does not find "a subtle mind; not an imaginative mind; not a suggestive mind. But a strong mind; a healthy out of door, moor striding mind; and impatient, limited mind; a conventional mind entirely accepting his own standard of what is honest, what is moral, without a shadow of doubt" (115). Woolf is critical of her father's writing, but at the same time she admires the "muscular agnostic," "cheery," and "hearty" father revealed in the writing (115). On the one hand, then, Woolf clearly feels her father's ill temper as a form of domestic violence that influences the family in malign ways. On the other hand, in the second and the third descriptions she presents a presumable (or imaginative) memory of the sociable father as well as admiration for her father as a

writer. These ambivalent sentiments reveal the complexities of the memories of the father, and, as I will explain shortly, form the basis for another queering of temporality.

Whybrow's "Leslie Stephen" chapter helps enrich our understanding of Woolf's memory of her father. Noting Woolf's father's love of Talland House in Cornwall, the model for the house in *To the Lighthouse*, Whybrow quotes one of his letters to Mrs. W.K. Clifford:

> We are here on a lovely blowing breezy day: the air is delicious – pure Atlantic breezes … and it is as soft as silk; it has a fresh sweet taste like new milk; and it is so clear that we see thirty miles of coast. We have gardens each full of romance for the children – lawns surrounded by flowering hedges, and intricate thickets of gooseberries and currants, and remote nooks of potatoes and peas, and high banks altogether a pocket-paradise with a sheltered cove of sand in easy reach (for Ginia even) just below. (54)

At Talland House Woolf's father is not a "steel engraving" obsessed with his intellectual career like Mr. Ramsay in the novel, but an engaged father interested in "romance for the children" and involved with "the children's games and their education" (Whybrow 54-5). Whybrow provides additional descriptions that note how Woolf's father has watched his "little rogue" (55) with lovely eyes. As such descriptions of Woolf's father's daily life at Talland House suggest, there are other moments that are not governed by the domineering, tyrannical father. If we consider such moments, the subtle change that Lily notices in Mr. Ramsay's smile during the boots scene in "The Lighthouse" may be

Woolf's way of revivifying the buried memories of the other times under the dominant memory of her father's patriarchal time in “The Window.”

When McCallum and Tuhkanen refer to Nietzsche's paradigm of history, they mention a Nietzschean term, "hiatus" (5) – "[a] break in the continuity of a material object; a gaping chasm; an opening or aperture" (*OED*) – as a means of breaking a continuity of a certain norm thereby queering the given norm's trajectory.[3] Not only does the aperture not only mark the fineness of the normative narrative as porous, but Nietzsche's "hiatus" (5), more importantly, engenders a further queer realm that can be evoked by the aperture's new opening. If I draw upon the meaning, and the significance, of the "hiatus" in relation to its function of queering continuity, Woolf in the boots scene seems to treat her memory of her father as a hiatus moment that breaks with the previous Mr. Ramsay, who is domineeringly demanding, and that invents a new story of Mr. Ramsay as vulnerable yet smiling. Whereas Woolf presents the historical productivity of the Victorian patriarchal legacy through the tyrannical Mr. Ramsay in "The Window," she queers this narrative of the Victorian male legacy in "The Lighthouse."

In this regard, the boots scene – when Lily unexpectedly encounters Mr. Ramsay's smiling and feels peace – is a profound moment that enables her to dispel the remembrance of the tyrannical Mr. Ramsay and to redirect her memory to a different phase, which is "new to her" (156). Lily perceives that

> [Mr. Ramsay] was like a lion seeking whom he could devour, and his face had that touch of desperation, of exaggeration in it which alarmed her, and made her

[3] MCallum and Tuhkanen specifically target heteronormativity and "a heteronormative future" (6).

> pull her skirts about her. And then, she recalled, there was that sudden revivification, that sudden flare (when she praised his boots), that sudden recovery of vitality and interest in ordinary human things, which too passed and changed (for he was always changing, and hid nothing) into that other final phase which was new to her. (156)

In this description, Lily notes her experiences of "sudden revivification," "sudden flare," and "sudden recovery" in the smiling moment, and thinks that Mr. Ramsay "was always changing" (156). Even though Lily remembers Mr. Ramsay as a tyrant who demands sympathy particularly from women, a trait evocative of Victorian patriarchal masculinity in the domestic realm, she also notices that he has been changing; with his revivification, Mr. Ramsay enables Lily to reach some "other final phase which [is] new to her" (156). His "sudden recovery of vitality and interest in ordinary human things" leads her to make her "first quick decisive stroke" (158) and motivates her to "re-fashion her memory of him" as "a work of art" (160). Here through Mr. Ramsay's change and through Lily's effort to retouch her memory of him in the form of "art" (160), Woolf touches again the historical remembrance of the Victorian patriarchy.

While Lily feels the profound change in Mr. Ramsay and reflects on the change on her picture, James – who earlier showed strong hatred of his demanding father – has started sailing to the lighthouse. As the previous attempt to make the expedition to the lighthouse in "The Window" has failed, this time, too, sailing does not seem easy; there is very little wind, so "The boat made no motion at all" (162). Indeed, while looking at their father – who is "frowning, and fidgeting, and pishing and pshawing and muttering

things to himself, and waiting for a breeze" (163) – James and Cam "[hope] the whole expedition would fail" (163). Cam reminds herself that "all those paths and the lawn, thick and knotted with the lives they had lived there, were gone: were rubbed out; were past; were unreal" (166-7), and this sailing is real, which is "intolerable" (169). For his part, James thinks that he "shall be left to fight the tyrant alone" (168). James's resentful resistance to his father and Cam's sense of the intolerableness of being with her father show their remembrance of Mr. Ramsay as the tyrant in "The Window." Because of this remembrance, in the following scene, while Mr. Ramsay is "reading a little shiny book with covers mottled like a plover's egg," James cannot help "dreading the moment when [Mr. Ramsay] would look up and speak sharply to him about something or other. Why were they lagging about here?" (183). At the same moment, Cam has been wanting "adventure and escape" from "her father's anger," "James's obstinacy," and her own anguish (188).

However, much as Lily suddenly encounters the unexpected moment, Cam's desperate anguish and James's hatred toward their father also meet unexpected moments. When Cam has been thinking about the escape from her distress, she simultaneously feels "a fountain of joy at the change, at the escape, at the adventure … [in which] the drops falling from this sudden and unthinking fountain of joy [fall] here and there on the dark, the slumbrous shapes in her mind" (189). When this "fountain of joy" comes into Cam's mind, she has been thinking of the "old gentlemen … Mr. Carmichael or Mr. Bankes who was sitting with her father" (189). Cam is reminded of the recent past, when she was in the study with her father; "watching her father as he wrote in his study, she

thought (now sitting in the boat) he was not vain, nor a tyrant and did not wish to make you pity him. Indeed, if he saw she was there, reading a book, he would ask her, as gently as any one could, Was there nothing he could give her?" (189-90). At this moment, what Cam has been watching on the boat is her father who is fully "plunged into" his reading (190).

Although Cam remembers her father as despotic, watching Mr. Ramsay on the boat reminds her of the buried moments of his displays of tenderness, which elicit a "fountain of joy" in her. In fact, reading could be one of Mr. Ramsay's most important ways to achieve the "Z" level, but in Cam's watching he seems to enjoy the reading as pure pleasure. Reading, which has been a significant tool to strengthen intellectual male authority, newly reminds Cam of her father's buried past; she draws upon the memory in her present on the boat, and transforms the intellectual means for fame in the past temporality into pure pleasure in the present. As reading now works differently for Mr. Ramsay, he seems no longer to care about what has consumed him, such as fame or genius.

In 1932, five years after the publication of *To the Lighthouse*, Woolf wrote an essay about her father, "Leslie Stephen," and she incorporates fragmented memories of her father's other moments that are not "'alarming'" (qtd 79). Woolf remembers her father's strolling in "Kensington Gardens, where he had walked as a little boy, where his brother Fitzjames and he had made beautiful bows to young Queen Victoria" (79); in these moments Woolf's father was not the awe-inspiring patriarch and man of letters.

Woolf provides another remembrance of her father as one who (surprisingly) gave freedom to his children:

> [I]f freedom means the right to think one's own thoughts and to follow one's own pursuits, then no one respected and indeed insisted upon freedom more completely than he did. His sons, with the exceptions of the Army and Navy, should follow whatever professions they chose; his daughters, though he cared little enough for the higher education of women, should have the same liberty. If at one moment he rebuked a daughter sharply for smoking a cigarette … she had only to ask him if she might become a painter, and he assured her that so long as she took her work seriously he would give her all the help he could. He had no special love for painting; but he kept his word. Freedom of that sort was worth thousands of cigarettes … [and] my father allowed [that freedom]. (qtd 79)

In these two examples Woolf shows that her father could be sometimes lovable or lenient in his own way. In spite of insisting upon "a certain standard of behavior," Woolf's father in her remembrance above is not the steel-engraving tyrant, but a man who could share freedom with his children.

As Dell, Whybrow, and Leaska have shown in argument cited earlier in this chapter, it is worthwhile to remember that Woolf was her father's favorite child. Viewing Woolf as her father's "literary successor" (351), Katherine C. Hill points out that "Virginia was clearly Leslie's favorite child, and his letters to Julia are crowded with comments that capture his preference for 'poor little Ginny' over her siblings" (352). According to Hill, Woolf in a 1927 letter to Vita Sackville-West written after the

publication of *To the Lighthouse* shows her response to her father's special love by saying that "I was more like him [father] than her [mother], I think; and therefore more critical: but he was an adorable man, and somehow, tremendous" (qtd 352). Those memories of Woolf's father in "Leslie Stephen" and her letter to Sackville-West reveal that Woolf remembers and treasures moments when her father was not the autocrat. And through Cam's remembrance of her father – who could ask, "Was there nothing he could give her?" – Woolf inserts those “adorable moments” into the story. If Lily encounters "sudden revivification" by discovering Mr. Ramsay's "interest in ordinary human things" in the boots scene, Cam also feels her own "sudden flare" this time by finding her father's endearing moment in his reading the "little shiny book" on the boat (156, 183).

Woolf's intentional redirection from the tyrannical father to the adorable father can be found through James as well. James, who is about to explode with his hatred for his father, also meets a surprising moment when he has almost reached the lighthouse. During the expedition, Mr. Ramsay repeats a verse of a poem a couple of times – "But I beneath a rougher sea" (206) – with the result that James is afraid. This verse initially appears when Mr. Ramsay has just embarked on the sailing. Because this initial moment of Mr. Ramsay's murmuring the verse is crucial to grasp how Mr. Ramsay understands his condition then and to compare his change later in the story, I quote the full description of the moment. When Mr. Ramsay murmurs "But I beneath a rougher sea" for the first time,

> [H]e had found the house and so seeing it, he had also seen himself there; he had seen himself walking on the terrace, alone. He was walking up and down

> between the urns; and he seemed to himself very old and bowed. Sitting in the boat, he bowed, he crouched himself, acting instantly his part – the part of a desolate man, widowed, bereft, and so called up before him in hosts people sympathising with him; staged for himself as he sat in the boat, a little drama; which required of him decrepitude and exhaustion and sorrow … and then there was given him in abundance women's sympathy, and he imagined how they would soothe him and sympathise with him, and so getting in his dream some reflection of the exquisite pleasure women's sympathy was to him, he sighed and said gently and mournfully,
>
> *But I beneath a rougher sea*
>
> *Was whelmed in deeper gulfs than he,*
>
> so that the mournful words were heard quite clearly by them all. (italics in original 166)

At this moment Mr. Ramsay uses the verse in order to dramatize his condition as a "desolate man, widowed, bereft" (166). Identifying and dramatizing his condition in such a way, Mr. Ramsay seems to justify his need of "women's sympathy"; as the narrator notes, it is Mr. Ramsay's "little drama" that he sets up for himself. In a broader perspective, what Mr. Ramsay has shown on this stage is the Victorian patriarchal masculinity in which the wife is expected to sympathize with her husband. This is why James dreads the verse, as it symbolizes Mr. Ramsay's demanding masculinity, which dominates "The Window."

Later on in the sailing, when Cam, James, and Mr. Ramsay have almost reached the lighthouse, James again feels that his father will burst out with "But I beneath a rougher sea" when they pass a spot where three men were drowned. Listening to this story of the drowned men, Mr. Ramsay takes a look at the spot, and James thinks that if his father says the verse again, he and Cam could not "bear it; they would shriek aloud" (206). Yet, surprisingly, Mr. Ramsay only says "Ah" (206). At this point, the narrator speculates on Mr. Ramsay's presumed thinking: "all he said was 'Ah' as if he thought to himself, But why make a fuss about that? Naturally men are drowned in a storm, but it is a perfectly straightforward affair, and the depths of the sea … are only water after all" (206). This moment suggests a profound change in Mr. Ramsay in comparison with the previous verse scene. Mr. Ramsay earlier makes use of the verse in order to dramatize his self-pity – which is based on his identification with a Victorian masculinity desperately in need of women's sympathy – and to call for sympathy from others. In contrast, in the latter "Ah" moment Mr. Ramsay seems to forget his self-identified condition as the desolate man and becomes indifferent to his previous preoccupations and to male suffering. Rather, he absorbs the immediate surroundings on the boat, seemingly thinking that "[n]aturally men are drowned in a storm" (206). Here Woolf as the narrator leads Mr. Ramsay to engage with the immediate moment and delivers him out of the predicament of male self-pity, bolstered by patriarchal masculinity.

This moment becomes more meaningful in conjunction with Halberstam's speculation on a function of forgetting. In the chapter "Dude, Where's My Phallus? Forgetting, Losing, Looping" (*The Queer Art of Failure* 2000) Halberstam provides a

brief analysis of the film, *Dude, Where's My Car?,* in which "Jesse and Chester forgot where they parked their car, did not remember [their mission,] saving the world from mass destruction, and found themselves alone again with a fridge full of chocolate pudding" (69). In this situation, forgetting seems to "[stall] the enactment of a heroic aftermath to salvation because the heroes have forgotten their own messianic mission and have returned to life in Dudesville" (69). Arguing that Jesse's and Chester's forgetfulness makes them forget "grand gestures," Halberstam puts emphasis on a potential "resistance" that "lurks in the performance of forgetfulness itself, hiding out in oblivion and waiting for a new erasure to inspire a new beginning" (69). In a broader sense, forgetfulness de-couples "the process of generation from the force of historical processes" and thus "becomes a rupture with [certain] eternally self-generating present, a break with a self-authorizing past, and an opportunity for a [new] future" (70). This way Halberstam theorizes the function of forgetting "as a strategy for the disruption" (71) of the reproductive historical process.

If we locate the "force of historical processes," the "eternally self-generating present," or "a self-authorizing past" (70) in Mr. Ramsay, we may see these concepts as the historical productivity of the tradition of Victorian patriarchy. As Griffin articulates that Victorian politicians and authors strenuously worked for the construction of the discourse of the Victorian domestic patriarchy (41-50), such construction of the ideological gender discourse may evidently produce the "eternally self-generating present" or "self-authorizing past" (Halberstam 70). However, in Mr. Ramsay's reading the book and forgetting his dramatic self-pity, Woolf deconstructs the process of

repeating Victorian patriarchy as the "self-generating present," (Halberstam 70). Through Mr. Ramsay's forgetting previous obsessions, Woolf evokes the Nietzschean chasm that breaks with traditional Victorian masculinity, and redirects the traditional narrative to a new temporality for envisioning a new type of masculinity that has not yet been realized in Victorian history. Mr. Ramsay's "Ah" is a transient, even nonchalant exclamation, yet its implication is powerful. Because Cam and James no longer find the expected cultural constraints in Mr. Ramsay, they begin to wonder what their father thinks. From this moment, it becomes apparent that Mr. Ramsay could bring to their interaction something unexpected, something that Cam and James have not yet seen.

Woolf pushes Mr. Ramsay's new momentum further in what follows. Their sailing along "long rocking waves" becomes more swift; the narrator adds that one "could hear the slap of the water and the patter of falling drops and a kind of hushing and hissing sound from the waves rolling and gamboling and slapping the rocks as if they were wild creatures who were perfectly free and tossed and tumbled and sported like this for ever" (206-7). After Woolf delivers Cam, James, and Mr. Ramsay out of their individual troubles, she brings them together along the free movement of waves so that they can feel perfect freedom. After Mr. Ramsay's "Ah," Cam and James start to think that if their father asks them anything, they will give it to him (207). However, surprisingly again, Mr. Ramsay this time asks for "nothing" for himself, but only says, "Bring those parcels. . . . The parcels for the Lighthouse men" (207).

Gabrielle McIntire captures a subtle change when she looks at this line; she argues that Woolf "humanizes the figure she critiques the most" (89) by recording his

"innocuous command" (90).[4] I go further, though, by proposing that it is important to compare Mr. Ramsay's "Bring those parcels" with his first pronouncement in the novel, "It won't be fine" (4). While superficially "It won't be fine" seems to be about the weather conditions for the expedition to the lighthouse, there is more going on under the surface, inasmuch as his comment is related to his concern with his authority as father, husband, and "Q" level intellectual. With the weather comment, Mr. Ramsay assumes that the other family members have to follow his judgment based on his position as the father and husband; moreover, he cannot compromise with what he thinks of as facts. Basically, Mr. Ramsay's concerns are focalized on the cultural definition of male authority in both private and public sphere. Yet in "Bring those parcels," what Woolf displays is a Mr. Ramsay who becomes assimilated into the ordinary surroundings by forgetting his previous preoccupations, the cultural conditions of male authority. In the boots scene with Lily, Mr. Ramsay forgets his self-pity, and thus he can engage with Lily's praise. Somewhat similarly, on the boat he is plunged into reading as pleasure rather than as a means of being the genius; he bursts into "Ah" instead of repeating the self-pitying verse.

In fact, all the previous instances of unexpectedness in Mr. Ramsay are rendered as queer moments evoked by his assimilation into immediate moments that are not involved with his previous preoccupations as the despotic father and philosopher. If indeed such assimilation is taking place, it is possible to say, as McIntire does, that his

[4] McIntire concludes that throughout *To the Lighthouse* Woolf "generates a fictional autobiography that offers a multipronged feminist indictment of cultural patriarchy and domestic tyranny while simultaneously beginning to map a poesis of healing from the wounds of the old order" (90).

"Bring those parcels" is not his authoritative command as the patriarchal subject but an "innocuous" remark. Emptying and erasing the imprint of the patriarchal command, Mr. Ramsay at this moment only thinks of the lighthouse men. Briefly put, whereas "It won't be fine" shows how his consciousness is revolving on the axis of his gendered roles as father, husband, and intellectual in a centripetal way, his "Bring those parcels" is centrifugal. Toward the ending Mr. Ramsay comes to forget himself, and thus he assimilates into the immediate situations with Lily's praise of his boots, his reading, old Macalister's story of the drowned men, and the lighthouse.

When Spiropoulou examines Woolfian history, she defines it as "alternative history" in which "'great men' and their actions" are not the subjects (44). Through this alternative history, according to Spiropoulou, Woolf "aims at restituting what has remained unrepresented and excluded" from "the official version of History" (44). For this purpose, Woolf "places emphasis on fragmentation and disruption rather than historical continuity and totalities, [by] bringing the past in constellation with the present" (6). Spiropoulou develops her understanding of Woolf's history by drawing upon Walter Benjamin's making a constellation among the fragmented "'monads'" of the past in order to achieve the political immediacy in the present (53). Benjamin in "Theses on the Philosophy of History" reworks the notion of the past by differentiating the past from history; the past "does not mean to recognize it 'the way it really was' [but] it means to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger" (255). Which is to say, Benjamin does not view the past as fact that has happened before; rather, he finds the meaning of the past in a different realm, memory. In this case, rather than being a fact

that has happened before, the past finds its meaning in memory: how the memory works with it. In broader realm, what is more important in the history of the past is to construct a constellation, a particular structure, in which certain (selective) memory "flashe[s] up" or "flits by" at a particular moment of "danger" in the present (255). Selective memory of the past is supposed to be reanimated at certain danger in the present in order to save the present from danger.

If Spiropoulou suggests the broader perspective of how Woolf and Benjamin intersect with each other in their revision of the official version of history, I narrow the scope of examination to the function of the fragmented monads of the past – which are supposed to be constantly rearranged in memory's shaping the constellation – and, more importantly, contextualize the idea within Woolf's revision of the Victorian patriarchy. In the novel, toward the ending, if Woolf leads Cam and James to locate the buried the memories of their father under the overwhelming memory of his patriarchal dominance, she assigns a different work – weaving the memories of the non-authoritative Mr. Ramsay and creating the constellation of the newly revealed memories – to Lily through her "work of art" (160). Having brooded over the question of the "unity of the whole" (53) and having not yet completed her picture, which is the reflection of the question, Lily can make "her first quick decisive stroke" on her canvas after she has seen Mr. Ramsay's smile, has discovered the subtle change in him, and has felt a "sudden revivification" (158, 156). While Mr. Ramsay, Cam, and James have been sailing to the lighthouse, Lily in front of her picture refers back to past memories. Here Woolf becomes most deliberate in showing how Lily makes "the work of art" through

refashioning these memories (160). Woolf thus parallels Lily's "tunneling her way into her picture, into the past" (173) to the sailing wherein Cam and James have been retracing the memories of the buried, non-authoritative moments of Mr. Ramsay.

In Lily's tunneling into the memory, on a day when all of the house party members (Mrs. Ramsay, Mr. Carmichael, Charles Tansley, and Mr. Ramsay) go to the beach, she has been trying to figure out the conflicts between the members, especially Tansley and Mr. Ramsay. Thinking how Mrs. Ramsay – "sitting there writing under the rock" – “resolve[s] everything into simplicity; [makes the] angers, irritations fall off like old rags; [brings] together this and that and then this, and so [makes] out of that miserable silliness and spite … something" with Tansley, Lily "re-fashion[s] her memory of him" (160). Perhaps Mrs. Ramsay might have been sitting somewhere on the beach, but it is uncertain whether she resolves Tansley's anger and irritation, and makes something out of his miserableness. Rather, the latter occurs in the realms of Lily's revisiting the memory with her imagination in her attempt at figuring out the matter of harmony or unity with Tansley, who regards women as at fault for the civilization's development.

Indistinguishably, Lily's reflection moves onto another moment as Mr. Ramsay comes in. She thinks of how

> when the children cried, "How's that? How's that?” cricketing[, s]he [Mrs. Ramsay] would look intent. Then she would lapse again, and suddenly Mr. Ramsay stopped dead in his pacing in front of her and some curious shock passed through her and seemed to rock her in profound agitation on its breast when

> stopping there he stood over her and looked down at her.… He stretched out his hand and raised her from her chair. It seemed somehow as if he had done it before; as if he had once bent in the same way and raised her from a boat which … had required that the ladies should thus be helped on shore by the gentlemen.… Letting herself be helped by him, Mrs. Ramsay had thought (Lily supposed) the time has come [that] she would marry him. (198)

To distinguish the mixed temporalities in the descriptions above is a subtle task. One of the temporalities is when Mrs. Ramsay is alive; another temporality is even more distant (and consists of imagination rather than memory), focusing on when Mrs. Ramsay decides to accept Mr. Ramsay's marriage proposal; the last temporality is Lily's present at the moment of her revisiting all the past moments. The descriptions include three-layered, complex temporalities, but the narrations also deal with different realms of consciousness based on fact, memory, and imagination. Lily revisits one of her memories in the past, presumably one of fact, and she additionally imbues the moment with her own imagination, thinking of how Mr. Ramsay may stretch out his hand to Mrs. Ramsay and she will accept his proposal of marriage. Creating distance from the Mr. Ramsay who has been domineering and demanding with Mrs. Ramsay in "The Window," Lily here creates a moment in which Mrs. Ramsay is in charge, evoking at the same time Mr. Ramsay's gentlemanly moment, which she makes echo "in the rough and tumble of daily life" in their domestic life (199). Crossing multiple temporalities and realms of consciousness, Lily retouches the factual past of the Victorian domestic patriarchy in the Ramsay couple's daily life and reimagines Mr. Ramsay as something

other than the patriarchal tyrant by developing the buried memories of his non-authoritarian moments and weaving them into a constellation in which the new Ramsay flashes up and flits by. Woolf's last work is to hold the vision of the new Mr. Ramsay within Lily's painting in order not to make the vision scattered and disappear.

The sailing scene ends with the arrival of Mr. Ramsay, Cam, and James at the lighthouse, and the arrival scene is paralleled by Lily's "laying down her brush" with her feeling vision. While thinking that "[Mr. Ramsay] has landed" and "It is finished," Lily turns to her picture with "all its greens and blues, its lines running up and across, its attempt at something" (208). As I mentioned earlier, Leaska points out that Lily's painting may reflect Cézanne's *Maisons au bord de la Marne*, particularly in terms of the placement of the tree as a matter of "architectural balance" (13). Yet Fry's brief essays "The French Post-Impressionists" and "Paul Cézanne" may enable us to find a different quality in Lily's painting. Fry articulates that post-Impressionists (including Cézanne) "do not seek to give what can, after all, be but a pale reflex of actual appearance, but to arouse the conviction of a new and definite reality. They do not seek to imitate [natural] form, but to create form" (167). When it comes to Cézanne's works, Fry locates "a character in which everything is due to the compulsion of inner forces, in which nothing has been planed down or smoothed away by external pressure" (180); thus for Cézanne one of the most significant matters is "to express his 'sensation'" (181), which captures a certain emanation of his subjects' "inner forces" (180).

If we draw upon Fry's idea of the inner force within the Post-Impressionists (including Cézanne) and connect it to Lily, what her painting – which has shown her

reflections on the matters of "the unity of the whole" (53) and the moving tree – eventually may render is how to make things coexist without any interruption to each other, by thinking of the matters of space. Through Mr. Ramsay – who "stretche[s] out his hand" (198) – and Mrs. Ramsay's being in charge of her decision, Lily most carefully retouches the Ramsay couple, so that, this time, in her imagination the couple do not disturb the inner force of each other (regardless of having their own characters). Reimagining her memories of the past, Lily imbues her painting with the vision, a new type of marriage in which the man becomes a giver and the woman becomes a taker: Mr. Ramsay as the giver of his hand to Mrs. Ramsay.

In a sense, what Lily has shown at the ending of the novel is a type of kaleidoscopic work. To make a kaleidoscope, some necessary supplies such as plastic, scissors, pen, or clear tape are needed. One of the interesting features of a kaleidoscope is that its preparatory process is not akin to its result. Each of the elementary supplies does not bear a likeness to its outcome, the ever-changing view of the optical instrument. As the preparation for making the kaleidoscope, Lily also gathers each material of fact, memory, and imagination to shape her vision of "the unity of the whole" (53). Yet like the process of, and the result of, making the kaleidoscope, Lily's materials of fact, memory, and imagination cannot work, respectively. Rather, to engender the visionary outcome – gender identity as "the unity of the whole" (53) yet embracing the natural expansion of the other – the materials need to work in a constellatory way. In other words, Lily's vision as the outcome is only achieved through the constellatory mingling of fact, memory, and imagination. Therefore, the importance of Lily's work may lie in

the nature of the process of work that brings about the ever-changing view by the constellatory working, which can never be fixed in the three different mingled realms. If this ever-changeability is added to masculinity as a new texture, the idea also can be applied to Woolf's vision of the post-Victorian masculinity. Rather than being fixed, masculinity can be constantly reshaped through how it is remembered and envisioned.

Elizabeth Grosz examines at length Henri Bergson's theory of time and Gilles Deleuze's re-appropriation of Bergson's time, and connects the fundamental unpredictableness, indeterminacy, and open-endedness, embedded in the flow of time, to the future of feminist politics. Although I will go into detail about Grosz's Bergson and Deleuze in a later chapter on Eliot, I now put emphasis on the profound indeterminacy that is implicit in time, as a final aspect of my analysis of Woolf. In the novel, when Lily encounters Mr. Ramsay's unexpected smile in the boots scene, she notices his change and thinks that "he [has been] always changing" (156). The novel presents the interconnected ideas of change and concomitant indeterminacy in its dealings with the queer time and memory. Through Lily's kaleidoscopic constellation that combines fact, memory, and imagination on her canvas, Woolf's novel powerfully shows how to create the interconnected ideas of changeability and indeterminacy, projects them onto the remembrance of Mr. Ramsay's masculinity, and suggests the masculinity with the new textures of changeability and indeterminacy as the vision for the post-Victorian masculinity.

CHAPTER III

THE WOUNDED MASCULINITY AS SHADOW OF THE PAST IN RUDYARD KIPLING'S *PUCK OF POOK'S HILL*

Rudyard Kipling "look[s] back from [his] seventieth year" to his childhood in "A Very Young Person: 1865-1878" (*Something of Myself* 3). As Zohreh T. Sullivan has pointed out, the "story [is] told by the elderly narrator who selects and organizes memories, images and events in roughly chronological order" (28). Kipling's reminiscence begins with the "impression of daybreak" in "the memory of early morning walks to the Bombay fruit market" (Kipling 3). Placing more weight on his impression than on the chronological timeline, Kipling follows his memories and zooms in and out of particular moments motivated by the intensity of impression. Probably because of this motif, the impressive "daybreak" (3) he has encountered in childhood not only starts but also finishes the essay, albeit being presented in different ways, times, and spaces. At the ending of the essay, Kipling's reminiscence moves to a memory of London in which "for the first time … the night got into [his head]. [He] rose up and wandered about that still house till daybreak, when [he] slipped out into the little brick-walled garden and saw the dawn break" (13) In this reminiscence, literally speaking, Kipling's daybreak functions as a boundary between sunrise and night. Figuratively speaking, being haunted by the impression of the daybreak, Kipling has positioned himself as a daybreak-like border figure between two sides, and this positioning of in-betweenness may influence his *Puck of Pook's Hill* (*Puck*), in which he renders a shadow that comes and goes between the two sides of past and present. As the story starts with the evocation of an ambiguous,

daybreak-like time, "Midsummer Eve, when the shadows [are] growing" rather than "Midsummer Night itself" (9). In the evening, because "the shadows [are] growing" (9), the reality could be refracted; or, rather, the refracted reality in the shadow may suggest another type of real that is evoked only at the particular moment of evening.

Examining Kipling's complex autobiographical background, especially his childhood and its impact on Kipling's literary life, Sullivan deals with the issue of duality, split, or ambivalence as a significant theme in Kipling's life and works. She argues for Kipling's "fundamental ambivalence towards his own identity" (28) as grounded in his "ambiguous position between his lost Eden and the larger colonial structure" (27). In Sullivan's examination, Kipling positions himself as liminal between India and Britain, and creates "dualistic forms" of writings that split between two worlds of "waking and dreaming, the frame tale with its split between outer and inner story" (28). Under this frame, Sullivan claims that Kipling's liminality – which often brings about a clash between two different (or opposite) realms – has led him to devise ways of ordering the two different worlds, and puts emphasis on the idea such liminality brings about Kipling's separation between the past (in memory) and the present (in reality).

Although Sullivan's ways of dealing with the issues of memory and the past in Kipling's works intersect with my approach to Kipling's *Puck*, my argument diverges from hers in an important manner. This is to say, Kipling's use of past and memory is not limited to the orientalization of the past times of his felicitous childhood, as Sullivan contends (Sullivan 30). Rather, the ways in which Kipling approaches the past and memory are more associated with his creation of a magical, queer realm, one that

importantly allows the shadow to refract the reality. Through the idea of the magical realm in which the shadow appears, in this chapter I argue that Kipling presents a different type of imaginative history in which the British Empire is deprived of the right of writing its history as the subject. Rather, in Kipling's imaginary creation, the shadow figures from the past – such as Sir Richard Dalyngridge and the Saxon Hugh, men wounded through the old England's adventures – become the narrators, telling a different history, and as haunting figures critically intervene in the British Empire's present, its imperialism. Showing how the narrative interweave the temporal perspectives together, I claim that in *Puck* Kipling's imaginative setting renders the knights/soldiers as the shadows of wounded colonial men from the past, makes these figures re/visit the present via their past shadows, and provocatively casts doubt on the British Empire's imperialism in Kipling's present times. In other words, by using the shadow as a metaphor that renders the refracted reality at the double-sided border of past and present, Kipling reveals that another, unseen history of the wounded past and men has been being written, and that the wounded history as the shadow of the present coexists with the Empire's history.

For the first part of this chapter, I examine Kipling's notion of history, the magical queer realm; in the second part, I explore how Kipling's setting of the magical queer realm leads the male characters to reflect on their colonial manhood in their adventurous past with skepticism rather than triumph. Using the perspectives above, I focus on the three medieval adventure tales – "Young Men at the Manor," "The Knights of the Joyous Venture," and "Old Men at Pevensey" – and on Kipling's notable poem

"The White Man's Burden" (1899), which deals with colonial manhood in his present and future.

Kipling's History as Magical Realm

At the very beginning of the story, "Puck's Song" (7) narrates historical events that have happened previously: the battle of Trafalgar, "King Philip's fleet," the Domesday Book, the invasion of the Saxons, Caesar's sailing from Gaul in the Iron Age, and "Flint Men" in the Stone Age from the first to tenth stanzas: throughout these narrations, the central theme seems to be the birth of contemporary England. However, due to the ways in which the last stanza concludes the poem, the old histories of England seem to be placed within the magical sphere rather than the factual records of history. After the narration of how England is born in the eighth stanza, the narrator's final remark is that "[England] is not any common Earth, / Water or Wood or Air, / But Merlin's *Isle of Gramarye*, / Where you and I will fare" (italics added 8). The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines "Gramarye" as "occult learning, magic necromancy." The invocation of Gramarye in the last stanza notes that England is not common earth, but rather the isle of magic to which "you and I will fare" (8). This is to say, the final stanza places the enumerated histories of England and the birth of England in the magical realm; accordingly, because of this very first setting, the history of the old England that will be told in the tales falls into the magical realm rather than facts.

As "Puck's Song" prefigures, Kipling also initiates the three earliest episodes with magical settings. In "Weland's Sword," the moment when Dan and Una encounter

Puck for the first time is when they are seated on "a large old *Fairy Ring*[5] of darkened grass, which was the [magical] stage" for the theatre in which they produce their version of "A Midsummer Night's Dream (italics added 9). In "Young Men at the Manor," when Dan and Una are introduced to Sir Richard Dalyngridge, their first meeting happens at "the children's *most secret hunting-grounds*" (italics added 33). In "The Knights of the Joyous Venture" Richard reappears when Una becomes "the Golden Hind or the Long Serpent" for the special purpose of "expeditions" (59). Dan and Una have "reached Otter Pool [with] the Golden Hind grounded comfortably on a shallow, and they lay beneath a roof of close green, watching the water trickle over the flood-gates down the mossy brick chute from the mill-stream to the brook" (60). Deeply immersed in the mood and listening to "the little voices of the slipping water," Una says, "'It's like the shadow talking, isn't it?'" to Dan, and at this moment they "[hear] feet on the gravel-bar that runs half across the pool and [see] Sir Richard Dalyngridge standing over them" (60). In each episode both Puck, "the oldest Old Thing in England" (13), and Richard, the old knight from Normandy (and therefore from the past), appear at the children's imaginary spaces – the "Fairy Ring" (9) and the "most secret hunting-grounds" (33) – at the daybreak-like moment that blurs un/reality. This is to show, when Dan and Una are invited to the

[5] In the essay about his childhood, especially the six years (1871-1877) of the "House of Desolation" (*Something* 11) period, Kipling remembers how he devised his own imaginary fence that "kept off any other world": "[E]verything inside the fence was quite real, but mixed with the smell of damp cupboards. If the bit of board fell, I had to begin the magic all over again. … The magic, you see, lies in the *ring or fence* that you take refuge in" (italics added 8). Here Kipling recollects that he as a child had his own apparatus – "coconut shell strung on a red cord, a tin trunk, and a piece of packing-case" (8) – to invent the magical realm, "the ring or fence" that keeps off the external world. In the initial setting of *Puck*, Kipling employs the same motif of the magical ring – "Fairy Ring" – from the memory of his childhood, and suggests that the tales that Dan and Una are told belong to the magic.

hi/story of old England, they are invited to the imaginary or magical realm and time beforehand.

In previous criticism of *Puck*, Kipling's approach to the past as imaginative archaeological history has received considerable attention. Indeed, Kipling was the first to capture the initial idea of the story in an archaeological way. Kipling notes that the initial motif of the *Puck* collections, *Puck of Pook's Hill* and *Rewards and Fairies* (henceforth *Rewards*), comes from when he bought his house Bateman's in 1902; specifically, Kipling and his cousin Ambrose Poynter discovered under twenty-five feet of well "a Jacobean tobacco-pipe, a worn Cromwellian latten spoon and, at the bottom of all, the bronze cheek of a Roman horse-bit" (*Something* 108). Moreover, when "cleaning out an old pond which might have been an ancient marl-pit or mine-head, [Kipling and other men] dredged two intact Elizabethan 'sealed quarts' … all pearly with the patina of centuries" (108). At these discoveries, Poynter jocosely suggested to Kipling writing "a yarn about Roman times" (108), and this is the beginning of the archaeological imagination in the *Puck* collections. Maybe because of this background, previous critics have named Kipling's approach to the past and history as an archaeological imagination.

In their discussions of the archaeological imagination, critics have also located the coexistence between past and present in Kipling's history. Lisa A. F. Lewis points out that "Kipling's vision of history" is to catch "an echo from past lives based on what little we know of them … [while] living in the present" (194). Gabriel Moshenska provides a broader overview of previous criticism's approaches to Kipling's sense of the past, the mixture of past and present at the same time, and adds his own interest in the

two archaeological landscapes, "rural Sussex and the Roman Wall" (17), as well as their impact on Kipling's imagination, to recent *Puck* criticism. As Lewis and Moshenska have shown, both previous and current criticisms have captured that the past and present coexist in Kipling's notion of the archaeological history in the *Puck* stories.

However, although it clearly makes sense to capture Kipling's sense of history in the form of the past (of the knight and soldier) mingled with the present (of Dan and Una), critics have not yet developed the underlying implications of why the past needs to coexist with the present in Kipling's imaginative hi/story. Although the main functions of the pastoral descriptions, the fairy Puck, and the archaic figures of the knight and soldier seem to be to evoke the imaginative history, they are tinged with complications in Kipling's consciousness of the imperial reality during his times. When it comes to *Rewards*, Kipling notes of the layered complexities of the story: "Since the tales had to be read by children, before people realised that they were meant for grown-ups; and since they had to be a sort of balance to, as well as a seal upon, some aspects of my 'Imperialistic' output in the past, I worked the material in three or four overlaid tints and textures" (*Something* 111). In an attempt to stretch out the layered structure of *Rewards* to its forerunner, *Puck*, I suggest that one of the key issues that can open up the channel of the complexity under the surface of the imaginative history is the "Imperialistic" aspect of the story (111).

According to John McBratney, even though Kipling viewed "the prospects of empire" with confidence in, and belief in, the Empire's "proper duties as white governors" (137) at the end of the nineteenth century, Britain's Liberal Party's triumph

and its engagement with the South African war in 1906 made him see the situation as one of "national decline" (138). McBratney explains that Kipling might have felt frustration over this decline and his sense of urgent need for the British Empire's "rehabilitation at the center" and responded by turning his attention from matters outside to those inside. McBratney's historical context evinces Kipling's acute concern with the inter/national circumstances during the writing of the *Puck* stories. Hence it becomes significant for readers to grasp in what senses Kipling goes back to the past history in his present times rather than simply characterizing Kipling's past as imaginative archaeological history evoked in the present.

The poem "Cities and Thrones and Powers," which appeares in the middle of *Puck,* may showcase how Kipling's imaginative history is interlinked with his awareness of the imperial present in the early twentieth century. Although the poem is a companion to a tale of the Roman Empire, the title and the poetic narration also enable us to link the poem to the British Empire with attention to the Empire's fear of decline. Along with this figurative backdrop to the British Empire's fear, Kipling displays a formulation of how the British Empire (in the figurative sense) and its imperial history follow the law of time. In the poem Kipling puts foremost importance on time: "Cities and Thrones and Powers / Stand in Time's eye" (*Puck* 109). Likening "Cities and Thrones and Powers" to "flowers," the narrator continues: "Almost as long as flowers, / Which daily die, / But as new buds put forth / To glad new men, / Out of the spent and unconsidered Earth, / The Cities rise again" (109). In the first stanza, the poetic narrator reduces the "Cities and Thrones and Powers" to "flowers" and limits their longevity to a day. As McBratney puts

it, if Kipling thinks of the Empire's rehabilitation – "The Cities rise again" – its rising would not be a type of permanent imperialism. Rather, the city's re-emergence would be like the life of a "Daffodil," although the Daffodil would perceive its "seven days'" life as "perpetual" (109). In this way, if Kipling places "Cities and Thrones and Powers" as well as their re-emergence in "Time's eye" in the first stanza, in the second stanza he condenses the life of the city into that of the "Daffodil" and characterizes its life as "seven days' continuance" (109). In the last stanza, Kipling vividly goes back to time: "So Time that is o 'er-kind / To all that be, Ordains us e 'en as blind, / As bold as she: / That in our very death, / And burial sure, / Shadow to shadow, well persuaded, saith, / 'See how our works endure!'" (109). Here Kipling clarifies that it is "o 'er-kind" "Time" that penetrates everything including "Cities and Thrones and Powers"; and, as the time finally remarks – "'See how our works endure!'" (109) – the life and death of city, throne, and power rely on the law of time rather than on city, throne, or power themselves. In other words, what happens to "Merlin's Isle of Gramarye," Kipling's allusion to the magical realm, in the initial setting of "Puck's Song" is that the imperial cities, thrones, and powers could become a "season's Daffodil," subjected to the law of time.

Tracing how the discourse of "imperial supremacy" of the British Empire has been constructed (113), Philippa Levine examines with what imperial discourses in/outside the country the British Empire rules its colonies through the nineteenth and the twentieth centuries. Briefly speaking, due to the key moments of crises such as "the Jamaican and Indian uprisings" in the colonies from the mid-nineteenth century, Britain's

leaders imposed "more direct autocratic forms of rule" on the colonies (113); as a result, a more patriotic sentiment became dominant in Britain. One of the results from the changes in the ruling system of the colonies is Britain's making the "distinction between those who ruled and those who were ruled" in a more strict way. For instance, while "[i]n much of the world in the eighteenth century, colonists lived in close contact with indigenous populations" (115), such "compromise and negotiation" between the colonist and the colonized became "less common than conquest and autocratic rule" (116). Along with the British colonists' autocratic ruling, "the alleged savagery and lack of civilisation of other culture [became] a major justification for … overall [ruling] policy" (116). In these imperial discourses, which the British Empire ardently disseminated, the Anglo-Saxon race is the acme of the civilization that rules time and the world; "more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race, that more of the best and most human, most honourable race the world possesses" (118). Considering that the idea that the Anglo-Saxons ought to be the world ruler represented Britain's national sentiment, what Kipling has shown in "Cities and Thrones and Powers" does not seem to follow what his nation was then pursuing. Rather, by placing the destiny of cities at the mercy of time, Kipling shifts the British Empire's perception of itself as the teleological end-point in its imperial vision to the object of time. In the perspectives above, Kipling's adding the magical layer to the history of old England functions to challenge the British Empire's teleological imperialism in its dominant perception of the present.

Kipling's Masculinity as Wounded Shadow

In Kipling's imaginative history, then the Empire's imperial vision, its self-positioning as the acme of the civilization at the end of the teleological linearity, falls into the form of the time-limited "season's Daffodil" in the magical history. In this section I examine how the issue of colonial manhood – the essential vehicle for the Empire's imperialism both inside and outside the country – also falls into the realm of the imaginative history to be critiqued. Before embarking on writing the *Puck* stories, Kipling wrote two notable poems, "Recessional" (1897) and "The White Man's Burden" (1899), that have been often recited within the context of British imperialism. Through these poems, as the Norton introduction to Kipling informs us, although he "is usually thought of as the poet of British imperialism," his poems "contain little by way of flag-waving celebrations of the triumphs of empire" (1793). Rather than the triumph of the British Empire, in these poems Kipling betrays his complicated sentiments about the Empire's decline ("Recessional") and the dilemma of colonization ("The White Man's Burden"). This point shows that, although Kipling has been referred as "the poet of British imperialism" (Norton 1793), even before writing *Puck* he was already aware of the knotty problems between the Queen's country and its weapon, colonial manhood. On the surface, the imaginative setting in *Puck* leads the knight and soldier to embark on the adventurous journey. Under the surface, however, Kipling does not seem to view the male figures' adventures in a triumphant way. Rather, he asks to what extent the colonial men's commitment to the country acquires validity in its practice of the British Empire's imperial imperialism.

By conjuring up Puck – "the oldest Old Thing in England" (*Puck* 13) – as a medium to evoke a multi-dimensional conversation between the old figures and the children, Kipling constructs the episodes with the imaginary invaders of old England. Doing so, Kipling presents Sussex[6] as an experimental microcosm by evoking a situation in which foreign invaders from Norman and Roman cultures encounter Saxons, the people of old England. In other words, through the story Kipling revisits Sussex, the old battlefield in which the old conquerors are gathered to conquer England. With regard to Kipling's Sussex setting, which completely excludes "industrialisation and urbanisation" (26) in his pastoral descriptions of the milking cow, "'cuckoo-cuk,'" and "a busy kingfisher" in "sleepy stillness" (11), although Alun Howkins points out the significance of Kipling's imaginary Sussex to the agricultural virtues of the old Englishness embedded in people like Hobden (27), I pay attention to the narrations of the old invaders of the old England. Through the invited invaders from Norman and Roman cultures, Kipling uses Sussex as the experimental place for his critique of British men's imperial commitment to the country.

John Tosh in "Manliness, Masculinities and the New Imperialism, 1880-1900" has traced the construction of the British Empire's discourse of colonial manhood. Summarizing how the Empire during the New Imperialism era "was widely perceived to

[6] As I have noted, Kipling moved to Bateman's in Sussex in 1902, and his moving to Bateman's inspired him to write the *Puck* stories. Along with this biographical context in relation to Sussex, the landscape has also a historical significance in the myth of England: "[t]he truly typical England was usually seen to reside in the historic and comfortably domesticated rusticality of the South" (Wiener 50). Tracing the "strand of the Southern Metaphor" (42) in literary works preoccupied with England's reconstruction of Englishness in the dreamy past, Martin J. Wiener suggests that Kipling's *Puck* is in line with the tradition of making the myth of England for the purpose of reconstructing an alternative, peaceful Englishness for the anxious country.

be in danger" (194), Tosh articulates that this insecurity prompted the "defense of the empire" and "required more men and better men" (195). Especially by the 1880s the British Empire had more strategically developed and disseminated the idea of "better men" (195) as the national ethos, and one of the results is that the Empire revised the educational curriculum in boys' public schools. In Tosh's explanation,

> The curriculum certainly reflected an imperial agenda – in history, geography, English literature and classics. But the public schools did not base their claim to service the empire on academic grounds. What they specialized in was manliness, or making men out of boys, and the agents in this process were not so much the school authorities as the boys themselves. Manliness was acquired through a process of physical hardening imposed by the often harsh living conditions at school. (197)

In the revision of the British Empire's curriculum for boys' education, the core feature is to cultivate the imperial manliness with the new ideals. Along with the extant qualities of manliness from the mid-nineteenth century such as "resolute action" or "self-control," what is added to the character of "better men" (195) is "duty above personal gratification" (197). Doing so, the British Empire's public school redefined the male duty, namely by requiring "commitment to an overriding imperial loyalty and an identification with a set of collective imperial values" (197). To construct such new types of manly characters for the Empire's benefit, "the officer cadet corps and team sports" (197) as a means for "physical and mental discipline" (198) were used as pivotal sites. Above all, the British Empire's revised curriculum in cultivating physically robust

men for the imperial commitment shows how the scope of masculinity came to be narrowed down in strategic yet oppressive ways.

Tosh's examination of the 1880s is not identical with the publication dates of *Puck,* yet it is not impossible for us to conjecture that the British Empire's imperial ethos in the two moments described by Tosh and Kipling was interlinked. In spite of the Empire's imperialism prevalent in/outside of the home country, the ways in which Kipling describes the episodes in *Puck* seem rather distant from the imperial discourse. In "Young Men at the Manor," Kipling employs a factual background, the battle of Hastings (1066) when William, Duke of Normandy, came out to take King Harold's England, and imbues the factual setting with the imaginative narration of Sir Richard's story. As Harriet Harvey Wood puts it, the battle of Hastings has an enormous importance not just in the history of England but also in the history of Europe, as it changed "the face of Europe" and caused "a fundamental realignment between its major players" (2). Moreover, in "Hastings: An Unusual Battle," Stephen Morillo informs us of "how hard and evenly matched the fighting was" (221). In comparison with other "ancient medieval battles that lasted more than an hour or two,"

> The length of the battle [the nine hours] reflects its … unusual feature. … First, both armies came close to breaking fairly early in the day. The Normans, believing William dead, fell into a general panic after the failure of their first attacks. William, baring his head, rallied them and led a counterattack on those Saxons who had pursued. Now it was the Saxons' turn to hold steady despite this setback. Thus passed the moment when most battles would have been won – one

> side panics and flees, or one side panics, rallies, and the other side breaks. At Hastings neither side broke, for even the Saxons' final collapse was not sudden and panic-stricken but grudgingly slow and stubborn. (221)

Wood and Morillo provide exemplary analyses how the battle of Hastings has been understood in terms of the battle's remapping of the European civilization (Wood) and the warriors' bloody match in the battle (Morillo).

Interestingly, however, in his narration about the battle Sir Richard seems to consider it more important to deal with how he makes friends with the Saxon Hugh than to describe the Norman victory in the war. In Richard's narration,

> [At Santlache] a single Saxon cried out to me in French, and we fought together. I should have known his voice, but we fought together. For a long time neither had any advantage, till by pure ill-fortune his foot slipped and his sword flew from his hand. Now I had but newly been made knight, and wished, above all, to be courteous and fameworthy, so I forbore to strike and bade him get his sword again. "A plague on my sword," said he. "It has lost me my first fight. You have spared my life. Take my sword." (37)

Right after this moment, when "[s]uddenly a clump of Saxons [run] out upon [Richard] and, seeing a Norman alone, would have killed [him]," Hugh saves Richard's life as well. And Richard says that, although their "Lords fought, [he and Hugh] each rejoiced [that they] had not slain the other" (37). In Richard's encountering Hugh in the middle of the battle, what Kipling sheds light on is not their physical robustness for serving their lords

– the decisive element of manliness in the British Empire's imperial value. Rather, the encouraged, manly characteristics in the battle have been altered to friendship.

Richard and Hugh develop their friendship into a closer male bond through further events, especially when the two figures work together in order to solve the troubles at the Manor, "a Saxon hornets' nest" (39). When the Norman knight De Aquila promises to give the Manor to Richard, both Richard and the Manor have problems. After De Aquila has left, Richard is alone with his "thirty men-at-arms, in a land [that he knows] not, among a people whose tongue [he] could not speak, to hold down the land which [he has] taken from [Saxons]" (40). Along with Richard's own matters, the Manor has wrestled with the problem of territorial fragmentation: "From the Upper Ford, Weland's Ford, to the Lower Ford, by the Belle Allée, west and east it ran half a league. From the Beacon of Brunanburgh behind us here, south and north it ran a full league – and all the woods were full of broken men from Santlache, Saxon thieves, Norman plunderers, robbers, and deer-stealers" (40). In this difficult situation for both Richard and the Manor, when one day "some Normans [are] driving off the swine there," Richard's and Hugh's people work together to "beat them off, and [save their] pork" (43). Working alongside Hugh, Richard tells him that "England must be thine and mine, … Help me, Hugh, to deal aright with these people" (43); and, over time, the two figures' friendship develops into a closer brotherhood.

J. S. Bratton has shown how the friendship between Richard and Hugh exists within a frame, Victorian and Edwardian juvenile fiction as an ideological vehicle for "the justification of the Empire" (78). She claims that Kipling's "heroes [in the *Puck*

stories] are devoted to notions of duty, power and responsibility – the values of an aristo-military caste" (81) – ultimately for the commitment to the Empire. In this sense, Bratton argues that Richard and Hugh "fight for [the] future greatness of England" (80); their brotherhood is designed and employed for the Empire's imperial purpose. In Bratton's perspective, therefore, the individual brotherhood between Richard and Hugh – which I have interpreted as friendship – becomes incorporated into the Empire's imperial narrative. More than a decade later, McBratney developed and complicated the issue of brotherhood not only with the *Puck* stories but also with Kipling's 1903 collection of poems *The Five Nations*. Finding a narrative that weaves the *Puck* stories together with *The Five Nations*, McBratney argues for "a new sense of imperial brotherhood" (139). According to McBratney, Kipling through the Sussex stories has called for an appreciation of "many lands" (144) because of the "diversity of England's makeup" in its old history, and has "hoped to encourage a robust blending of affiliations in the [Empire's] future" (139).

On the one hand, then, Bratton has understood brotherhood as a subordinate issue to the greatness of the British Empire (in a vertical way). On the other hand, McBratney has shown a broader perspective in which the brotherhood between Richard and Hugh in the *Puck* stories is a means of the (horizontal) "imperial federation" (140) that represents Kipling's private hope for the stronger Britain. In a sense, McBratney seems to show more complicated speculations – how and why Kipling has "refrained from [employing] a conventional evolutionary structure" in his emphasis on the "love of one's fellow men" (144) in the *Puck* stories – than does Bratton's clear emphasis on the greatness of the

British Empire in brotherhood. In a broader sense, however, McBratney's argument for Kipling's presentation of the brotherhood as a means of (the plural sense of) the "imperial federation" (140) overlaps with the idea of powerful Empire, which in turn overlaps with Bratton's idea. In their analyses, therefore, Kipling's presentation of brotherhood in the *Puck* stories seems framed under the Empire's broader project for imperialism.

Far earlier, in *A History of England* (1911), Kipling with C. R. L. Fletcher has shown his ideas of the battle of Hastings, the brotherhood between nations, and the "imperial federation" (McBratney 140) for the "future greatness of England" (Bratton 80). When Kipling introduces his readers to Saxon England before the Norman Conquest, he enumerates dangers from "foreign neighbors" (40): "Denmark and Norway," "Scotland, once Pict-land," "Flanders … the modern Holland and Belgium; a land already famous both for pirates and traders," "Normandy, the great province on the north coast of France" (40-1). Particularly when it comes to Normandy and its relation to the Saxons, Kipling adds more descriptions: "The 'Normans' … became the cleverest, the fiercest. … They did not cease to be adventures, and we find their young men seeking their fortunes all over Europe. They thought their Saxon neighbours very slow and stupid fellows, who were somehow in possession of a very desirable island which they managed very badly, and which it was the Normans' duty to take if possible" (41). Saxon England, which was not a united country then, was surrounded by dangers from foreign neighbors, of which Normandy was the strongest. Giving more words to the backdrop to

the Norman Conquest and the Normans' valor at the battle of Hastings, what Kipling sheds remarkable light on is the consequences of the Conquest in England:

> The battle of Hastings decided, though not even William [Duke of Normandy] knew it, that the great, slow, dogged, English race, was to be governed and disciplined (and at first severely bullied in the process) by a small number of the cleverest, strongest, most adventurous race then alive. Nothing more was wanted to make our island the greatest country in the world. The Saxons had been sinking down into a sleepy, fat, drunken, unenterprising folk. The Normans were temperate in food and drink, highly educated, as education went in those days, restless, and fiery. They brought England back by the scruff of the neck into the family of European nations, back into close touch with the Roman Church, to which a series of vigorous and clever popes was then giving a new life. Such remains of Roman ideas of government and order as were left in European were saved for us by the Normans. The great Roman empire was like a ship that had been wrecked on a beach; its cargo was plundered by nation after nation. But if any nation had got the lion's share of its leavings it was the Frenchmen, and through the Frenchmen the Normans, and through the Normans the English. (Kipling, *History* 43-4)

In short, in the Norman Conquest Kipling finds the benefits that have been essential to constructing England in a stronger way. Through the Normans' leading England to be educated, civilized, and thereby developed, England has become much stronger than before. In spite of "six years of utterly ruthless" effort in the process, William's ways of

mastering England – giving land to some great earls with "a strong oath to be faithful to the King" (45), for instance – eventually made the country "*as one people*" (italics in original 44). Such interpretations indicate that Kipling fundamentally views the Norman Conquest as "the beginning of the history of the English race as one people and of England as a great power in Europe" rather than focusing on the fact that the country was being conquered. As Kipling and Fletcher's preface notes that the book was "written for all boys and girls who are interested in the story of *Great Britain* and her *Empire*" (italics added), Kipling has already shown the perspective of the great Britain (Bratton), and the perspective on how England has become a stronger country through the foreign neighbors' federation (McBratney).

Going back to my analysis of Richard and Hugh's brotherly friendship, in spite of Bratton's adequacy and McBratney's complexity in their arguments, what they might have missed is the implications of the concept of the shadow; Richard refers to Hugh as his "shadow" (74) after Hugh has been wounded by the "devil" (74) that is a gorilla and has become "an armless man" (79) during their adventure in the South, recounted in "The Knights of the Joyous Venture." Almost from the first time that Richard lands in England, he and Hugh have been together, first in governing the Manor and subsequently in their adventure in Africa. If Richard's Manor – the reduced microcosm of the old England – has essentially begun with the federate system, Hugh is the earliest confederate from its beginning, and Richard concludes that "'England must be thine [Hugh] and mine" (43). Given the setting, it seems possible to imagine that Richard and Hugh are designed for incorporating into one another as the bodily joint of the federated

body of England. In this sense that Richard and Hugh are physically interconnected, Hugh's being a wounded shadow connotes that the wound follows Hugh's larger and more solid body, Richard, in the system of federation.

I further connect the implications of Hugh's being the wounded shadow for Richard to the conundrum of imperial masculinity during Kipling's time. In Levine's examination of Britain's ruling the empire and its identification with the sun that never sets, she emphasizes the Empire's ruling scale, which has "administered 47 territories" – "such a diverse array of regions" and people – by "the start of the twentieth century" (113). To prove scale, Levine provides two figures, "*The Empire on Whom the Sun Never Sets postcard*" (italics in original 117) and "*Craven tobacco advertisement, 'The Sun Never Sets*'" (italics in original 118), that buttress Britain's "boast of the size and success of [its] imperial ventures" (116). Particularly, the latter advertisement claims Britain's "global reach" (117), which covers territories worldwide. If Britain boasts of its position as the imperial sun (within its self-fashioning), however, it also needs to be reminded that the sun is supposed to be followed by shadow. This is to say, the sun accompanies its shadow as long as it is up in the sky, until night falls. Figuratively, if the British Empire is the imperial sun that has administered the 47 worldwide colonial territories, the Empire could be followed by its colonial shadows. In this case, the Empire could be haunted by the (anxiety or fears emanating from) colonial shadows, and it could be threatened in the cases of "the Jamaican and Indian uprisings" mentioned by Levine (113).

As Kipling has been deeply concerned with the prospects of the Empire and as he has been engaged with constructing the colonial discourse through his works, he is clearly aware of the structure of the colonial federation in which the Empire is the core (and the whole) of the structure and the colonies are the components of it. Within this wide realm of colonization, the ways in which Kipling presents Hugh as the wounded shadow of Richard may reflect on the situation of Britain, in which the Empire – the imperial sun – has been beleaguered by the potentially fearful wounds of the colonial shadows. If we read the main episode in "Young Men at the Manor" alongside Kipling's historical account of the Norman Conquest in *A History of England* – how the Conquest turns England into a the powerful, united country – Richard's main contribution can be interpreted as the ideal model of federated governing between Norman and Saxon, by demonstrating that England has become the stronger nation with the more structured ruling system emanating from "[originally] the Frenchmen, and through the Frenchmen the Normans, and through the Normans the English" (*A History of England* 44). Yet if the main component – Saxon Hugh – of federation becomes wounded through the adventure, the inner structure of the body of federation in England becomes unstable due to the essential part's wound. In broader perspective, if the British Empire could become the imperial sun only with the colonies' cooperative assistance, it is possible to ruminate on another side of the Empire when the colonies bring their wounds rather than the expected assistance, and haunt the country as the wounded shadow. In latter case, the colonies become a burden on the Empire rather than being an ideal component of the imperial federation; so they function as Hugh does to Richard at the end of the adventure.

Kipling, in fact, has already shown his concerns with the imperial burden in "The White Man's Burden" in a suggestive way. Previously, while McBratney concisely mentions that Kipling has "urged his American cousins to assume their proper duties as white governors" (137), Susan K. Harris's explanation is more detailed. Paying attention mainly to the British imperialist press's effort to construct public opinion of "the imperial mission" through 1898-1899 (245) and arguing for the poem's alignment with the media's construction, Harris claims that "The White Man's Burden" frames "pro-imperialist British opinion about the next step of the U.S." in an attempt at convincing "Americans that US imperial success could only come about through close attention to, and implicit dependence upon, the advice of those who had gone before" (244). For both McBratney and Harris, Kipling's pro-imperialism in the poem seems unequivocal.

Although there is a sense that Kipling posits pro-imperialism in the poem, however, he does not seem to grasp the position with certainty. Rather, if there is any sense of Kipling's pro-imperialistic position in "The White Man's Burden," it seems an inevitable pro-imperialism.[7] In the first stanza, the poetic narrator no doubt seems to support imperialism: "Take up the White Man's burden – / Send forth the best ye breed – / Go bind your sons to exile / To serve your captives' need" (*Norton* 1821). Yet the next narration likens the imperial duty to a "heavy harness" that needs "patience to abide" (1821). The third stanza presents a still more pessimistic view that the imperial duty could turn out to be nothing: "Take up the White Man's burden – / The savage wars of peace – / Fill full the mouth of Famine / And bid the sickness cease; / And when your

[7] Kipling denotes the idea "What else could I have done?" "the plinth" (*Something* 111) of the structure of *Rewards*. The poem seems Kipling's early version of questioning the British Empire's imperialism.

goal is nearest / The end for others sought, / Watch Sloth and heathen Folly / Bring all your hope to nought" (1821). Here if the "savage wars of peace," "mouth of Famine," and "the sickness" are the problems of the colonies, those matters are not solved by the imperial's dutiful business. Rather, the end of the stanza reveals that the difficult matters of the colonies could overshadow what the imperialists do, by making all the hopes "nought." Along the layered lines, the narrator betrays its thoughts that "[t]he silent, sullen peoples" in the colonies "[s]hall weigh your Gods and you" as a burden, rather than assuring the imperial mission with no doubt. The last stanza shows that this is how Kipling understands the colonial manhood that is destined to take up the burden in the colonies yet with "all the thankless years" (1822).

Although the earlier episodes in *Puck* seem to be adventure tales, from the Norman Conquest to the journey South, Kipling's early reflection on the complexities of the Empire's imperial mission as well as the problems of colonial manhood in its practice of the mission in "The White Man's Burden" is tinged with same sadness that fills the stories. When Richard and Hugh return from the South to England after their journey in "The Knights of the Joyous Venture," both Hugh, "a one-armed man," and Richard, "a cripple," have been wounded (87). Not only the adventurous pair but also De Aquila have become old – "like a little white falcon" (85) – at that point. So whereas the previous two tales are narrations of how England has become a stronger, united nation through the Normans' bringing a developed ruling system ("Young Men at the Manor"), and of how the adventure stretches out its realm to overseas ("The Knights of the Joyous Venture"), the third tale, "Old Men at Pevensey," starts with the physically crippled

conditions of the three founders of the post-Conquest England. Along with their physical weaknesses, there is another change to Richard and Hugh: they no longer govern the Manor, as the "[l]and and governance belong by right to young men" (87). Although the young men at the Manor have welcomed Richard and Hugh, they can see that "[their] day was done" (87). This is why Richard and Hugh have left the Manor and have "[ridden] back to Pevensey" (87), as Richard narrates that "it all passed long ago. They [the young men at the Manors] [are] young; we [are] old. We let them rule the Manors" (88). So the background of Richard and Hugh's going back to Pevensey suggests that they are no longer charge of the adventure or the governance of the land. As De Aquila puts it, Richard and Hugh have become the "ghosts" of the old days (88).

As ghosts, Richard and Hugh have returned to Pevensey and have worked with De Aquila at guarding the gateway of England, now in a state of high alert "with an eye to the sea, for fear of fleets from Normandy" (88),[8] for England's peace. In the background time of tension, the main episode in the tale focuses on how the three guardians contribute to the protection of England as well as how England has kept its peace: "'We [De Aquila, Richard, and Hugh] [have] guarded the coast too well while Henry was fighting his Barons; and three or four years later, when England had peace, Henry crossed to Normandy and showed his brother some work at Tenchebrai that cured

[8] William I, who led the Norman Conquest in 1066, had three sons, Robert, William II (also known as "Rufus," or the Red King), and Henry. William I "left Normandy to Robert and England to his second son, [William II]" (*A History of England* 58). After William II's death in 1100, "his youngest brother Henry seized the crown of England" (59). Based on this old history of England, the tale notes that the king whom Richard, Hugh, and De Aquila serve has been changed from William II, "[t]he Red King" (85), to Henry. During these periods, because of the occasional rebellions against each other between Robert of Normandy and William II and Henry of England, the guardians at the border such as Richard, Hugh, and De Aquila need to be alert.

Robert of fighting" (105). In spite of the result of England's peace, however, the ways in which the three founders of the old England talk about their past do not sound triumphant. Not showing any pride in what they have done in the past, Richard's final remark – "'We [have] talked together of times past. That is all men can do when they grow old'" (105) – sounds rather terse, as if all that remains for the "poor ghosts" (88) from the past, including De Aquila and Hugh, is to look backward without further adventure. If we try to grasp a broader narrative not only in "Old Men at Pevensey" but also in the previous two tales, "Young Men at the Manor" and "The Knights of the Joyous Venture," it is possible to notice double sides of the adventure narrative. On the one hand, the great adventurers – the ancestors of the British Empire – have embarked on their imperial journey from the Norman Conquest and have expanded its scope to the South. On the other hand, in the last Norman-Saxon tale, the very founders of England, Richard, Hugh, and De Aquila, seem to choose to be ghosts who have a memory of the glorious past and yet are reluctant to have further adventures, as they only look at their past without any expectation for the future. Although "Old Men at Pevensey" does not clearly present that the adventure would wane, the tale, at least, leaves the main figures in the past, and deprives them of promises of more land and further future.

This subtle undertone conveying the impossibility of future adventures is more clearly summed up in "Old Men at Pevensey"'s ending poem, "The Runes on Weland's Sword" (106). The narrator tells us,

A smith makes me

To betray my Man

In my first fight.

To gather Gold

At the world's end

I am sent.

The Gold I gather

Comes into England

Out of deep Water.

Like a shining Fish

Then it descends

Into deep Water

It is not given

For goods or gear,

Bur for The Thing.

The Gold I gather

A King covets

For an ill use.

The poem summarizes the main episodes in the three-part serial of Norman-Saxon tales: The first stanza is about Hugh's betrayal of his "Man [Saxon]" for the purpose of helping Richard for making England strong ("Young Men at the Manor"); the second and third stanzas are indicative of Richard and Hugh's acquisition of gold – which may symbolize one of the crucial aims of the British Empire's imperialism – as the outcome of their adventure to the South ("The Knights of the Joyous Venture"); The fourth stanza traces the whereabouts of the gold, which has been sunk into a deep well, after the adventuring pair have brought it to England ("Old Men at Pevensey"). The fifth and sixth stanzas connote the ways in which the poetic narrator ruminates on what has happened in the tales; the gold acquired through the adventure – which is supposed to be used for good – only remains as in ill-used "Thing." The expressions "The Thing" and "ill use" have subtle connotations. On the one hand, the narrator may raise doubt of the validity of the adventure through the revelation of the adventure's outcome, in which gold becomes an ill-used thing. On the other hand, in questioning the validity of the adventure, the narrator may further betray that the adventure has only left the aimless, unsubstantial "Thing" rather than certain substantial "goods or gear." In the narrations, therefore, the poem suggests how Hugh's sword – which has been used for making England a united nation at the initial stage – has been transmuted to a mere tool of "The Thing" that may not deserve to have any proper name. With all the implied messages in "The Runes on Weland's Sword," in spite of the main episode showing how the three guardians could protect England's peace, under the surface De Aquila, Richard, and Hugh may look backward on the past years of the old England with uncertain, doubtful eyes.

Judith Plotz's "Kipling and the Uses of Poetry" gives further guidance for comprehending Kipling's use of the mixed form of prose and poetry in *Puck*. Plotz pays particular attention to how the poem critically engages with its relevant prose; "Kipling's poetic outriders recalibrate or undermine their companion stories" (52). Plotz's analysis of "A Pict Song," the companion poem to "The Winged Hat," is effective in grasping the idea of the poem's critical engagement with the story. Plotz argues that "A Pict Song" complicates "its contiguous prose narrative … for it cancels out the largely benign view of the Picts offered" (55) in "A Centurion of the Thirtieth" and "On the Great Wall," two Roman stories. This is because, although Parnesius and Pertinax, the two main characters in the Roman stories, "pride themselves on their fellowship with old Allo, on their anthropological and psychological understanding of the little Picts," the poem presents a different narrator that tells a different story from the prose narrator:

> We are the little Folk—we!
>
> Too little to love or to hate.
>
> Leave us alone and you'll see
>
> How we can drag down the Great!
>
> We are the worm in the wood!
>
> We are the rot at the root!
>
> We are the germ in the blood!
>
> We are the thorn in the foot! (174)

As the title of the poem informs us, the poetic narrator is a Pict, one of the "little Folk." In spite of his small size, however, the stanza presents how the little Pict has the

potential of subverting "the Great." Rather than planning to enlarge their size to "smash and destroy" "the Great," the Pict targets the core – serving as "the rot at the root," "the germ in the blood," or "the thorn in the foot" to acutely attack "the Great." This is why Plotz finds that the "most subtle power of the *Puck* poems" lies in "their double mode of encompassing history" (58).

Plotz's comprehension of the "double mode" in Kipling's use of poetry and its powerful impact deepens my understanding of the male characters' looking backward in the analyses of "Old Men at Pevensey" and "The Runes on Weland's Sword"; especially, I am struck by how Kipling uses the sword as a metaphor in his reflections on the double-sided relation between the Empire and colonial masculinity. Much as Kipling has presented his ideas of the conundrum of colonial masculinity in "The White Man's Burden" earlier than *Puck*, he in the same year has also shown the earlier version of the sword as a metaphor in *Stalky & Co*. In the chapter "The Flag of Their Country," Kipling delineates a complex moment of the English boys' private thinking at the public boarding school, when a distinguished visitor, an MP, addresses "the duties and responsibilities of the life" of the patriot (241). Based on his experiences of loyal duty, the MP proudly delivers a speech on how "[s]ome of them, doubtless, expected in a few years to have the honor of a commission from the Queen, and to wear a *sword* … [which] would be of great benefit to the land they loved and were so proud to belong to … [and] some of them anxiously looked forward to leading their men against the bullets of England's foes; to confronting the stricken field in all the pride of their youthful *manhood*" (italics added 242). In his address, the MP delivers a message that the boys

need to "wear a sword" as an essential part of a suit of armor for a "youthful manhood" in which they are required to serve England. Unexpectedly, however, in their private realm the boys do not welcome such thoughts:

> In a raucous voice, [the MP] cried aloud little matters, like the hope of Honor and the dream of Glory, that boys do not discuss even with their most intimate equals, cheerfully assuming that, till he spoke, they had never considered these possibilities. He pointed them to shining goals, with fingers which smudged out all radiance on all horizons. He profaned the most secret places of their souls with outcries and gesticulations. He bade them consider the deeds of their ancestors in such a fashion that they were flushed to their tingling ears. Some of them … might have had relatives who perished in defense of their country. They thought, not a few of them, of an *old sword* in a passage, or above a breakfast-room table, seen the fingered by stealth since they could walk. He adjured them to emulate those illustrious examples; and they looked all ways in their extreme discomfort … [and] sour disgust. (italics added 243)

In these descriptions, Kipling quietly enters into "the most secret places" of the boys' "soul" and reads their poignant uneasiness about the destined path of manhood that they are expected to embark on soon. Although the MP idealizes the national duties and responsibilities of fighting against England's enemies as loyal service to the country, the boys' response of disgust and discomfort makes us think that the boys' foes may be their ancestors who have inherited the sword rather than the foreign enemies outside England.

If the sword is a multifaceted metaphor for Kipling, the particular scene above shows that it has layered meanings within it. The sword can be understood in two different sides; on the one hand, the sword may represent the loyal duty for the old ancestor generation in the past. On the other hand, the sword is indicative of the altered sentiment – "discomfort" or "sour disgust" (243) – for the young generation in the present. Through the cacophonous understandings between the past generation represented by the MP and the younger generation of the boys in the public school, what Kipling betrays is the chasm within the idea of the colonial manhood of England. This is to say, whereas the old sword represents the British Empire's colonial manhood from the past generations, the deep uneasiness of the boys' response to the manly path suggests hidden yet acute conflict in their understanding of colonial manhood. Within its project of making better, powerful colonial men, the British masculinity has been already undergoing inner conflict. This inner conflict further indicates that although the British Empire has the Other in its colonialism, it may have an "unseen, ever-resentful Other" (Plotz 56) inside the country, as it needs to inwardly colonize the mentality of the British young boys who are supposed to inherit the colonial legacy from their colonial forerunners. In spite of the granted imperial legacy, if the young boys resent that they are not allowed to shape their own thoughts, the Empire unexpectedly becomes a place that incubates its resentful Other at the core of its project. If the foreign colonies as the wounded shadow have been viewed as the white man's burden, in this case the British Empire may have another type of wounded shadow, "the rot at the root," "the germ in the blood," or "the thorn in the foot" (174) at its core.

In "The Runes on Weland's Sword," the first part of the poem may connote that Hugh's sword has been used for founding a strong England and expanding the adventure out of England. Nonetheless, with the consideration of Kipling's earlier use of the sword in *Stalky & Co* – in which the boys show strong disgust toward the invoking of the old sword – the poem's latter parts, containing the narrator's accusation that the sword's outcome, gold, falls into ill-use, indicate that the sword's journey has gone wrong. If so, the poem may explain why rather than taking the sword, English boys may be reluctant to embark on the manly destiny of serving the country.

In "The Knights of the Joyous Venture," Kipling mentions the shadow twice for Richard and Hugh. For Richard, Kipling renders his reappearance out of the shadow, when Una feels "the shadows talking" near the brook. Later, one of the shadows comes out of the scene and tells his story; that is Richard. Considering Richard's tale as the old history of England, what Richard brings to Dan and Una's present is the past. In this case, Richard's shadow is a medium to connect the past to the present. In Hugh's case, a shadow being seems to have more than one layer, as Richard says "O my brother" to Hugh, who is "little more than a shadow" (74), in the adventure episode. This is to say, although Hugh, too, is the incarnation of the past on account of his co-foundation of the old England with Richard, Hugh's being a shadow in Richard's narration also seems to refer to their close bond, the shadow-like brotherhood – not in the good condition but in the wounded condition. In other words, Hugh is attached to Richard as a shadow-like brother specifically in his wounded state. Through the medium of shadow and its layered uses, Kipling can render the idea of in-betweenness, of past and present, and of the

brotherly relation between Richard and Hugh, so that the shadow keeps re/visiting and (sometimes) haunting what it has been attached to.

In the structure of the past in which the shadow lives, therefore, what Richard and Hugh deliver to Dan and Una is not only about the past, how they have founded the old England, but also, more poignantly, about how the shadows have lived as crippled old figures in the later days of their old England. In this sense, the specific past that haunts Dan and Una's present entails the memory of the wound of the adventurous colonial men of a bygone England. If Richard and Hugh are the shadows of the wounded men from the old England in Kipling's understanding of the past, it is possible to extend the scope of the past to the author's further reflection on the British Empire's present. Through the crippled founders' poignant looking backward, Kipling suggests that the British Empire may be haunted by the wounded men in its colonial past.

In "Spectrographies," having a conversation about the *phantomatic effect*" of ghost and specter with Bernard Stiegler (italics in original 38), Jacques Derrida specifies the specter's spectrality:

> [S]pecter, as distinct from ghost … speaks of the spectacle. The specter is first and foremost something visible. It is of the visible, but of the invisible visible, it is the visibility of a body which is not present in flesh and blood. … And what happens with spectrality, with phantomality … is that something becomes almost visible which is visible only insofar as it is not visible in flesh and blood. It is a night visibility. (38)

For Derrida, the matter is the specter's traceability that "marks the present with its absence" (39) rather than the specter's actual in/visibility. In this feature of the specter's traceability, its being present in its absence, Derrida locates the profound impact of the specter as "someone by whom we feel ourselves watched, observed, surveyed," as if the specter is the "wholly other" that is connected to, yet insoluble in, the present (40). The "wholly other" does not exchange any actual glance or conversation with me; rather, it conjures up a "fact that there is a visor symbolizes the situation in which I can't see who is looking at me, I can't meet the gaze of the other, whereas I am in his sight. [The specter] is the right of inspection itself" (41).

I read Kipling's rendering of Richard and Hugh as shadows in the realm of the past as the specter's "night visibility" in conjunction with his critical reflection on the British Empire's past and present. By giving the poignant touch of the male shadows with their wounds, Kipling betrays his concern with the colonial men's past in order to raise the question of the validity of the men's wounds in the British Empire's imperial project. At the same time, most importantly, through the tales being told in Dan and Una's present time, Kipling makes the shadow of the colonial past of the old England intervene in the present, so that the past as the "wholly other" (40) can inspect the British Empire's imperialism in the present. This is how "Merlin's Isle of Gramarye" – the magical realm of the imaginative history – leads us to understand the story, as all of the knotty matters of the old England past. The wounded male shadow in the past, and the shadow's haunting the British Empire's present, are only evoked in Puck's magic, oak and ash and thorn.

CHAPTER IV

SPECTRAL MASCULINITY IN GEORGE ELIOT'S *SILAS MARNER: THE WEAVER OF RAVELOE*

In an attempt at complicating gender studies that have been mainly "rooted in the politics of women's liberation" in feminism through 1980s and 1990s, Michael Roper and John Tosh in *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain since 1800* (1991) examine gender as "a social system [that] constructs the opportunities and experience of both men and women" (7). Problematizing a feminist perspective on patriarchy that assumes masculinity as universal, Roper and Tosh probe the issue of masculinity and argue that the study of masculinity will make "possible a more dynamic, more differentiated explanation of gender relations than patriarchy" (11).

Previous gender-oriented criticism of George Eliot's 1861 novel *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe* has mirrored the shift in theorists' attention from feminism to the study of masculinity. Following the feminist line, U. C. Knoepflmacher in "Unveiling Men: Power and Masculinity in George Eliot's Fiction" (1981) pays attention to Eliot's "handling of male characters … [as reflecting] a masculinity [that] she wants to tame, subdue, or feminize," and argues that Eliot molds the male characters by "feminine creativity" (133) with her feminist vision. In comparison with Knoepflmacher's feminist-centered approach, Danny Sexton in "'How Was a Man to Be Explained?' Masculinity, Manhood, and Mothering in Silas Marner" (2016) shows increased attention to masculinity in understanding gender in Eliot's novel. Following Roper and Tosh's lead by viewing masculinity as a part of a broader "social system" (7) in which man also falls

under scrutiny, Sexton has attempted to complicate the issue of masculinity, which has sometimes been received as universal, by arguing for Marner's masculinity as deviant from Victorian patriarchy.

Because masculinity as a theoretical issue is relatively recent in comparison with femininity, critics have not yet given much attention to the topic of masculinity in *Silas Marner*. In this regard, Sexton's article represents a meaningful attempt at revivifying the scholarly discussion of both the story and what it has to say about masculinity. However, Sexton's analysis of the title character and protagonist has its own limitations, and therefore points to ways in which the discussion could be further developed. Specifically, Sexton's analysis of Marner is centered on the opposition between male and female – or between fatherhood and motherhood – in order to argue that Marner's masculinity mixed with motherhood reflects Eliot's resistance to the Victorian binary gender system. Although my examination of *Silas Marner* in this chapter does not refute Sexton's main position, I aim to complicate Marner's masculinity with a consideration of the complexities in Eliot's use of temporalities in order to point to a unique realm in which Marner's queer masculinity and fatherhood can be evoked.

In the novella, Eliot presents two different spaces, Lantern Yard and Raveloe, and imbues the spaces with two different senses of temporality. On the one hand, since Lantern Yard at the initial stage of the story is introduced as Marner's past, it temporally signifies the past. On the other hand, as the main stage of the story, Raveloe is received as Marner's present. Yet what Eliot complicates is that although the past is likely to be regarded as the old, Marner's past (Lantern Yard) may not represent the old in larger

social terms. Rather, as Lantern Yard is an industrial and urban environment, the space more closely resembles the dominant, industrial present of Eliot's own times. Likewise, although Raveloe is likely to be received as Marner's present, in the context of 1861 it is associated with the old, as the place is grounded in an agricultural way of life that, like Marner's profession of weaver, is rapidly diminishing. [9]

Unraveling the temporal complexities embedded in Lantern Yard and Raveloe, I first examine Marner's personal life, how Eliot traumatizes Marner in Lantern Yard in order to undermine the ascending sense of presentness brought by industrialism, and how she replaces the sense of presentness by placing him in an alternative space, Raveloe, with Eppie. I broaden the scope of the examination from Marner's personal life to Eliot's own critical reflection on her times, especially the mid-Victorian period when she was writing *Silas Marner*. Although the history of Marner in Lantern Yard is traced only briefly, Eliot never disregards the significance of the place. Rather, by leading Marner and Eppie to revisit Lantern Yard right before the end of the novel, Eliot displays different versions of past and present, and creates a provocative moment of temporal confrontation between the past and the present by making the figures witness how the past, Lantern Yard, has been swept away by the dominant industrial current (the manufacturing towns and factories). Although Marner and Eppie are living in the novel's present at the ending, they may not represent the present tense, as they feel unease with what is happening in front of their eyes and return to their old country, Raveloe.

[9] The explanatory notes indicates that by the 1830s, thirty years after Marner has come to Raveloe, all aspects of the rural conditions had been affected by industrialization (189).

In other words, through this scene of witnessing, Eliot presents the layers of the past in two ways; while what has happened to Lantern Yard during Marner's absence from it conveys one sense of the past, in another sense Marner and Eppie are also figures from the past in their role as witnesses from Raveloe, as they do not identify the industrial current as their present. By eventually leading Marner and Eppie to return to Raveloe with what they have witnessed, Eliot places them in between the sense of the past and that of the present, so that Marner and Eppie function as specters from the past who have the potential to intervene in the dominant present. In this regard, Marner and Eppie occupy the past and present simultaneously. By rendering Marner and Eppie as spectral figures from the past, Eliot utilizes them to "[counter] the teleological drive of heteroreproductive futurity" of the Victorian gender norm, as Carla Freccero puts it (1). From this perspective, Marner's masculinity should not be read as a mere rejection of the norm, as Eliot grapples with complexities in which the issues of Victorian gender and the history of the Victorian past and present are entangled with each other. Due to these complexities, Marner's masculinity should also be understood as a formless and spectral shape that works on the grid of temporalities in order to haunt the dominant present.

Mutilated Masculinity and the Past in Lantern Yard

To begin with, it is important to fully unfold the historical connotations in Eliot's brief introduction to Marner's history of "metamorphosis" (7) – how he has come to Raveloe from his original community, Lantern Yard – at the beginning of the story. In the history of this "metamorphosis," although Marner has been "condemned to solitude" (7) in Raveloe, "a village where many of the old echoes lingered, undrowned by new voices …

lying on the outskirts of civilization" (5), his previous life in Lantern Yard "had been filled with the movement, the mental activity, and the close fellowship, [that] marked the life of an artisan early incorporated in a narrow religious sect, where the poorest layman has the chance of distinguishing himself by gifts of speech, and has, at the very least, the weight of a silent voter in the government of his community" (7-8). This is to show, even though Marner is alienated in solitude in Raveloe, he has pursued a different life in his former community, in which he occupied a much more central (and thus less spectral) place than his marginal position in Raveloe provides.

In previous critics' understandings of Marner's gender identity, critics have tended to dismiss the significance of Lantern Yard by only focusing on Raveloe. For instance, Sexton assumes that Eliot is consciously critiquing the Victorian binary gender norm, which "allows for only two gender markers (the masculine and the feminine) that are viewed as distinct and separate" (201); he argues that Eliot "presents a view of gender that is radically different from the binary one that was the norm in Victorian England" and that this nondominant view is facilitated by Eliot's placing Marner in "a remote part of England at the dawn of the nineteenth century" (201). Along with the main frame, Sexton focuses on Marner's motherhood rather than the presumed fatherhood in Raveloe, and rarely considers Lantern Yard.

Likewise, when Larry T. Shillock examines Marner's gender identity as male mother and argues that his version of masculinity is Eliot's creative way of criticizing the Victorian common notions of binary gender, he provides brief comments on the novel's setting: "Eliot situates *Silas Marner* between the French Revolution and the first Reform

Act … and just prior to the difficult economic times following 1815" (34). Shillock, however, does not sharpen the complexity in Eliot's spatio-temporal settings in between Lantern Yard and Raveloe when he posits that Eliot "holds at bay the competitive forces of modernity so as to attribute to her locale a kind of fairytale timelessness" (34). That is, Shillock views Eliot's remote setting of Raveloe as a tool to create "timelessness" rather than to evoke an acute historical moment. But a frame that only emphasizes Raveloe and its remoteness shows a lack of consideration of Marner's past in Lantern Yard.

In order to think about and to develop what Sexton and Shillock have missed in understanding Marner's gender identity as something developed in more than one setting and temporality, I draw upon Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall's explorations of the implications of religious belonging and its impact on distinguishing identity in a communal realm. In *Family Fortunes* (1987) Davidoff and Hall analyze the relationship between religion and the ascending Victorian middle class, and argue that "religious belonging carried with it many benefits both spiritual and material" (75). This is to say, "Religious belonging gave distinctive identity to particular communities and classes in a society" (76), because both "religious beliefs and practice gave tenant farmers, small manufacturers and professionals who were struggling to establish themselves, a certainty about their claims and a reason for rejecting some of the values of the aristocracy and gentry" (77). Most fundamentally, religious belief could offer "individuals a sense of identity and a community" along with "personal comfort and security" in a rapidly changing and therefore unstable society (77).

Davidoff and Hall specifically point to the period between 1790 and 1820, when "a steady development in the building of new churches and chapels and the enlarging of both Anglican and Dissenting facilities" was occurring. This period coincides with the action of the novel. Applying Davidoff and Hall's examination of the historical period from 1790 to 1820, the moment of the Napoleonic Wars and their immediate aftermath, to *Silas Marner*'s temporal setting, it is possible to conjecture about what purposes are served by Marner's church membership, his artisan position, and his fiancée; since his religious belief seems closely connected to his projected marriage inasmuch as both are situated within a single Dissenting congregation, Marner may aim to establish his position in an acknowledged way within the Lantern Yard community. Because religion is closely linked to one's establishment of a communal position, Marner's situating his religious belief in Lantern Yard implies what type of gender identity he wants to construct. In other words, Marner's gender identity in Lantern Yard, which he fails to fulfill, could be eventually a path for entering the Victorian middle class in the future.

Accordingly, Eliot's setting Marner's goals within the context of the emerging Victorian middle-class culture in his past history rather than the present could be linked to her own critical reflection on the ascending norms that are supposed to be combined with masculinity. By preventing Marner's desired gender identity from being continued and reproduced, Eliot mutilates the potential of the reproductive narrative of (the soon-to-be) normative masculinity, which is supposed to merge into other relevant norms such as heterosexual marriage and having a job in the industrial market. Eliot makes Marner be traumatized, renders his experiences in Lantern Yard as past, and dislocates him in

the alienated Raveloe with never a backward look at his past. If we consider how religious piety has been grafted into the ascending Victorian middle-class ideology during the Industrial Revolution, and has become the hegemony, Eliot's setting Marner's pursuit of these values in Lantern Yard as the past is a striking reversal of mainstream history.

After Marner's traumatic past in Lantern Yard, Eliot refers to the river Lethe, as it symbolically provides a dreamy past with no memories in which Marner's mind has become "unhinged from [its] old faith and love, [and has] sought [the] Lethean influence of exile … [as] its symbols have all vanished, and the present too is dreamy because it is linked with no memories" (13-4). Eliot's connotative reference to the river Lethe and its "influence of exile" (14) enable us to conjecture that Marner's experiences in the past and his life in the present are not clear to him, as he has been deprived of the symbols – previously, religious belief and the marriage in Lantern Yard – in which he once found the meaning of life. Losing the symbolic meanings of life precludes Marner from pursuing further the narrative that connects the past to the present. Therefore, Marner's Lantern Yard past through his crossing the Lethe and his having a dreamy past with no memories is not just his past but also Eliot's deliberate temporal scheme, so that she creates a distance for Marner from the dominant present and future.

Marner's Transformations in Raveloe

After Lantern Yard, where "[Marner's] trust in man had been cruelly bruised" (12), he has moved to "another lap" (13), Raveloe. Eliot provides the comment that "[e]ven people whose lives have been made various by learning, sometimes find it hard to keep a

fast hold on their habitual views of life, or their faith in the Invisible" (13) as a backdrop to Marner's state of mind in Raveloe, where he is unable to find the "habitual views of life" and the "faith" (13). Cathy Caruth's introduction to the traumatic past and its effect is helpful for further understanding Marner's state of being unable to connect the meanings in the past to his present. Drawing on the work of French psychologist Pierre Janet (1859-1947), Caruth examines the feature of traumatic recollection in which the recollection becomes inaccessible to conscious control, and claims that trauma is "the confrontation with an event that … cannot be placed within the schemes of prior knowledge [as the matter of intelligence]" (153). Accordingly, a traumatic event cannot be a "'narrative memory' that is integrated into a completed story of the past" (153) due to its incapability of being incorporated into the realm of understanding. In Caruth's sense, what Marner has experienced psychologically – his dreamy sense of past and present as well as his being locked in oblivion – can be understood as resulting from what Caruth calls the traumatic event that fails to be integrated into a "narrative memory" (153). This insight makes clearer that what Eliot deals with through the dissociative past and present is the matter of the narrativity of Marner's Lantern Yard life and its disruption.

After thus conducting a temporal amputation through the disconnected past and present, and after the long isolated years in Raveloe, Eliot starts to touch on Marner's gender hi/story in a more visible way through his peculiar fathering of Eppie, the adopted daughter who has toddled into his cottage on New Year's Eve. In examining "representations of outlaw fathers … and their relationships with their queer sons,"

Helena Gurfinkel argues for "queer patriarchy" as a significant trope in Victorian and modernist British literature (1). Gurfinkel defines "queer patriarchy" in two ways. On the one hand, the queer patriarchy is "a nontraditional, nonthreatening, primarily – but not exclusively – nonheterosexual, often and variously marginalized and disempowered, but pervasively present and culturally important, paternal subjectivity" (1). On the other hand, it is "the bond between such queer paternal figures and their sons, biological and nonbiological" (1). Defining the queer patriarchy and finding relevant literary representations of queer fathers, Gurfinkel aims to complicate the binary gender roles between father and mother, and to show how "queer family ties function throughout to unsettle, or to revise, the normative heterosexual model" and the normative masculinity (3).

In *Silas Marner*, due to Marner's fathering of Eppie, his way of queering the Victorian patriarchy is more related to Gurfinkel's first model, in which the queer patriarchy depends on a "nontraditional," "nonheterosexual," and "marginalized" "paternal subjectivity" rather than being associated with the bond between queer fathers and sons (1). Specifically, as previous critics including Sexton and Shillock have already pointed out, Marner's fathering (or male mothering, as he nurtures Eppie in the domestic realm) marks him as the deviant, queer father who does not follow the gendered educational norm based on the separate spheres of private realm (mothering) and public realm (fathering). And, clearly, it is possible to see how Marner's fatherhood deviates from the normative, patriarchal fatherhood in his rearing of Eppie. When Eppie, aged three, "develop[s] a fine capacity for mischief, and for devising ingenious ways of being

troublesome," she cuts through "a broad strip of linen" – Marner's "means of fastening her to his loom" – with scissors and "run[s] out at the open door" (125-6). Shocked by this incident and the potential for Eppie to have encountered danger on her illicit excursion, Marner, who has hitherto been reluctant to punish her, decides to discipline his daughter by shutting her in the coal-hole as suggested by Dolly Winthrop. But the coal-hole punishment proves an entire failure, as Eppie understands it as another "pleasing novelty" (127), an opportunity for fun. After such incidents, Marner abandons the "belief in the efficacy of punishment," and Eppie is "reared without punishment"; their "stone hut was made a soft nest for [Eppie], lined with downy patience: and also in the world that lay beyond the stone hut she knew nothing of frowns and denials" (127-8).

In explaining her historical research on the discourses of Victorian motherhood and fatherhood, Barbara Fass Leavy notes the specific norms of education for Victorian mothers. According to Leavy, the Victorian mother was responsible for the "earliest religious training" (11), "early education," and "moral upbringing of her child, promoting obedience, selflessness, and self-control" (12). Such elements of mothers' responsibilities are importantly related to the "national well-being" (11). If there is any sense in which we could understand Marner's nurturing Eppie as congruent with the Victorian mother's education of the child in the domestic realm, his rearing of his daughter is discordant here. Rather, what Marner has created is a queer realm, "a soft nest" that wards off the disciplinary child education designed for the national ideology. In this regard, Marner's nurturing Eppie is closer to queering the teleological futurity of

childrearing for the national well-being, as he pays attention only to Eppie's happiness in each present moment.

Marner's non-identification with normative fatherhood becomes more developed and complicated with regard to the impact of his queer bond with Eppie, as his relationship with the daughter results in a creation of his new gender identity. Indeed, by isolating Marner and Eppie, Eliot puts aside socio-cultural matters and gradually transforms Marner. Keeping before the reader a comparison with Marner's previous preoccupation with gold, what Eliot now emphasizes through Marner's ongoing relationship with Eppie is how the little daughter carries the "endless claims" of everything (123) and how this response to the world influences Marner. In this regard, the narrator provides the following key passage:

> Unlike the gold which needed nothing, and must be worshipped in close-locked solitude – which was hidden away from the daylight, was deaf to the song of birds, and started to human tones – Eppie was a creature of endless and ever-growing desires, seeking and loving sunshine, and living sounds, and living movements; making trial of everything, with trust in new joy, and stirring the human kindness in all eyes that looked on her. The gold had kept his thoughts in an ever-repeated circle, leading to nothing beyond itself; but Eppie was an object compacted of changes and hopes that forced his thoughts onward, and carried them far away from their old eager pacing towards the same blank limit – carried them away to the new things that would come with the coming years. (123-4)

The description above captures the profound change in how Marner carries himself. Whereas his worship of the gold earlier trapped him in a world in which constant repetition means that there is no different between past and present, he now moves onward "to the new things" located in the as yet unreached future by following Eppie's constant claims of the newness of everything. This comment by the narrator shows that, while of course Marner displays nonnormative fatherhood in rearing Eppie, it is still more important that his relationship with her leads him to revise his own life. At this point, although what Marner's following the new things with Eppie may bring to his life seems vague, his nonnormative fatherhood – which only focuses on the present happiness – may imply the potential of his new future in comparison with the reproductive futurity that he has sought before in Lantern Yard.

Christopher Bollas's concept of the transformational object can further develop our understanding of Marner's symbiotic relationship to Eppie. Bollas first finds the transformational object in the intersubjective mother-child relation. By claiming that "mother and child continuously negotiate intersubjective experience that coheres around the rituals of psychosomatic need [including] feeding, diapering, soothing, playing and sleeping," Bollas argues for the "mother as the infant's 'other' self" who "transforms the baby's internal and external environment" (1). From this perspective, the infant is likely to perceive the mother not as a still object, but as "a process that [could] be identified with cumulative internal and external transformations" (1). The point is that "the mother [as the transformational object] is experienced as a process of transformation, and this feature of early existence lives on in certain forms of object-seeking in adult life, when

the object is sought for its function as a signifier of transformation" (2). Such object-seeking experience in the infant stage leads to the adult life in a different way. Rather than possessing the object, the adult pursues the object in order to "surrender to it as a medium that alters the self," which ultimately brings about "metamorphoses of the self" (2). In Bollas's theory, then, the early memory of the object-seeking constructed in the "symbiotic relating" (2) between mother and child functions as a medium that constantly brings about the transformations, or the metamorphoses, of the self later in adult life. Put briefly, the subject or the self could vary according to the different quests for different objects including "a person, place, event, ideology" (2) at each different stage of life.

Although Bollas's symbiotic relating theory may easily remind one of Eppie's early relationship with Marner, it is also applicable to Marner's adult life. If Eppie undergoes the symbiotic relating stage as the child, Marner's metamorphosis may represent how the symbiotic relating through the object-seeking memory in early years recurs in later adult life. Experiencing Eppie as the object, which is not still but constantly transforms, Marner, too, transforms himself. If Marner's object-seeking has to do with "the life of an artisan early incorporated in a narrow religious sect … in the government" in Lantern Yard (Eliot 8), his object later in Raveloe has been changed into Eppie. Accordingly, by identifying Eppie as his object and by following Eppie's newness, Marner begins to transform his previous locked self to a new self. So the ways in which Eliot delineates Marner's identity through his fathering (or mothering) are not only related to the deviancy from the gender norm based on separate spheres but also, and more profoundly, connected to how Marner enters into a new phase of transforming

himself. This further shows that, if Eliot attempts to mutilate the potential narrative of the emergence of normative masculinity by causing Marner's pursuits in Lantern Yard to end in trauma and placing the experiences in the oblivious past, through his later years with Eppie she lets Marner reawaken to rewrite his story.

By initiating Marner's process of transformation with Eppie, Eliot readies Marner for reaching full consciousness by not only reminding him of his past memory but also linking it to his present moments. In one of the daily excursions with Eppie, "[s]itting on the banks … Silas began to look for the once familiar herbs again; and as the leaves, with their unchanged outline and markings, lay on his palm, there was a sense of crowding remembrances from which he turned away timidly, taking refuge in Eppie's little world, that lay lightly on his enfeebled spirit" (124). The reason why Marner cannot help turning away from his past is due to the traumatic event when William Dane – Marner's closest friend at the time – and his fiancée, Sarah, betrayed him. However, with Eppie, while Marner "timidly" turns away from the past memory, yet "his soul, long stupefied in cold narrow prison, was unfolding too, and trembling gradually into full consciousness" (124). Rather than being confined to the traumatic past, this time Marner can use the herb to unfold his present life by linking it to the momentary past in a new way.

As a matter of fact, very early in the story, an herb has been used as a medium for Marner to remind himself of his past. When Marner has been weaving, he has seen

> the cobbler's wife [Sally Oates] seated by the fire, suffering from the terrible symptoms of heart-disease and dropsy, which he had witnessed as the precursors

> of his mother's death. He felt a rush of pity at the mingled sight and remembrance, and, recalling the relief his mother had found from a simple preparation of foxglove, he promised Sally Oates to bring her something that would ease her. … In this office of charity, Silas felt, for the first time since he had come to Raveloe, a sense of unity between his past and present life, which might have been the beginning of his rescue from the insect-life existence into which his nature had shrunk. (16)

Although this incident with the herb (foxglove) and Sally Oates reminds Marner with "a rush of pity" of his mother in the past, the episode does not lead him to go further. Due to the people's growing interest in him and Marner's increasing irritation at it, the "transient sense of brotherhood" eventually "heightened the repulsion between him and his neighbors, and made his isolation more complete" (18). When Caruth mentions the flashback to the traumatic past and its failure to be integrated into consciousness, she notes that traumatic memory "*has no place*, neither in the past … nor in the present" in one's conscious level (italics in original 153). What the earlier episode with the same herb with Sally Oates shows is how Marner disconnects his past memory from his present Raveloe life in order not to complete the linkage between the past and present. This severing is probably because, although the herb is able to evoke Marner's nostalgic memory about his mother in the past, the ways in which Raveloe community wants him "to charm away" illnesses after the incident may evoke memories that he finds repellent, namely of how the Lantern Yard community betrays him. That could be why Marner wards off the potential for companionship at the community level before completing the

linkage between the past and present in the conscious realm. Even though the herb has functioned as the medium for Marner to remind himself of the past, he unconsciously prevents that memory from finding a place in his consciousness. Significantly, Eliot uses the herb differently in Marner's later life with Eppie. Although the same stimulus reminds Marner of his past, he is no longer stuck in the past in a painful way; he now connects it to his present with his soul, which unfolds "into full consciousness" (124).

Eppie's influence on Marner's engagement with the present goes further, as Eppie links her father to the Raveloe community. In Marner's "journeys to the farm-houses" for his linen business before Eppie's arrival, he "had been treated very much as if he had been a useful gnome or brownie – a queer and unaccountable creature, who must necessarily be looked at with wondering curiosity and repulsion." With Eppie, however, he is increasingly met with "open smiling faces and cheerful questioning, as a person whose satisfactions and difficulties could be understood" (128). The children, too, are no longer "afraid of approaching Silas when Eppie [is] near him: there was no repulsion around him now, either for young or old" (129). This change from the neighbors' hostility to hospitality shows how Marner's transformational object – Eppie – enables him to involve himself in the present, making a new linkage between the past and present in the personal realm, and a connection between himself and Raveloe in the communal realm; as the narrator puts it, "the little child had come to link him once more with the whole world" (129).

Along similar lines, Eppie leads Marner to revisit his traumatic past, to perceive the possibility of new modes of understanding, and to write a new narrative of his gender

identity based on the new mode of understanding of the present, which consists of daily life with Eppie (10). Eliot further displays the influences of the “new soil” into which Marner has been transplanted (Eliot 129), showing how the soil newly connects Marner's private sphere to the public sphere, and how it redefines the relation between the two spheres. In the private sphere represented by Marner’s stone hut, neither Marner nor Eppie follows the acknowledged, gendered norms of fathering (or mothering) or child discipline. Rather, Marner and Eppie create their own nest, which abandons the conventional gendering process designed for the national well-being.

Likewise, if the public sphere has socially acknowledged expectations for both genders including the roles of father and daughter, the Raveloe community (Marner and Eppie's public sphere) does not impose conventional gender expectations upon the queer couple, as the Raveloe people sympathize – as is shown through their "open smiling faces and cheerful questioning" – with Marner's "satisfactions and difficulties" in rearing the little daughter (128). As Eliot, for the creation of a new connection between Marner and Raveloe, foregrounds Eppie as the "new soil," the ways in which Eppie's "new soil" links Marner's private sphere to Raveloe's public sphere are connected to farming a broader than usual ground in which understanding and sympathy for the queer father and the daughter can arise in the communal realm. Therefore, although Eliot depicts planting the new soil as an individual matter, by likening Marner to a man "who has a precious plant to which he would give a nurturing home in a new soil, thinks of the rain, and the sunshine, and all influences, in relation to his nursling [Eppie]" (129), the impact of the soil exceeds the individual realm and reaches to the Raveloe community.

At the end of chapter 14 in part I, Eliot uses a reference to the biblical Sodom to conclude the story of the early years of Marner and Eppie. As Eliot puts it,

> In old days there were angels who came and took men by hand and led them away from the city of destruction. We see no white-winged angels now. But yet men are led away from threatening destruction: a hand is put into theirs, which leads them forth gently towards a calm and bright land, so that they look no more backward; and the hand may be a little child's. (130)

More specifically, Eppie is the angel who saves Marner from the traumatic past, which has devastated him for a long time. Although the little angel still reminds Marner of his past, this time the past does not mean the continual chain of Marner's whole experience in Lantern Yard. Rather the past – the herb, for instance – exists only as fleeting moments, and more profoundly functions to weave the momentary past into Marner's present. So, for Marner, Eppie exists as the medium to evoke the temporal confrontation between the momentary past and the present moment, and, with the new present, Eppie drives her father to rewrite the story of going forward.

In "Theses on the Philosophy of History," Walter Benjamin uses the angel as an allegorical figure in his reflections on the past in a narrowed scope and on history in a broader scope. By using a 1920 painting by the German-Swiss artist Paul Klee (1879-1940), *Angelus Novus*, as his metaphor of the image of history, Benjamin shows his idea of how the past should be redefined and what should be captured in the present, and attempts to incorporate those ideas into his concept of history. Benjamin explains that

> Klee shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. (257)

First, in this analysis of Klee's angel, it is important to grasp what is implied in the "single catastrophe" that the angel sees while he "is turned toward the past" (257). According to Kia Lindroos, the catastrophe "represents the idea of the progress" (81) embedded in the dominant history, and the angel's looking backward means that he is oriented more toward the things that have been marginalized, vanished, and buried under the dominant progress (70). This means that, although the angel stands on the edge of the overpowering, progressive history, he interrupts its linearity by turning against the direction of progress. Therefore, Klee's angel in Benjamin's understanding generates a temporal confrontation between the progressive (yet catastrophic) present and the vanished past. As a further result, the temporal confrontation provides not only a critical reflection on the dominant present, but also "the potential redemption … of the past moments" that could have been buried through the reflection on the present (Lindroos 60).

Eliot's using Eppie as the angel for Marner's redemption resonates with Benjamin's interpretation of Klee's angel. First of all, in using the angel both Eliot and Benjamin understand the past as the image of flashing moments rather than the

chronologically ordered continuum of the past days. Second, in both visions, the angels have been placed between the two temporalities of past and present, and accordingly, they create moments of temporal confrontation. Last, as a result of these temporal confrontations between the past and the present, the angels could save the past from being buried and the present from being overpowering. In Marner's case, his present with Eppie as the new life in Raveloe cannot be identified with Benjamin's perception of the overpowering, progressive present. However, if we consider that Marner's queer present may not represent what has been conceived as present in Eliot's time, Eppie could be understood as the Benjaminian angel, which intervenes in the dominant present. Put briefly, Klee's angel in Benjamin's analysis holds out the possibility of a more complicated understanding of Eliot's use of Eppie as the angel. Although something akin to the biblical Sodom in which the angel appears is not specifically present in the novella, the allegory connotes Eliot's complex understanding of the past as well as her envisioning the temporal confrontations between the past and the present ultimately for the redemptions of both the buried past and the dominant present. Eliot's angel looks forward while Klee's (as noted by Benjamin) looks back, but both serve as mediators between the two directions, and both interrupt something powerful.

Eliot's Critical Reflection on History: The Queer Spectrality of the Past

Eliot's critical engagement with the dominant present is associated with her questioning of the subject of fatherhood, to which the economic system and its impacts on gender roles within the family are intricately related, and she shows her reflection on the discourse of fatherhood through the debate over a father's duty and right between the

biological father (Godfrey Cass) and the adopting father (Marner). At first glimpse, Eliot's raising the subject of fatherhood late in the story when Cass and Marner confront the matter – asking who has the father's "right" (164) and "duty" (165) – seems rather distant from her own times, as Marner and Cass apparently do not belong to the Victorian period. Yet Eliot may nonetheless be presenting her reflections on the discourse of fatherhood during the Victorian period. In *A Man's Place*, John Tosh views middle-class fatherhood as the representative of Victorian fatherhood, and deals with middle-class issues such as the separate-sphere ideology or the cult of domesticity as the pivotal matters in understanding Victorian fatherhood. It was not the landed gentry but the commerce-based Victorian middle class that created the separate-sphere ideology – which distinguishes the working place from the home and establishes separate gender roles associated with each space – and turned domesticity into a cult as the byproduct of the separate spheres. Tosh gives particular attention to domesticity's impact on fatherhood. In the chapter "Father and Child" Tosh argues for the father's "ambiguous position" and notes that as a result of this ambiguity, there was "a great deal of uncertainty about what was expected of fathers" (79). Differently put, owing to the separation between the workplace and the home, "the gendered character of man and woman, of father and mother, became more polarized … there was less tolerance for paternal behavior which appeared to encroach on the maternal role" (87). In this polarized climate of motherhood and fatherhood especially characteristic of the middle-class family, the father's ambiguous position and role in the actual domestic realm became an important issue, although it was not fully discussed at that time. Tosh has

shown that in Victorian middle-class life, the actual fatherhood in the domestic sphere contradicts the conventional expectations of "[a]uthority, guidance and discipline" (89). Victorian fatherhood, therefore, problematizes the contradictoriness in the conventional gender expectations resulting from the Victorian middle-class economics.

In Eliot's story, neither Marner's condition as the isolated linen-weaver at the outskirts of Raveloe nor Cass's class status as a member of the rural gentry seems to fit into the Victorian middle class grounded in commercial business. However, when Cass and Marner have their conflict over fatherhood, Eliot subtly notes the shifted economic condition: "[S]ixteen years after [Marner] had found" Eppie, a "great change has come over" Cass's Red House (132). With Nancy, Cass's wife, in change, "Now all is polish, on which no yesterday's dust is ever allowed to rest, from the yard's width of oaken boards round the carpet, to the old Squire's gun and whips and walking-sticks, ranged on the stag's antlers above the mantelpiece" (146). Along with the changes in the domestic realm, there is another change; visiting the Red House, Miss Priscilla Lammeter says to her sister that "I'm as glad as anything at your husband's making that exchange o' land with cousin Osgood, and beginning the dairying … you'll never be low when you've got a dairy" (147). In other words, Miss Lammeter notes that Cass, previously an idle member of the rural gentry, has a new business interest in dairying.

In "Women and the Dairy Industry in England, c. 1800-1939" Nicola Verdon provides an overview of the history of the English dairy industry. According to Verdon, dairying had become "big business by the eighteenth century," and

> From the mid nineteenth century the dairying industry entered into a period of growth and internal change. Agriculture as a whole went through an extended period of depression between c.1870 to 1940, but dairying was one sector that saw growth and comparative success. … There was increasing demand for liquid milk in urban areas, a demand that could be met with the development of a comprehensive railway network and refrigeration. This demand was met by existing dairy farmers as well as other farmers switching to milk production. (1-2)

Verdon's overview above shows the growth of the dairy industry in England being aided by its connection to urbanization and the transportation revolution. This insight suggests that Cass's new interest in dairying is an entry into Victorian industrialization, since the business does not depend on the local agricultural land but rather on the systematic network based on the growth of cities and the advances in technology. Cass's decision to move into the dairying business becomes more important in the context of the symbolic significance of the railway in the early Victorian era. In discussing the first Victorian generation's response to "unprecedented change" (405), Andrew Sanders refers to William Makepeace Thackeray's statement that "the coming of the railways in the 1830s" demarcates "one age from another" (405). For Thackeray the railway not only seems to "have accelerated the passage of time" but also seems to produce "a gulf between now [the new era] and then [the old world]" (405). In other words, the railway is a symbol that highlights the boundary between the past and the present, and in this line of thought, Cass's involvement in dairying symbolizes his entry into the new era.

Examining notable Victorian literary figures' different explorations of the issues of time, history, past, and present, which have been characterized by the era's "unprecedented change" (405), Sanders mentions that Walter Scott's "story set 'sixty years since'" is "useful in the sense that the gap of two generations allows for some detachment from disruptive historical experience," and he refers to Eliot as a writer who has "adopted Scott's perspective" (421). Regarding Sanders's perspective on Eliot's adoption of Scott's decision to set a story "sixty years since" (421), it is possible for us to speculate about why Eliot initially sets Marner's story several decades before her own time and why she later allows the time of the narrative to move into a more recent present. In *Shadowtime: History and Representation in Hardy, Conrad and George Eliot*, Jim Reilly explores Eliot's understanding of history. By paying attention to Dorothea Brooke's perception of the world in *Middlemarch*, Reilly asserts that the female character's "tortured version of sightseeing" (46) and her alienation from the world suggest that Eliot understands the history during her era as "unintelligible" (49). According to Reilly, Eliot foregrounds a worldview of the nineteenth century as in crisis through the fragmented perception of Dorothea, as she perceives "[t]he vision of the West's history" not as a matter of the "continuity" of generations but as "the history of struggle" between histories (50). Reilly explains that Eliot aims to "reconstruct a past world" in order to permit "a profound intellectual reassessment and brilliant permutations of presentation" of the present (3).

Putting Sanders's and Reilly's perspectives together, then, it is possible to think of Eliot's use of past temporality as an attempt at assessing her present times. Experiencing

the unprecedented changes during the Victorian period and building her literary career at the peak of that time, Eliot, might have been reassessing the time periods from then (past) to now (present) through Marner's history. The complexity in Eliot's representation of history lies in how she grapples with the temporalities. As Eliot perceives of the struggle of histories even within the immensely disruptive changes occuring between the gaps of generations, she devises the past temporality as haunting spectrally the present temporality. That is why, I will argue below, Eliot renders Marner's past history as the recurring and haunting spectral, and why it becomes grafted on to the changed, industrial present it the very late part of the story.

In previous criticisms, Eliot's complicated understanding of history along with her reflection on her own times in *Silas Marner* has been dismissed. As Terence Cave's introduction notes, due to the happy ending and the fairy-tale motifs throughout the story, *Silas Marner* has been rather overlooked in Eliot criticism, and has been regarded as Eliot's "minor masterpiece" at best. And, indeed, by leading Eppie to choose Marner – who has "never been married" (144) – over her biological father, Eliot finishes Marner's "strange history" (175) in a way that refers to but does not involve the satisfaction of heterosexual desire, inasmuch as Marner can be a patriarch without being a husband. In the early chapters in part II, Eliot depicts how Marner's life has been changed with the additions of more family members, "a friendly donkey," a "brown terrier," and "a tortoise-shell kitten" (136), since Eppie has come to him. This wonderful life could be devastated by Cass's claim for his rights as Eppie's father. However, making no further change except for creating a still "larger family" now including Eppie, Aaron (Eppie's

husband), and Dolly (Aaron's mother), Eliot writes the happy ending for Marner's history, depicting the wonderful life at "the Stone-pits" that "shone with answering gladness" (176).

Yet Marner's story is far more complicated, and even the way in which Eliot concludes the story is not simply a fairy-tale happy ending. It is in the penultimate chapter that Eliot describes Marner's revisiting Lantern Yard with Eppie thirty years after he has left his native country, and in this scene Eliot suggests how the industrial current has shifted the landscape. First of all, while looking at "the streets of a great manufacturing town," Marner becomes "bewildered by the changes thirty years had brought over his native place" (171). Eppie, too, feels unease at "the noise, the movement, and the multitude of strange indifferent faces" (171). After finding out with difficulty the exact location of what was previously Lantern Yard, Marner "started and stood still with a look of distressed amazement" while looking at "an opening in front of a large factory" that has swept away "chapel and all" in Lantern Yard (172-3). So even though Eliot seems to conclude the story happily without much alteration at the Stone-pits except for the larger garden and family, Marner and Eppie at that point are not fairy figures who are exempted from the dominant current of the industrial present, as they have already witnessed how the industrial factory and manufacturing town have annihilated what previously has existed. Such immense changes in the landscape are accordant with Marner's being affected by the advancing industrialization -- "cheaper factory-made articles [have been] reaching all parts of the country and demand for hand-weaving [has been] consequently falling" (189) – noted prior to his revisiting the old

country. Therefore, rather than presenting Marner and Eppie as unrealistic, intact figures insulated from what happens outside, Eliot presents them as people who come from, and remember, the agricultural past, and moreover as people who can evoke the past in the midst of the present.

In "Queer Spectrality: Haunting the Past," Carla Freccero raises the idea that the past exists "in the present in the form of a haunting," and frames it as "queer history" that opens "the possibility of being haunted, even inhabited, by ghosts [from the past]" (194). Doing so, Freccero further broadens the notion of queer history to its potential effects. If the history of the past formed by the dominant ideology of the present has been haunted and questioned through the spectral past, the futurity of the dominant present becomes questioned and suspended as well; furthermore, the dominant present's being questioned can "[open it] up for multiple possibilities" (195) of different futures. When examining Klee's angel and Eliot's presenting Eppie as the angel, I have argued that the two angels have been placed between the temporalities of the past and present; create a moment of temporal confrontation between the progressive yet catastrophic present and the vanished, marginalized past; and hold out the potential for redemption of both the buried past and the catastrophic present. Combining the idea of temporal confrontation with Freccero's spectral past, I now argue that Eliot presents Marner and Eppie as spectral figures from the past to queer the progressive present. If Eppie has been depicted as the angel who stands between Marner's past in Lantern Yard and his present in Raveloe, just before the tale’s ending Eliot presents both Marner and Eppie as figures who stand

between the past of Raveloe and the present in the altered landscape, represented not only by Lantern Yard but also, tellingly, by its absence.

In terms of the happy ending, even though Marner and Eppie have witnessed the dominant industrial present, perhaps Eliot leaves them in the isolated Raveloe with the fairy-tale happy ending because – as the critical observer who views history as "struggle" between histories rather than as the "continuity" of generations (Reilly 50) – she wants to use these figures who remember a different past as a means of disrupting the continuous narrative of the dominant present. So, having different past memories, Marner and Eppie as the spectral figures from the past may haunt the present, but more significantly still, may be able to intervene in the dominant narrative of the present. Considering Marner and Eppie's potential of being spectral from the past, how Eliot ends the story can be read as what Freccero calls "a messianic invocation" (199) as a critical means of queering the dominant present rather than as the happy ending.

Writing *Silas Marner* during the mid-Victorian period, Eliot was clearly aware of how the Victorian gender norms were entangled with industrialism and its outcomes; fatherhood is one of the areas in which this entangling was particularly evident. Eliot might have also felt that fatherhood had particularly significant potential to reveal certain contradictions embedded in the dominant norms of Victorian society. Fatherhood enables Eliot not only to engage with the dominant fe/male gender discourse, but also to raise a creative alternative to the gendered norm. As Tosh and Claudia Nelson have separately pointed out, there was in the nineteenth century great uncertainty about fatherhood (Tosh 79) and a marked fragmentation of voices about "the male role within

the home" (Nelson 43). Tosh articulates the conundrum: if "public and private were really separate spheres defined by gender, then parenting must fall exclusively to the woman's lot. If, on the other hand, the virtues of domesticity laid claim on both sexes, fatherhood became a telling touchstone of men's commitment to the home" (79). Due to these coexisting yet contradictory views, according to Tosh, "there was a great deal of uncertainty about what was expected of fathers" (79). Similarly, Nelson sets out the idea of fatherhood as "confusing" (41) and develops the issue of male androgyny revealed in the ambiguous fatherhood. As Nelson puts it, "[a] number of historians of masculinity have noted that mid-Victorian ideals of Christian manliness … were in many ways androgynous [due to their valuing of] feeling, piety, self-sacrifice, and other qualities also appropriate to womanliness," so that "the separate construction of the separate spheres made male androgyny potentially both troubling and essential" (57).

These two scholars' comments on the Victorian father's confusing roles also resonate with Leavy's summary of the contents of *The British Mothers' Magazine* (1845-1864), which "suggests that mother acquired increased importance at the expense of father, whose role became increasingly passive, his patriarchal authority paradoxically exercised in response to what was becoming his intensifying helplessness and dependency in family matters" (16). Especially regarding the mid-Victorian period, due to the prominence of the cult of maternity, the issue of fatherhood has not always been much questioned, and in many cases it has rather been regarded simply as engaging the gender roles that are supposed to support the social norms of the separate spheres. Yet as the work cited above suggests, investigating what values are intricately tied to each other

within the issue of fatherhood provocatively reveals the contradictoriness embedded in the gender norms that are so frequently taken for granted. *Silas Marner*, I contend, derives much of its energy from this contradictoriness, showing both how the separate spheres that are the outcome of industrialization lead to problems and how time, too, may be represented as being divided into separate spheres of a different sort, with spectral past and spectral future overlapping with one another much as masculinity and femininity do as well.

For in this chapter, the ways in which I have discussed fatherhood in relation to Marner's queer masculinity are interlinked with the question of temporalities. At the first stage of examining Marner's masculinity, I probe what Marner has pursued in the past in Lantern Yard, and draw on the work of Davidoff and Hall to propose that Marner's religious belonging may connote his seeking for an identity that would fit into "particular communities and classes in a society" (76), as religious belief offers "individuals a sense of identity and a community" (77). Based on Davidoff and Hall's findings on religious belonging, it is possible to predict that Marner's life in Lantern Yard, had Eliot permitted it to continue uninterrupted, eventually could have merged with the ascending current of the Victorian middle-class ideology. Another way of saying this is that Marner's masculinity initially seems on track to follow dominant male gender norms of Eliot's era. However, in order to mutilate Marner's potential narrative of being the normative middle-class man characterized by the "piety" of Christianity, "domesticity" through marriage, and "a proper sense of responsibility about business" (Davidoff and Hall 113), Eliot represents him as betrayed by the very community that is

participating in generating this new masculine vision. In a more complicated sense, what Eliot mutilates is not only Marner's personal narrative of being the normative man but also, more symbolically, the sense of presentness associated with the ascendant middle-class ideology, as Lantern Yard, grounded in the urban, industrial environment, seems closer to Victorian England's sense of its present than the "sixty years since" world of Raveloe. By freezing the urban, industrial time through the traumatized Marner, Eliot disrupts the narrative of the dominant present.

The second stage of my argument focuses on how, after Eliot mutilates Marner's potential to become the Victorian middle-class man, she displaces Marner into Raveloe, the isolated "village where many of the old echoes lingered, undrowned by new voices" (Eliot 5). Doing so, Eliot further complicates the spatio-temporal issues. Although Marner's life in Raveloe seems closer to the present because it takes place later than his exile, Eliot replaces the sense of present that emerges in the urban, industrial Lantern Yard by writing Marner's present story in the retrograde space of Raveloe, where the life of the community is based on the waning economy of agriculture. After leading a spider-like life as a linen-weaver for fifteen years, Marner meets Eppie, who changes his life. Most remarkably, being Eppie's father and nurturing his daughter like a mother, Marner is no longer traumatized by his past memory. Rather, Marner, inspired by Eppie who reminds him of his past, sorts out some flashing moments in the past, and weaves them into his present life in a new way. To some degree, if we presume that historical novels typically reflect on the author's present times, what Marner represents in rearing Eppie could be the type of male androgyny in the domestic realm that appeared in the mid-

Victorian period (Nelson 57). Yet if Eliot reflects on her present times, she nonetheless writes Marner's story in the past tense; more importantly, the idea of androgynous fatherhood that she supports contradicts mid-Victorian society's investment in the separateness of male and female gender norms and thereby destabilizes the (seemingly) ideal norm. Put briefly, if Eliot intentionally traumatizes Marner's seeking for the distinctive position and identity that would fit into the communal norm of Lantern Yard through marriage and religious belonging, she gives him a new history in Raveloe by making him be Eppie's father and develop a new identity as the queer father who nurtures the daughter like a mother in the domestic sphere. More importantly, although Eliot seems to write Marner's story as the past tense by setting Marner's new life with Eppie in Raveloe sometime in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, writing the story in the past tense is Eliot's shrewd strategy not only to criticize the firm binarism between fe/male gender roles but also to suggest an alternative to the future of masculinity through the androgynous Marner.

At last, even though the conclusion seems to be a happy ending, Eliot shows her keen awareness of how the society has been entirely shifted by the dominant, industrial present, by making Marner and Eppie witness how the manufacturing town and factories have replaced Lantern Yard. Due to this experience, Marner and Eppie are identified as figures who have lived in the past and can remember the past; thus they have the potential to intervene in, haunt, and queer the dominant present with their memory of the past. Because of the complicated aspects in Eliot's placements of the temporalities, Marner's gender identity, too, has to be understood along with the temporal

complexities. Therefore, due to the entanglement of industrialism, heterosexual marriage, family types, the separate-spheres ideology, and binary gender roles, the multiple temporalities revealed in *Silas Marner* can be viewed as a means of disrupting the ideological perceptions that dominate the mid-Victorian time. Eliot, furthermore, places Marner in each different temporality with a different gender identity. Eliot does not just end the story by comparing Marner's different masculinities in different temporalities; rather, what she eventually creates is the idea of the spectral past, through her depiction of Marner and Eppie near the novella's end. Through Marner and Eppie's haunting spectrality, their queering of temporality, Eliot suggests that although gender identity accommodates to the social norms that dominate a given time, it also has the potential to be identified with the critical politics between being marginalized and being dominant through the evocation of other things that could be marginalized as the spectral past in the present. Therefore, rather than representing a one-dimensional identity for the social accommodation, in rendering the collage of temporalities Eliot evokes Marner's masculinity as the formless specter, thereby enabling a critical reflection on the broader history of gender during her times.

CHAPTER V

MASCULINITY IN TEMPORAL HYBRID BETWEEN PAST AND PRESENT IN GEORGE ELIOT'S *THE MILL ON THE FLOSS*

Whereas George Eliot's *Silas Marner* has received relatively little attention from previous critics, numerous previous critics have visited her novel *The Mill on the Floss* (1861), which was published a year earlier than *Marner.* In terms of gender issues, as Susan Fraiman summarizes, the enthusiastic feminism of the late twentieth century helped to generate the diverse yet Maggie-centered discussions that dominate *The Mill* criticism. However, such feminist approaches – which have viewed Maggie's renunciation in the novel as "a sober reflection on women's opportunities in the nineteenth century," as Oliver Lovesey puts it (26) – have increasingly shifted in the twenty-first century, giving new attention to the male characters with the emergence of studies of Victorian masculinities. For instance, works such as Kathleen Blake's "Between Economies in *The Mill on the Floss*: Loans versus Gifts, or, Auditing Mr. Tulliver's Accounts" (2005), Kevin A. Morrison's "'Whose Injury Is Like Mine?' Emily Brontë, George Eliot, and the Sincere Postures of Suffering Men" (2010), and Shelley Trower's "Tomboys and Girly Boys in George Eliot's Early Fiction" in *The Victorian Novel and Masculinity* (2015) are indicative of the increased interest in the novel's discussion of masculinity. As Judith Kegan Gardiner points out that "masculinity, too, is a gender and therefore that men as well as women have undergone historical and cultural processes of gender formation that distribute power and privilege unevenly" (11), studies of Victorian masculinities have contributed to enriching and complicating the

discussions of gender in *The Mill* by problematizing earlier tendencies to read nineteenth-century masculinity only as monolithic, hegemonic, and patriarchal.

In spite of such complications, however, the discussions of the male characters in *The Mill* above have also shown limitations in their dependence on a particular perspective, namely masculinity as the social, cultural representation of "what it is to be a 'man'" (Harvey 297), in understanding Eliot's male characters as well as their gender identities. The current academic shift from femininity to masculinity may not adequately respond to Eliot's own thoughts about masculinity in her works. On the one hand, as Eliot clearly grapples with the issue of gender through Maggie and Tom Tulliver's different positions in the world of the novel, viewing masculinity as a social and cultural representation is meaningful, due to its critical function to reveal the marginal masculinities. On the other hand, any approach to the male characters that relies on a single temporality grounded in the historical context does not fully take into account Eliot's complicated design of temporality, in which the siblings' gender identities are not only played out within but also slip out of one of the temporalities of Victorian clock-time. If Eliot presents Maggie and Tom as socio-cultural representations in her shrewd reflection on the gendered differences between women and men during her times, as previous critics have pointed out, she also revises the notion of time in order to render and place the siblings' gender on different temporal grounds.

In this chapter, I consider Eliot’s unique temporal design, in which the characters' gender identities are played out in her own version of time. The first part of this chapter examines Eliot's complex use of time, which intermingles the different planes of past,

present, and memory. Based on Eliot's complex temporal frame, I show how she uses Maggie to problematize and destabilize Tom's teleological journey toward establishing a industrial manhood within capitalism that designates fe/male gender roles. Paying particular attention to a profound function of Tom's childhood memory, I argue that his old memory works as what Eliot calls "present Past" (Lovesey 544), functioning as a means of undermining his teleological construction of adult manhood. I conclude that Eliot devises a temporal hybridity – in which she grafts Tom's childhood memory onto his adult manhood in the present reality – in order to suggest a new type of masculinity that is not completely integrated into the social demands. In this regard, although Tom dies almost immediately after his final cry of "Magsie," the revelation communicated by his use of the childhood language of love inaugurates a new type of masculinity.

Eliot's Complex Use of Time, History, and Past

Critics have long explored Victorians' obsession with time and history. Jerome Hamilton Buckley in *The Triumph of Time* (1966) encapsulates various Victorian authors' perspectives on time and history. He considers Victorians' extension of "the limits of time and space" as a common characteristic, instancing John Ruskin (who saw history as a "meaningful continuity of human experience"), Robert Browning, Alfred Tennyson, and Thomas Arnold (who represents to Buckley "the widened view of the past"), among others (16-17). Within the context of Victorians' increased interest in time and history, Buckley points out how some Victorian historians created a narrative of "the progress of history" that "presuppose[s] some immanent will dictating the progressive direction" (32). Two decades later, John Clive in "The Use of the Past in Victorian England"

responds to the ideas of Victorians' time and history by giving the subject a slightly different direction. Whereas Buckley attempts to find a common feature in Victorian authors' and historians' ideas of history and time, Clive puts more emphasis on these writers' differences. Like Buckley, Clive examines William Morris, Arnold, and Browning, but he also adds authors such as Elizabeth Gaskell, George Gissing, and Eliot. In Clive's mapping, Eliot's use of the past exposes a dilemma or "ambivalent attitudes" (58) caused by the juxtaposition of the rapid improvement of technology and the pre-industrial nostalgic past. According to Clive, the beginning of Eliot's *Scenes of Clerical Life* "welcome[s] the 'age of improvement,'" yet it also "look[s] back with a mixture of longing and regret to less efficient but more colorful days" (58). Briefly put, in spite of their differences, what I find most important about the work of Buckley and Clive is that they suggest a map of Victorian authors' (including Eliot) different perspectives on history and time.

If Buckley and Clive provide a broad map of multiple Victorians' way of thinking about time and history, Jonathan Smith in "The 'Wonderful Geological Story': Uniformitarianism and *The Mill on the Floss*" probes only Eliot's past. Looking in detail at how Eliot has been influenced by Charles Lyell's geology and Charles Darwin's evolutionary biology, Smith argues that Eliot "negotiates *between* Lyell and Darwin … to accept evolutionary theory, but [is] suspicious of those who equate evolution with inevitable progress" (italics in original 431). Smith describes the profundity of Lyell's *Principles of Geology* (1830) in its invention of a vast scope of historical narrative: "Lyell contrasts his version of the earth's past to the vision of his catastrophist opponents

by likening his opponents' view to the historical narrative produced when 'annals of the civil and military transactions of a great nation are perused under the impression that they occurred in a period of one hundred instead of two thousand years'" (439). In examining the Lyellian frame for geology, Smith reveals an important intersection between *The Mill* and *Principles of Geology* in that Lyell's historical perspective of "steady-state earth" – in which "'the influence of minute agencies continued through long periods of time'" (434) is not rendered as "evidence of progress" (437) – corresponds to Eliot's questioning "Victorian beliefs about economic progress" (442).

Smith's Lyellian reading further develops and complicates Eliot's understandings of the past in *The Mill*, as Lyell invites consideration of a vast temporal scope. Using Lyell's temporal frame, Eliot can readily trace Maggie's arm (for instance) back "two thousand years" rather than a mere hundred (Smith 439; *Mill* book 6 ch. 10), placing her present not only in recent times but also in a far broader temporality. With this extended temporal scope, Eliot can zoom in her present at a certain point, but she can also zoom out her contemporary time and place it in a larger picture at a different point. In the characterizations of the novel, on the one hand it is true that Eliot renders Maggie and Tom as the socio-cultural representations of gender in her contemporary times. On the other hand, and more importantly, she also changes and zooms out the siblings' present temporality by leading them to revisit their childhood memories and to slip out of the given present reality.

Eliot shows her knotted sense of the past in her introduction to St. Ogg's, which U. C. Knoepflmacher aptly describes as the "aggregate of historical strata" (27). According to the brief history of St. Ogg's in the first book, it is

> one of those old, old towns which impress one as a continuation and outgrowth of nature, as much as the nests of the bower-birds or the winding galleries of the white ants: a town which carries the traces of its long growth and history like a millennial tree, and has sprung up and developed in the same spot between the river and the low hill from the time when the Roman legions turned their backs on it from the camp on the hill-side, and the long-haired sea-kings came up the river and looked with fierce eager eyes at the fatness of the land. (115-6)

By likening St. Ogg's to "a millennial tree," Eliot refers back to its history from Roman times, and adds more layers of the old shadows of "the Saxon hero-king," "the dreadful heathen Dane," and "the Normans" (116). If the old histories in which each different epoch is layered atop the last present the history of St. Ogg's consist of the first main stratum, the narrator gradually narrows down this scope by looking into the history of the town in less far-off times, namely "[the] troubles of the civil wars … where first Puritans thanked God for the blood of the Loyalists, and then Loyalists thanked God for the blood of the Puritans" (117). If this relatively less far-off history is the second main stratum of St. Ogg's past, the narrator's further move to Mrs. Glegg adds the last stratum of the past. Surrounded by "the mellow look" of "the brick houses" (117), the narrator muses that "in Mrs. Glegg's day there was no incongruous new-fashioned smartness, no plate-glass in shop windows, no fresh stucco-facing or other fallacious attempt to make

fine old red St Ogg's wear the air of a town that sprang up yesterday," and remarks that her day "seems far back in the past now" due to the "changes that widen the years" (118). Mrs. Glegg more vividly senses the changes through the "two points of view" afforded by the "front and [the] back parlour in her excellent house at St. Ogg's":

> From her front windows she could look down the Tofton Road, leading out of St Ogg's, and note the growing tendency to “gadding about” in the wives of men not retired from business, together with a practice of wearing woven cotton stockings, which opened a dreary prospect for the coming generation; and from her back windows she could look down the pleasant garden and orchard which stretched to the river, and observe the folly of Mr. Glegg in spending his time among “them flowers and vegetables.” (119-20)

What Mrs. Glegg's two views from the front and the back parlor suggest is the emergence of the separation between a man in the "business" realm (as "the coming generation") and another type of man represented by Mr. Glegg, a retiree who spends his time in the domestic "garden." This shows that Mrs. Glegg's recollection of her early days – which contrast with the situation in her present, the 1820s – is the last stratum of St. Ogg's past. Putting the strata together, Eliot suggests St. Ogg's as the embodiment of the vast scope of time, which consists of the remotest past, the less far-off past, and the most recent past, each of which has its own comparison with the present. This layered history, in which Eliot represents that the relics of each different past temporality still exist, show how Eliot carefully approaches the past in order not to appropriate it for the progressive present. This is why so many critics comment on the significance of the past

in *The Mill.* Summarizing the novel's diverse achievements – its engagements with "contemporary historical, scientific, religious, and philosophical thought" as well as its "critique of the relations between men and women" – Dinah Birch, for one, concludes that what combines the multiple stories into "a single narrative is Eliot's steady insistence that our human identity, with all its weakness and its heroism, is deeply rooted in the past"; "[t]he voice of the past" as a means of weaving "an unforgettable whole" (xxix).

Besides the historical strata of St. Ogg's in which the multiple histories in different temporal epochs are layered onto each other, Eliot adds one more, different type of layer to her concept of past through memory. Prior to starting the story of the Tulliver family, the narrator comments:

> I have been pressing my elbows on the arms of my chair, and dreaming that I was standing on the bridge in front of Dorlcote Mill, as it looked one February afternoon many years ago. … I was going to tell you what Mr and Mrs Tulliver were talking about, as they sat by the bright fire in the left-hand parlour, on that very afternoon I have been dreaming of. (8-9)

The narrator's remembrance or dream from the very first moment implies that the novel's treatment of the history of the Tulliver family is related to dimensionalities in which the planes of history and memory are intermingled. Since memory is not identical with history as fact, they stand on different planes, and therefore, engender different dimensionalities. Hence, in reading the hi/story of the Tulliver family, the dominant single, linear timeline needs to be reconsidered, as Eliot evokes the idea of

dimensionality and applies it to the siblings' lives. Tom and Maggie represent the Victorian historical time when they persorm the gender roles required for male and female. However, the two figures diverge from the temporality of the present reality by revisiting the different temporal plane of the past memory of childhood. Inventing the ways in which Tom and Maggie can revisit the past memory of childhood in the midst of present adulthood, Eliot also profoundly revises the gendered identities that have been constructed by that point.

Tom as a Historical Representation of Man

When feminist approaches have actively engaged with the gender discussions in *The Mill*, the critics' focus has been Maggie, and Tom has been examined in line with the patriarchal force that brings about Maggie's self-renunciation. Fraiman, for instance, draws upon the bildungsroman narrative, applies it to Maggie, and argues that Maggie's bildung criticizes the old version of bildungsroman that assumes the male protagonist's autonomy as well as man's "progressive movement through the world" (138). Using this Maggie-centered frame, Fraiman interprets Maggie as an eccentric gothic figure who decenters Tom's narrative, in which he is situated as an indicator of the novel's "nominal status as Bildungsroman" (141). As I have suggested in my introduction to this chapter, the subsequent emergence of studies of Victorian masculinities treating "man" as a social, cultural representation has led critics to examine male characters using the methodology of historical contextualization. In the case of *The Mill*, the historical frame that critics have often drawn upon is the transition of economies from pre-capitalism to capitalism in the 1820s. When Blake examines Mr. Tulliver, she reveals how the

economic transition has brought about this male figure who has become "ensnared" in the shifting economic system (223), and therefore has become marginalized on account of his pre-capitalistic perception. Similarly, although Joshua D. Esty pays attention to Maggie's bildung, he questions Tom's bildungsroman narrative against this same historical background of economic transition, and argues for the ruptured growth of the siblings as a detail in the progressive narrative of the capitalistic economy.

The commentaries on the male characters in the Maggie-centered discussions have been extended by Morrison's closer attention to Tom's role as a suffering man. Morrison, too, does not dismiss "the transformation from yeomanry to bourgeois capitalism" (278), but he additionally draws upon Wendy Brown's understanding of liberalism, "which develops coevally with capitalism" along with a "set of concepts (including autonomy, liberty, the individual, and the public sphere)" (272). Borrowing Brown's account of a "gendered ontology of liberalism" that "is fundamentally incoherent because the autonomous male, who has shed reliance and encumbrance, depends on the nonautonomous subjects of the household to sustain him" (272), Morrison complicates Tom's masculinity by contending that although he seeks to become the ideal "self-interested male" typical of liberalism, he fundamentally (and contradictorily) needs "the selflessness of [Maggie] to sustain him" (280). In other words, for Tom, the ideological requirement of liberalism – "a state of sovereignty" – results in "an ontological crisis" (280), as his autonomous identity contradictorily depends on a selfless supporter. Whereas most previous critics offer rather inchoate commentaries on Tom's gender identity, Morrison has complicated our understanding of

Tom. That is, by probing into the historical liberalism, Morrison has added to current discussions of masculinity a new layer of masculine gender identity, man's ontological crisis, that has challenged the idea of patriarchy as monolithic masculinity.

Even though critics' use of the historical contextualization itself is not problematic, the methodology needs to be more carefully employed in approaching Eliot's Tom. This is to say, as Morrison's interpretation shows, his historical contextualization of capitalism and liberalism, which seems to rely on the single, historical timeline in the Victorian period, may not be enough to fully reflect on the complex aspects of the novel's approach to both history and Tom. When it comes to Tom's masculinity, although his later years reveal the teleological construction of the industrial manhood modeled on his uncle Mr. Deane, the self-made man in the business realm, Eliot places in Tom's childhood a potential for conflict between different gender roles. In the first and second books, before "the golden gates are passed" (185), readers meet a Tom who struggles to decide to choose the direction that he needs to follow. In chapter 5 of the first book, Tom notifies Maggie of his (immature) superiority: "I always have half-sovereigns and sovereigns for my Christmas boxes, because I *shall be a man*, and you only have five-shilling pieces, because *you're only a girl*" (italics added 35). This sentence shows a contradiction between Tom's expectation of being a man in the future and his sense of Maggie's static status as a girl in the present. While Tom imagines himself as an advancing figure who can dream of the future in the present, he puts Maggie at a standstill in a futureless position, which inevitably deprives her of the capacity of looking forward. Although Tom is still only a boy, he betrays the

genderedness of his expectations for the future as something only allowed for men – and, therefore, he seems to be aware of an important aspect of male privilege.

However, Tom's gendered (yet boyish) desire for his advancement as a superior man in the future becomes unstable in the very next moment. After the episode of the dead rabbits, and after Tom decides to punish Maggie for having forgotten to feed the rabbits, the narrator describes Tom as "behav[ing] with a weakness quite inconsistent with his resolution to punish her as much as she deserved: he actually began to kiss her in return, and say – 'Don't cry, then, Magsie'" (39). The narrator adds that, unlike "members of a highly civilized society," Tom and Maggie are "still very much like young animals" (39). Even if Tom reveals his gendered desire – his advancing position, as, prospectively, a mature man and Maggie's static position as a girl – at one point, the narrator intervenes in the desire at another point, so that the desire cannot be firmly fixed. Right before ending the chapter, the narrator more strongly invalidates Tom's desire by tying him and Maggie together within childhood's language of love. Summing up the siblings' early phase, the narrator emphasizes how the love in their childhood functions as "the mother tongue":

> Life did change for Tom and Maggie; and yet they were not wrong in believing that the thoughts and loves of these first years would always make part of their lives … [within] childhood … such things as these are the mother tongue of our imagination, the language that is laden with all the subtle inextricable associations the fleeting hours of our childhood left behind them … [that transform our wearied] perception into love. (41-4)

In the descriptions above, the narrator presents two dimensions of lives and temporalities between childhood and adulthood and indicates that the separated worlds can be reunited in the language of love. Even if one part of life will change Tom and Maggie's lives, they can be together in another part of life governed by memory. This also makes us conjecture that, even though the Victorian era's different set of gender expectations is supposed to shape the siblings in their later phase of growth, it is a dimensional aspect that may be contradicted by another dimension of their earlier years made up of the different language. It is important, therefore, to bear the moments of Tom's inward contestation in mind to comprehend his trajectory of gender identity through boyhood and adulthood. On the one hand, the competing moments in Tom's childhood evince his gendered desire for male superiority. On the other hand, the moments of struggle also partake of the animalistic impulse – one not yet fully cultivated by the social norms – as well as its further function to invalidate the severity of the "members of a highly civilized society" who define adult manhood.

From the third book onward, Tom's childish weakness meets a turning point after his father's physical, mental, and financial fall. From the point of his father's downfall, Tom becomes engrossed in establishing the industrial manhood that has been gradually dominating St. Ogg's business sphere. If Tom's naturally stiff and resolute mind is nevertheless malleable due to the animalistic impulse during his childhood, he becomes more and more resolute, determined, and dominant as time passes. At the end of chapter 5 in the third book, we see Tom's cruelty to Maggie. After he fails to get "a situation" from Mr. Deane (233), Tom rebukes Maggie: "[Don't] put yourself forward. You think

you know better than any one, but you're almost always wrong. I can judge better than you can" (234). Then the narrator adds: "Poor Tom! he had just come from being lectured and made to feel his inferiority: the reaction of his strong, self-asserting nature must take place somehow; and here was a case in which he could justly show himself dominant" (235). What Tom may feel from uncle Deane – who states that "[t]he world isn't made of pen, ink, and paper, and if you're to get on in the world … you must know what the world's made of" (231) – is his incapacity for work, a discovery that is fundamentally different from his satisfaction with himself during childhood. Mr. Deane, who only considers the monetary value assigned by the marketplace logic, regards Tom's education in Latin as useless, and therefore views Tom as incapable of work in the business realm.

In "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800-1914," John Tosh points out the unprecedented importance of work, especially for the middle class, in nineteenth-century Britain. The historian explains that "[i]n the middle class … masculinity was more firmly locked than ever into a notion of paid, productive work … [work] became the path to self-making, a creative act conferring meaning on the work and identity on the worker" (332). Work, in other words, is closely intermingled with the middle-class man's gender identity. Mr. Deane's statement reflects on the relation between the worldview produced by the unprecedented level of industrialism (with capitalism) and nineteenth-century men's commitment to the shifted world logic centered on work. At the same time, Mr. Deane's advice also demarcates a crucial moment showing how the marketplace worldview, which demands one's practical usefulness in

the business realm, ruthlessly penetrates an individual's worldview, in this case Tom's. In this sense, Tom's scolding Maggie seems like an unreasonable outlet in which his inferior position in the marketplace is displaced onto claims of male superiority in the domestic realm. What Mr. Deane fundamentally does to affect Tom is that he replaces Tom's childish, immature superiority as a boy with the different desire to achieve industrial manhood in the business sphere. From this point, Tom's inchoate boyhood has encountered a turning point and followed a path to construct that industrial manhood, and accordingly, his previously embryonic gendered desire has become a stronger gender dualism that separates not only the roles taken by him and his sister but also the domestic sphere (for Maggie) and the public sphere (for himself).

Tom's Masculinity in Temporal Hybrid between Past and Present

In the full narrative of the story, while the narrator traces Tom's experience and journey in and beyond the domestic realm up to the third book, the story moves its main attention from him to Maggie from the fourth book onward; the narrator then returns to Tom at the ending with Maggie's attempt to rescue him in the flood. Thus, in this section, I develop the analysis of Tom via Maggie with a profound emphasis on the function of childhood memory. Due to Tom's harsh treatment of Maggie in the process of their growth, a number of scholars have pointed out the gendered disparity between them. Whereas the early feminist approaches to the novel focus on Maggie's renunciation – asking whether it is "a spiritual victory" or not (Fraiman 137) – based on the Victorian gendered context, the later analyses of the subdivision of Victorian masculinities have shared the idea that Maggie occupies a position of female dependency that

fundamentally supports male autonomy (Morrison). In spite of the distinct attentions to female and male character, respectively, both feminist and masculinity analyses have drawn upon the Victorian historical contexts, the systematic disempowerment of Victorian women (Fraiman), and how liberalism naturalizes "the gendered dualisms that authorize male autonomy and female dependency" (Morrison 290).

Analyses that have responded to the historical problems of the Victorian gender dualism along a single timeline, however, may need to be developed, as Maggie's consciousness from the fourth book onward is not a matter of a single dimension of the gendered reality in her present times. Rather, Maggie shows dimensionalities made up of two different types of temporalities in which she oscillates between her childhood and adulthood. This is to say, although Maggie's self-abnegation may certainly be attributed in part to the gendered reality that reflects Victorian gender expectations for females, such gendered asceticism cannot explain everything about Maggie's life due to her inward placement of her present experience in the context of the past memory of childhood. Maggie's life consists of two distinct temporal planes, the socio-culturally gendered present and the memory of the past. In chapter 1 of the fifth book, Philip criticizes her ascetic life at home and fretfully says, "[Y]ou would never love me so well as you love your brother." Maggie answers, "Perhaps not … the first thing I ever remember in my life is standing with Tom by the side of the Floss, while he held my hand: everything before that is dark to me" (307). For Maggie, who "wanted some key that would enable her to understand, and, in understanding, endure, the heavy weight

that had fallen on her young heart [in her present reality]" (286), the determination of the self-abnegating life is part of her answer.

Yet Maggie's answer for the present hardship constantly gravitates to her past times, the memory of her life with Tom. Thomas Pinney has noticed Maggie's affections for her past memory of childhood – "[t]he past that Maggie has known is by no means perfect, yet it derives, through its hold on the affections, an authority superior to every new claim in her life" (137) – and argues for Eliot's having been influenced by William Wordsworth in her reverence for "the life of the past as a guide for the present" (134). Donald D. Stone, too, identifies *The Mill* as "her most Wordsworthian novel, in which the heroine is paralyzed by a myth of the past and a myth of her own childhood" (194). However, what Eliot evokes through Maggie's affections for her childhood memory may not be the nostalgic return to the past. Rather, late in the novel Eliot makes use of Maggie's past memory of childhood as a means of connecting it to the matters of the present.

In "The Memory of Another Past: Bergson, Deleuze and a New Theory of Time," Alia Al-saji examines "[the] ontological account of memory" (207). Based on Bergsonian and Deleuzian theories of time, Al-saji argues that "'the only subjectivity is time, non-chronological time grasped in its foundation, and it is we who are internal to time" (228). For this argument, Al-saji points out a problem called "attentive recognition" that "reduces memory to recollection … forgetting other planes" and that "excludes those memories that are not relevant to present interests and actions … oriented to the present" (224). With regard to Maggie's life in book five, on the one hand,

her self-abnegating life is a plane of the present that demands forgetting the language of love during childhood. On the other hand, as Philip recognizes, Maggie's consciousness in the present life continuously gravitates toward her childhood. So Maggie belongs to at least two temporal planes in different dimensions, those of the passing present (in reality) and the coexisting past (of childhood). The characteristic temporal plane and dimension suggest that Maggie's gendered present, which requires a severe gender dualism between her and Tom, is transformed into one of the temporal planes that Maggie involves in the present reality. Maggie's present, in other words, is dimensional rather than homogeneously single.

Right before the end of chapter 4 of the fifth book, Maggie has another meeting with Philip, which makes her oscillate between the past and the present again. As Philip reminds Maggie of her past, the narration explains what this oscillation means for her: "The recollection of that childish time came as a sweet relief to Maggie. It made the present moment less strange to her" (335). This remark suggests that, for Maggie, childhood is not a fragmented image emanating from a past that is entirely cut off from the present. Rather, Maggie employs her past in order to understand her daily present, and to create a realm for psychic rest. Departing from Philip, Maggie leaves the childhood memory and comes back to an "actual daily life" that requires her gendered, feminine role: "The tissue of vague dreams must now get narrower and narrower, and all the threads of thought and emotion be gradually absorbed in the woof of her actual daily life" (337). Yet such a returning to the gendered reality is not Maggie's sole life; it is rather one of the dimensions in her life, as she has already shown her access to another

dimension formed by the memory of her childhood. What Maggie demonstrates through her constant returning to the memory of childhood in her present reality is that through the medium of memory, she is not (or cannot be) completely integrated into the gendered present.

While Maggie is oscillating between the temporal dimensions of the past in childhood and of the present in reality, Tom in later parts of the book has locked himself in the working realm and has focusing on achieving adult industrial manhood. There are two sides to the ways in which Eliot problematizes Tom's teleological journey. On the one hand, in the realm of Tom's present reality, Eliot intentionally traps Tom between two conflicting systems, that of the traditional yeomanry and that of the emerging capitalism, so as to betray his contradictory identifications and to render the impossibility of completing what Tom pursues. On the other hand, via Maggie, Eliot directs Tom to revisit his childhood. Rather than the simple recollection, Eliot deliberately grafts the childhood memory onto Tom's adulthood present.

Tom's speech in chapter 7 of the fifth book to the effect that Mr. Tulliver's debts will be paid to the creditors is one of the examples that show how Tom is caught up in the two conflicting economies. In the speech, Tom subtly notices on what bases he has built his masculine identity:

> [Tom] was glad that he had been able to help his father in proving his integrity and regaining his honest name; and, for his own part, he hoped he should never undo that work and disgrace that name. But the applause that followed was so great, and Tom looked so gentlemanly as well as tall and straight, that Mr.

> Tulliver remarked … that he had spent a deal of money on his son's education. (354)

The depiction implies two crucial points: first, Tom's identity as a man relies on proving his father's "integrity," and in this case, his identity is bound up with the traditional yeomanry with which his father has been engaged. Second, however, as Tom "looked so gentlemanly," he now seems to situate himself in the realm of the gentleman, which is associated with a different type of value. Victoria Clarke finds the Victorian definition of gentleman in Samuel Smiles's *Self Help*, in which the gentleman is described as "a wholly rounded, masculine figure who benefits from 'training all parts of [his] nature; the physical and moral, as well as the intellectual' to build a suitable masculine character" (1). Examining the Smilesian gentleman, Clarke points out his transgression of class boundaries, and mentions that such transgressive potential offers an individual "the drive to access resources for his training" (1). If the ideal of self-help has been particularly significant for the burgeoning middle-class attempt to usurp the traditional aristocratic hegemony, in Tom's case, his sense of himself as "gentlemanly" has to do with his own transgressive movement from the son of the bankrupt miller (in the realm of the traditional yeomanry) to the self-made man (in the realm of the modern capitalism). In a sense, as the narrator puts it, Tom earnestly follows the cultural expectations for a man, as his severity – "strength of will, conscious rectitude of purpose, narrowness of imagination and intellect, great power of self-control, and a disposition to exert control over others" (456) – reflects how the culturally encouraged values have permeated him. However, in another sense, Tom embodies a fundamental cacophony

between the two conflicting economies. Suggesting Tom's straddling yet contradictory identifications with the two competing values, Eliot betrays the instability, and impossibility, of Tom's goal of achieving the industrial manhood in Dorlcote Mill.

When Esty examines Tom's development as his process of bildung, he argues that Tom "is arrested by uneven modernisation" due to his failure to pass "the conjugal and vocational rites" (111). Esty interprets Tom's trajectory as odd due to the fact that, although Tom "begins moving towards a modernised education, then succeeds in a capitalist-style trading venture, [he] finally doubles back in a relentless drive to reinstate the economic life of the yeoman and reinhabit Dorlcote Mill" (111). Esty's interpretation suggests that even though Tom now looks like a "tall straight" gentleman, his returning to Dorlcote Mill – rather than inhabiting the more modernized realm in St. Ogg's in which Mr. Deane has been involved – indicates that his gender identity eventually fails to transform to the modern, capitalistic identity that he might have desired. To be sure, Tom has entered "a different world" by being "Mr. Deane's disciple," and, accordingly, his "vision has been adjusted" (Knoepflmacher 26). Yet in several ways his gender identity is not completely readjusted from the traditional world to the modern world. As Esty argues, Tom's process of bildung is disrupted, since he eventually returns to Dorlcote Mill, the representation of the traditional pre-industrial world. By straddling the two conflicting realms, that of his father and that of the self-made gentleman, Tom has shown his failed recognition of the different masculinities in each different economy. Unlike his sister who goes back and forth between the two distinct temporal planes of the past of childhood and the gendered present, thereby engendering the different

dimensions, Tom plays out his journey in the single temporal plane of the gendered present. In this stage, Eliot has not yet revised Tom's single timeline, yet even in the single temporality, Tom's gender identification encounters contestation because he is hearkening to the demands of the past as well as those of the present.

Eliot pushes and complicates further her problematization of Tom's teleological goal to achieve the industrial manhood at the ending of the story. While Eliot betrays the problematic contradictions within Tom's identification in his speech before the creditors, at the end of the novel she vividly deconstructs his single timeline by leading Maggie to wake up his buried memories of childhood. If Maggie redeems herself from disempowerment through "spiritual victory" (Fraiman 137), she also saves Tom by reawakening his past memories. In the last part of the sixth book, determining to depart from Stephen, Maggie informs him of what her decision would mean: "[Life with Stephen] would rend me away from all that my past life has made dear and holy to me. I can't set out on a fresh life, and forget that: I must go back to it, and cling to it, else I shall feel as if there were nothing firm beneath my feet" (478). This way of putting the matter shows that what Maggie wants is not to identify herself with the gendered present – which requires a marriage, an ideological union of the two genders – but to identify her world with the past, which is made up of the language of love. If we consider the implication of Maggie's return to the memory of the past childhood, what Tom may encounter through Maggie in the flooding river seems to be his forgotten language of love from his youth. The narrator describes how Tom feels when Maggie comes to save him:

> It was not till Tom had pushed off and they were on the wide water … that the full meaning of what had happened rushed upon his mind. It came with so overpowering a force – it was such a new revelation to his spirit, of the depths in life, that had lain beyond his vision which he had fancied so keen and clear – that he was unable to ask a question. They sat mutely gazing at each other. … But at last a mist gathered over the blue-grey eyes, and the lips found a word they could utter: the old childish – 'Magsie!' (520)

In the description above, Tom's childish "Magsie" is not an instant cry, but rather a "revelation" from "the depths in life," which he has forgotten for years. If Tom has been preoccupied with building upon his gender identity in the realm of the present-day workplace, the "Magsie" moment is indicative of the reunion of the separated worlds of childhood and adulthood.

In fact, Eliot's perspective on childhood – "the mother tongue of our imagination" and "the language" that has potential to "transform our perception into love" (41-2) – is also noticed in her 1869 sonnet sequence "Brother and Sister."[10] In these poems, Eliot still does not specify the meaning of love, but this time she more often refers to love with emphasis. In the first and second sonnets, Eliot narrates how the brother and sister are closer to each other – "When our two lives grew like two buds that kiss / … / Because the one so near the other is" – and how "those young mornings," "[t]he firmaments of daisies," and "[t]he bunched cowslip's pale transparency" carry

[10] In his introduction to *The Mill*, Lovesey notes that although *Brother and Sister* was published later than the novel, in this series of Shakespearean sonnets, Eliot "revisits many of the autobiographical scenes from [*The Mill*]" (541).

"that sunshine of sweet memories" of their young days since the "[l]ong years have left" (Lovesey 541-2). In the fifth sonnet, Eliot more clearly describes the siblings' childhood memories in a way that "give[s] words a soul, / The fear, the love, the primal passionate store" and shape "impulses make manhood whole" in its engendering love.

> Those hours were seed to all my after good;
> My infant gladness, through eye, ear, and touch,
> Took easily as warmth a various food
> To nourish the sweet skill of loving much.
>
> For who in age shall roam the earth and find
> Reasons for loving that will strike out love
> With sudden rod from the hard year-pressed mind?
> Were reasons sown as thick as stars above,
>
> 'Tis love must see them, as the eye sees light:
> Day is but Number to the darkened sight.

Eliot here likens the memories of the hours in youth to "seed" and "food" due to their nourishing the "skill of loving," and emphasizes the memories' foremost importance, "'Tis love must see them" (543). Although Eliot senses the "growing self" in the present, the self is part of her, as the childhood "Past" exists as the "root of piety" (544) – which keeps motivating the extension of love toward the "Unknown" and mankind as "whole" – and coexists with the present. As she does in *The Mill*, Eliot in the last two sonnets is

aware of that her childhood memory becomes a fantasy at a certain point, and it soon will be subjected to a world of "the harder, truer skill," which not only designates "What is" and "What will be" (especially for the brother's "inward vision") but also results in "Change," "divorce," and "two forms" (545-6). Through the very last two lines, however, Eliot does not end the work with "the harder, truer" adult-world that has brought about the divorce between the siblings, but rather grafts the adult-world onto "another childhood-world" in which she would be “born a little sister there" (546). So the young childhood-world and the adult-world later are not entirely separated from each other. Rather, the two worlds in Eliot's poem are connected as the "present Past" (544) in the form of memory. [11]

Eliot's idea of memory as "present Past" can be explored more deeply with Elizabeth Grosz's examinations of Bergson and Deleuze's "concept of the future open to the under- or unutilized potentiality of the past and the present" (93). In order to analyze Tom's re-evoked childhood memory in the form of "present Past" (Lovesey 544) as well as its function to direct him to revisit his teleological masculine narrative, I draw at some length upon Grosz here; in the explanation, I pay attention to how Grosz explicates Bergson’s and Deleuze's concepts of past, present, memory, and how those planes of

[11] Eliot's use of memory and time is important in *Romola* (1863) as well. Late in the novel, Romola, severely shaken by her godfather's death secretly brought about by Florentine political parties, has fled from Florence. While lying down in a boat and drifting away, Romola speculates on what has passed before her: "Had she found anything like the dream of her girlhood? No. Memories hung upon her like the weight of broken wings that could never be lifted" (504). In fact, Eliot's metaphoric use of the memories' broken wings at this late stage of the novel is related to her earlier descriptions of "The Day of the Betrothal" in chapter 20. In the chapter, at the moment of the betrothal between Romola and Tito, Eliot inserts the "image of Winged Time … surrounded by his winged children, the Hours" (200). In comparison with the memories' broken wings, which make it impossible for memory ever to leave, time is supposed to flow using its wings. If such winged time implies the fluidity of time, the memory with the broken wings connotes its feature of non-departure. In other words, in Eliot's sense, time is apparently fluid, yet the memory through the passage of time may exist as non-departure.

temporalities and memory are combined in Bergsonian virtuality. At first, Grosz explains that Bergson "speaks of two different kinds of memory" (100). The first type of memory is "body-memories (or habit-memory)," which is "bound up with bodily habits and thus essentially forward-looking insofar as it aims at and resides in the production of an action"; in this regard, the habit-memory is about "the achievement of habitual goals or aims" (100). While the habit-memory is "action-oriented, the most present- and future-seeking of memories, from the inert past" (101), the second type of memory – "recollection or memory proper" – is "always spontaneous, tied to a highly particular place, date, and situation, unrepeatable and unique, perfect in itself" (101). Because the second type of memory, recollection, exists "perfect in itself" (101), it is distinguished from the first type of habit-memory, which operates in future-orientation; and the pure recollection is always directed to the specific point of the past. So whereas both the habit-memory and the pure recollections go with "the act of recognition" that recognizes something in its "correlation of a current perception (or perceptual object) with a memory that resembles it" (101), the ways in which the habit-memory and the pure recollections operate are different from each other.

Grosz's understanding of the Bergsonian past and present goes further in their relations to perception and memory; the perception "can never be free of memory, and … thus never completely embedded in the present but always elements of the past" (102). For Grosz, the Bergsonian present "acts and lives … functions to anticipate an immediate future in action" (102). Whereas the present is "a form of impending action," the past is that "which no longer acts, although in a sense it lives a shadowy and fleeting

existence; it still is, it is real" (102). By comparing the present with the past, Grosz puts a subtle yet profound emphasis on the past's chance "to be mobilized in the course of another perception's impulse to action," "if it can link up to a present perception"; accordingly, "the present is not purely in itself, self-contained," as it "straddles both past and present, requiring the past as its precondition, while being oriented toward the immediate future" (102). This is "the *simultaneity* of past and present," and within this simultaneity, the past "exists, but in a state of latency or virtuality" (italics in original 103). Most importantly, the profundity of Bergson's concept of the coexistence between the past and present lies in his idea of virtuality.

To develop the relation between the past and present in the realm of virtuality, Grosz uses Deleuze's elaboration of virtuality in which he articulates the insight that the Bergsonian concept consists of the "pairs virtual/actual and possible/real" (106). On the one hand, Deleuze points out that "the possible produces the real by virtue of resemblance" (108); and, due to this resemblance, the possible may imply its limited reduction to the resemblance of the real. On the other hand, unlike the feature of the possible, "the virtual never resembles nothing the real that it actualizes. It is in this sense that actualization [in virtual realm] is a process of creation that resists both a logic of identity and a logic of resemblance to substitute a movement of differentiation, divergence, and innovation" (108-9). In comparison with the process of realization that is "governed by two principles – resemblance and limitation" (106), the process of the actualization of virtuality goes along with "creativity and innovation," as divergent, creating varieties and thereby being "the emanation of a multiplicity" in a virtual sense

(109). Consequently, the Bergsonian concepts of past, present, memory, and virtuality disorder "linear or predictable temporality" through "the open-endedness of the concept of the virtual" (110) that emanates from the past in the present. In one sense, there is "a fundamental continuity between the past and the present," but in another sense, the ways in which the past involves the present – and, furthermore, the future – are profoundly associated with contingency and differentiation through the passage of time.

Grosz's lengthy explanation of the Bergsonian and Deleuzian past, present, memory, and the virtuality that connects them is relevant to the ending scene of *The Mill*, when Tom's "Magsie!" – which implies his rekindled past memory of the childhood – unexpectedly erupts from the sibling's harsh and tragic present. In the last part of the story, through Maggie's arduous journey inspired by her desire to rescue her mother and Tom from the river, Eliot removes all the socially constructed signs that worsen their conflicts in order to evoke a sense of reconciliation between the siblings, which may be possible only in the language of love during their childhood. The narrator reports,

> Along with the sense of danger and possible rescue for those long-remembered beings at the old home, there was an undefined sense of reconcilement with her brother; what quarrel, what harshness, what unbelief in each other can subsist in the present of a great calamity, when all the artificial vesture of our life is gone, and we are all one with each other in primitive mortal needs? Vaguely, Maggie felt this; -- in the strong resurgent love towards her brother that swept away all

> the later impressions of hard, cruel offence and misunderstanding, and left only the deep, underlying, unshakable memories of early union. (518)

As Eliot describes it, Maggie's journey on the flooding river to save her brother eliminates "all the artificial vesture" and leaves only the "primitive mortal needs" (518). At this moment, Maggie dives into the present as the momentum rather than the present as a part of the ideological narrative for the linear sense of futurity; she rows "as if her life were a stored-up force that was being spent in this hour, unneeded for any future" (518). Correspondingly, Tom's old-childish "Magsie!" responds to Maggie's primitive impulse, which has grown in love in childhood and has lived as "present Past" beneath their present reality.

To a certain point in his process of growth, the main component of Tom's present has been the "habit-memory" that forces him to discipline himself; this "habit-memory" is bound up with his seeking to achieve industrial manhood in the marketplace. However, in comparison with Tom's "habit-memory," which is oriented to the realistic present and the teleological future, Tom's "Magsie!" evokes his "pure-recollection," which specifically points to his childhood when he lived with the "young animal[-like]" (39) impulses. Accordingly, this rekindled childhood memory, which makes Tom act by animalistic impulse, leads him to an unexpected action, namely to clasp and embrace Maggie "never to be parted" (521). Eliot's treatment of memory – the evocation of the childhood memory as a means of intervening in the present (as part of the continuum of the teleological narrative) – finds its most profound meaning in its virtual existence on account of its potential for the unexpected creation of divergences and multiplicity.

Therefore, the siblings' return to the past and their death together, which causes them to "liv[e] through again in one supreme moment the [young] days" (521), do not just mean nostalgia for the past. Rather, returning to the past is used as the medium in order to invoke an unexpected intervention in the prescriptive gendered present.

In 1856, reviewing the German journalist Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl's "The Natural History of German Life," Eliot illuminates Riehl's contribution in his examinations of the German peasantry. Eliot associates Riehl's exploration of the natural history of German peasants with the value of art, which "is the nearest thing to life; it is a mode of amplifying experience and extending our contact with our fellowmen beyond the bounds of our personal lot" (110). In this regard, Eliot interprets Riehl's text as the example of the "greatest benefit we owe to the artist" in terms of his contribution to "the extension of our sympathies" (110). Concerned that "[a]ppeals founded on generalizations and statistics require a sympathy ready-made, a moral sentiment already in activity" (110), Eliot articulates that Riehl's opposite direction – in which he does not generalize the natural history of German peasantry according to an abstract tabulation – can be an example of "a picture of human life" as "the raw material" (110) that carries not only peculiarities but also "innumerable special phenomena" (130). From Eliot's perspective, Riehl's consideration of the accumulated past in the German peasant tradition displays certain peculiarities, which could be easily dismissed and appropriated in the mainstream of the industrial modernization in Germany. By examining the different approaches to the past life of German peasant exemplified by Riehl's and other authors' works of "simplification" or generalization, Eliot draws her own perspective of the past as root:

"The nature of European men has its roots intertwined with the past, and can only be developed by allowing those roots to remain undisturbed while the process of development is going on, until the perfect ripeness of the seed which carries with it a life independent of the root" (128-9). Europe's present, for Eliot, must be viewed in its "connexion with the past" (129).

In *The Mill* Eliot mixes this emphasis on the past's connection to the present with the critique of the problematic gender dualism in her times. Eliot sets the novel in the transitional period of the 1820s-1830s, when "the newer economics was actively layering onto the still persistent older one" (Blake 219). Through the deliberate setting of the "great curtain" rendered by the "rush of the water, and the booming of the mill," Dorlcote Mill becomes isolated from "the world beyond," St. Ogg's, in which a more capitalized business world has been emerging. Not only the separation of the locations but also the contrasting characters such as Mr. Tulliver and Mr. Deane (or Mr. Wakem) help to illustrate the transition from pre-modern to modern England, especially in terms of their different understandings of money.

Through the novel's setting and characterizations, Eliot shows her critical awareness of the emerging capitalistic modernization in which the past still lingers. Another trajectory that Eliot traces is how the process of capitalistic modernization affects the traditional life of the Tulliver family; Eliot delineates how the force of modernization has been permeating Mr. Tulliver, Mrs. Glegg, or Mr. Deane. Of all the characters, Tom and Maggie most acutely undergo the impact of change on their lives through the separated gender roles, respectively. In this chapter, I have focused on Tom's

trajectory of masculinity in considering how the modern present truncates his life from childhood and how Eliot attempts to attach the truncated past to his present through the memory.

Tom's entering the business realm in St. Ogg's and his teleological narrative of being the industrial man in the marketplace are in line with the mainstream change of the economic transition from the pre-capitalistic society to the modern capitalistic society. Yet the drive to be the industrial man has been challenged by Eliot's drawing upon the past that is made up of the different language of love in childhood. While Eliot is conscious of the epochal shift, which forcefully directs the present into the progressive way,[12] she has shown her critical engagement with the present. Within it, the past is not appropriated for the progressive modern present. Through the idea of "present Past," Eliot does not reduce Tom's past memory of the childhood to the nostalgic past; rather, she employs Tom's past as a queer temporality and grafts it onto his narrative of adulthood masculinity to queer and thereby challenge the teleological present narrative.

Therefore, Tom's "Magsie!" may not be an end, the moment before his death, so much as the beginning of Eliot's visionary imagination of a new type of man in which childhood memory and its animalistic language of love (as the root) have been grafted onto adult masculinity. As Eliot understands that the European men's root is entwined with the past, which remains "undisturbed … until the perfect ripeness of the seed which carries with it a life independent of the root," the new type of masculinity can emanate

[12] Thomas Babington Macaulay's evidence of progress in his response to Robert Southey's *Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society* (1829) can be the representative example of the recognition of the present as a strong force of progression (*Norton* 1557).

from the past. Yet as the "perfect ripeness of the seed" becomes independent of the root, the new ripeness in adulthood in Eliot's invention of masculinity is not identical with its root of the past childhood; it is, rather, a peculiar hybrid that resembles nothing that has come before.

In "*The Mill on the Floss* and the Revision of Tragedy" K. M. Newton revisits the novel's ending as tragedy and views Eliot's revision of tragedy "in the light of time being continuous movement, undermining the idea of finality" (140). Newton probes how the "tragic collision" could be "brought about by circumstantial and accidental factors in themselves trivial" (145), and argues for the evocation of undecidability in each character's fate. From one angle, Newton's approach in finding a pattern of undecidability that runs through the "continuous movement" of time corresponds to my analysis of the novel. Tracing the siblings' gendered trajectories with the emphasis on the brother, I have found a deconstructive moment when Tom's construction of industrial manhood becomes undetermined. To evoke the undecidability in Tom's masculinity, Eliot imbues his trajectory of masculinity with the idea of "present Past" in which the past memory, the animalistic impulse, and the old language of love intervene in the teleological narrative of the present. By grafting the past memory of the childhood onto the gendered present in reality, Eliot devises a temporal hybridity, the present Past, and invents a new type of adult masculinity that is not supposed to reproduce the realistic present. Tom's impulsive cry, therefore, is a touchstone moment for his rebirth as a new type of being, one that even Tom himself has never experienced before. That is why Tom's "'Magsie!" still resonates for readers of *The Mill*.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

In "Response: Responsibility to the Present," Andrew H. Miller raises the question of "'why studying the past matters for the present'" and shows a concern over "[w]hat in present (or recent) modes of Victorian criticism is to be left behind" (122). Thinking Victorian studies' "institutional present" (125) at stake, he attempts to justify Victorian studies as "an act of identification, of seeing the present in the past" (124). Here Miller reflects on Victorian studies' "institutional present," (125) seems to be aware of potential limitations inherent in the field's reliance on the past, and tries to connect the academic discipline of the past to concern in the present. That is why Miller entitles his response to Victorian studies' academic discipline "Responsibility to the Present."

In a sense, this dissertation applies Miller's concern with the matter of the past in the present to the study of Victorian masculinities. John Tosh's examination of masculinity in historical terms has been influential; indeed, it has been employed as one of the quintessential sources for the exploration of Victorian masculinities. As a reaction to feminism's understanding men as "the upholders and beneficiaries of patriarchy" (7), Tosh has investigated men's history to demonstrate that "both male dominance and masculinity have shifted over time lies the possibility that they will not always be entirely fused" (19). On the one hand, by exploring various experiences of men in different places, Tosh has contributed to revealing that masculinity, too, has a history in which it has been situated in a power relation. On the other hand, Tosh's approach to

masculinity – in *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle Class Home in Victorian England* (1999), for instance – seems to fixate the frame of the field in the past history.

Although Todd W. Reeser refers to the issue of temporality, his approach to masculinity does not seem much different from that of Tosh. In "Unstable Time: Masculinity in History" he mentions that temporality "has a mutating effect on masculinity," "since no cultural definition of masculinity remains static over the course of time" (217). Reeser sheds light on the importance of examining masculinity "in historical terms," since it "contributes to the larger goal of disbanding simplistic or essentialist notions of masculinity" (218). Much as Tosh argues for the shift of male dominance over time, Reeser also contends that masculinity is not "transhistorical" (218), inasmuch as he assumes the differences of masculinities in different historical periods. To be sure, the approach to masculinity in historical terms, which reveals that masculinity is not ahistorical, has wreaked unexpected havoc on the previously dominant concept of masculinity as unitary and monolithic.

As a Victorianist, however, conducting research over time, I have been becoming more and more aware of the limitations of the field's methodology of historicizing the past temporality. The established academic approach seems to define the literary analysis of masculinity (even if conducted in the realm of gender studies) as historical analysis; as a result, it inadvertently makes us overlook some important issues embedded in gender identity. The awareness of the limitations inherent in a conventional historical approach, accordingly, led me to think about how to deconstruct the seemingly fixated temporal frame of the past in the field, to come up with an intersection between its

approach to the past and its meaning in the present, and to recast the seemingly past-tense studies in present tense. To do so, in this dissertation, I first have tried to make a dialogue among Eliot and Kipling, Woolf, and James. In the dialogue, I assume Eliot as the past-tense author in the Victorian period, as Kipling, Woolf, and James regard themselves as present tense in viewing the preceding era as the retrospective past. I conclude that although a close reading of Eliot's texts individually may show that her approach to masculinity is a representation of her times, reading her text in dialogue with those of Kipling, Woolf, and James may construct a trajectory that shows how masculinity works through the passage of time rather than within a given, and thereby fixed, period. That is, examining masculinity in the mid-Victorian texts together with masculinities in late- and post-Victorian texts may conjure a dialectic of masculinity in a diachronic way rather than in a synchronic way. Furthermore, the dialectic in the selected texts shows a pattern in which masculinity works by the contingences evoked by the spectral past rather than the conventional norm for the teleological future. So I am making a conversation among Eliot and Kipling, Woolf, and James – who, as John Gardiner observes, "had their roots in the Victorian age" and viewed the era as the past of living memory (31) – in order to render a dialectical trajectory of masculinity rather than a static representation of masculinity, while expecting that the trajectory destabilizes previously past-tense studies.

My second concern is related to queer theory and its approach to ontology, a mode of being. In "The New Other Victorians: The Success (and Failure) of Queer Theory in Nineteenth-Century British Studies," Richard Kaye notes that the subfield of

Victorian masculinity studies has employed queer theory to enrich the discussions of marginal masculinities. Some of Kaye's examples – Eric Clarke's *Virtuous Vice: Homoeroticism and the Public Sphere* (2000) and Morris B. Kaplan's *Sodom on the Thames* (2012) (756-7) – present how queer theory has been used for locating homoerotic or homosexual masculinities in nineteenth-century British literature. This dissertation's use of queer theory is different from Kaye's examples. In "Critically Queer," Judith Butler points out two possible meanings of queer: "'queering' might signal an inquiry into (a) the *formation* of homosexualities (a history inquiry which cannot take the stability of the term for granted, despite the political pressure to do so) and (b) the *deformative* and *misappropriative* power that the term currently enjoys" (italics in original 229). Although queer theory notably has been employed in tracing homoerotic or homosexual relations, my use of queer theory emphasizes its recent attention to queer temporality in relation to the second case in Butler's definition of queer. The main use of queer temporality in this dissertation is not only to deform and misappropriate the heteronormative temporality in the broader realm but also to raise a vital question, the matter of a mode of being – or becoming, in E. L. McCallum and Mikko Tuhkanen's term – which seems to be gradually forgotten in Victorian studies' tendency to rely on the past temporality.

I have examined the male characters' queer engagements in time, in which they go back and forth between the past and present temporalities through the medium of memory, and how their evocation of queer temporality resonates with their mode of being – or becoming – in their contemporary present. In each chapter, I have sought to

demonstrate, the central male figures in my sample texts perform different masculinities that diverge from the temporality of the dominant heterosexual normativity. In a sense, the characters are specific representations created in a particular period; in this case, their masculinities seem to be played out in past tense due to their historicity. However, by blurring the characters' seemingly past-tense masculinities through each author's implicative use of memory, I have tried to transform the interpretive point from masculinity in historicity to masculinity in life. For instance, due to their spectrality, the traumatic (*Marner*) and/or glorious (*Puck*) past memories not only trace but also intervene in another temporality of the present. Doing so, the characters have to keep reshaping their present lives in a contingent, unexpected way according to the spectral past rather than the fixed prescriptions in the dominant temporality. As a result, the ways in which the male characters' masculinities diverge from the normative trajectory render each different mode of being, how they live in the present with the past. In an attempt to attach the current methodology of historical contextualization to the matter of ontology, I suggest this dissertation's approach to masculinity as a way of accomplishing what Michael André Bernstein has dubbed "*sideshadowing:* a gesturing to the side, to a present dense with multiple, and mutually exclusive, possibilities for what is to come" (italics in original 1) in studies of masculinity. If studies of Victorian masculinities' way of looking backward to histories have invented the notion of plurality – differences in masculinities – and have contributed to destabilizing and deconstructing the monolithic masculinity, through this dissertation, I have wanted to raise a question how to live in the pluralities: not to look forward but to live in the present.

WORKS CITED

Al-Saji, Alia. "The Memory of Another Past: Bergson, Deleuze and a New Theory of Time." *Continental Philosophy Review* 37 (2004): 203-39.

Anand, Natasha. "Theorizing Men and Men's Theorizing: Mapping the Trajectory of the Development of Victorian Masculinity Studies." *Rupkatha Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities* 7.3 (2015): 107-17.

Benjamin, Walter. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections.* Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Schocken Books, 1969: 253-64.

Bennett, Judith M. *History Matters: Patriarchy and the Challenge of Feminism*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2006.

Bernstein, Michael André. *Foregone Conclusions: Against Apocalyptic History*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994.

Bersani, Leo and Adam Phillips. *intimacies*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2008.

Birch, Dinah. "Introduction." *The Mill on the Floss*. Ed: Gordon S. Haight. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Blake, Kathleen. "Between Economies in *The Mill on the Floss*: Loans versus Gifts, or, Auditing Mr. Tulliver's Accounts." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 33 (2005): 219-37.

Bollas, Christopher. *The Christopher Bollas Reader.* London; New York: Routledge. 2011.

Bratton, J. S. "Of England, Home and Duty: The Image of England in Victorian and Edwardian Juvenile Fiction." *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. Ed. John M. Mackenzie. Manchester, UK: Manchester UP, 1986: 73-93.

Buckley, Jerome Hamilton. *The Triumph of Time: A Study of the Victorian Concepts of Time, History, Progress, and Decadence*. Cambridge: Belknap P of Harvard UP, 1966.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex."* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Caruth, Cathy. "Introduction." *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Ed. Cathy Caruth. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1995: 3-12.

Cave. Terence. "Introduction." *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe.* Ed. Terence Cave. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.

Clarke, Victoria. "Male Models: Fatherhood and Gentleman-Making in the Victorian *Bildungsroman*." *WRoCAH Student Journal* 2 (2016).

Clive, John. "The Use of the Past in Victorian England." *Salmagundi* (Fall-Winter 1985 -1986): 68-69; 48-65.

Davidoff, Leonore, and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780-1850.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987.

Dell, Marion, and Marion Whybrow. *Virginia Woolf and Vanessa Bell: Remembering St Ives.* Padstow: Tabb House, 2003.

Derrida, Jacques, and Bernard Stiegler. "Spectrographies." *The Spectralities Reader:*

Ghosts and Haunting in Contemporary Cultural Theory. Ed. María del Pilar Blanco and Ester Peeren. London: Bloomsbury. 2013: 37-51.

Eliot, George. "Brother and Sister." *The Mill on the Floss*. Ed. Oliver Lovesey. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2005. 541-46.

-----. *Silas Marner: The Weaver of Raveloe.* Ed. Terence Cave. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.

-----. *The Mill on the Floss*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

-----. "The Natural History of German Life." London: Penguin Books, 1990, 107-39.

Esty, Joshua D. "Nationhood, Adulthood, and the Ruptures of *Bildung*: Arresting Development in *The Mill on the Floss*." *The Mill on the Floss and Silas Marner*. Ed. Nahem Yousaf and Andrew Maunder. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Ellis, Steve. *Virginia Woolf and the Victorians*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Flax, Jane. "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12.4 (1987): 621-43.

Fletcher, C. R. L., and Rudyard Kipling. *A History of England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

Fraiman, Susan. "*The Mill on the Floss*, the Critics, and the Bildungsroman." *PMLA* 108.1 (1993): 136-50.

Freccero, Carla. "Queer Spectrality: Haunting the Past." *A Companion to Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Studies.* Eds. George E. Haggerty and Molly McGarry. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell, 2007: 194-213.

Freeman, Elizabeth. "Theorizing Queer Temporalities: A Roundtable Discussion." *GLQ:*

A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies 13:2-3 (2007): 177-95.

-----. *Time Binds: Queer Temporalities, Queer Histories*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2010.

Fry, Roger. "Paul Cézanne." *Vision and Design*. Ed. J. B. Bullen. New York: Oxford UP, 1981. 179-185.

-----. "The French Post-Impressionists." *Vision and Design*. Ed. J. B. Bullen. New York: Oxford UP, 1981. 166-170.

Gardiner, John. *The Victorians: An Age in Retrospect*. London: Hambledon and London, 2002.

Gardiner, Judith Kegan. "Introduction." *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory: New Directions*. Ed. Judith Kegan Gardiner. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002. 1-29.

"gramarye, *n*." *OED Online*. Oxford UP. 23 February 2019.

Griffin, Ben. *The Politics of Gender in Victorian Britain: Masculinity, Political Culture and the Struggle for Women's Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Time Travels: Feminism, Nature, Power*. Durham; London: Duke UP, 2005.

Gurfinkel, Helena. *Outlaw Fathers in Victorian and Modern British Literature: Queering Patriarchy*. Madison; Teaneck, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2013.

Harrey, Kate. "'People Must Marry': Queer Temporality in Virginia Woolf and Katherine Mansfield." *Virginia Woolf and Her Female Contemporaries: Selected Papers from the 25th Annual International Conference on Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Julie Vandivere and Megan Hicks. Clemson, SC: Clemson UP, 2016.

Halberstam, Judith. *In a Queer Time and Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives.* New York: New York UP, 2005.

-----. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2011.

Haralson, Eric. *Henry James and Queer Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

Harris, Susan K. "Kipling's 'The White Man's Burden' and the British Newspaper Context, 1898-1899." *Comparative American Studies* 5.3 (2007): 243-63.

Harvey, Karen. "The History of Masculinity, circa 1650-1800." *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 296-311.

"hiatus, n." *OED Online*. Oxford UP. 28 February 2019.

Hill, Katherine C. "Virginia Woolf and Leslie Stephen: History and Literary Revolution." *PMLA* 96.3 (1981): 351-62.

Howkins, Alun. "Kipling, Englishness and History." *Kipling 86: Papers Read at the University of Sussex in May 1986 as part of the Commemoration of the Fiftieth Anniversary of Rudyard Kipling's Death*. Ed. Angus Ross. Brighton: U of Sussex Library. 1987: 25-9.

Hyman, Virginia R. "Concealment and Disclosure in Sir Leslie Stephen's 'Mausoleum Book.'" *Biography* 3.2 (1980): 121-31.

James, Henry. *"The Beast in the Jungle" and Other Stories*. New York: Dover Publications. 1993.

Kaye, Richard. "The New Other Victorians: The Success (and Failure) of Queer Theory in Nineteenth-Century British Studies." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 42. (2014): 755-71.

Kipling, Rudyard. *Puck of Pook's Hill*. EriK Publications. 2016.

-----. *Something of Myself and Other Autobiographical Writings*. Ed. Thomas Pinney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

-----. *Stalky & Co*. New York: Doubleday & McClure Co. 1899.

-----. "The White Man's Burden." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 8th ed. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. Vol II. New York: Norton, 2006. 1821-2.

Knoepflmacher, U. C. *George Eliot's Early Novels: The Limits of Realism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1968: 162-220.

-----. "Unveiling Men: Power and Masculinity in George Eliot's Fiction." *Men by Women*. Ed. Janet Todd. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1981. 130-46.

Leaska, Mitchell. *Granite and Rainbow: The Hidden Life of Virginia Woolf*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.

Leavy, Barbara Fass. "Fathering and 'The British Mother's Magazine', 1845-1864." *Victorian Periodicals Review* 13. ½ (1980): 10-17.

Levine, Philippa. *The British Empire: Sunrise to Sunset*. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited, 2007.

Lewis, Lisa A. F. "'References,' 'Cross-References,' and Notions of History in Kipling's *Puck of Pook's Hill* and *Rewards and Fairies*." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* 50.2 (2007): 192-209.

Lindroos, Kia. *Now-Time Image-Space: Temporalization of Politics in Walter Benjamin's Philosophy of History and Art*. Jyväskylä, Finland: U of Jyväskylä, 1998.

Lovesey, Oliver. "Introduction." *The Mill on the Floss*. Ed. Oliver Lovesey. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2005: 8-43.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. 8th ed. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. Vol II. New York: Norton, 2006. 1557-62.

Marcus, Laura. "Woolf's Feminism and Feminism's Woolf." *The Cambridge Companion to Virginia Woolf*. Ed. Sue Roe and Susan Sellers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

McBratney, John. *Imperial Subjects, Imperial Space: Rudyard Kipling's Fiction of the Narrative-Born*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2002.

McCallum, E. L., and Mikko Tuhkanen, eds. *Queer Times, Queer Becomings*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2011.

McIntire, Gabrielle. "Feminism and Gender in *To the Lighthouse*." *The Cambridge Companion to* To the Lighthouse. Ed. Allison Pease. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 2015. 80-91.

"Merlin." *Encyclopedia,* 23 Feb. 2019, https://www.encyclopedia.com/people/literature-and-arts/english-literature-1499-biographies/merlin

Miller, Andrew H. "Response: Responsibility to the Present." *Victorian Studies* 59.1 (2017): 122-26.

Morillo, Stephen. "Hastings: An Unusual Battle." *The Battle of Hastings: Sources and Interpretations*. Ed. Stephen Morillo. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK; New York: Boydell Press, 1996: 219-28.

Morrison, Kevin. "'Whose Injury Is Like Mine?' Emily Brontë, George Eliot, and the

Sincere Postures of Suffering Men." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 43:2 (2010): 271-93.

Moshenska, Gabriel. "Digging up Pook's Hill: Archaeological Imaginaries in Kipling's *Puck* Stories." *Landscapes* 13.1 (2013): 16-31.

Nelson, Claudia. *Invisible Men: Fatherhood in Victorian Periodicals, 1850-1910.* Athens; London: U of Georgia P, 1995.

Newton, K. M. *George Eliot for the Twenty-First Century: Literature, Philosophy, Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

Person, Leland S. *Henry James and the Suspense of Masculinity*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2003.

Pinney, Thomas. "The Authority of the Past in George Eliot's Novels." *Nineteenth -Century Fiction* 21.2 (1966): 131-47.

Plotz, Judith. "Kipling and the Uses of Poetry." *Kipling Journal* (2016): 49-62.

Reeser, Todd W. *Masculinity in Theory: An Introduction.* Chichester; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. 216-26.

Reilly, Jim. *Shadowtime: History and Representation in Hardy, Conrad and George Eliot*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Roper, Michael, and John Tosh, Eds. *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain Since 1800*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Rose, Phyllis. "Mrs. Ramsay and Mrs. Woolf." *Women's Studies* 1 (1973): 199-216.

Sanders, Andrew. "History." *The Cambridge History of Victorian Literature*. Ed. Kate Flint. New York: Cambridge UP, 2012: 405-21.

Schlack, Beverly Ann. "Fathers in General: The Patriarchy in Virginia Woolf's Fiction." *Virginia Woolf: A Feminist Slant*. Ed. Jane Marcus. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1983. Print: 52-77.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990. 182-212.

Sexton, Danny. "'How Was a Man to Be Explained?': Masculinity, Manhood, and Mothering in *Silas Marner*." *Critical Insights: George Eliot*. Ed. Katie R. Peel. Ipswich, MA: Salem Press, 2016: 199-212.

Sheehan, Paul. "Time as Protagonist in *To the Lighthouse*." *The Cambridge Companion to* To the Lighthouse. Ed. Allison Pease. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge UP, 2015. 47-57.

Shillock, Larry T. "Hoarding Motherhood in Silas Marner." *West Virginia University Philological Papers* 52. (2005): 33-44.

Shoemaker, Robert B. *Gender in English Society, 1650-1850: The Emergence of Separate Spheres?*. London; New York: Longman, 1998.

Smith, Jonathan. "The 'Wonderful Geological Story': Uniformitarianism and *The Mill on the Floss*." *Papers on Language and Literature* 27.4 (1991): 430-52.

Spiropoulou, Angeliki. *Virginia Woolf, Modernity and History: Constellations with Walter Benjamin.* Basingstoke, England; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Stevens, Hugh. *Henry James and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Stone, Donald D. *The Romantic Impulse in Victorian Fiction*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1980.

Sullivan, Zohreh T. *Narratives of Empire: The Fictions of Rudyard Kipling*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Tosh, John. *A Man's Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.

-----. *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain.* New York: Pearson Longman, 2005.

-----. "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800-1914. *Journal of British Studies* 44 (2005): 330-42.

Verdon, Nicola. "Women and the Dairy Industry in England c. 1800-1939." XIV International Economic History Congress, 21-25 August 2006, Helsinki, Finland. Conference Presentation.

Wiener, Martin J. *English Culture: And the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1850-1980.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.

Wood, Harriet Harvey. *The Battle of Hastings: The Fall of Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Atlantic Books, 2008.

Wood, Jane. *Passion and Pathology in Victorian Fiction*. Oxford UP, 2001.

Woolf, Virginia. "Leslie Stephen." *Collected Essays* Vol. 4. Ed. Andrew McNeillie. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967.

-----. *To the Lighthouse*. New York: Harcourt, 1989.

-----. *Moments of Being*. ed. Jeanne Schulkind. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985.