THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN JULIAN BARNES' *ARTHUR & GEORGE, THE NOISE OF TIME* AND *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

RAZIYEH JAVANMARD

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

FEBRUARY 2024

Approval of the thesis:

THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN JULIAN BARNES' *ARTHUR & GEORGE, THE NOISE OF TIME,* AND *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT*

submitted by **RAZIYEH JAVANMARD** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy in English Literature, the Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Sadettin KİRAZCI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences _____

Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik
Head of Department
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut-Naykı
Supervisor
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut-Naykı (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-Avcı
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca
Çankaya University
Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Selen Aktari-Sevgi
Başkent University
Department of American Culture and Literature _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Raziyeh, Javanmard

Signature:

ABSTRACT

THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN JULIAN BARNES'
ARTHUR & GEORGE, *THE NOISE OF TIME*, AND *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT*

Javanmard, Raziyeh
Ph.D., Department of English Literature
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı

February 2024, 265 pages

This thesis explores the representation of masculinity as a sociocultural phenomenon in three of Julian Barnes' biographical works of fiction, namely *Arthur & George* (2005), *The Noise of Time* (2016), and *The Man in the Red Coat* (2019), which all develop a critical attitude towards essentialist views on maleness and adopt intersectional perspectives on sexuality and gender. Each of the three selected biographical novels involves famous historical male figure(s) from the late 19th and/ or the early 20th centuries – Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930) in *Arthur & George*, Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich (1906-1975) in *The Noise of Time*, and Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi (1846-1918) in *The Man in the Red Coat* – and the novels incorporate incidents adapted from the real life stories of these historical figures in their characterization, setting and plot. By focusing on how Barnes fictionalizes and manipulates the factual life stories of these well-known male figures, the present study investigates the ways these three works challenge the common understanding of hegemonic masculinity in the context of the post-industrial era, in England, Russia and France. It explores the ways in which these works promote multiplicity and mutuality in masculinization, and it focuses on how these novels undermine the flawed assumptions on "authentic" masculinity, in order to extend the definition of manhood to incorporate connection and performativity.

This research concludes that, as suggested by these novels, official discourses cannot stabilize the category of masculinity, or develop a homogenous notion of maleness.

Keywords: Hegemonic masculinity, problem of masculinity, post-industrialism in England, Russia and France, Julian Barnes

ÖZ

JULIAN BARNES'IN *ARTHUR & GEORGE, THE NOISE OF TIME* VE *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT* ROMANLARINDA ERKEKLİĞİN TEMSİLİ

Javanmard, Raziyeh
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Nil Korkut Naykı

Şubat 2024, 265 sayfa

Bu tez, Julian Barnes'ın biyografik kurgu eserlerinden olan *Arthur & George* (2005), *The Noise of Time* (2016), ve *The Man in the Red Coat* (2019) romanlarında erkekliğin temsilini sosyokültürel bir olgu olarak analiz etmektedir. Bu eserlerin hepsi erkekliğe ilişkin özcü görüşlere karşı eleştirel bir tutum geliştirmekte ve cinsellik ve toplumsal cinsellik konularında kesişimsel bakış açıları benimsemektedir. Seçilen üç biyografik romanın her biri, 19. yüzyılın sonu ve/veya 20. yüzyılın başlarından ünlü tarihi erkek figürleri içerir: Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930) *Arthur & George*'da, Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich (1906-1975) *The Noise of Time*'da, ve Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi (1846-1918) *The Man in the Red Coat*'daki baş kahramanlardır. Bu romanlar bu tarihi şahsiyetlerin gerçek hayat hikayelerinden uyarlanan olayları içermektedir. Bu çalışma, Barnes'ın bu tanınmış erkek figürlerin gerçek yaşam hikayelerini nasıl kurguladığı ve manipüle ettiğine odaklanarak, bu üç romanın, benzer bir modernizasyon döneminden geçen İngiltere, Rusya ve Fransa'daki ortak hegemonik erkeklik anlayışına nasıl meydan okuduğunu ve eril cinsiyet kimliklerinin inşasında çokluğu ve karşılıklılığı teşvik etmek için kullandığı yöntemleri araştırmaktadır. Çalışma, Barnes'ın seçilmiş eserlerinin, "özgün" erkekliğe dair kusurlu varsayımları açık veya gizli bir şekilde nasıl eleştirdiğini ve erkeklik tanımını bağlantı, çokluk ve edimselliği içerecek şekilde nasıl

genişlettiğini incelemektedir. Bu çalışmada Barnes'ın bahsi geçen romanlarında erkekliğin sabit bir kategori olmadığı anlayışının hakim olduğu sonucunavarılmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Hegemonik erkeklik, erkeklik sorunu, sanayileşme sonrası İngiltere, Rusya ve Fransa, Julian Barnes

To My Parents...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my grateful thanks, first and foremost, to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Nil Korkut Naykı for her helpful guidance and support. Without her flexibility, her interest to help and her profound knowledge of literature and critical theory, my research would not develop in the right direction. She was a huge source of support and inspiration throughout my academic adventure, and I appreciate and value all her kind and sincere effort in inspiring and reorganizing my thoughts in the proper direction. I am also deeply thankful to the members of my dissertation committee, Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik and Assist. Prof. Selen Aktari Sevgi for their insightful advice and effective contributions in this study. Despite my geographical distance from the campus, and despite doing almost the whole reseach online, my supervisor and my dissertation committee members have always been supportive and understanding. It was with the assistance, constant encouragements and the genuine committment of these three great academicians that this study grew into its present shape.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to my other members of thesis defence jury, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-Avcı and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca for spending their time to offer me valuable feedback and constructive comments for improving my thesis. Furthermore, I owe a huge debt of gratitude not only to my supervisor, but also to Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztabak-Avcı for guiding me, throughout my PhD studuies, in learning about different schools of throught, exploring a variety of literary studies, and for giving me the courage to apply multiple theoretical and philisophical perspectives on a wide range of literary works. Following their illuminating comments in my studies opened my eyes to an abounding world of knowledge and understanding in English Literature.

Last but not least, I wish to say my special thanks to my parents, siblings and my dear friends for their kind and firm faith in me and my abilities. Their encouragements, infinite love and patience helped me start and continue my studies and to complete this dissertation. Without them, it would be impossible to come through all this way to success. There are a huge number of people to whom I owe my heartfelt thanks for their educational and moral support throughout my PhD studies and academic endeavour. I honestly value their contribution, and sincerely appreciate their help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM iii
ABSTRACT iv
ÖZ vi
DEDICATION viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xii
CHAPTERS
1. INTRODUCTION 1
1.1. The Development of Theories on the Problem of Masculinity 11
2. THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN *ARTHUR & GEORGE* (*A & G*) 22
2.1. A Historical Review of the Definition of Masculinity in Victorian England 24
2.2. The Realistic Representation of English Masculinity in *Arthur & George* 41
2.3. Challenging the Notion of the White Englishman in *Arthur & George* 56
3. THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN *THE NOISE FO TIME* (*TNT*) 76
3.1. A Historical Review of the Evolution of Hegemonic Masculinity in Russia 79
3.1.1. Masculinity in Russia before the Russian Revolution of 1917 79
3.1.2. Masculinity in Russia after the Russian Revolution of 1917 83
3.1.3. Shostakovich's Relationship to the Soviet Regime 96
3.2. The Realistic Representation of Russian Masculinity in *The Noise of Time* 97
3.3. Challenging the Notion of Russian Masculinity in *The Noise of Time* 128
4. THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT* (*TMRC*) 149
4.1. A Historical Review of Hegemonic Masculinity in Belle Époque France 153
4.1.1. French Masculinity in the Early 19th Century 153
4.1.2. French Masculinity in the Mid-19th Century 158
4.1.3. French Masculinity in the Late 19th Century (the Belle Époque) 162

4.2. The Realistic Representation of French Masculinity in *The Man in the Red Coat* 170
4.3. Challenging the Notion of French Masculinity in *The Man in the Red Coat* 205
5. CONCLUSION 217
REFERENCES 224
APPENDICES
A. CURRICULUM VITAE 247
B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET 250
C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU 265

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A & G : *Arthur & George*

TNT : *The Noise of Time*

TMRC : *The Man in the Red Coat*

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> Why did people imagine that progress consisted of believing in less, rather than believing in more, in opening yourself to more of the universe?
> (Barnes, *Arthur & George* 265)

"The crisis of masculinity", or the more common and less dramatic term, "the problem of masculinity" or "man problem," is commonly associated with a feeling of uncertainty and confusion in gender roles and identities of male members of society. While a few critics take the problem of masculinity as a part of human nature and a continuation of the ancient man's subjective "preoccupation with the 'essential' self" and the desire to return to the missing core of one's true self (Petersen 13), the majority of critics relate this problem to external sociocultural factors and their impact on identity formation. According to Griffin, "'[c]risis' usually (conventionally) denotes a decisive moment, or a turning point, and can be understood as the moment when it is to be decided whether something is to go on, to be modified or terminated (medically, crisis refers to a striking change of symptoms that may lead either to recovery or death)" (18). In terms of gender, a crisis may refer to a set of culminating incidents that decide the extent to which a specific gender marker is to be altered. Jordan relates the need for modification in gender markers to sociocultural transformations, and explains that "crisis is represented as a critical juncture where gender identities are fragmenting due to enormous social change. In this 'decisive moment', masculinity must be modified or terminated, must recover or die" (72). Following the mainstream research on the problem of masculinity, the present study aims to explore the impact of sociopolitical transformations in a certain historical time and place on the formation of masculine identities in the context of Julian Barnes' three biographical works of fiction (or biofictions), namely *Arthur & George* (2005), *The Noise of Time* (2016), and *The Man in the Red Coat* (2019).

This dissertation examines the sources of pain and confusion in Barnes' male characters in assuming gender roles, and it scrutinizes their struggle to conform to the hegemonic

model of masculinity or to challenge essentialist views on gender. The study engages in a close textual analysis of the representation of maleness and the problem of masculinity in the selected works of Barnes in order to investigate the forward-looking perspective of these narratives on the performativity of manhood in various sociocultural contexts. The study explores Barnes' critical historiography in these selected biofictions to find out how these works criticize the dependence of the frameworks of masculinity in different cultures on sociocultural prejudices, such as classism, sexism and racism. By investigating the anti-authoritarian approach of Barnes' narratives to masculinity, the present research aims to study the ways the novels takes to go beyond sexual hierarchies, question gender coherence and seek social acceptance for marginalized males.

Coined by the French critic, Alan Buisine in his "La Biographique" (1991), the term "biofiction" (interchangeably used in the present study with "biographical novel"; though some biograpical fiction do not take postmodern approaches, I am adopting the term as including the postmodern understanding) refers to a genre that incorporates postmodern historiography. The genre, as Lackey says, represents a seemingly realistic account of a historical figure's life story which "cannot accurately signify or represent the biographical subject because the author's subjective orientation will always inflect the representation" ("Locating" 5). The novelist manipulates the historical records to convey his own intended message. For Broom, biofiction is a "linguistic collage of two literary genres, biography and fiction, where both elements contribute their respective qualities to form a new, imaginative whole" (341). In this collage, the boundary between the historical truth and fiction is blurred to help the reader to go beyond the facts and arrive at epistemological discussions on a historically untold truth. Keener defines biofiction, in his *Biography*, as a genre that "applies 'novelistic' discourse to the representation of a historical life" (183). As in postmodern fiction, this literary form reinvents the past to subvert totalizing narratives of history and to draw attention to the ignored aspect of a historical figure's life story or to generate an alternative perspective towards his life. Lackey explains:

> [b]iographers seek to represent the life of the subject as accurately as possible, while authors of biofiction use the life of their subject in order to create their own vision of the world. This idea of using a life is of crucial importance, for it shifts the emphasis from biography's sacred art of accurate representation to the creative writer's sacred art of imaginative creation. (Biographical 10)

It is the author's perception of a historical figure and his life that is foregrounded in a work of biofiction, rather than the realistic account of the character's life. Even if biofictions are based on memoirs, published biographies, letters and authentic documents, these narratives usually focus on the undocumented gaps in historical accounts, penetrate the consciousness of the selected historical figures, and provide insight into their untold thoughts and feelings.

Rather than providing historical facts about the selected biographical subject in a chronological or accurate way, a biographical novel may make a selective use of historical information or it may modify the type and temporal sequence of real incidents and actions in order to pave the ground for discussing the intended topic. As Barnes' biofictions (and more especifically *The Man in the Red Coat*) exemplify, a work of biofiction may merge historical facts with multiple intertextual references to non/fictional sources of the time to create the required context for conveying the intended message. Considering the significance of sociocultural elements in discussions on masculinity, since the genre biofiction incorporates both fictional and factual representations of actual historical figures and their surrounding sociocultural contexts, I believe that among other literary genres, biofictions with male protagonists may supply a more reliable ground for studying the representations of masculinity and the man problem as sociocultural phenomena.

I claim that studying works of biofiction is valuable and worthwhile because exploring the life story of actual historical figures, putting emphasis on their possibly untold concerns as real masculine figures, and making elaborations on the reactions these known characters show for dealing with the problem of masculinity in their own time, might provide alternative behavioral patterns for masculinization in the present world. According to Paul Jones (2004), at the same time that human beings create and interpret images, humans are being shaped by images (14); creating innovative images of masculinity or making new interpretations of the existing images in literature, I believe, can positively impact the assumption of maleness in public opinion and promote alternative conciliatory attitudes among individuals.

Barnes' interest in incorporating real-life historical elements and figures in his works of fiction is related to the historical consciousness the genre may create in readers. Through his biofictions, Barnes draws attention to the continuing impact of sociocultural

traditions on identity formation, and he creates "a moment of awakening" about the possible misunderstandings and misconceptions in a certain period of time in a certain culture (Buxton 82). In rewriting history in this way, Barnes raises epistemological questions on the nature of human identity and on the formation of the gendered self in individuals, but gives no definite answer to any question. In a video interview conducted on Feb 3, 2013, titled "Converses a la Pedrera," Barnes says: "I never thought I was put on earth to change things. […I think] I was put on earth to ask questions, to say 'What do you think about this?' 'What would happen if things were like this, rather than like that?' I never wanted to tell people how to live or how they would live, or suggest that a better way could be done if this or that were changed" (ESCAC DOCS 15:34 to 16:20).
The present dissertation makes the point that Barnes fictionalizes history, not to give a straight historical account of the selected protagonists' lives, but to challenge the normative assumptions that have defined their masculinities, and to problematize the myth of masculine essence which is believed to be innate and stable in different cultures.
The reason I have especially chosen to explore the biofictional works of Barnes is that, I found a versatility of themes – subjects such as love, sexuality, art, identity – in Barnes' works, a quality which gave me the chance to explore his works from different perspectives; the diversity of themes in Barnes' biofictions has also helped me relate my study on gender in his biofictions to complex discussions on hegemonic masculinity, men's personal and social concerns, and the impact of gender confusion on individuals in different contexts. Additionally, Barnes' biographical works of fiction are not bound to his country of origin, England, and thus, studying his biofictions provide an ample space to explore the representation of masculinity in other Western countries, and to make investigations on maleness in different cultures: *Arthur & George* is set in late Victorian and Edwardian England, *The Noise of Time* in late 19th and 20th century Russia, and *The Man in the Red Coat* in late 19th and early 20th century in France. Furthermore, since Barnes' fictionalized accounts of historical figures incorporate both factual and fictional elements to raise epistemological questions on the characters' assumptions of gender and the discourse of national/ collective identity, this selection of works prove most conducive to my goal in exploring the sociocultural aspects of maleness and the problem of masculinity in literary works. Also, Barnes' critical distance in rewriting history helps to go beyond sociocultural frameworks to challenge social values and cultural beliefs.

Another reason for which I have selected Barnes is his fairly vast knowledge of the culture, history and literature of Russia and France. What he depicts in his *The Noise of*

Time and *The Man in the Red Coat* about the real-life historical figures, their surrounding sociocultural context, the mentality of the people of the time, their concerns and lifestyles, are all based on Barnes' long years of studying/writing on, traveling to, or residing in France and Russia, and this depth of knowledge suggests further reliability in analyzing the biographical information incorporated in the respective novels. About Barnes' connection to France and French culture, the author considers himself as "an English Francophile" (Barnes, *Letters*, 320), takes France as his "second country" (Barnes *Something to Declare*, xiii), and admits that the landscape, art and history of France spark his imagination. France is discussed in his works, as the setting of his stories, or the source of his inspiration. Guignery says:

> His work – more particularly *Metroland* (1980), *Flaubert's Parrot* (1984), *Talking It Over* (1991), *Cross Channel* (1996), *Love, etc.* (2001), *Something to Declare* (2002) and *Nothing to be Frightened of* (2008), but also his various essays, reviews and notebooks which form part of his archives held by the Harry Ransom Humanities Centre at the University of Texas in Austin – is teeming with references or allusions to French culture, their presence justified by the topics and contexts of these books, as well as by the personality of their fictional characters. (37)

Among all his works on France, *The Man in the Red Coat* is known as Barnes' most mature work on French art and culture (Tang 97). Barnes' knowledge of Russia and Russian culture is also extensive. *The Noise of Time* (2016) is not the first work of Barnes on the destructive influence of the authoritarian Soviet regime on individuals and the distortion of truth in Communist societies. Barnes' explorations of the impact of Communism started from his school age, with his reading of literary and political Russian books (*The Observer* 29), and the passion continued with his publishing a long essay, titled "Trademan's Entrance" in 1990 (about the difficult situation of people in Bulgaria), and his short novel, *The Porcupine* in 1922 (about post-communist Eastern Europe, fictionalizing the trial of Stoyo Petkanov, the former authoritarian communist leader). According to Michael Scammel, in his non-English works, Barnes avoids filtering his "narratives through Western eyes," and he manages to "narrate events from the inside," and more effectively, through "impersonating a native" (89). Rather than looking through the unsophisticated and disparaging eyes of a stranger, Barnes shows empathy and tries to understand the actual feelings, concerns and distresses of the people of the countries he writes about; he incorporates his own emotions through personifying the local historical figures in his works. In his interview with Shusha Guppy, Barnes

admits that he is "very European, which is unusual for an English writer, but also very English, especially to a foreigner" (Guppy 64). Barnes prefers to explore the perspectives of the people of different nationalities and does not restrict himself to the topics specific to his own country of origin.

The three selected works of fiction analyzed in the present dissertation are biographical in that the plot, characterization and the setting are based on the life story of real-life masculine figures, mainly from the late 19th and the early 20th centuries: *Arthur & George* is a parodic detective biofiction, telling the life story of the British writer and physician, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930) in late Victorian and early Edwardian England; *The Noise of Time* is focused on the life story of the Russian pianist and composer, Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich (1906-1975) in the Soviet era; and *The Man in the Red Coat* incorporates incidents and characters mostly from the life story of Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi (1846-1918), the French gynecologist and surgeon. Although masculinity is not a central concept in any of these novels (and perhaps especially not in *The Noise of Time*), as the present study indicates, in these three biofictions, the essentialist assumptions of masculinity are challenged, and this creates a space for inclusivity and diversity in understanding maleness. Even though some other works of Barnes, such as *Flaubert's Parrot*, also include masculine protagonists, and although they similarly explore the male characters' anxieties and personality-related concerns, they have not been considered for the present study because these novels are not based on the life story of actual historical figures, and they do not incorporate actual sociopolitical incidents in their contexts or explore the impact of social elements on the characters' masculinization.

The selected novels in this thesis (*Arthur & George, The Noise of Time* and *The Man in the Red Coat*) are somehow similar in that they all explore the problem of masculinity during/ after the start of industrialization and urbanization (in the late 19th and/ or early 20th centuries), and one can find in these novels the reflection of sociocultural transformations taking place in the background of the protagonists' life stories. This shared quality of all the selected works makes the current study on the impact of sociocultural elements in masculinization and the way they are represented by Barnes more synchronized. The late 19th and/or the early 20th centuries, as discussed already, coincide with the time most societies in the West were struggling with radical movements such as modernization and feminism. Studying these three biofictions gives

us the chance to compare the impact of social changes on male protagonists, and critically examine the similarities and differences they go through in each of the narratives in tackling the crisis of masculinity.

Conceptual studies on the problem of masculinity in postmodern works of fiction are not many in number. The problem or crisis of masculinity is mainly analyzed in sociological studies or pro/feminist philosophical discussions, as in Seidler (1990s), Segal (2007), Whithead (2007), or Hearn & Pringle (2006), but such studies in intersection with postmodern literary works appear to be fewer in number. In his "Masculinity Studies and Literature," Hobbes makes the point that "[i]n contrast to feminist theory or women's studies, masculinity studies is a relatively new approach to analysing literature" (383). Andrew Michael Roberts' *Conrad and Masculinity* (2000) for example, analyzes Conrad's works from the perspective of gay studies, film theory and feminism. Alice Ferrebe briefly analyzes the assumption of English masculinity in Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Remains of the Day* (1989) as a psychological concept, rather than a sociocultural construct. Peter Ferry's *Masculinity in Contemporary New York Fiction* investigates the performativity of maleness in the explorations Ellis, Auster, and DeLillo make in their literary works set in New York. However, the works of fiction selected by Ferry do not focus on certain historical male characters or the impact of sociocultural transformations on their masculinization. Compared to other literary studies, the present dissertation is unique in exploring representations of the problem of masculinity as a sociocultural phenomenon in modernizing England, Russia and France in the biofictions of a single British novelist, Julian Barnes. By applying the valuable insights from the existing sociological, philosophical and historical ideas and theories on masculinity to the selected works of fiction, this dissertation intends to show how Barnes' biofictions depict the arbitrariness of the norms of masculinization and highlight the futility of the attempt to find or follow a certain essentialist model/tradition in assuming masculinity.

By conducting this study, this dissertation humbly attempts to contribute to not only masculinity scholarship but also to gender studies relating to Barnes' fiction. It is original in merging literary studies on Julian Barnes with sociological discussions on maleness and masculinity. Apart from Joseph Kestner's feminist study on *Arthur & George* in *Sherlock's Men: Masculinity, Conan Doyle, and Cultural History* (1997), Barnes' works of fiction, including his biographical novels, are mostly examined in terms of postmodern historiography or the deconstruction of Englishness, as in Tang's

"The Rhetoric" (2022), or Berberich's "All Letters" (2011). Childs (2011) and Merritt Moseley (2009), explore Barnes' works in terms of memory, fabulation, and irony, and they identify the author's thematic and technical concerns. Frederick Michael Holmes (2009) and Pateman (2002), on the other hand, provide extensive studies on the literary and the inventive narrative structures applied in Barnes' novels. Psychological perspectives have sometimes been adopted in exploring his biofictions, as in Antakyalioglu's study on *The Noise of Time* as a narrative of trauma (2018); some researchers focus on the unreliability of the narrators in his biographical accounts, such as Hansen (2007), but only a few have concentrated on gender issues, especially masculinity, in his biofictions. Among the few studies that explore the assumption of gender in Barnes' fiction, in general, we can refer to Eric Berlatsky's (2009) study on *Flaubert's Parrot* from a feminist perspective, and Jill E. Wagner's dissertation on "Engendered Edens" (2009) which makes a comparative feminist study on Barnes' *A History of the World in 10½ Chapters* (1989) and John Fowles' *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. In Guignery (2006), Guignery & Roberts (2009), and Shusha Guppy's conversation with Julian Barnes (2009), there are references to feminism in Barnes' works and discussions on how strongly the novelist manages to represent characters of different sexes, but none of these has critically addressed masculinity as a social construct. The present research stands, therefore, as a response to the notable lack of masculinity studies in relation to Barnes' biofictions.

The key terms to be made use of in the present study are: hegemonic masculinity, masculinization, mutuality, and separatist masculinity. The discussion in this dissertation is centered around understanding traditional or "hegemonic masculinity" not as a static or monolithic model of maleness, but as a dynamic and superior set of societal norms that marginalize other forms of masculinity in the gender system, based on the ruling ideologies (Connell, *Masculinities*). My analysis of the selected novels reveals antithetical features in the masculinity of known historical figures in Barnes's works in order to put emphasis on the fact that although hegemonic masculinity promises coherence, power and authenticity, and although it maintains an un/conscious presence in men's lives and continues to encourage males to try to measure up all their actions and behaviors to its ideals, in actual life hegemonic masculinity is impossible to embody because of its internal contradictions and ruptures (Butler 2006). Maleness proves to be ambivalent and contradictory in nature.

The other key term to be employed in the analysis of Barnes' biofictions, "masculinization," refers to the lifelong performative process of give-and-take, during which males usually learn to un/consciously repeat, negotiate, or break a certain cycle of what other men do. The present research on Barnes' biographical novels shows that even in societies with a predominant stiff-upper-lip model of maleness, where masculinization forces men to hold in check a range of emotions, needs and capabilities that are socially associated with non-males (such as empathy, nurturing and compassion), there are chances for negotiation and modification in masculinization. Barnes' biofictions incorporate male characters from various sociocultural backgrounds, each of whom, at some point, negotiate or modify the traditional understanding of masculinity in their own respective societies.

In the present research on the representation of masculinity in Barnes' biofictions, masculinization often appears as a performance that can challenge the predominant gender norms in a society. Following postmillennial revisions Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) conducted on the concept of "hegemonic masculinity," it can be argued that men and women exercise a conscious will, to some extent, in adopting or rejecting ideologies. Since the term "hegemonic," in this view, involves "certain notions of consent and participation by the subaltern groups," Connell and Messerschmidt describe women, gay men and black men as the authenticators of the white man's supremacy (848). In addition to exercising a conscious will in falling under domination, individuals, Connell and Messerschmidt believe, can actively dispute unpleasant masculine features and/ or foster any "behavior that might serve the interests or desires" of others (840-1). In this "relational approach" toward masculinization, instead of blindly adhering to discourses and elements of power on the formation of one's gender markers, each individual has the liberty to oppose the dominant gender ideologies by his/her own personal acts, and prevent themselves from being homogenized by stereotypes embedded within hegemonic masculinity. In line with this idea, in their *Communities of Color* (2004) Curry-Stevens and Cross-Hemmer explore and give examples of the ways individual black men can adopt to resist racial discrimination, surpass the ambivalent positionality assumed for colored men and challenge the social structures that authenticate the superiority of white men. Following this perspective, the present study examines the roles Barnes' characters play in challenging the traditions of sexism, classism and racism that define the hegemonic model of masculinity in each of his biofictions.

Following the discussions on the possible capacity of the human will in acquiring gender markers, the present study scrutinizes the ways Barnes' biofictions adopt to address the crisis of masculinity by replacing essentialist policies with another key concept, "mutuality," a term interchangeably used in this dissertation with intersubjectivity, interdependence, reconciliation or deterritorialization as it involves re-establishing an inclusive relationship between the seemingly opposite poles of the self and the Other.

Mutuality, as Boyd says, happens once men begin to see non-males "not as competitors, but as cherished partners in the co-creation of our common life," or when men begin "to resist, individually and collectively, those institutional realities and structures of consciousness— internal and external— that harm and distort others and [them]selves" (129). The blame, in this view, is to be laid on the oppressive system, not on individual men, because otherwise, men might misunderstand and act defensively in response to discussions on relationality. In his *Undoing*, Pease recommends preventing such a misunderstanding among men, by "untangling a critique of patriarchy as a particular form of gender order from a general critique of men" (105). Accordingly, this dissertation evaluates the potential for reciprocal relationships in assuming masculinity in Barnes' biographical fiction, and it targets the underlying hierarchical system (not individual characters) that fosters discrimination and exclusivity in defining manhood.

The idea of reconciliation brings up another key concept around which the present research is formulated: "separatist masculinity" or the heroic ego, which is exemplified in warrior-hero figures or in protective adamant models of maleness in the present consumerist free market, to advertise an exclusive, authentic and unique pathway for the construction of masculinity, denying the possibility of contradiction, innovation and individuality in the formation of gender markers (Segal 2007, 92). Following Balbus' (2002) synthesis of masculinity studies with feminist psychoanalytic theories on the masculine heroic ego, the present dissertation investigates the ways in which Barnes' masculine figures challenge the separatist model of masculinity which is based on men's narcissist attributions, their illusion of omnipotence, and their antagonism against non-males (212). Due to repudiating emotionality and denying the need for building humane relations with others, the separatist self, as Segal says, is always suffering from an extreme hunger for intimacy, and fails to achieve full recognition or complete participation in selfhood (96). According to Bob Mullaly's *Challenging Oppression* (2002), the contemporary capitalist and neoliberalist social institutions gain huge

advantage from normalizing separatist antagonistic masculinity as they provoke consumerist thoughts, values and lifestyles that harm subordinate men and distract them from the actual power struggles between men of higher classes. Following this idea, this dissertation identifies narcissistic attributions among the male characters of Barnes' selected works, and it inspects the ways the narratives take to break the cycle of essentialist maleness which tries to address the problem of masculinity by abolishing women's rights and implementing impersonal strategies for institutionalizing sexism and racism.

The section below presents a brief survey of the development of theories on the problem of masculinity, and concludes with some notes on how the present research contributes to the existing currents of thought on masculinity. It then presents the methodology used in conducting the present research.

1.1. The Development of Theories on the Problem of Masculinity

Since the second half of the 19th century, issues related to the concept of masculinity have become more pertinent in the West in parallel with the development of movements such as modernism, antiracism, secularism, skepticism, and more importantly, feminism. At the same time that these movements empowered social minorities and encouraged innovation in individual and group behaviors, they inevitably disturbed the "male-on-top" social structures, which resulted in serious uncertainties or questionings concerning masculine identities. Books and journals – such as William Wallace Everts' *Manhood: Its Duties* (1854), Cramb's *Reflections on the Origins* (1900), and the antifeminist works of Eliza Lynn Linton (1822-1898) – were published to address the man problem and suggest solutions by promoting traditional gender binaries, and reminding the public of men's assumed ontological status or innate superiority. They tried to restore the old coherent and exclusive image of masculine essence by defining the tenets of maleness on the basis of men's domination over the non-male and the non-White. It was commonly believed that the provoked disturbance to the discriminatory principles of maleness could be reversed or undone.

By the start of World War I, as shown in books such as Frederic Manning's *The Middle* (1929), the struggle to get to the essential core of manhood through heroism, patriotism,

fraternity and the stiff-upper-lip model of maleness intensified. Gradually, however, once the truth about the physical, mental and social descent of war veterans was disclosed, the traditional model of heroic masculinity was challenged by a large volume of anti-war books, discussing the nations' disillusionment with the traditional understanding of masculinity and militarism, as in Robert Graves' *Goodbye* (1929), and Siegfried Sassoon's *Memoirs* (1930). The bitter realities of war, the high level of destruction, the images of men's maimed or killed bodies, the psychological trauma of the surviving military men, and the socioeconomic crisis many countries went through after the Great War led to the questioning of the idealized image of the invulnerable or triumphant warrior that defined the battlefield as the elevated stage for men's proof of heroic masculinity. In the interwar period, the disillusionments concerning war, heroism, and masculine ideals went hand in hand with the societal tensions the radical movements (such as feminism, modernization, etc.) continued to create at the time by rejecting traditional gender norms, and by putting emphasis on individualism and innovation in assuming gender markers.

With the start of World War II and the traumatic experience of men at the frontlines, ideals of militaristic toughness and masculine stoicism were challenged even more fundamentally. Wartime propaganda that promoted democratic ideals in many countries, together with anti-authoritarian sociopolitical activities that intensified during and after WWII, facilitated discussions on gender roles and equality and questioned hierarchical gender relations. After World War II, while the "hard man" model of manhood had failed to provide a solution to the problem of masculinity, the confusion over the sexual identities and roles of males increased because of the "widespread questioning [...] of not only the norms of 'manliness', but also of supportive frameworks of knowledge" (Petersen 20). In the majority of Western countries, decolonization and independence movements – such as Feminism, Civil Rights Movement, LGBTQ+ Rights – emerged and developed in the postwar era, each of which effectively challenged the dominant power dynamic, raised counterculture discussions on sexuality, and called for more egalitarian and novel perspectives on gender and sexuality in the post-war era.

One of the emancipatory movements that introduced a new perspective on the problem of masculinity in the second half of the 20th century was the second-wave feminism of the early 1960s. While the majority of second-wave feminists held strict views on

manhood and perceived misogyny as a universally widespread phenomenon, and while they tried to find a way around the problem of patriarchy and masculinity by reversing gender hierarchies (Ashe 11; Giddens 70; Redstockings Manifesto Paragraph III & II), some liberal feminists like Betty Friedan, in her bestselling nonfiction book of 1963, *The Feminine Mystique*, questioned the mentality that had fostered gender hierarchies, and pointed the finger at misogynistic traditions (rather than individual men) as a destructive force that had created an unreal image of men and women and thus ruined their relationships. Friedan, therefore, tried to sever masculinity from the notion of patriarchy and displayed maleness as "a social role that, like femininity, needed to be understood and interrogated" (Adams et al. 4). By displaying sexism as a modifiable tradition, Friedan paved the ground for social constructionist and poststructuralist approaches to the problem of masculinity.

The problem of masculinity was also precipitated by the development of the Gay Liberation Movement in the late 1960s, as it used women's strategies of emancipation to question heterosexual normativity within the benchmarks set for masculinity; gay men blurred gender binaries, challenged the borderlines between the central (e.g. militarism and heroism) and the peripheral (e.g. effeminacy and emotionality) patterns of masculinity, and contradicted the hegemonic norms on the complementarity of the sexes in Western family structure (Mowlabocus 23). Through all these movements, manliness turned into a category, or a fabricated concept that could be performed differently. According to Carrigan et.al, "[t]hough there had been books about masculinity before the 1970s, there had not been a *genre* debating the nature of masculinity and its social expression" (567). Considering masculinity as a fabricated genre turned the assumption of gender markers into an arbitrary and incoherent process. The idea aligned with the postmodern "crisis of category" which rejected the either/or mentality embedded within sexual, social and cultural stereotypes (Gediman 1064), and represented maleness as "a political condition experienced as a journey requiring constant negotiation between individuals, none of whom have access to maps (or if they have, each reads them differently), and all of whom have slightly different destinations in mind" (Whitehead 148). In this context, critics such as Andrea Dworkin in *Woman Hating* (1974), tried to tackle the problem of masculinity by highlighting androgynous aspects of the human body: "We are, clearly, a multisexed species which has its sexuality spread along a vast fluid continuum where the elements called male and female are not discrete" (183). By

encouraging men to come to terms with their own feminine selves, Dworkin showed that males and females could not be divided into naturally opposite or distinct poles, and thus the struggle over the superiority of one sex over the other would be meaningless.

Following the discussions on the interrelationship between masculinity and femininity, anti-sexist male critics (the male proponents of feminism), such as Myron Brenton in his *The American Male* (1966), developed reconciliatory approaches to the problem of masculinity. In Brenton's opinion, men's anxiety and plight at the face of women's increasing autonomy could be relieved if men freed themselves from patriarchal conventions and welcomed the new gender roles that feminists offered, for example for the sexual/ reproductive freedom of women, or their rights for political participation, or wage and work equality (70). In the 1970s, Brenton's idea of reconciliation between men and feminism led to the start of the first profeminist men's organization in Britain, named Achilles Heel Collective, and the publication of their biannual magazine, *Achilles Heel* (Pease *Recreating* 4; Stoltenberg 45). Although the organization was small and unstable with no centralized structure, and although profeminists initially failed to go beyond essentialist approaches to consider socio-cultural power dynamics, the group paved the way for major transformations in understanding masculinity in the late 20th century (Brittan 2; Hearn 74; Jordan 133). Profeminists opened eyes to the possibility of solving the man problem through cooperation and intersubjectivity (Kimmel 635).

In response to the growth of profeminist men's groups, antifeminist organizations, such as Men's Liberation Movement (in the 1970s), Men's Rights Movement (in the 1980s) and Mythopoetic Men's movement (in the late 1980s), started to defend men as "victimised and guilt-tripped by women, especially feminists" (Goldrick-Jones, *Men Who Believe,* 35). In her widely-quoted *The Feminized Male* (1969), Patricia Sexton, the anti-feminist psychoanalyst, blamed women for depriving men of complete socialization, and claimed that the problem of masculinity would be solved by disparaging, rather than advocating, feminism. Robert Bly's best-seller, *Iron John* (1990), likewise, tried to justify male supremacy and revitalize the lost "wild" masculinity. Antifeminists perceived males to be "emotionally and sexually manipulated by women, forced into provider roles where they work themselves to death for their gold-digger wives" (Messner, *Men Freeing Men* 32). To save men, antifeminists like Jack Sawyer rapidly founded and developed men's centers to raise awareness about men's needs and

distresses (Seidler, *Men, Sex* 20). Sawyer invited males in his "On Male Liberation" (1970) to do or discuss what they were previously prohibited from, such as expressing their emotional selves, or representing their sexual bodies in public and media, and repeating mottos like "It's okay to cry" (2). Though it initially looked like promoting unmanly features, the idea proved to alleviate the anxiety and fear among men, and facilitated their freedom of expression. Gradually, by the inclusion of emotionality and sexuality (the conventionally unmanly features), the followers of men's liberation and men's rights movements stood against masculine stereotyping and disturbed the normative gender binaries, which inadvertently reaffirmed the possibility of having intersectional approaches to the man problem.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Socialist Feminist Men's Movement in Australia and Britain followed social constructionist approaches to subdivide the apparently unified category of masculinity into various groups – based on their race, ethnicity, sexual orientation and social class – and they replaced the term "masculinity" with "masculinities" to facilitate intersectional views and to prevent exclusion in masculinity studies. By studying the diversity of hierarchies in male-to-male and male-to-female relationships, Socialist Feminist men turned masculinity into a continuing process of contestation and marginalization or a form of "social doings" (Carrigan et.al, 1985, 589) that depended on creating "differences that are not natural, essential, or biological" (West & Zimmerman 137). According to this view, gender distinctions were continually being constructed and modified in men based on what Connell and Messerschmidt called traditional or "hegemonic masculinity" i.e. the "most honored way of being a man" that "required all other men to position themselves in relation to it" (832). Discussions on the constructed nature of hegemonic masculinity opened the space, for the first time, for debates on the problems of marginalized men (gay or black) as they were previously "emasculated" and disregarded in the gender hierarchy set by essentialists (Whitehead 45-48; Messner, *Men Freeing Men* 56). For socialist feminists, men of each specific race, social class or sexuality had their own particular problems. Andrew Tolson's *The Limits* (1977), for example, focused on black working-class males in the U.S., and the problems specific to this group of men. While the problem of masculinity was diversified, the solution socialist feminists offered was almost the same: abandoning supremacism. In his *Rediscovering* (1989), for instance, Seidler warned white men about the harms of racism, and proposed reconciliatory behaviors (71).

Gradually, in the 1980s, as the antifeminist movements lost strength, the insistence on solving the man problem through reconciliation increased, because of which some behavioral changes were observed in men, and a "new masculine subjectivity" was formed with socially and personally miscellaneous features, and no "absolute integral self," trying to "create solidarity with women and gay men on the basis of a respect for difference" (Pease *Recreating* 110). It was believed that in the absence of a gender core, the likelihood of diversity and the interconnections between the self and the not-self would maximize. In the late 1980s, by extending the boundaries of maleness, and by the support received from Canadian White Ribbon Campaign (WRC) – which grouped men and boys to stop violence against females – deconstructionist profeminist approaches gained strength in Britain and America in solving the problem of masculinity. These profeminists followed poststructuralist theories, such as Judith Butler's performativity of gender to disclose the contradictory and illusory nature of heterosexual masculinity. In profeminist studies, as in Pronger's "On Your Knees" (1998), Hopkins' "Gender Treachery" (1996), Kaufman's "Men, Feminism" (1994) and Seidler's *Men, Sex* (1992), the solution to the problem of masculinity was in abandoning domination (or "deterritorialization") and welcoming contradictions and instabilities in masculinization. The term "fluid masculinity" was thereby coined to replace the dialectic understanding of maleness to transcend the restrictions imposed by heterosexual and patriarchal tough guy ideals (Wetherall & Edley 337). This assumption of fluidity turned masculinity into a destabilized gender trait that can be experienced in various ways, not necessarily fulfilling the traditional or societal expectations about maleness. Gender politics, therefore, became more complicated and inclusive.

Toward the mid-1990s, however, anti-feminists and essentialists expressed serious concern over the ubiquity and severity of the crisis of masculinity in the west. Lauren Berlant (1997), for example, explained that men of the 1990s felt "truly exposed and vulnerable. They felt anxious about their value to themselves, their families, their publics, and their nation" (2). Also, Anthony Clare, a British psychiatrist of the time, confirmed that "At the beginning of the twenty first century it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that men are in serious trouble" (xviii). So, in the late 1990s, while the pro/feminist movements had prepared the ground for defining a novel non-discriminatory perception of maleness, governments in the west displayed systematic anti-feminist reactions to address the problem of masculinity. In Britain, David Blunkett

(the Minister of Education in 2000) attributed the problems of previously-ignored working-class boys and men, to all males of the time, and "announced urgent action to boost boys' performance in schools" (Segal xix). Also, the British Men's Health Forum developed into a governmental organization in 1997, which "support[ed] men's groups and projects in 'socially disadvantaged' areas, especially for unemployed men" (Hearn 82). Men were provided with systematic treatments in an urgent way, and females' achievements were displayed as a blatant violation of the natural superiority of the males (Segal xx). Scase (1999), for example, related the considerable increase in men's rate of suicide in the 1990s, to the happy life of women (usually single) living free from the restraints imposed by the conventions of patriarchy. The empowerment of women was blamed for the deteriorating mental health in men and their social isolation; also, the prevailing discussions on the need for gender equality in workplaces were taken as the source of economic distress in males. Gender discrimination was being brought back into existence to address the problem of masculinity.

While authorities were struggling to revive patriarchal masculinity, capitalism and Neoliberalism came to their rescue, and worked as a means for renouncing women's rights and prioritizing men's. The western capitalist market progressively invigorated the traditional gender stereotypes about men's heroic predatory market skills, and gradually put the crisis of masculinity into a reverse gear by masculinizing the grounds of global competition. For Ehrenreich, in the capitalist world, gender discrimination was more effective than before, as it happened to be more "impersonal, corporate and bureaucratic" (289). At the same time with capitalism, New Labour gained strength, promising to bring sociopolitical justice to all. Because of the significance they gave to privatization, Neoliberals' claims for equality, however, institutionalized sexism and racism, and thereby muted those who had just started to express themselves (Kapoor 1029).

As a result, traces of disregard (if not disdain) for feminism and women's concerns appeared in different countries, and profeminist activities were drawn to the margin for a while and then almost stopped (Hearn 75; Segal, xxv). Goldrick-Jones (2002) relates this decline to the complicated nature of interdisciplinary approaches to the man problem: "it's extraordinarily difficult to navigate political tensions around not only racism and sexual orientation, but also male privilege and men's relations with feminism" (202). To

find a more realistic and plausible solution, essentialist male-on-top activism increased, refusing to show any serious concern for women's rights. According to Hearn's "Autobiography," nothing happened as "'anti-profeminist' or indeed as 'anything'". The systematized support for men "wrongly" displayed the male-dominated mainstream of the time to be "(gender-)neutral," and claimed to practice "plain politics" (85). Supremacism was reinstated. Some social critics, consequently, lost their hope for finding an egalitarian solution to the crisis of masculinity. In her *The Will to Change* (2004), bell hooks, for example, found patriarchy inseparable from the hegemonic model of masculinity in the west, and claimed that even if profeminists might at first criticize "male domination," they, at the end, would submit to it as they needed "to be accepted and affirmed in a patriarchal workplace" and society (28). Similar to hooks, in the study De Visser et al. (2009) conducted on a group of British 18-to-21-year-old boys, misogyny proved to be an essential masculine feature for most young boys.

The conflict between pro/feminist and antifeminist perspectives in the early 21st century inspired a new phase of studies on the man problem and a new course of intellectual discussions on maleness. In his "The Construction of the Construction of Masculinities" (2011), Brod labeled the early 2000s as "a new dawn," and referred to the publication of a long list of books and journals to illustrate the diversity of studies conducted on the man problem between 2002 and 2009. In the opinion of Brod, such a huge unprecedented record of publications on the man problem showed that the studies on maleness had passed their initial stages and "reached some sort of intellectual maturity" (24). Goldrick-Jones, later, called this air of sophistication a "Post-millennial" movement (201) as it revised and continued the deconstructionist and socialist perspectives on the man problem. Post-millennial revisions, as Hearn (2005) explained, tried "to deconstruct the dominant" in practice to facilitate social justice (85). Segal (2007), for instance, gave real-life examples of the attitudes some known masculine figures adopted at the time not to get "caught up in a system which is exploitative of and oppressive to women, gays, and certain other men" (243). In the provided examples, Segal drew attention to women's and gay/ black men's positive roles in the construction of famous men's manliness. Bob Pease (*Recreating*, 2000), in another example, drew attention to the taken-for-granted privileges of men in actual life to reject the unfounded claims about their miserable situation. Social critics, like Stephen Boyd (1995) and Kapoor (2013), on the other hand, challenged the empowerment initiatives and the

limited leadership roles neoliberals offered to women and sexual/racial minorities for not addressing structural prejudices, and also for their being limited to market policies. Neoliberal strategies, Boyd and Kapoor believed, failed to heal gender disparities for prioritizing individual benefit to social equity, and they defied the assumption of intersubjectivity and relationality in the construction of masculinity.

In short, from the mid-19th century onward, issues related to the concept of masculinity have been analyzed from different perspectives. Considering the ebb and flow of pro-and-anti feminist reactions to the problem of masculinity, and in response to the increasing influence of neoliberalism and capitalism in the present world, which insist on restoring hierarchical essentialist gender stereotypes to address issues of maleness and masculinity, the present dissertation follows the above-mentioned critical and socialist pro/feminist perspectives to put forward an all-encompassing intersectional view on the problem of masculinity in Barnes' biographical novels to explore the ways in which the novels challenge the assumption of maleness by unchaining manhood from its underlying heterosexist and racist prejudices and by making it independent of the overwhelming demands of hegemonic masculinity. Rather than taking maleness as a universally inherent essence or a biological core in men, in this thesis it is suggested that in Barnes' novels, masculinity works as a modifiable social construct that can be changed within and across social structures, and can be performed differently through constant negotiations between individuals and the related society.

In exploring the selected novels, this dissertation takes a critical view of the supremacist nature of male-dominated activism that heightened in the mid-1990s and still continues its course. Like Connell, in *The Men and the Boys* (2000), the present study suggests through its readings that it is not possible to address the problem of masculinity "by nostalgia. We need new and more democratic patterns in gender relations, not re-runs of discredited patriarchies" (6). Following Pease (*Undoing*), the present research, through analyzing Barnes' novels, points to the drawbacks of essentialist masculinity studies that try to normalize social discrimination for resolving the man problem. While the New Labour uses the competitive economy of the 21st century as an excuse to reinforce hyper-masculinity and to revive gender binaries (Cornwall et al. 17), the present dissertation follows poststructuralist perspectives in exploring the selected novels, hence, challenging the assumptions on "Ideal Masculinity" that propagate homophobia, sexism,

racism, homosociality, etc. The analyses revolve around the idea that once the hegemonic model of masculinity is questioned, men's reconciliation with the marginalized others will take place and the intended equity and inclusion in masculinization will emerge.

In the light of poststructuralist and socialist feminist studies, the present study explores the representations of masculinity in the selected works of Barnes, regarding maleness as a fluid process of contestation and marginalization which is based on arbitrary, contradictory and incoherent gender policies. The study investigates how Barnes' selected narratives go beyond reductionist views of maleness to foster a liberal and inclusive understanding of manhood, and it explores representations of maleness in Barnes' works from the perspective of critical thinkers in the performativity of gender such as Judith Butler, whose idea of "gender parody" in *Gender Trouble* (2006) displays gender as an "imitation without an origin" (188). The present research also explores Barnes' representation of masculinity through concepts like Kristeva's *ecriture feminine*, Bakhtin's Heteroglossia, and Foucault's hereditary degeneration in men to unveil the manifold, contradictory and individualized nature of masculinity. All these specific theories will be discussed and elaborated when needed during the analysis of the novels.

Here, masculinity is taken as an interdisciplinary field of study that incorporates and relies on insights from gender studies, feminist studies, sociology, cultural studies, anthropology, political science and history. To incorporate marginalized males as represented in the selected novels, masculinity is displayed to be intersected with race, sexuality and class, and it is assumed that males have a special privilege over non-males, even if they are victimized by the hierarchical ruling systems or even if they are "subordinated by class, race or sexuality and so on" (Pease, *Undoing,* 102). Pease says, "Even if they are marginalised by other social divisions, they still maintain gendered advantages over women within their marginalised communities" (*Undoing* 102). Following Allen Johnson's *Unraveling* (1997), this thesis identifies and challenges the "institutionalized privileges" (4) of male characters from different sociocultural backgrounds in Barnes' biographical works of fiction to analyze how these works revers racial, sexual and class hierarchies, and challeng the social assumptions on the difference between common/ uncommon or ideal/ inferior models of masculinity. In Barnes' works, although males may not benefit from institutionalized privileges to the same degree (based on their sexual, racial or class positionalities), they are often favored by the ruling

gender stereotypes in different ways. In his representations of masculinity, Barnes keeps a critical distance from the prevailing gender norms to challenge the taken-for-granted masculine privileges.

This dissertation is divided into three chapters, apart from the Introduction and Conclusion. Each chapter focuses specifically on the analysis of the problem of masculinity in one of the three selected biofictions: Chapter 2, which immediately follows this one, is dedicated to the exploration of the notion of Englishman as represented in *Arthur & George;* Chapter 3 focuses on Russian masculinity in *The Noise of Time,* and Chapter 4 on being a Frenchman in *The Man in the Red Coat*. All the analytical chapters in this study start with a historical review of the construction of masculinity in the related historical time and place: Chapter 2 starts with discussions on the hegemonic model of maleness and the problem of masculinity in Victorian and Edwardian (or Prewar) England; Chapter 3 starts with a historical review of the construction of Russian masculinity and the challenges in assuming maleness, before and during the Soviet regime; and Chapter 4 begins with the historical analysis of French masculinity during the Belle Époque. All chapters incorporate an extensive textual analysis in the light of insights taken from sociological/philosophical studies on gender and sexuality in each culture.

In the textual analysis of each novel, I initially identify the ways Barnes' works use to create a realistic representation of maleness and to reflect the historically-true problem of masculinity in the selected biofictions through his characterization and plot development; then I investigate how these works keep a critical distance from the realistic account to propose a more inclusive perspective for addressing the man problem in the context of each work. Going through this process, this research makes a significant contribution to the literature by merging literary analysis with sociological studies on masculinity (as in Whitehead or Connell & Messerschmidt), with philosophical approaches to gender regulations (as in Judith Butler's gender parody), with postmodern assumptions on sexuality (as in Foucault's voluntary servitude or Kristeva's semiotics), and with discussions on art in gendered power dynamics (as in Bourdieu's musicology) and reality (as in Baudrillard's hyperreal) to arrive at how Barnes' selected biofictions avoid normalization in the definition of gender markers in order to challenge gender hierarchies and to question the myth of manhood in an innovative way.

CHAPTER 2

THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN *ARTHUR & GEORGE* (*A & G*)

Julian Barnes' parodic detective biofiction, *Arthur & George* (2005), explores the problem of masculinity and examines the possibility of questioning the hegemonic model of maleness in the context of Victorian and early Edwardian England. The novel seems to retain the same air and impression as the dominant printed works of the early 21st century about manliness in that it similarly depicts the alienation of the white man from himself and his own society due to a decrease in his socioeconomic power, and it opens the definition of masculinity to "ambiguity, complexity, [and] mutability" (Segal *Slow Motion* xvii-xviii). Harry Brod compares the early 21st century (the time *Arthur & George* was published) to the scene of a crime in which the dead "corpse" of masculinity is on the floor, and philosophers and critics, like "detectives," visit the crime scene to identify the problem, and "to reconstruct what happened" to the victim ("The Construction," 2011, 23). In this perspective, Barnes' *Arthur & George* seems to reflect some of the same concerns over the crisis of masculinity by detecting the origins of English manhood and by revealing its performative and constructed nature.

Barnes sets *Arthur & George* in prewar (the late Victorian and Edwardian) England, which is commonly assumed to be the idyllic period for Englishmanness, and usually depicted as "some kind of Indian summer of English supremacy and unchallenged greatness" (Berberich's "All Letters" 123). The author constructs the plot of the novel on the basis of the real-life story of an English-Parsee solicitor called George Ernest Thompson Edalji, who was wrongly convicted and imprisoned for a few years in the 1910s, on the charge of mutilating livestock and writing threat letters while living in a South Staffordshire village, England. As in the novel, after being released on license (and not allowed to return to his favorite job as a solicitor), George appeals to Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the great author of the time, and gets pardoned by his intervention. Similar to what happens in Barnes's fictional world, George thereafter returns to his job, and moves to London together with his sister, Maud.

While legal British texts appreciate George Edalji's case for the formation of the first English Court of Criminal Appeal, and while literary critics often analyze the representation of the incident in Barnes' *Arthur & George* from the point of view of postmodern historiography and postcolonialism, the present research scrutinizes the novel for its representation of masculinity in England and the conscious attempt to re-construct the notion of the Englishman. In the multidimensional context of the novel, the narrative ironically uses detective fiction – the conventionally conservative masculine genre – to challenge the illusion of pure English masculinity in the late 19th and early 20th century by reversing gender hierarchies, questioning racial prejudices, reconciling opposites, and by foregrounding the internal conflicts of his protagonists, Arthur and George, to explore manhood through the juxtaposition of feminine/ masculine, and white/ non-white elements. The struggle of the protagonists, Arthur and George, to conform to the conventions of Victorian manliness and the futility of their attempt, put the males in quite a predicament, creates pain in power, and provokes the crisis of masculinity in the novel. In my discussions on the crisis of masculinity, I explore not only Arthur's and George's plights, but also the novel's general stance on the man problem.

Arthur & George replaces the traditionally clean-cut image of men and English masculinity with an ambiguous flickering shadow that could be interpreted in different ways. In the innovative understanding the novel develops about maleness and masculinization, as Culbertson's comment may apply, the problem of masculinity is displayed to be rooted in "[s]exism, assumptions of superiority, culturally inherited sex stereotyping, antithetical thinking, emotional sterility, the unexamined perpetuation of tradition— all [of which were] forms of a frozen attitude in urgent need of conversion and renewal" (35). As *Arthur & George* indicates, to critically review the myth of manhood and to address the problem of masculinity effectively, all types of sociocultural discriminations are to be put aside.

To elaborate on what I mean, I start with a historical review of the construction of English masculinity in Victorian and early Edwardian England, and I explore the profound influence of sociocultural doctrines such as imperialism, racism, empiricism, Christianity, etc. on the assumption of manliness in that era. Then, I continue with an extensive textual analysis of factual representations of Victorian masculinity in *Arthur &*

George, discussing the similarities the novel shares with historical accounts on the features and characteristics of Victorian and Early Edwardian maleness. After investigations of realistic representations of maleness in the novel, I continue the textual analysis by exploring the ways the novel contradicts the legacy of empiricism, racism and sexism in that era in defining manliness; in this section, I look into the interconnections between the idea of English masculinity, the idea of nation and the image of the Englishman, and I investigate the ways this perception of maleness is disputed and challenged in the novel to open space for discussions on mutuality, contradictions, hyperreality and individuality in the construction of English masculinity.

2.1. A Historical Review of the Definition of Masculinity in Victorian England

Being led by an imperial government since the late 16th century up until the 20th century, the white middleclass Englishman of the Victorian era perceived himself to be integrated closely with the state, and thus he constructed his own manliness mainly by devoting himself to war and by following the example of imperialist warriors. Following his forefathers, he was willing to participate in combats in order to practice masculine autonomy and independence, the "core attributes" of which "were physical vigor, energy and resolution, courage, and straightforwardness" (Tosh 335). The imperialist ambition of England had convinced the British man to reinforce his own authoritative masculinity by acting like a coarse, practical, and adventurous colonial agent, expressing his British individuality by conquering nature, gaining opportunities for land ownership, achieving economic prosperity, establishing colonies and putting down roots in different parts of the world (Mangan 11). The widely-used metaphors of war had impacted the ways of thinking and reacting of individual British men so deeply that in the Victorian era Britain became known as a "militaristic nation," and "soldiering" turned into the "moral mandate" of manhood for people of different social classes, even the aristocrats (Mangan 12-13). The idealization of war and soldiership promoted patriotism, conservatism and royalism among males in Britain of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

In this context, racism legitimized the authoritative and militaristic aspects of English masculinity to a great extent, and validated the superiority of white men's cultural values over the non-whites. In addition to the discriminatory policies the British Empire had established at the time as the biggest colonial power of the region, and beside the brutal

colonial activities British military force conducted in their "exploration of dark continents," the literature, the media and culture of the era assigned the white man a higher rank by displaying men of foreign nationalities as primitives or criminals (Linsley 2). While the "civilized" white man was acting like a noble, brave and adventurous Englishman, following all moral frameworks, the "uncivilized" was believed to be unintelligent and violent, and this "produce[d] different kinds of hierarchies based on race and class" in British society of the time (Ghosh 744). Freud, as Linsley explains, compared the empire to "a phallic symbol," and the colored man to the "feminized" or the "sexual object," suppressed and monopolized by the Englishman (6). Silencing the colored man's sexuality and suppressing his desire for masculine autonomy was believed to be necessary for consolidating the white man's maleness.

Another social factor that used to justify and strengthen imperialist masculinity in England, since long, was the idea of associating the idea of the white man with reason, and that of the non-white with passion in both cultural and political dimensions, according to which the superior rational Englishman claimed the right to instruct and discipline the feeble effeminates with "lower levels of civilization, and consequently, levels of mental capacity" (Linsley 5). Following the earlier doctrines of the Enlightenment and individualism that related happiness, progress and liberty to the values of rationalism, and in line with the rise of empiricism and scientific thinking in the Victorian era, which insisted on the principles of natural selection in solving sociopolitical problems, the imperialist Britain insisted on the significance of rationality, objectivity and the erasure of affect and effeminacy in the definition of manliness to facilitate and preserve the white man's ideological domination all over the world (Outram 29). The priority of masculine logic and intellectual reason over feminine passion, ambiguity and illogicality was believed to be natural and intrinsic. "The core element of individualism" in Victorian England lay "in an abstract realm of reason, honouring mind over body and emotions. It has been understood as something crafted, wrested from the vagaries of Nature and of everyday life, above all an integral part of a type of masculinity" (Davidoff 26). The Victorian man was, therefore, expected to pursue empirical thinking.

One more dominant social force in England that influenced early Victorian masculinity was Christianity and the religious revival movements in the early 19th century that insisted on returning to the Catholic roots of the Church of England, putting emphasis on

the hierarchical relationship among males and females, and associating maleness with God's promise to divine protection. Within the framework Christianity provided for gender roles, men were perceived as spiritual leaders and the head of the household, expected to protect their families by committing themselves to moral cleanliness, self-control, courage, honesty, hard work, and sexual restraint (Carroll 28). Gender binaries were considerably valued in Christianity, and effeminacy was viewed as a virulent "poison" to which manliness served as an effective natural "antidote" (Watson et al. paragraph 2). Unmanly behaviors, qualities or characteristics were therefore not tolerated, and gender stereotypes were perpetuated.

The idea of suppressing effeminacy in imperialist, empiricist and Christian masculinity in the Victorian era had its roots in the significance of sexism and gender binaries in the construction of English masculinity at the time: "there was hardly any overlap between the active, rational, resolute male and the emotional, nurturing, malleable female. The two sexes were essentialized, and woman was constructed as 'other' in a more absolute sense than ever before" (Tosh 336). Men were, in fact, believed to be ungendered, and the empirical historiographies refused to take gender and sexuality into account (330). For instance, women's role was not mentioned in the first edition of E. J. Hobsbawm's famous historiography, *Industry and Empire* (officially published in 1864) that recorded socio-political institutions of British Empire in the past two hundred and fifty years. Kingsley (1999) regards the absence of women in British historiography as the sign of modern Britain's general "myopia" or ignorance toward women of the time (52). Women's restriction to the domestic sphere put Victorian men in the outstanding position of "breadwinners" in their families, and insisted on women's need for protection (Tosh 332). The notion of the Victorian Englishman was considerably dependent on the patriarchal social system of the time.

Consequent to idealizing women's role as Angels of the House and excluding them from the public sphere, male bonding became substantially valued in masculinization in England, as it relieved men from the anxiety of socializing with women or seeking domination over them; the exclusive male companionship was believed to salvage men's masculinity as absolute and reinforce the image of the individualistic and strong British man (Davidoff 26). Though the hegemonic model of white masculinity required men to show "interest in the family and kinship" (Davidoff 25), the majority of Englishmen's

relationship to and interest in the family was "unstable and problematic" (27). While the family unit was "seen to be natural, the building block of society," in line with the patriarchal social structures of the time men preferred to keep their family ties and tasks "outside of 'the social'" because traditionally the "family has been regarded as a feminine domain" (Davidoff 26). At the same time with appreciating the "mechanism of male partnership, mainly of father, brothers, or uncle, nephew and in-laws" (Davidoff 28), men tried to preserve control and power over women, and had restricted relationship with their non-male family members. Expressing strong interest in the family could put men at the risk of effeminacy and degradation.

The conventional assumptions about white, empiricist, sexist or Christian masculinity, however, were not stable, and proved to be uncontrollably shakable as time passed. Modernization tendencies and the industrial revolution that had begun to transform the technological, economic and sociocultural situation of England since the late 18th century, were gradually diminishing the Englishman's traditional understanding of his own place and values (Davidoff 27). Earlier, he used to live in a small community, worked alongside his relatives in a family business, and built his own selfhood based on his immediate sociocultural context. With the start of the industrial revolution, the Englishman's lifestyle had to change based on the needs of the urbanizing society; he had to adapt himself to the insatiable demand of the expanding job market, and make revisions in his relationships with other men and women (Davidoff 27). On account of industrialism and capitalism, he had to focus on his own personal (rather than communal) economic success, and hold onto the new consumerist values that prioritized prodigal consumption habits and cherished the accumulation of financial wealth and material possessions as the measure of a man's success and sense of pleasure.

The increasing significance of material possessions in masculinization and the opportunity modernization created for commercial, scientific and technical advancements, brought about a ceaseless class struggle between men of different social classes over the new occupational, educational and investment opportunities. Thanks to the socioeconomic transformations of the time, males from almost any social background seemed to be allowed to pursue different professions and gained a prospect of advancement in their wealth and occupational prestige. This possibility of improving one's status in the class structure of the time, as Morgan says, made men of lower and middle classes feel "a sense of ontological security—a relatively stable sense of 'being

in the world'" (176). By putting further "emphasis on meritocratic values" in masculinization, industrialization "promote[d] the notion that people can achieve what they want if they have enough talent and are prepared to work hard" (Manstead 267). The idea encouraged men to work harder and try to prove their own appropriateness and proficiency in different fields.

Despite its initial appeal, as time passed, the competitive nature of modernizing England developed a growing feeling of uncertainty and tension over the real competence of man for taking on the modern world, and this uncertainty provoked mounting anxiety over men's role in the changing modern era. While technology was perceived "as the agent and child of democracy that would save humanity" from "barbarism, and inequality," it reduced the need for men's muscular strength at work, and resulted in the unemployment/ underemployment of a large number of men (Schmiechen 288). Also, industrialization provided a considerable number of women and racial minorities with a tremendous chance to receive education/ training, and enter the work force (though on much lower wage than white men); this change challenged the supremacy of the Englishman as the only breadwinner of his family, and began to create a rupture in the power dynamics of the Victorian era which was based on the exclusive autonomy of the white man (Kimmel "The Contemporary" 123). The social expectations on what white men or women could/ should do began to change.

Gradually, as modernizing England was witnessing widespread transformations in its sexual and racial order, working acquired a new meaning in the acquisition of masculine identity, and it turned into a means not only for the personal development of men, but also for deriving moral support, strengthening male bonding, and preserving men's connections to their own cultural roots (Tosh 332). At the same time with encouraging men to enjoy their works as an inspiration for creative self-making, and for inventing personal codes of conduct, working protected men from getting alarmed over the gradual disappearance of the old moral landmarks in industrialized England. Together with providing men with a chance for self-advancement through nondomestic ways of moneymaking, working saved males from a "condition of passivity and dependence that would otherwise have placed the victim's manhood in question" (Tosh 333). Work played a pivotal role in authenticating men's masculinity, and in ensuring their prominence in both public and private spheres.

In the face of the increasing trend of urbanization and the growing market-led lifestyles, the typical man of the mid-Victorian era had to keep his life "increasingly organized around the dual commitment to work and home so characteristic of modern industrial society" (Tosh 331). This sense of responsibility developed the "bourgeois" model of manliness in which thrift, self-discipline, and enterprise were admired, and the emphasis was on men's efficiency and skills in managing workflows and family relationships. Men of bourgeois masculinity identified themselves as "honest labourers," and they favored self-improvement and independence through working hard and preserving standards of morality. In line with social insistence on "objectivity," the bourgeois man of Victorian England refused emotionality and aesthetic due to associating them with the feminine, and focused instead on the practicality and functionality of his own words, thoughts and actions (Schmiechen 288). The hardworking bourgeois man proclaimed himself superior to idle aristocrats, and believed that the extension industrialization had created in the occupational opportunities could decrease the substantial inequalities of power between the poor and the wealthy (288). They assumed that industrialization would provide men with "different ways of 'doing' masculinity (collective versus individual, hands versus brains, and so on), and these different modes of masculinity were reinforced by clear distinctions at work and between communities" (Morgan 176).
For bourgeois men, hard work could heal class divisions and ensure man's independence.

Things didn't, however, go as the bourgeois predicted. Although some of the men of the middle class managed to advance as entrepreneurs or professionals and exerted a profound influence on the worlds of politics, commerce and culture of the time, class distinctions remained sharp and obvious even in the face of political and legislative transformations throughout the Victorian era (Morgan 170). Inspired by the prevailing ideas on the possibility of social mobility, socialist and labor parties were developed to help men of the lower class to claim political rights and ask for higher wages, all of which resulted in the approval of Reform Bill of 1866 and 1867 Act and extended voting privileges from men of gentry to all male adult citizens of the U.K., regardless of their level of income, education, property ownership, religion, race, etc. (Kimmel "The Contemporary" 122). Yet, the sense of socioeconomic and political insecurity continued among men, and the discontent of the majority of them with their own work and life conditions increased. Even in the late 19th century, despite the development of the labor

parties, a large number of men as family breadwinners had difficulties in meeting the basic needs of their families due to their poor working conditions and low income (Morgan 177). In socially-stratified Victorian England, the vicious cycle of disadvantage for middle and working classes seemed to repeat itself continually (Manstead 268). Thus, despite all attempts, "the divisions between social classes [we]re becoming wider, not narrower" and the discontent was placing the white man under constant pressure (Manstead 267). In spite of their heightened social and political awareness, most middle-class men in Victorian era were not granted the same privileges and they did not have access to the same ideal opportunities as the white men of the upper class, and this caused a deep sense of frustration.

The difficulties associated with modernization or class struggle were not, however, the only sources of the man problem in Victorian England. The notion of the white man was already under pressure by the anti-racist movements that had gradually started to dismantle the Empire since "the latter half of the 18th century in the wake of black uprising in Morant Bay, Jamaica" (Linsley 1). Toward the late 19th century, the growth of decolonization activities and the resulting legal reformations (such as the passing of the Indian Emigration Act in 1883) seriously disturbed the British consciousness which was preoccupied with imperialist racial discriminations since the late 16th century, and it gradually created feelings of insecurity, degradation and emasculation in the typical white man of the time. The resistance of the colored man against the imperial power (as publicly revealed in independence movements of the late 19th and the early 20th centuries) put the political and economic sovereignty of the U.K. at real risk, and disturbed the white man's assumed high regard for his own sociocultural superiority over the non-whites (Linsley 2). "Independence movements, from a psychological perspective, represented not a repressed male sexuality, but a repressed male desire for autonomy and leadership in patriarchal non-white societies" (Linsley 8). The rise of independence movements, toward the late 19th century, broke up the supposedly-natural relationship between English masculinity and racial oppression, and confronted the white man with an uncertain future.

Assumptions about the ideal image of the white man were further challenged by the growth of secularism and the consequent moral degeneracy. Despite the attempt Catholic institutions and Protestant organizations were making for adapting theological principles

to sociocultural changes and technological advancements of the time, in the second half of the 19th century by the growth of scientific views (as in Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in 1859) the old Christian ideas about the origin of man, sexual dualities, social hierarchies, and the creation of the world were fundamentally challenged, and the consequent conflict between Christianity and science resulted in the gradual development of secularism, skepticism, and a growing confusion over men's "real" role in the family and society (Linsley 7). The insistence on separating religion from the personal/ public life of individuals and from the governing system, disturbed the overall foundation, based on which the notion of the Englishman was established and questioned the narrow gender expectations on masculine autonomy, male supremacy and self-control. What used to consolidate English masculinity earlier proved to be inadequate in reinforcing masculine values in the late 19th and 20th centuries. While the Empire was trying to reinforce British national masculine identity by promoting Christianity, imperialism, racism and empiricism, the economic and sociocultural transformations of the time compelled the white man to make a revision in his own understanding of maleness and his relationship with other men and women.

The pervasiveness of secularism and skepticism in the late 19th century disturbed individuals' trust in the traditional social norms of the time, and heightened men's feelings of disengagement, discontent and frustration with the ruling power structures. Feeling disillusioned and, at the same time, struggling to redefine their own place and role in the rapidly-changing socioeconomic context of the time encouraged some Englishmen of the time to prioritize their own personal values and life purposes, and to try to find their own individual pathway to manliness independently (Rectenwald 13). It was difficult for the Englishman to create meaningful connections or to establish harmonious lasting relationships with other men, which was against the old traditions of fraternity and companionship in masculinization (Rectenwald 12). Feeling isolated in the industrialized society of the time aggravated men's sense of insecurity in the late Victorian era and exacerbated their confusion; they had to continually prove their own authenticity, worry about their personal achievements, struggle to justify their own individual direction and try to create a reliable sense of purpose in life to be recognized. The consequent attempt for developing a new perspective on human consciousness and the suppressed desires of human beings, gave rise to Art for Art's Sake movements that criticized capitalist and industrialized England, in order to free individuals from social

expectations and to prioritize individual expression and aesthetic freedom (Friedman 89). The new perception helped man "to see his desires anew" and make a reconsideration on their own understanding of selfhood (Friedman 2). In this revision, he

> profoundly rearrange[d] the contents of his consciousness and set the stage for his eventual rejection of the moral strictures of Bourgeois Victorian life. […] Though this revelation [wa]s, at first, profoundly unsettling, aesthetes soon f[ound] themselves harnessing the sense of fear and alienation and transforming it into a liberating sense of detachment from oppressive social norms. This experience elicit[ed] a version of subjective autonomy that allow[ed] them to envision new modes of seeing, thinking and living that expand[ed] the boundaries of contemporary social and intellectual structures. (Friedman 2)

Following the new radical aesthetic movements of the time, some men distanced themselves from conventional moral principles and gender hierarchies to celebrate sensuality, beauty and pleasure and to experiment with new forms of gender expression (Friedman 90). As some artists claimed, their Bohemian lifestyle and feminine attitudes and attributes (displayed for instance through their choice of feminine hairstyles or flamboyant clothing and accessories) were a revival of the concept of male beauty from Elizabethan era that added to the gender confusion of the time by distancing men from the strict gender norms of Victorian England.

What also aggravated the crisis of masculinity toward the late 19th century was the rise of unconventional sexual inclinations among men. Previously, in the early and mid-Victorian England, masculinization was considerably dependant on heterosexuality and the denial of "effeminacy" in men, which was, at the time, interpreted as the denial of men's interest in out-of-wedlock relationships and men's innate interest in physical or martial activities (Carter 143). As time passed, in line with the departure from moral norms and conventional gender expressions, "effeminacy" in men became associated with homosexuality which was taken as a disturbing sign of degeneracy and subversion. As Oscar Wilde's trials in 1890s indicated, homosexual men lived up to a highly negative social image in Victorian England, and they were rejected as the threatening "other" (Carter 144). Toward the late 19th century, although the public hostility toward gay men was growing, homosexual tendencies among men increased and new forms of sexual expression and leisure (such as pornography in the form of erotic literature and art) increased in the society. The new sexual expression and the possibility of transcending the norms of heterosexual masculinity challenged the conservative

bourgeois man's strict adherence to gender binaries and gender hierarchies, and it foregrounded men's potential for emotionality and domesticity (Cook 15). Toward the fin de siècle era, the former stiff-upper-lip model of heteronormative masculinity was disturbed, and the ground was paved for further transformations in gender dynamics.

As the impact of traditional sexual and racial doctrines declined and new forms of sexual expression became common, critical thinking on social relationships among individual men and women increased, and the sexist stereotypes and attitudes, based on which English masculinity was traditionally established, were challenged. According to Mosse, the departure homosexuality was making from traditional gender norms, together with the disturbance women's movement (later known as the first-wave feminist movement) made in gender hierarchies since the mid-19th century, put Victorian men under tremendous pressure:

> The years from the 1870s to the Great War gave new impetus to masculinity and its countertype. The enemies of modern, normative masculinity seemed everywhere on the attack: women were attempting to break out of their traditional role; 'unmanly' men and 'unwomanly' women were becoming ever more visible. They and the movement for women's rights threatened that gender division so crucial to the construction of modern masculinity. (Mosse 78)

Normative masculinity was in trouble because the distinctions between maleness and femaleness were getting blurred and sexual hierarchies were thrown into disorder. Although in the early 19th century, the feminist challenge seemed to be insignificant and it could be nullified by the prior profound impact of imperialism, empiricism and Christianity on masculinization, by the late 19th century it turned into one of the main reasons for undermining male authority.

Starting from the passing of the Custody of Infants Act in 1839, the feminist movement gained strength with the formation of Langham Place Circle in the 1850s, and the publication of feminist periodicals such as *English Woman's Journal* in 1858, and *Englishwoman's Review* in 1866. Massive antisexist campaigns were set up and organized by Langham Place Circle for women's causes in the fields of education, marriage, employment, etc. all of which raised awareness about women's rights in relationship to men, and opened up a distinct possibility for women's liberation from patriarchal power structures. Feminists also started the modern birth control movement

in the 1870s for displaying "involuntary motherhood" as a means for the domination of men over women. The movement highlighted the significance of sexual freedom in females, and put emphasis on women's share in controlling reproduction (Hoquet 115). Constitutional laws against masculine privileges were enforced. At the same time with the partial improvements in Victorian women's social and legal situation, "men had to deal with not only a revival of feminist polemic but also material improvements in the position of women that diminished masculine privilege. The legal reduction of the powers of husbands in the 1870s and 1880s, the advances in female education, and the growing independence of young single women (symbolized by the New Woman)" problematized the traditional sexual hierarchies through which traditional manhood was defined (Tosh 337). Divorce rates gradually increased, and commitment to the family lost its prior significance in the assumption of gender markers (Tosh 342). The breakdown of family relationships intensified the man problem as it intensified loneliness and social isolation in men.

Toward the early 20th century, as individuals more widely experimented with unconventional gender roles and sexual pleasures, the number of men suffering from sexually transmitted diseases like syphilis increased and Victorian England blamed female immorality for misleading men. The ruling patriarchy was, in fact, not only victimizing but also accusing women for putting men into trouble. As a result, women activists started a massive campaign against the victim-blaming Contagious Diseases Acts that enforced unjust legal treatment for regulating women suspected of prostitution (Ramday, 26). Sarah Grand was one of the famous avant-garde figures of this campaign whose *The Heavenly Twins* (1893) openly discussed the subject of venereal disease to raise awareness in women about the risks in marriage, and developed the New Woman agenda to invite women to break from the stereotypes perpetuated about soft and motherly womanhood (Bonnell 123). North American Review of *The Heavenly Twins* (1893) described the anger of the male readers with Grand's book in this way: "Many a man who read *The Heavenly Twins* would have shot the book if he had a pistol in his hand at the moment". In spite of the opposition of mostly male and some female authors (like Eliza Lynn Linton) against the "shameful" New Woman struggle and their disagreement with Grand's counterculture activities, the campaign managed to shake traditional gender norms profoundly, and inspired a great number of educated women authors to question the socially-engineered conventions that provided legal protections

for the frivolous men and punished the supposedly "immoral" women (Ramday, p. 29). A great number of books were therefore produced, for the first time in England, in support of women's rights, and this put further pressure on the need for modifying the prevailing model of masculinity. Comparing and contrasting the perspective of the opponents and proponents of women's rights in fin de siècle era, in her *Man up,* Ramday (2015) concludes that the period was a critical time for mapping out an "evolution" in both male and female behaviors. While this climate of change was calling for adaptability and resilience in the assumption of masculinity and femininity, the state tried to protect the hegemonic model of English masculinity from criticism in order to help men claim back their own diminishing masculine autonomy.

As the gender crisis in Victorian England was deepening toward the late 19th century, in a defensive response to the radical movements of the time, the conservatives began to put further emphasis on the distinctions between markers of gender in men's way of speaking, dressing, attitude and morality to restore the essentialized understanding of English masculinity, and to "other" the females and the non-whites once more. Communities and societies were formed for men in Victorian England to empower the founding dynamics of the patriarchal society of the time. Some of these communities were focused on the revival of "self-sacrificial warriorhood" and restoring the honor of "martial martyrdom" (Mangan 10). Militarism was, for them, an inseparable aspect of manhood that needed to be reinforced. Other societies dedicated themselves to exploring and studying the "universal" features of men living in different parts of the world. These investigations collected data and documents to display manhood as an ongoing distinct continuity and to encourage males to preserve their paternal traditions; their findings, for instance, insisted on men's inborn lack of emotionality and their innate interest in aggression and dangerous tasks as the vital masculine traits for the survival of mankind (Mangan 11-12). The attempt for restoring the former "splendor" of maleness increased in the late 19th century.

Under the influence of male empowerment activities, despite the development of anti-racist independence movements in the late 19th century, the colonial ambition again became increasingly driving for men, and the imperialistic periodicals, weeklies and magazines began to assign "new responsibilities" to English boys and men to expand Great Britain. In his *Reflections on the Origins and Destiny of Imperial Britain* (1900),

Cramb described the "fate-appointed task" of the Anglo-Saxon males as "to subdue the world, to establish there her peace, governing all in justice" (17). Cramb compared the British Imperial soldier to great mythical heroes, like Achilles, for being "self-devoted to death, with a courage so impetuous, casting their youth away as if it were a thing of no account, a careless trifle" (35). The idealistic images the media created, in the late 19th century, of imperialist wars and war heroes, as Mangan says, "produced young men confident of their duty to fight and die" (34). It was this revival of colonialist and militarist ideologies that later encouraged the typical British man of the time to welcome the Boer war and the World Wars as strong chances for consolidating his own masculine sense of self.

Masculinization through military adventure insisted stubbornly on the glorification of aggressive warrior-hood, and promoted competitive athleticism, toughness, dominance, and the pursuit of physical vigour. Social Darwinists who perceived social success as a process ruled by "survival of the fittest," believed that the successful vigorous men were those who always assumed themselves to be in the battlefield either at home, in the playground, or at the stock exchange. "Darwin's theory of evolution, also popularised during the late nineteenth century, seemed to establish the 'scientific' basis for the necessary elimination of the weak by the strong" (Segal 91). The idea reproduced the earlier fear of feminization and tenderness, encouraged homophobia, re-insisted on Englishmen's brutal audacity to suppress others, and cultivated outward courage and self-reliance, all of which aligned with the racist and imperialist ideologies of Great Britain about the "'natural' superiority of English manhood" (Segal 91). Despite the growing anti-racist, socialist and feminist movements, the state enticed the nation to hold onto the conventional perception of English masculinity as a matter of national survival. The firm belief in the necessity of militaristic warrior-like preoccupations increased toward the early 20th century. Kimmel's *Manhood* explains that the insistence on militarism was a "revolt not against women but against feminization. The vast prairie is the domain of male liberation from workplace humiliation, cultural feminization, and domestic emasculation" (150). Different strategies were devised to preclude emasculation.

To prevent the feminization of boys by their female teachers and classmates, for instance, special schools and colleges were constructed for boys, based on the difference

that was, in the late 19th century, assumed between boys' and girls' evolutionary development (Mangan 18). In these educational centers masculine codes of conduct were taught to be based on chivalric heroism, militarism and imperialism that idealized self-sacrificial service in boys. There, boys received training on how to survive physically and psychologically against the cold, poor food and bodily injuries (Segal 92). What further retained this air of masculinization was the beginning of specialist publications for boys:

> Magazines and weeklies for boys of the middle and upper middle classes [were] containing serialized novels of England and Empire with tales of war, sport and adventure first appeared in the 1860s. […]. They included *The Boys' Own Magazine, Young England, Chatterbox, The Boy's Journal* and *Every Boy's Magazine.* In the 1870s *The Boys' Own Paper* appeared. […] The first number of *B.O.P.* indeed the first pages - contained a short story 'My First Football Match'. It concerned the initiation of a new boy at his public school. (Mangan 24)

Publications designed for boys encouraged young males of different age groups to simulate and imitate premature militarist, heroic and imperialist traits of manhood.

During the Boer war (1899 – 1902), to emphasize the significance of war as a rite of passage in the acquisition of idealized militarism, boys' periodicals and magazines started publishing copies of the letters of the soldiers participating in the Boer war, as the live and tangible examples of the "real men" of the time (Nasson xi). At the same time with the denial of feminine emotionality in men, the spread of the soldiers' war letters tried to reinforce male bonding and display the pleasure of loyalty to the Queen, the country and to one's army family as an exclusive masculine delight. By publicizing the narratives written by war participants, the ruling system attempted to exemplify and perpetuate the traditional stereotypes about the natural interest of British men in having and keeping the "stiff upper lip" model of maleness (Rutherford). The white man was expected to show endurance in the face of hardships in order to perform his masculine duty to his nation. Traditional gender expectations were therefore being revived.

In addition to reinforcing militarism, the widespread publicity about the Boer war also aimed to suppress interraciality in Victorian Britain, and to highlight the distinctions between the black and white Englishman. According to Caballero, the African presence in England goes back to the growth of the slave trade since the 16th century, and it has always been accompanied with "marginality, conflict, rejection and confusion" of the

colored man in England (p. 1). Despite the prevalence of racism, racial mixed-ness and interracial marriages between the black and the middle-class/ upper class white man gradually increased to the extent that toward the late 19th century the fear and trepidation of being personally and socially outdone by the black males hunted the white British man: What if the black man outperformed the white in his job? What if his wife gave birth to a black man's child? (Caballero 13-14). Publications that foregrounded and idealized the brutality and aggression of the white man against the Africans in the Boer war, attempted to other the black, and to reassure the white Englishman of his own distinct masculinity.

At the same time as motivating militarist masculinity, the post-Boer-war news about the extreme cruelties of British forces in South Africa aroused increasing anti-imperialist reactions inside and outside Britain. Legislators' debates in Parliament that had started since the Crimean War (1853-6) over the problematic role of England overseas, increased and challenged the British men's role as patriarchs and the foreign forerunners of power. The internal conflicts between the Liberal and Conservative Parties, and the international objections against the British war policies resulted in the publication of unpatriotic pamphlets and the start of anti-war campaigns and protests in big cities in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, all of which revealed financial and political corruptions among British colonizers, and disclosed the anti-humanistic attitudes of British soldiers in colonial concentration camps (Galbraith 112). Anti-imperialist and anti-war reactions drew the public's attention to the brutality, aggression, and stoicism underlying the claims of the British war leaders about granting civil rights to the Africans (117), and they troubled the long-established tradition of English masculinity that was based on the assumption of soldiership, patriotism and royalism.

By the turn of the century, in the post-industrial Edwardian England, British masculinity was problematized not only by the continuation of the internal tensions inside England, but also by the great impact of Europe on global trade and labor, and by the revolution in the military power of Germany, all of which put Britain on the defensive, and decentered British sovereignty in economic and political terms (Tosh 340). The British Empire which was once believed to be "an unequivocal assertion of masculinity, a place where autonomy could be achieved" (Tosh 341) went into decline due to the geopolitical changes in the world. In this post-industrial era, the collapse of British financial markets,

the great rise in inflation, the failure of manufacturing sectors, and the consequent high rate of unemployment, created the sense of degeneration in the male-on-top model of Victorian masculinity that was formed around the male-breadwinning models (Skeggs 9). The majority of British men could no longer fulfill societal expectations for protective maleness, and felt socially unappreciated in post-industrial England.

The internal and external challenges to patriarchal gender hierarchies in the early 20th century became more serious by the arrival of the First World War. According to Mangan, the government's labeling the war as "the man's war" encouraged many men to test and prove the authenticity of their own manliness by enlisting as a soldier and fighting in the war (13). In assumptions underlying pre-war British masculinity, as Mangan (1995) says, the "emphasis on military matters was intense. It amounted to the worship of war as a sacred path to moral purity, ascendancy and domination" (13). As the conflicts heightened between Allies and Axis, the desirability of patriotic militarized masculinity increased among British men (19). By the start of the WWI, "Great Britain produced 1.5 million volunteers in its first two years" which was higher than the number of volunteers in other western countries (14). Describing the initial years of the war, Mangan reviews the works of literature that were produced at that time in admiration of soldiers and battlefields, and says: "[t]he national hero was now a warrior, and a patriotic death in battle was the finest masculine moral virtue" (15). Participation in the valorous errant of the war was believed to restore the glory and validity of "being a man".

At the same time that WWI created comradeship and gathered men of different social and racial classes to cooperate for a common goal, and although it shattered the hierarchy between men of South Coast Britain with Durham miners, within the span of a few years, the war turned the pursuit of militarist masculinity into a pure absurdity. Wingfield-Stratford describes the psychological trauma the soldiers went through and the tragic disillusionment of warrior qualities in British men, confirming that: "To anyone born in the twentieth century it must seem incredible that there was actually a time, within living memory, when war was regarded almost in the light of a glorified test match - a thrill of all thrills, more to be looked forward to than feared" (78). By the spread of news, videos, and images of shell shock, wounded, suffering and dead men, eyes were opened to the bitter social and spiritual descent of men in wars. Showalter described shell shock as "the body language of masculine complaint, a disguised male

protest not only against the war but against the concept of 'manliness' itself" (p. 172). The experience of the Great War robbed men of their epitomes and noble ideals of manhood, and introduced males to the lower existential values and realities of devastating Britain (McDevitt 35-39). The prewar norms of English manhood were thus opened to further scrutiny in the early 20th century.

The war paved the ground for a challenge in the conventional gender norms of the time. At the time of men's participation in the Great War, in the absence of men, the British women gained the chance to take over men's occupations in a variety of offices and factories (Gullace 66). Some women were hired by the army, operating near the front lines as nurses, doctors, and even adjutant forces which challenged the combat taboo, based on which only males could be militarized (Gullace 66). These changes in gender roles affirmed women's sense of agency and asserted their independence from men. Through the increase in the employment of women, in 1919, the Sex Disqualification Act gained Royal Assent, based on which legal restrictions on women's participation in certain jobs and positions were removed, and women were allowed to work in professions related to medicine, law, and the military (66). The legal approval of gender equality in the workplace posed a further threat to masculine autonomy that continued sporadically during the next decades.

In short, English masculinity in Victorian England went through significant transformations. In the early 19th century, in line with the long-established imperialist, racist and sexist ruling system of the time, militaristic masculinity prevailed, which advocated patriotism, self-sacrifice, male bonding and royalism among men. Following the doctrines of Christianity, the Englishman was perceived as the spiritual leader and the head of the household, and he was required to have self-control, and be pious, honest and courageous. Gradually, by the growth of empiricism and scientific thinking, the Christian model of maleness was underestimated, and rationality, objectivity, and the denial of emotionality were encouraged in males. Toward the mid-19th century, while the "bourgeois" model of masculinity tried to reinforce the significance of traditional manliness through practicing self-reliance and hard work, the possibility of conforming to the traditional model of masculinity in modern England proved to be impossible. In the second half of the 19th century, the conventional model of masculinity was shaken by the development of secularism and radical anti-racist and feminist movements; as a

result, gender dynamics were transformed and new forms of sexual expression were developed. To help men claim back their diminishing masculine autonomy, authorities established an exclusively male-centered educational system and founded communities and societies to highlight gender markers. The attempts the government made, nevertheless, were thwarted by anti-imperialist and anti-war reactions inside and outside Britain and also by the geopolitical changes in England's political and economic situation in the late 19th century. By the start of WWI and Englishmen's ensuing disillusionment with militaristic ideals, the crisis of masculinity aggravated even further.

2.2. The Realistic Representation of English Masculinity in *Arthur & George*

The fictionalized representation of England and English masculinity in Barnes' biofiction, *Arthur & George,* resembles what historical accounts actually illustrate about the Victorian era and the notion of the white man, as if the novel is attempting to reconstruct the genuine idea of the Victorian Englishman in a fictional version. By taking a real-life historical figure, namely Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, as one of the two protagonists of the novel and by assimilating the life story of actual Victorian males such as George Edalji, *Arthur & George* arouses great expectations about the incorporation of pure prewar ideals of English masculinity. Historically speaking, Sir Doyle is "one of the icons of Englishness," whose patriotic, militarist works of literature have been highly admired since the late 19th century (Calafat 461). What heightens the expectation of reconstructing the idea of the Englishman is the predominance of Victorian and Edwardian features, not only in the plot and the setting, but also the characterization and the narrative style of the novel. The personality of the male characters and the way they treat the females and the non-white people bear more than a passing resemblance to that of prewar Englishmen. The resemblance sounds strikingly strong when Barnes himself confirms (Schiff & Barnes 72-3) that the novel adopts phrases and lines from authentic documents, letters, and newspapers of the time, the original notes of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and the related government reports on the case of George Ernest Thompson Edalji in the 1910s (Berberich, "All Letters" 122). This authenticity reassures us about the possibility of re-establishing the sense of the ideal prewar England and the hegemonic model of masculinity of the time within *Arthur & George.*

The traces of the historical authenticity of the novel and the portrayal of Victorian masculinity can be found in the initial sections of the narrative as it alternates between

third-person narratives centered around the consciousness of Arthur and George. The sections dedicated to Arthur's life story start with the inefficiency of his father, Charles Doyle, and how Arthur and his family mistreat him. At the beginning of the novel, the father is shown to go through a continuous "decline" (*A & G* 8). He is a sentimental penniless drunkard who "had lost his way in life" (*A & G* 8). He is said to be "weak and unmanly" because he "had let down the Mam [i.e. Arthur's mother] and condemned his children to genteel poverty" (*A & G* 61). Rather than holding the top position patriarchal family structures assigned for fathers in Victorian England, Arthur's "occasional" father (*A & G* 10) is gradually removed from the family, and dies alone in a lunatic asylum due to epilepsy. According to the explanation of Andrews & Digby, in Victorian England "it would have surprised no one to hear that men became insane as a result of poverty or a lack of work. Middle- and working-class men alike were expected to stand on their own two feet and provide sufficiently for a family as well. […] A man without work was somehow less than a man – no matter to what class he belonged" (126). Arthur's father lives a humiliating life due to his failure to conform to Victorian ideals of hardworking or breadwinner English masculinity that were associated with being "independent," "being able-bodied" and "respectable" (Andrews & Digby 126-7). The failure of the father, who is conventionally perceived as the "main transmitter" of masculine identity to the son (Pease 9), throws Arthur into a total confusion about the proper way for masculinization. To achieve masculinity, Arthur feels a pressing need for a reliable role model who may, in the words of Kimmel, "inculcate manhood" into him (*Manhood* 158). Being witness to his father's degradation, the young Arthur cannot trust his help in his own social or intellectual development. The father runs the danger of emasculating Arthur as he fails to provide him with an appropriate model of manliness.

In the beginning, at the same time that Arthur shows no desire for taking the side of his father, he has problems in accepting his mother's (the Mam's) autonomy. He initially develops an ambivalent behavior toward the Mam: together with his need for her, Arthur feels ashamed of his dependence on the mother and tries to demonstrate his own authority over her. Like the bossy "mini patriarchs" of bell hooks who "do not have the strength to overpower their mothers" and yet act like a "kind of husband" toward them (hooks 62), from time to time, Arthur becomes aggressive and possessive toward his mother, and "dare[s to] impugn [his] mother's honor" (*A & G* 249). In the opinion of hooks, the need a mini patriarch feels for domination over the mother has its roots in the

pressure imposed by the ruling patriarchy outside their house. Arthur cannot accept his own mother as a legitimate power due to the insistence of the outside society on sexism as a requisite for masculinization. “The polarization of masculine and feminine identities,” as Fletcher says, is “at the core of gender ideology” in Victorian England (Fletcher 41). Seemingly, the young Arthur tries to restore the lost male supremacy in his relationship with his mother.

In this struggle for power, the main thing that soothes Arthur and helps him restore the sense of male supremacy is his mother’s stories of chivalry. While listening to her stories, Arthur identifies himself with the popular heroes of patriarchal Arthurian legends, especially King Arthur, with whom he shares the same name: “And of course there was no braver or more noble king than Arthur” (*A & G* 23). In spite of the absence of his father, it is from *Morte d’Arthur* that Arthur gets “the sense of what a man was, or might be” (*A & G* 24). Gradually, through associating himself with the chivalrous heroes, Arthur perceives himself as the legendary savior of helpless maidens. He thereby manages to overcome the ambivalence he felt toward his mother and thus feels like a protective man of the time. But the model of masculinity chivalry presents is highly dependent on sexism. According to Koprivova, in legends of chivalry, “women are considered seducers and therefore capable of endangering the knights’ chastity” (82). The females are, in this view, not only in need of male protection but also inferior to men and seducing them. By believing in the reality of the legends and the chivalric code, Arthur feels vigorous enough to save women. He, at the same time, believes that women may put his chastity at risk.

The struggle of power between Arthur and his mother is reminiscent of the prevailing concern of Victorian England over protecting boys against feminization and domestic emasculation. Also, the development of Arthur’s interest in chivalry exemplifies the model of Victorian masculinity discussed by Mangan (12) and Kimmel (123), according to which boys were believed to have an overwhelming innate love for fighting and gallantry. What Arthur’s mother does in introducing her son to chivalrous heroism resembles what the authorities did in late Victorian era for promoting principles of knighthood among boys, claiming that these principles could turn young men into proper citizens. Due to the increasing social problems in England of the late 19th century, raising boys was turned into one of the main solutions to saving the falling country from its doomed fate (Olsen 46).

The mother's stories of chivalry help Arthur to overcome his own confusion over the relationship between men and women. In Balbus' words, in reaction to his fearful desire for a reunion with his mother, Arthur "seek[s]the safest possible connections with others, connections within which his need for others takes the form of a *need to take care of them*" (Balbus 223). Since childhood, Arthur conceals his need for maternal love and emotionality by pretending to protect his mother. Parallel with chivalric legends, Arthur comes to the idea that since his father "had failed in his chivalric duty to the Mam," it is he himself who has to take the responsibility for "the task" (*A & G* 24). He decides to earn money by writing stories similar to Arthurian legends to turn the Mam into a legendary lady: "He would write stories: he would rescue by describing the fictional rescue of others" (*A & G* 24). By assuming a pitiable figure for his own mother, Arthur copies the model of chivalric stories to create the illusion of his own autonomy over the Mam. Arthur preserves his dependency on his mother under the excuse of her need for protection.

As Arthur grows older, he displays the same chivalric sense of superiority toward other women. "It was the rules of chivalry, and not the textbooks of physiology, which governed his first approaches to the fairer sex" (*A & G* 23). He thinks of young women as "malleable, plaint, waiting to be shaped by the impress of the man they marry" (*A & G* 163). Arthur objectifies women by acting like a womanizer: "once he proudly informed the Mam that he was honorably in love with five women at the same time" (*A & G* 23). As in stories of chivalry, Arthur builds his relationship with women based on sexism. Arthur marries twice at the excuse of chivalry. In his first marriage, he chooses the most submissive girl, Touie, who "always said 'Yes' to anything he proposed" (*A & G* 221). It is at the funeral of her father that Arthur becomes interested in Touie. Those distressing days are the most suitable time for Arthur to marry her out of pity: "Arthur's chivalrous feelings were aroused by the black-clad mother and sister, now alone in an unfamiliar town with no male support" (*A & G* 27). Instead of admitting his own need for an emotional attachment to Touie, Arthur pretends to love her for her protection.
The marriage with Touie does not make any change in Arthur's attachment to the Mam, or in his sexist behavior toward women. For Arthur,

> [h]is mother is the only woman to whose governance he is prepared to submit. With other members of the sex he has been, variously, large brother, substitute father, dominant husband, prescribing doctor, generous writer of blank cheques

> and Father Christmas. He is solidly content with the separation and distinction of sexes as developed by society in its wisdom through the centuries. He is resolutely against the notion of votes for women: when a man comes home from work, he does not want a politician sitting opposite him at the fireside. (*A & G* 163)

Arthur takes women's autonomy as a threat but feels confident in his relationship with women as he thinks he is familiar with the "characteristic of all women" (*A & G* 28). He believes to know how to keep the females in their place, and seems to enjoy the ruling patriarchy of his time.

Toward the middle of the novel, and contrary to his life-long claims for supporting the fairer sex, Touie gets tuberculosis and remains in sickbed for 13 years. Her illness harms Arthur's masculinity because, as Arthur himself admits, it was his own "inattention" that caused that illness. He regretfully says: "I had eyes and did not see. [...] I was too busy with my own ... success" (*A & G* 62). Her illness reveals the selfish desires that lie behind the seemingly protective gestures of Arthur. After the start of Touie's illness, since there is no hope for her healing, Arthur looks for another person of the fairer sex to love and support. At the same time that he "still regards [Touie] with affection and respect," Arthur falls in love with Jean, a girl 17 years younger than himself, and tries to develop this new relationship toward marriage (*A & G* 167). Following the codes of chivalry, during Touie's illness, Arthur stays unconsummated, and he tells Touie lies to conceal his betrayal and to protect Touie, this time, by hiding the truth. Arthur believes that "his moral life belongs more happily in the fourteenth century" (*A & G* 204), according to which "[t]wo white lies are allowed to a gentleman: in order to shield a woman, and to get into a fight when the fight is a rightful one" (*A & G* 171). Before Touie's death, Arthur justifies his own breach of trust through the chivalric code.

The affirmation of his mother also encourages Arthur to continue his relationship with Jean. During the years Touie is in sickbed, the Mam is the main person to appreciate Arthur's polygamy. When she meets with Jean, the Mam:

> approves, as she approves of Touie back in Southsea days [...] In the Mam's view, Touie, pliant and agreeable, was exactly the right wife for an ambitious yet confused young doctor needing acceptance in the kind of society that would provide him with patients. But were Arthur to marry now, he would need someone like Jean, someone with capabilities of her own, and with a clear, forthright nature which at times reminds the Mam a little of herself. (*A & G* 170)

The Mam appreciates Jean's ductility as a source of solace for Arthur, and she justifies Arthur's act of betrayal on the grounds of his need for social acceptance. As in historical accounts, in the patriarchal society the novel represents, sexual stereotypes are so internalized in women's personalities that they themselves "become conditioned into colluding in their own oppression" (Whitehead 86). Even in the absence of a misogynist masculine role model, due to the pressure of sexist ideologies, women add fuel to the fire of patriarchy by practicing gender-based stratifications of the time.

Jean, however, is different from what Arthur or his mother expect, because she draws Arthur's attention to the individuality of females and makes him uncertain of his own masculinity. In fact, Jean "comes as a shock to Arthur" and makes him feel distressed (*A & G* 163). Arthur's shock reminds us of the fear and trepidation of late Victorian men for the unconventional independent and autonomous woman of the time (Olsen 46). According to Fletcher, "in the 1880s and 1890s, the phenomenon of the New Woman, sometimes smoking or cycling, put men on their mettle, creating anxiety about male authority" (43). Jean somehow embodies the unconventional features of the New Woman. She is a rich and intelligent girl who does not need Arthur's support. She is interested in masculine sports like riding horses (*A & G* 164) and skiing (*A & G* 169), and does not care about Arthur's literary works, adventures or activities. Despite his social and literary achievements, Jean does not initially perceive Arthur as an omnipotent figure to adore or to make an emotional connection with.

Jean also challenges Arthur's perception of the fairer sex. Through his relationship with Jean, Arthur comes to the idea that "women – other women – are like distant lands" (*A & G* 189). He is no longer self-assured about his knowledge of women or their emotions and desires. Although Arthur tries to hold Jean "at bay" (*A & G* 285) by refusing to give a direct answer to her questions, he cannot deny the fact that Jean is "equal to himself," not inferior (*A & G* 168). Jean is "the first intimate woman friend to whom" Arthur "has not given a nickname" (*A & G* 170). His love for Jean, however, does not improve Arthur's sense of chivalric masculinity, because in contrast to the traditional models of chivalry, Jean does not initially show appreciation or reciprocal kindness, and she does not give Arthur the chance to display courage and protection. In Jean's presence, Arthur does not feel like an always-confident man.

Arthur's fading interest in Jean, however, wins back Arthur's supremacy over Jean. After Touie's death, for a while Arthur loses his interest in marrying Jean, his ten-year

"waiting girl" (*A & G* 222), because of which Jean decides to change herself, and she starts to openly express interest in Arthur's concerns. Jean remembers how Arthur used to admire Touie's "self-effacing" and "gentle" behavior (*A & G* 221), and accepts to act like Touie and to turn into the kind of the nurturing wife Arthur desires. She says: "I shall be at your side, Arthur, always at your side. And therefore looking in the same direction. Whatever that direction may prove to be" (*A & G* 315). Like Touie, "she will travel with him; she will sit in the front row when he gives a lecture; she will smooth his path and make sure of proper service in hotels and trains and liners [...] She will be there at his side, and she will indicate, by word and constant deed, that this will remain her place until death do them part. This is the kind of wife she intends to be," Jean thinks to herself (*A & G* 222). After ten years of waiting for Arthur, Jean "has no desire to be a waiting wife" (*A & G* 222), and in order to stop waiting, Jean accepts to pay the price for the marriage with Arthur through her own submissiveness. Jean's feminine care and attention gives Arthur the sense of being a "real" man.

Arthur's chivalrous misogyny impacts not only his personal life, but also his writing and activities. Because of his interest in playing the role of the savior in his relationship with women, once Arthur starts writing, he writes about "rescuable maidens" (*A & G* 24). Gradually, he channels his protective mood to writing detective novels, and eventually he turns into the best-selling author of his *Sherlock Holmes* book series, which adds to his protective gestures. "Ever since Sherlock Holmes solved his first case, requests and demands have been coming in from all over the world" (*A & G* 209). People think that "anyone with the intelligence and guile to devise such complicated fictional crimes must therefore be equipped to solve real ones" (*A & G* 209). Thereby Arthur turns into a national and international man of support, rationality and objectivity. Weese confirms that the characterization of Holmes is highly influenced by "Arthur's conception of Englishness and chivalric heroism"; Holmes is "the Victorian-age knight who uses detection as a means to rescue others" (310-11). To demonstrate his gallantry, Holmes is expected to discover the objective truth. In the opinion of Fathallah, "the character of Sherlock Holmes has historically depended upon the triumph of rationalism as an order of knowledge and a logocentric regime of enunciation that renders everything readable, knowable and masterable to the master detective" (492). Holmes is an embodiment of the Victorian man of both chivalry and reason.

The Sherlockian ability to quell disorder and discover the truth has been inseparable from the notion of the Englishman since before the start of World War I. In his *We Must*

Have Certainty, J.K. Van Dover describes classic detective tales that began in the mid-Victorian era as a reinforcement of Victorian masculinity, and explains that in these tales, "the detective embodies the Western drive for objective certainty" (133). The genre used to provide the Victorian boy with a proper model of masculinization, and assured him that "objectivity is still possible; [that] there is, after all, a complete and absolute and demonstrable account of what has really happened. There is one, and only one, narrative that correctly assigns causes to effects, murderers to their victims" (Van Dover 133). Crime fiction promoted a sense of objectivity and certainty in boys. Here, through the use of an omniscient narrator, the inclusion of Sherlock Holmes in characterization, and the interest of Arthur in Holmesian deduction (that makes inferences based on unconvincing evidence), *Arthur & George* seems to represent the necessity of a similar rationality within the presented model of masculinity.

Parallel with portraying the development of Arthur's misogynistic and chivalrous masculinity, the novel displays a different picture for the masculinization process of the second protagonist, the conservative George, who is born to a Scottish mother and a Parsee father from Bombay. George's father has become a priest in the Church of England after converting to Christianity under the influence of missionaries in India. As the evidence indicates, the father is suffering from inferiority complex because of being a man of color living among the British locals who dislike him (*A & G* 81). Although he has managed to marry a British wife and he appears to be accepted as a priest by the Church of England – which is, as George says, "the blood that flows though the arteries and veins of the Empire to reach even its farthest shore" (*A & G* 17) – the father seems to still feel inferior to his British wife and tries to practice Victorian male supremacy through upholding patriarchy and denying his racial inferiority at home. Due to his race, he seems not to be well integrated into English society.

Since George is their first child, the Father puts considerable insistence on raising George in the way he himself desires. Like Arthur, George's father practices masculinity through sexism. He considers men as the head of the household, and women as a threat against masculinity. He marginalizes his wife and daughter, Maud, at the excuse of the feminine need for a special protection; when Maud is 4, and George 10, since Maud is "too frail to be left on her own all night," it is decided that their mother should sleep with her, and George with his father (*A & G* 16). This arrangement keeps Maud "in as much

ignorance as possible" (*A & G* 49), gives the father a total responsibility for the moral, social and intellectual development of George, and makes George learn and practice the behavior of his own father more carefully. Unlike Arthur who always preserves his dependency on women under the excuse of women's need for protection, young George mainly imitates his father's model of masculinity (*A & G* 17), and gradually grows into an individualistic self-centered man, trying to function with no feminine bondage.

As in Arthur's story, George's masculinity is dependent on the polarity between men and women. The father disparages the unmanly features of George, claiming that he has taken them from his mother. When George is blamed in his class for "being stupid," his father addresses his wife, saying: "The child gets her nerves from you Charlotte" (*A & G* 10). Although George Ernest Thompson Edalji's real-life mother was a supportive well-educated English woman, as Risinger says, "in Barnes's world Charlotte is all but absent" (34), and her absence gives the father enough space to exercise total control over George. In *Arthur & George*, the father humiliates his own wife by insisting on George's need for denying feminine features: "The vicar knows his son to be a decent and honorable boy. He must overcome the nerves he seems to have inherited from his mother" (*A & G* 31). In their house, after a certain age, only Maud is allowed to cry because "she is an invalid as well as a girl" (*A & G* 31). In this gender-segregated context, George puts all his effort into denying effeminacy and imitating his father, considering him as an "Olympian deity whose sworn word was irrebuttable" (*A & G* 140). He never doubts the words and deeds of his father.

The significance of the father figure in George's masculinization and the absence of his mother, remind us of historical accounts on the strategies the British government took in the late 19th century for preventing the emasculation of boys: To overcome the fear of feminization, in the late 19th century, strategies for the "remasculinization" of the houses and parenthood started. Previously, "[w]omen were entirely in charge of the socialization of young boys. The three principal institutions that dominate[d] early childhood socialization— family, religion, and education— were completely staffed and run by women" (158). By the late 19th century, however, "many men felt that they needed to wrest control over socialization and get more actively involved themselves. To that end men decided to inculcate manhood into the next generation" (158). In order to grow up into real men, boys were to be guided by their own fathers and protected from the domestic life and their own feminizing mothers.

As historical accounts indicate, in the late 19th century, fathers took total responsibility for raising their sons, in the hope of creating male-to-male unities and raising more "real" masculine boys. Gender-based stratifications consequently increased: "Boys' and girls' spheres of play were, for the first time, completely separated. Fathers sought father-son togetherness and feared a young boy's identification with his mother and sissification by playing with his sisters" (160). Masculinity was to be passed by the father to his sons, rather than the mother; the failure of the father in fulfilling this duty could emasculate the son and deprive him of the "appropriate" model of masculinity (206). Toys and clothes became more gender specific, and thus sexist culture penetrated into the domestic sphere. All these gender-based stratifications aimed to re-establish the male-on-top sociocultural frameworks in the assumption of gender markers, and tried to encourage males to adhere to the heteronormative patriarchal social system of the time. In Barnes' *Arthur & George*, George experiences a very similar situation in his house.

At the encouragement of his father, George practices Victorian rationality and deduction to the extent that he is said, from the beginning, to "lack imagination" (*A & G* 4). As he grows, George develops full trust in the legal system of Britain and displays interest in objectivity. From childhood, George roleplays solicitors and detectives, and practices how to achieve clarity in solving riddles (*A & G* 22, 64). Following the empiricist mentality of Victorian England, George practices rationalism to achieve objective certainty in his assumptions, and he perceives his own life to be free from complications: He "thinks of the story of his parents' lives in very linear and straightforward terms" (Weese 306), and believes that his own life follows a similar way, especially because of his reliance on English law. His interest in law encourages George to make objective sense of everything and to create connections. He clings to the hope that "at the end, you have an agreement, a decision to be obeyed, an understanding of what something means. There is a journey from confusion to clarity" (*A & G* 64). George is obsessed with the Victorian interest in rationality, and he expects to experience a straightforward move from adolescent boyhood into mature manliness.

George is assured by his father about his mental ability for being a man of law: "with your brain you will be a very fine solicitor" (*A & G* 32). He pursues law and "feels confident and happy with the law" when "the Birmingham Law Society" awards him "Second Class Honors" and "a Bronze Medal" (*A & G* 64-5). The father gives the

example of a successful Indian man in England, and tells George that by becoming a solicitor, George will similarly turn into "a respected member of society" (*A & G* 42). George accordingly believes that being a "solicitor" can compensate for his racial inferiority, but his behavior is usually kept under strict scrutiny and he has to struggle against those white men who suppress his desire for masculine autonomy. In his teens, George stands against the offensive Sergeant who was calling him a "little mongrel" and stops his humiliating behavior with his claims about "going to be a solicitor" (*A & G* 30). Once he becomes a solicitor, George grows such a firm belief in his job that he thinks it can compensate for his other deficiencies in masculinity: He "is not physically brave" but he "knows the laws of England, and knows he can count on their support" (*A & G* 75). He takes the courtroom, even during his own detention, as "his natural territory" (*A & G* 108). As in historical accounts and similar to men of bourgeoisie in Victorian England, George shows complete dedication to his work:

> Disciplined attention to business had long been the mark of the self-made man, but nineteenth-century attitudes to work went beyond crude economic rationality. They reflected unease about the unfettered acquisitiveness of commercial society and the disappearance of traditional moral landmarks. In its most elevated form (as in the hugely popular writings of Thomas Carlyle) work ceased to be drudgery and became the path to self-making, a creative act conferring meaning on the work and identity on the worker. (Tosh 332)

In the competitive and commercial society of modernizing England which is going against cultural and ideological traditions, for some men, performing occupational duties seems to establish a feeling of personal authenticity. George identifies himself as a representative or agent of law, and like hard working bourgeois men, he tries to practice his masculinity through fulfilling all his duties at work; he invests his whole time and energy into his job, and shows passion and reliability is handling legal cases (*A & G* 65). His work is the site of his masculinity, and his sense of the masculine self seems to be built around his job. He loves his job as a means of authenticating his manliness, or as a path to success; his job is a reliable source for deriving moral support and achieving personal authenticity.

Despite his considerable interest in the English legal system and the typical rationality of Victorian England, George does not seem to have a proper understanding of what it means to be an Englishman, of England and of his own position in that country. He is brought up with the illusion of being an Englishman. "I am not a Parsee, Father. This is

what you and mother have taught me" George says (*A & G* 43). George's parents refuse to tell him the truth about the blatant racism rampant in England. His father tries to, instead, sustain and foster the illusion of Englishmanness in George: "You are an English man. But others may not always certainly agree", the father states (*A & G* 42). Throughout his childhood, the father repeats similar scenarios and questions his son on similar cases to assure George of his Englishman identity. In the opinion of Cavalie, "the fact that these random quizzes about his English identity take place at dawn, when George is only half-awake, gives the feeling that the young boy is almost brainwashed into becoming English" (98). George seems to passively take in the ideas dictated by his Father. Because of being continually brainwashed, he does not pay attention to the discrimination against Indians in England. He thinks of himself as an "English man," and the British state as a "rational institution" (*A & G* 218), with an objective set of rules. Comparing himself to other Englishmen, George thinks to himself: "How is he less than a full Englishman? He is one by birth, by citizenship, by education, by religion, by profession" (*A & G* 217). Whenever others question his English identity, George relates this point to a questioning of his masculinity, and he gets confused about why his non-white origins impact his manliness.

In spite of his adherence to clarity and objectivity in English law, things do not work as George expects, and confusion arises when he is prevented from getting integrated into the English Law Society of the time. He is arrested in his workplace, interrogated, and put on trial, during which, as the newspapers of the time say, "the typical solicitor in his swarthy face" is replaced with an "essentially oriental" appearance (*A & G* 114). Due to his non-English origins, George is wrongly imprisoned for being convicted of maiming animals and writing threat letters, after which the court leaves George in an in-between situation by announcing him both "guilty *and* innocent" (*A & G* 310). At the end of his imprisonment period, George is "granted a free pardon for a crime he never committed and yet to be told at the same time that it was quite right he served three years' penal servitude" (*A & G* 310). By foregrounding his race, the British court prevents George from returning to his favorite job as a solicitor. This loss of job disturbs his conformity to the Victorian model of masculinity and frustrates his lifelong ambition: "Until he was pardoned and compensated, he could not go back to being the man he had been before" (*A & G* 303). His loss of job can be counted as one of the major factors for decentering men in Victorian England and it dulls his sense of control over life. George tells Arthur:

"The money is not important. I want my name back again. I want to be readmitted as a solicitor. That is all I want. To be allowed to practice again. To live a quiet, useful life. A normal life" (*A & G* 212). Without his job, George feels ineffective in life. The ban on George's job also displays the devalued existence of the colored men whose personalities, gender markers and feelings were not socially recognized and acknowledged at the time (Wright 83). Cavalie regards George's difficulty over being a solicitor as an example of the "invisibility" and inferiority of the colored men in Victorian era (99). George's frustration is silenced until Arthur intervenes.

The invisibility of the colored man in *Arthur & George* refers to the widespread concern over racial hierarchies in Victorian England, especially in the late 19th and the early 20th century, during which European countries (mainly Germany, the U.S. and Japan) began a new wave of imperialism, and disturbed the industrial and economic autonomy of Britain. Instead of resistance, the U.K. made a political concession with the new imperialist powers, a diplomatic gesture which was believed to bring a trade-based unity and brotherhood among people of different nationalities in and outside England (Deane 2). The concession, however, inspired aggressive racism within Britain and the British colonies, which was usually justified as the English nostalgia for the ancient imperial barbarism, the time Britain used to defeat the enemies and spread British civilization throughout the world (2). To empower its fading supremacy, the English struggled to rehabilitate the imperialist mindset in works of literature, social interactions and the legislative body. In this context, the non-white man was displayed as an uncivilized savage who lacked "proper manliness" for his superstitious ignorant mind (Wright 83). To the same extent that white manhood in the late Victorian and Edwardian age was based on reproducing racial stereotypes, non-white masculinity was doomed to be subservient and debased.

Going beyond the white/ non-white duality seemed to be improbable in such a context. Describing England of the late Victorian Age, Watson says: "Essentially, imperialism became so synonymous with British identity" that "imperial philosophy served as the cultural and psychological foundation on which many people based their worldview" (2). Racial discrimination undeniably prevailed in England of the late Victorian era, especially against Indians. According to historical accounts of Watson, long before and throughout the world wars, India had proved to be "the most valuable resource of the

British Empire" in which imperial forces applied terrifying policing tactics to scare the colonized and to prevent insurrection (2, 3). The groundless accusation of George within Barnes' novel seems to exemplify one of these imperial tactics. Tate says: "The police who pursue George are doing so because they are convinced he is guilty; their confidence is based on shocking but then widespread ideas regarding race and national identity that would now be laughable" (Tate 64). British masculinity seems to be highly dependent on the white/ non-white binary in *Arthur & George.* To highlight the significance of racial discrimination within the social context of the novel, the narrator refers to the treacherous white men about whom "[t]he police had been informed, but there was no arrest made in the case" (*A & G* 296). The ignorance of the police about the guilty white men contrasts with the wrongful conviction of innocent George, and signifies the role of social context in the construction of white/ colored Englishmanness. George's masculinization is negatively impacted by racial prejudices.

George is victimized by the insistence of Victorian England on racial hierarchies and the rejection of interraciality in the definition of masculinity. Despite the denial of his father, George is racially abused throughout his life: first by his classmates and colleagues, ridiculing him for not being "the right sort" (*A & G* 9, 58), and then by a series of threatening letters, all of which end up in his conviction and imprisonment. Because of his "Oriental" origins, George is compared to the "Devilish clever" men (*A & G* 58). Despite passing the Abolition of Slavery Act in 1833, the English kept the behavior and the activities of the racially-inferior men under strict scrutiny and prevented them from getting easily integrated into English sociopolitical institutions and establishments (Buckle 2).

Due to his hopeless attempt for being accepted as a white man, we may compare George to Homi Bhabha's concept of the "mimic man" who follows "the effect of a flawed colonial mimesis, in which to be Anglicised is emphatically not to be English" (Bhabha 125). George is a colonial subject whose mimicry does not end in resemblance to the white. Anson's sarcastic words on George's mixed blood (*A & G* 275) also remind us of the words of Schwarz on the love between the black man and the white woman, which was believed to be ominous in the Victorian era, and the child of such a couple was taken as one of the "identity-less children – 'half-castes', 'neither one thing nor the other' – destroying England from within, unseen, from within the bedroom, and in the process jeopardizing white mastery itself" (Schwarz 47). We may categorize George

among the identity-less offspring whose attempt at becoming an Englishman is doomed to fail. It is perhaps because of racial prejudices that for the most part of the novel, George remains almost lonesome, anonymous and passive, while Arthur actively participates in social and personal relationships.

Once British law eradicates the unreal identity his father had constructed for him as an Englishman, George loses his firm belief in the father and his reason-based model of manhood. The change in George's perception can be obviously observed during the trials: "George thought his father, for the first time, was beginning to look like an old man. His voice seemed less compelling, his certainties less obviously irrefutable" (135). As the questioning went on at court, "he [George's father] – and the world with him – was beginning to appear more fallible" (136); "[h]e was looking old, and irritable, and less than master of the situation" (137). At the end of the hearing, George thought about how "his father had failed him; had failed to reveal himself as an Olympian deity" (140). George believed that the reason for which his father had become "flustered," in the trials, was because "[h]e was not used to having his word challenged, however courteously" (137). During the imprisonment period, in the visits his father had been making once a year with George, "[i]t grieved him to admit the fact, but George found his father's visits unhelpful. They disturbed the orderliness and the calm of his life" (161). The father is no longer the source of order for George, and his memory continues to disturb George throughout the novel, even 12 years after his father's death. George's deviation from his father's mindset and his model of masculinity leads to bigger changes in the novel.

For almost two-thirds of the novel, Arthur and George develop their own masculine selves separately, and the novel swings between the masculinization accounts of the two men. Moving back and forth between the almost contradictory concerns and perspectives of George and Arthur creates structural and thematic dualities within the subsections included in the first two chapters. What mends this division is the appeal letter George writes, at the end of the second chapter, to Arthur, "the very ideal of an English gentleman" (*A & G* 334), in the hope of healing his own harmed masculinity (i.e. re-taking his job) and learning the proper way to being an Englishman. It is the encounter between Arthur and George, in the third chapter – entitled "Ending with a Beginning" (*A & G* 207) – that reconciles the structural and the thematic dualities within the novel and opens it to new perspectives toward masculinity and being an Englishman. At the same

time as following historical accounts in displaying the significance of misogyny, racism, chivalry and deductive rationality within the masculinization process of actual historical characters from prewar England, *Arthur & George* questions the binaries, based on which traditional masculinity is formed through the confrontation between Arthur and George. The whole novel is, in fact, "toying with dualit[ies]" (Childs 1), creating and at the same time challenging the male/female and white/colored binaries, showing that there is no essence or no single authentic manliness in prewar England to stick to. As the examples show below, the challenge against binaries creates a chance for the inclusion of the othered non-male and the non-white in the definition of English masculinity.

2.3. Challenging the Notion of the White Englishman in *Arthur & George*

In *Arthur & George*, Arthur's maleness proves to include antithetical features as the novel develops, despite his widespread fame and his apparent conformity to prewar norms of masculinity. Arthur's disposition oscillates between that of the liberal and the imperial man: At some points of the novel, like the typical Victorian and Edwardian man, Arthur constructs his own masculinity through reinforcing imperial tendencies. For example, like a great imperial agent, and following colonialist and militarist ideologies of the time, Arthur voluntarily participates in the Boer war as a doctor, and heals the English forces in the war (*A & G* 184), after which he wins a knighthood, and gains the honor of dining with the King of England (*A & G* 191). Arthur's imperial interests accord with the significance of military values, soldiership and patriotism in the definition of imperial masculinity. Racial hierarchies are so important to Arthur that when his sister Connie presents her fellow Ernest William Hornung, Arthur nags: "Hornung. What is he, this Hornung? Half Mongol, half Slav, by the sound of him. Could you not find someone wholly British?" (59). Arthur prefers himself and his family members to socialize with the purely English.

However, as the novel develops, Arthur grows anti-imperial tendencies as well. Once Touie dies, the only thing that revives Arthur's sense of chivalrous masculinity is his assistance to George, the mixed-race man. Sir Arthur's autobiography, as George reads, says: "In 1906 […] my wife passed away after a long illness ... For sometime after these days of darkness I was unable to settle to work until the Edalji case came suddenly to turn my energies into an entirely unexpected channel" (335). Rather than his habitual

appeal to racial prejudices, it is this time, saving the victim of these prejudices that restores manliness in Arthur. In his liberal approach to George's case, Arthur encourages George to take a new perspective toward the British state: "If the British state were a rational institution, you would even now be back to your desk in Newhall street" (*A & G* 218). As Arthur says, it is because of the deficiency in the British state that George is left in an in-between situation, deprived of his job. In the opinion of Arthur, in spite of his father's insistence on George's Englishness and the possibility of ignoring racism, people of George's race are all considered as the "black sheep" of the society (98). The non-white is, as Arthur pinpoints, the disfavored Other whose inferiority aggrandizes the white man. Because of his contradictory assumptions of racism, it is difficult to categorize Arthur on either side of the imperial/ liberal man, and the novel leaves this issue ambivalent to disengage the understanding of English masculinity from racial hierarchies.

Unlike the early Victorian men who believed in rigid morality and adhered to Christian heterosexist binaries for masculinization (Laqueur 16), Arthur and George refuse (though to different degrees) to rely on the grand narrative of religion. As the protagonists adopt the process for the acquisition of masculine identity, institutional religion loses its eminence and it gets replaced by works of fiction as a model for morality. Arthur "had stopped attending" the church since early youth because "[t]he Mam had told him what was the case; and now, he gazed up at Father Murphy as a storyteller he no longer believed" (*A & G* 15). Christianity is nothing more than a fabricated construct for Arthur. Based on his interest in stories of chivalry, Arthur follows the morality of the 14th century (*A & G* 204), and later becomes one of the leading figures of British Spiritualism in which masculinity is defined "as the courageous encounter with a potentially annihilating otherness" (Barsham 5). The true man, in this faith, should go beyond the othering dualities that Victorian Christianity requires.

In George's case, compared to Arthur, the distrust in the Christian model of masculinity happens very slowly. He is brought up in a strictly religious family, with an initial full trust in his priest father. But due to the failure of his father's logic and what he experiences in prison, George is convinced to make a revision in his lifelong submission to the Christian model of masculinity. During the time he is in detention, George decides

to put aside his father's preferences and turn to fictional works his mother favored: "His father had brought him a Bible, his mother a one-volume Shakespeare and a one-volume Tennyson. He read the latter two" (*A & G* 118). Disillusioned by the rigid teachings of the Holy Bible, George decides to resort to the polyphonic world of literature. During imprisonment, George "had been keeping himself sane in Portland Gaol with the novels of Tobias Smollett" (*A & G* 318). In spite of his initial firm belief in Christianity as an inseparable element of being an Englishman, in prison he encounters men who easily convert to Judaism to be transferred to a more comfortable prison. Maleness thereby proves not to be necessarily dependent on Christianity. The fictionality of religion becomes gradually obvious to George. In the funeral of Arthur, George compares the "rituals of the Church" to the "theater" and dramatic performances, and finds that they are similarly artificial, rehearsed and structured based on a narrative (*A & G* 342).

In addition, George gradually loses his trust in the sexist Christian mindset, and starts to show care and concern for females and advocates women's rights (*A & G* 330). The protagonists' gradual independence from Christian masculinity may allude to the first-wave feminist movements of time, or to the moral degeneracy and skepticism the educated Englishmen expressed toward Christian faith since the mid-19th century onward. Living in London as a solicitor, George perhaps witnesses legal activities taken at the time for gender equality, and also absorbs the air of secularization of the fin-de-siècle that challenged the biblical accounts on human identity, and thus he segregates his assumption of manliness from Christian doctrines.

At the same time that it helps the protagonists to unchain themselves from pursuing racial and religious assumptions in the construction of masculinity, the novel highlights the ways the characters' sense of self is influenced by hyperreal fictional elements. "It seemed to Arthur that the world was running mad: his father was fresh in the ground, and his wife condemned, but young city men were apparently tying crepe bands to their hats in mourning for Sherlock Holmes" (*A & G* 64). Sherlock Holmes in Arthur's book dies at the same time with Arthur's father, but people mourn for the fictional hero, not the father. The border between the actual and the fictional Englishman is blurred, and the hierarchy between the real and the unreal is reversed. Holmes is "a character in whose true existence readers effortlessly believed" (*A & G* 209). But, Arthur's father is never acknowledged as a man, neither socially nor in his own house because of his inefficiency in acting out the Victorian model of masculinity.

Furthermore, the names of the characters created by Arthur (Sherlock Holmes and Watson) in the *Sherlock Holmes* books, are interchangeably used for Arthur and his assistant, Wood, in actual life. In the hyperreal context of the novel, fictional characters are more valued and they seem to be more genuine than the actual individuals, and this encourages Arthur himself to imitate Holmes' gestures: "Sherlock Holmes famously smoked a pipe – and Sir Arthur, he [Georg] understood, did likewise" (*A & G* 298). The behavior of Arthur, the popular figure of the genuine Englishman is formed based on that of his own invented character. By the precedence of the unreal over the real, the implied author challenges the authenticity of Arthur's manliness as that of "the very ideal of an English gentleman" (*A & G* 334). Barnes' narrative confuses the reader about the actual identity of the seemingly real men in the novel, to extend the definition of English masculinity to multiplicity, and to thwart the attempt for verifying the authenticity of manly features.

Wood, like Arthur, imitates his own fictional equivalent and enjoys acting like Watson as it adds to his masculinity. He prefers to continue as Watson in pursuing George's case, rather than "to revert to his usual [actual] position of secretary and amanuensis, taking dictation like any female stenographer" (*A & G* 236). Before imitating Watson, Wood perceived himself as a female secretarial assistant, for being limited to clerical tasks and not getting involved in solving actual criminal problems. Acting as Watson gives Wood the chance to collaborate with Arthur more actively. What makes Wood resort to his own fictional version, and feel more masculine by playing the role of Watson might also be the reversal *Arthur & George* has created in the hierarchical relationship between Sherlock Holmes and Watson. In a video interview recorded on Apr 16, 2015, Barnes explains the reversal in this way:

> In a way, it looks as if Arthur and Woody are like Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson. But in fact, in the book, Arthur is getting things wrong. In Sherlock Holmes story, if Dr. Watson says something, Sherlock Holmes says: "Oh, that's stupid because this is the clever answer". When it happens in my book, Wood suggests something and Arthur says that's stupid, and that's not right. But in fact he [Wood] is usually right. Arthur is the one who is made to be stupid. So I reversed it. ("Julian Barnes' Interview" 10:35-11:12)

Wood perhaps enjoys the opportunity this roleplaying creates for his intellectual superiority over Sherlock Holmes, as it assures his conformity to Victorian logocentric rationalism. The reversal of the hierarchy between the detective and the assistant

questions the image of the typically smart Victorian detective in classic crime fiction. Arthur is more prone to making mistakes in comparison to his assistant, and this opens the claims about his ideal masculinity to further question.

Arthur & George is, in fact, an example of the "postmodern anti-detective" story, not only for reversing the hierarchy between detective and assistant but also for deconstructing the possibility of "closure and clarity" (Weese 314). Unlike the classic model of Sherlockian novels that end with a definite result and improve manliness by creating a sense of objective stability and rationality, there is no clear ending for *Arthur & George.* Ambiguities are left unresolved, for example about George's gambling debts and the documents the officers have accumulated against him. The novel is, in fact, a depiction of the failure of the detective, not his success:

> Though Arthur does turn up plausible evidence against another man (Royden Sharp), who might well have committed the crimes of which George is accused, that evidence is as circumstantial as that for George and never acknowledged when the Home Office reopens his case. Much to George's dismay, Arthur obtains the evidence against Sharp by illegal means, thereby rendering it inadmissible in a court of law. (Weese 313)

In spite of the desire the protagonists show for clarifying the beginning and for closure, there is no convincing clarification at the end of the novel about the criminal case of George. Whether it was George or Royden Sharp who was maiming animals with an Oriental tool remains unsolved. By subverting the conventions of detective fiction and by disturbing, at the same time, the binary of real/ unreal, and white/non-white manhood, Barnes' work develops a complicated understanding of the construction of masculine identity. In Weese's opinion, in this multidimensional approach, the novel "challenge[s] monocultural constructions of Englishness" (323, 302). This open-endedness opens space for plurality, and promotes the assumption of multiplicity in identity. The possibility of diversity in Englishness confounds the expectation of defining an exclusive pattern for identity formation.

In his feminist study on hegemonic stereotypes of masculinity in *Arthur & George,* Kestner relates this lack of closure and the possibility of multiplicity to the sense of uncertainty and unknowability that permeates the whole novel and helps to challenge conventional gender binaries. In this ambivalent context, Kestner says, the author activates critical thinking in the reader toward gender categories, and dismantles and

decenters the need for conforming to gender ideologies of the time, to negotiate innovative features in the construction of gender markers (23). Once ruling assumptions are questioned, the overall struggle to find a unique and coherent definition for English masculinity would be doomed to failure. In the words of Smith, Barnes' *Arthur & George* has "de-masculinize[d] hard-boiled detection" by leaving the novel open to different impressions and by promoting irrationality within the conventionally strict structure of detective fiction (79). The lack of certainty emasculates the supposedly objective genre of crime fiction.

Arthur's struggle for creating closure and ending, however, continues throughout the story. In spite of his initial attempt to be "clear and certain" (*A & G* 41), his Sherlockian deductions prove to be arbitrary. To prevent ambiguity and to overcome the problem, Arthur writes his stories by starting from the closure. He explains that after writing the conclusion, "then you unravel the knot with one glorious piece of deduction" (*A & G* 293). His works consist of sets of evidence and reasoning for the conclusions he makes in the first place. Similarly, his support for George is based on his preoccupation with George's innocence. Before even meeting with George and prior to finding any persuasive evidence about the truthfulness of his claims, Arthur promises to struggle against the injustice suffered by George: After reading George's very first letter, he says: "Reply? I'm going to do more than reply. I'm going to stir things up. I'm going to knock some heads together. They'll rue the day they let this happen to an innocent man" (*A & G* 209). Without any convincing initial reason, Arthur decides to prove George's innocence.

In contrast to the classic models of the genre, the technique Arthur uses to conduct his investigations for restoring George's honor and hence masculinity is mainly fictional, not factual. Arthur publishes his own survey on George's case under the heading of "Sherlock Holmes Investigations" (*A & G* 284). Within his fabricated research, George is a mere fictional character, like Arthur and Wood who identify themselves with Sherlock Holmes and Dr. Watson. Reading the title of Arthur's published investigations "made him [George] feel like several overlapping people at the same time: a victim seeking redress, a solicitor facing the highest tribunal in the country; and a character in a novel" (*A & G* 297). There is no border between self and not-self. This fictionality contradicts George's lifelong insistence on the clarity of legal facts. In his opinion,

Arthur's investigation "was all true, yet untrue; flattering yet unflattering, believable yet unbelievable" (*A & G* 298). Though the investigation is about George himself, he cannot draw a line between true and false information. Anson, the chief of police, similarly believes that Arthur's investigations are "a series of mistakes," nothing more than "a story" (*A & G* 266). Despite the logicality one expects to see in investigations made by the author of the best prewar detective fiction, confusion reigns within his study.

Regardless of its illusory nature and ambiguous closure, it is, however, the fictional and the antithetical depiction of George's case that finally wins the course, and restores his harmed honor and masculinity by removing the ban on George's solicitorship. By the intervention of Arthur, George manages to return to his job. In the topsy-turvy context of *Arthur and George,* it is the illogical words of Arthur that gain victory, not George's initial attorney whose words "had been clear, with no false emotional appeals" (*A & G* 142). The unexpected final victory of Arthur obviates the necessity of associating the notion of the Englishman with rationality. To George's "dismay," in their first meeting, Arthur explains that his "plan is not to repeat the work of Mr. Yelverton [George's initial attorney], to express the same reasonable doubts"; Arthur says: "I'm going to make a great deal of noise. The English –the official English- do not like noise. They think it vulgar; it embarrasses them. But if calm reason has not worked, I shall give them noisy reason" (*A & G* 219). It is the "noisy reason" and the inclusion of confusion within the logical assumptions that saves George. The illusory nature of Arthur's observations, documents and accounts contradict "the legacy of empiricist philosophy from Bacon, Locke, and Hobbes to the British literary and historiographical traditions" (Weese 311), based on which the whole idea of the Englishman is formed. In classic crime fiction, "this tradition [of empiricism] places faith in the knowability of the world through individual experience and the senses" (Weese 311). In the postmodern context of Barnes' narrative, the knowability is suspended, and the solution achieved for the problem of being a proper man, in other words, of masculinity, is based on ambiguous evidence.

Contrary to the typical Victorian model of masculinity that denied ambiguity and illogicality to put further emphasis on empiricism, scientific thinking and determination, in the puzzling context of *Arthur & George* the association of rationality with manhood is disputed by the protagonists' belief in the interrelationship between science and non-science (Schneider 147). George learns about the 'invisible connections" between

"science […] history [and] literature" during his higher education (*A & G* 64). Arthur gets interested in spiritualism and finds "scientific origins" to justify "telepathy and the spirit world" (*A & G* 259). Under the influence of Spiritualism, Arthur challenges the authenticity of scientific findings and comes to the idea that "knowledge never stayed still, and that today's certainties might become tomorrow's superstitions" (*A & G* 38). Arthur's doubt in the reliability of factual knowledge contradicts the core value of Victorian maleness that insisted on finding reasonable, mature and straight answers for all questions and riddles (Schneider 147). As the story develops, Arthur loses his trust in empirical certainty even more, and sticks to the "improbable" truth (*A & G* 228). Addressing Arthur, Anson says: "I doubt you are susceptible to phantoms and ghosts and zombies" (Weese 344). By displaying Arthur's inability to choose science from unfounded beliefs, the implied author raises doubts about his conformity to the conventions of pure Victorian masculinity. The curiosity of Arthur, the prewar popular model of English masculinity, about the irrational provides ample opportunity for the inclusion of the illogical in the definition of being an Englishman.

In spite of the expectations the novel initially arouses (through its plot, setting, characterization, narrative style and the inclusion of biographical elements) about representing true prewar English masculinity, despite its reproducing the sexual and racial stereotypes of the time, and in spite of borrowing texts from the relevant historical documents or the original notes of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, the novels' claims to veracity are challenged through incorporating historiographical metafiction. One cannot trust the underlying assumptions of prewar masculinity in *Arthur & George,* because what seems to be historically true proves to be fabricated and intuitive within the novel. George's awareness of Arthur's fictive writing style creates layers of historiographic metafiction within the narrative that, show Barnes' "incredulity toward metanarratives" or the whole notion of life writing, in the words of Lyotard (Lyotard xxiv).

> George's considerably more subdued reaction to Sir Arthur's investigations alerts the reader to the fact that not all might be as clear-cut and 'logical' as Sir Arthur assumes or as Sherlock Holmes finds in his fictional cases. […] Importantly, this strategy helps to remind the readers that they are, indeed, reading a *novel*, a work of fiction, in which even the characters, George Edalji in particular, are feeling like 'a character'. (Berberich "All Letters" 127)

The use of historiographical metafiction challenges the reliability of biographical works, and questions the authenticity of real-life historical figures represented in these works.

The subjectivity observed in Arthur's investigations can be found in the seemingly objective media of the time as well: at the time George was being released from prison, because of the incorrect timing of a reporter, "the newspaper printed the picture of a wrong man" for George (*A & G* 162). The sense of disbelief Barnes' narrative arouses in these examples, opens our eyes to the possibility of mistake, deviation and plurality in all historical accounts and documents that claim to present true prewar masculinity.

Barnes' narrative thwarts the readers' expectations for and the protagonists' attempts at discovering a distinctive model of Englishmanness within *Arthur & George*. Following the model of historiographic metafiction, Barnes' account of history "dissolve[s] boundaries between fiction and history" in order to "present historical 'reality' as always mediated" and to "recast the epistemological and methodological challenges of knowing the past" (Goode 149). Through historiographical metafiction, the whole notion of accounting for prewar masculinity in *Arthur & George* and the related historical documents based on which the novel is written, ironically turn into human constructs and fictive realities. By disturbing the boundaries of fiction and history, Barnes' narrative negates historical totalizations on the notion of the Englishman to pave the ground for diversity and individuality in the construction of manliness. In the absence of a reliable historical account on the dominant model of manhood in Victorian England, one can never find a real replica of masculinity.

The artificiality of Englishness also unsettles the assumption of a genuine sense of being an Englishman in *Arthur & George*. In the opinion of Mrs. Anson, "if you paid an investigator to elaborate your family tree, you would always end up being connected to some great family" in England (*A & G* 263). The ease of manipulation in genealogy troubles the notions of true or pure English identity. Barnes, as Berberich's "England? Whose England?" states, is interested in the "construction' of alternative versions of England and the English" and this frustrates the effort for finding a true representation of gender markers in that country (167). What does being an Englishman mean when Englishness is by itself an illusion? Once national identity is imagined, "who decides what counts, and what does not?" (168). In his interview with Schiff, Barnes admits the idea that by displaying the uncertainty of nationality, he tries to highlight the futility of the attempt for "get[ting] back to some kind of origin, particularly through the creation of replicas and enhancements of the past" (77). However hard we try to duplicate the prototypes, we may never find an original model to practice.

The more the protagonists endeavour to find the notion of the true Englishman, the more the novel foils the attempt. Initially George "regards Sir Arthur as a very official Englishman indeed: his name, his manner, his fame, his air of being absolutely at ease [...]. If Sir Arthur had not appeared to be part of official England, George would probably not have written to him in the first place" (*A & G* 217). But what George assumes about Arthur proves to be nothing more than a fantasy. Like George, Arthur does not have English origins. Arthur is "Irish by ancestry, Scottish by birth, instructed in the faith of Rome by Dutch Jesuits" (*A & G* 25). Arthur assumes himself and George as "unofficial Englishmen" (*A & G* 217). He knows that their own versions of being Englishmen are not real replicas of English masculinity, but only two of the endless subjective versions of it. Sometimes, Arthur finds himself to be "a fraud. In some ways he has always felt a fraud, and the most famous he has become, the more fraudulent he has felt" (*A & G* 203). The failure of Arthur in displaying the quintessence of being an Englishman raises the question of authenticity: If Arthur is not a pure embodiment of English masculinity, then what does it mean to be an Englishman? The unattainability of true English manhood paves the ground for accepting the possibility of multiplicity and transformation in manliness.

Once he gets pardoned through the irrational strategies of Arthur, George starts a step-by-step attempt to accept the possibility of the unconventional within the model he has already developed for English masculinity. He gradually gets interested in Sir Arthur and his method, and begins to appreciate Arthur's support in returning him to his previous life (*A & G* 332). Though George initially believes Arthur's investigations to be a kind of "hearsay" or "a piece of washing line gossip" (*A & G* 304), little by little he becomes a fan of Arthur and feels proud of his help. George appreciates Arthur as a man "who risked his own reputation to rescue George's" (*A & G* 354). Like Arthur, George loses his trust in objective science, and toward the end of the novel, George quits his lifelong attempt to achieve certainty: "At fifty-four, he thinks a lot of things, he believes a few, but what can he really claim to know" (*A & G* 355). He abandons his earlier insistence on objectivity, closure and clarity in life. Considering George's final loss of trust in his own rationality, Weese says: "In this gesture, George, more than Arthur, seems to accept the open-ended, permeable narrative patterns that shape his worldview and the course of his life, and thereby to revise his own fairly conservative definition of Englishness" (321). Considering the beginning stages of the novel, we may say, George is transformed even more than Arthur, though it is mainly the encounter with Arthur that brings about this transformation.

The change in George's disposition is more obvious when in the last scene he is reminded of his childhood. During Arthur's memorial, George is so gripped by the fear of his dead father that, as soon as the conjurer refers to the message received from a ghost with the particulars of his father, "George's flesh" starts "throbbing all over as if he has been thrown naked into a bank of nettles" (*A & G* 351). Though the father has died 12 years earlier, being among spiritualists activates George's always-missing imagination, and makes him believe that the message must be a "paternal rebuke to his son's failing faith"; he thinks "perhaps I am going to soil myself as I did when a boy on the way home from school, perhaps that is why he is coming, to remind me I am a child, to show me his authority continues even after he is dead, yes, that would not be unlike him" (*A & G* 351). George seems to sincerely believe the illogical possibility of a disturbance to the border between the dead and the alive.

By blurring the boundary between the living and the deceased, the novel seems to create an anti-authoritarian context for transforming hierarchies, and developing an innovative perspective toward the ruling binaries of the time. In the opinion of Wolfe, the possibility of the impossible in George's view, in the last scene, is a "hocus-pocus," a supernatural other-worldly reconciliation for the prevailing dualities outside the novel: "How un-English this ectoplasmic finale. But, let us add, how therapeutic to our embittered, divisive age. Fresh, new outlooks on ever-worsening political feuds could build peace, not only between people but perhaps also between the living and those believed dead" (188). Considering the institutionalization of racist and sexist binaries in the neoliberal policies of the early 2000s (Kapoor 1029), it might be inferred that Barnes' supernatural reconciliation between dualities in *Arthur & George* is not a pure coincidence. The novel is written at the time British New Labour blamed female autonomy and marginalized the colored man to re-masculinize the state through developing capitalism, insisting on privatization and foregrounding male-dominated activism (Ashe 661). Based on the prevalence of neoliberalism, we may take the scene about George's fear of his dead father as an attempt at making peace and reunion. The plausibility of reconciliation between the dead and the alive accelerates the process of transformation in understanding manliness.

The chance the novel gives the protagonists to modify their own definition of masculinity turns maleness into a performative process of give-and-take between the

individual and the culture, during which there might be an opportunity for the individual to choose to repeat or to break a certain cycle of what other men do. In this approach, the characters are neither concrete nor rigid because they can subvert or negotiate their own understanding of English masculinity. Through imitating chivalric heroes, Arthur, for instance, distances himself from the model of masculinity of his own inefficient father. George, in another example, refuses to repeat the entire cycle of heterosexual English masculinity he has observed in Arthur and his father. He reproduces their maleness in a more selective way: Unlike his father, George respects the opinion of his sister Maud from childhood on (*A & G* 52).

In contrast to his father and Arthur, George values women more as he grows older, and tries to make a gradual reconciliation with the feminine. Although George overcomes his own crisis of identity and hence masculinity by the help of Arthur, he does not follow Arthur's model of masculinity blindly. He re-evaluates the model to present a more reconciliatory perception toward male-female relationships. Close to the end of the novel, George displays his approval of feminist ideas, even though it is against the preferences of his favorite man, Sir Arthur: "There was one matter on which Sir Arthur was profoundly wrong [...] He opposed votes for women", George thinks to himself (*A & G* 330). In contrast to his father and Arthur, George "had always supported female suffrage during the time it had been an issue" (*A & G* 330). Barnes' narrative, thereby, gives the protagonists the chance to depart from the model of masculinity supported by their fathers or the society. In the highly patriarchal context of *Arthur & George*, Barnes' work manages to create men that are made to be more responsive to feminist mentality and demands. Barnes' postmodern version of the late 19th and the early 20th century in *Arthur & George* avoids generalization on masculine traits, and provides individual characters with a chance for disconnecting themselves from the hegemonic model of masculinity and practicing their own distinct understanding of maleness. Masculinization is an individualized process in the novel.

The dynamic process of masculinization repudiates the attempt for achieving authenticity and originality, and it criticises the insistence on mimesis. By highlighting the gradual change of the masculine characters and by illustrating the constructed nature of Englishman-ness, Barnes' narrative plays with notion of the Baudrillardean hyperreal and simulacra to celebrate multiplicity (Berberich 176). The novel seems to answer

Stuart Hall's call for "re-imagining 'Britishness'" in the present multicultural world that tries to remain hierarchical and restrict itself to specific models (Berberich "England?" 168). There is no real replica of masculinity. The novel implies that the attempt to learn, impose or replicate a certain type of English masculinity is in vein, and the society should have the capacity for accepting different versions of individualized manhood, rather than insisting on illusory hegemonic models. It decenters the assumptions on finding a unique pathway to maleness. Barnes' narrative, instead, shows British masculinity to be arbitrary, unstable, constructed in nature, with no meaningful cohesiveness. This instability gives a chance for the inclusion of the other within the definition of the Englishman.

In Barnes' complicated and multiform model of masculinity, maleness is over-reliant on femaleness. The gaze of women, for example, affects men and their masculinity. According to the feminist gaze theories of Mulvey, in patriarchal societies "to-be-looked-at-ness" is conventionally considered as one of the determining features of female subjectivity (837). In this view, the male onlooker has the authority to turn women into his own objects of desire and control. In Barnes' novel, however, the patriarchal model of the gaze is reversed, and it is women whose gaze defines the identity of the male protagonists. Like women of traditional gaze models, Arthur desires to have a woman as "the first witness of his life" because women's gaze charges him "with energy" (*A & G* 256). The Mam remains his lifelong maiden who decides on Arthur's field of study, his job, religion, marriage, career and his works of literature (*A & G* 168). In the same way that Arthur is "enchanted" by the "grey eyes" of his mother (*A & G* 186), George gains "strength" from Maud's gaze (*A & G* 160). As the novel develops, Maud becomes "stronger and more capable" (*A & G* 298). At the time the verdict is being issued, "Maud, whom [George] had expected to be wailing, surprised him. She had turned her whole body in his direction and was gazing up towards him, gravely, lovingly. He felt that if he could retain that look in his memory, then the worst things might possibly be bearable" (*A & G* 144). By displaying women's gaze as the source of energy for men, Barnes' narrative illustrates masculinity to be interdependent with femininity.

Rather than displaying the contrast between maleness and femaleness, Barnes' novel portrays a polyphonic mixture of them within his individual characters. Stereotypically-

feminine features can be observed in Barnes' male characters, for example, in the "over-timid" behavior of George (*A & G* 322) and in the "delicate" manners of Arthur's brother-in-law (*A & G* 193). The opposite is seen in Barnes' female characters who perform masculine behavior, as in the "unladylike" sports Jean plays (*A & G* 164) and also in the patriarchal preferences of Arthur's mother, for example when she confirms and supports Arthur's out-of-marriage relationship with Jean while Touie (his official wife) is suffering in the deathbed. Also, the Mam embodies the pressure women experience in sexist societies that consider fathers as "main transmitters to their sons of culturally approved forms of masculinity" (Pease 9). Since the denigration of the father figure could prevent Arthur from conforming to patriarchal conventions and since it could emasculate Arthur and hinder his advance to adulthood, the Mam reproduces patriarchy through repeating chivalric stories for the young Arthur, and this promotes the assumption of male superiority in him.

To criticize the insistence of hegemonic models of masculinity on practicing male supremacy, Barnes' narrative goes beyond the idea of blurring the boundary between masculinity and femininity to disclose the ways the sexist mentality victimizes men themselves. In his analysis on men's emotional and physical suffering, and their ambivalent pain in power, Kaufman says:

> There is, in the lives of men, a strange combination of power and powerlessness, privilege and pain. Men enjoy social power and many forms of privilege by virtue of being male. But the way we have set up that world of power causes immense pain, isolation, and alienation not only for women but also for men. This is not to equate men's pain with the systemic and systematic forms of women's oppression. Rather, it is to say that men's worldly power— as we sit in our homes or walk the street, apply ourselves at work or march through history— comes with a price for us. This combination of power and pain is the hidden story in the lives of men. This is men's contradictory experience of power. (142)

The discussions on men's pain in power reveals the inconsistency in men's lives, and challenges masculine autonomy from within. Kaufman continues: "The idea of men's contradictory experiences of power suggests not simply that there is both power and pain in men's lives. Such a statement would obscure the centrality of men's power and the roots of pain within that power" (142). The predicament of men, in this perspective, is displayed to be rooted in masculine privileges, as these privileges increase men's need for "acceptance, affirmation, celebration, and propagation" of power (143). What

empowers the masculine identity can simultaneously turn into a source of trouble for men.

In Barnes' *Arthur & George,* the patriarchal privileges similarly put protagonists in a difficult predicament as the novel develops. Both George and Arthur feel at a time tortured for practicing patriarchy, and they both experience men's ambivalent pain in power. At the same time as they struggle to achieve social power, both men are suffering from emotional pressure. Because of his father's insistence on sexist mentality, George initially humiliates women, and thus he fails to improve his own social skills properly (not only with women, but also men) to the end of the story. Toward the middle of the novel, George "regarded the tendency of human beings to agglomerate in one place as the beginning of unreason. It was true that he lived in London, a most populous city, but he was able largely to control his contact with his fellow men and women. He preferred them to come to his office one by one; he felt protected by his desk" (*A & G* 328). George confronts many problems in expressing himself and interacting with others. He has no friends, "[n]either male comrades nor, for that matter, friends of the fairer sex. [...] He does not engage in sporting activities either. [... not even in] the great manly English games" (*A & G* 277). In his fifties, his relationship with people is limited to nodding (*A & G* 332). For George, socialization is chaotic because of his problems in expressing himself. He experiences social anxiety in his interactions with others, and prefers to focus on other aspects of life.

In addition to causing difficulty in social relationships, sexism paradoxically awakens an unquenchable thirst in George for reunion with women. Following his father's patriarchal lifestyle and based on his own academic achievements, at the beginning, George develops a "pompous" and boastful self. Yet, he fails to feel fully masculine and perceives himself to be not man enough. Little by little, he becomes curious about the "unrevealed process" others take to turn into real men (*A & G* 66). He gradually develops a feminist perspective and feels a growing need for the "contentment" other men derive "from female companionship" (*A & G* 93). As time passes, the necessity of having relationships with women becomes so important for George that toward the end of the novel, he does "not want anyone to think he was incapable of marriage" and enjoys it when others mistake Maud for his wife (*A & G* 339). Despite his initial attempt to define masculinity as independence from women, toward the end of the novel, George finds manliness to be inseparable from having a proper relationship with women.

Arthur, like George, is not immune to the antithetical anxieties caused by his assumption of male supremacy. Arthur's gestures of protective chivalry work against him and inflict harm on his relationships with women. As the novel develops, he feels a great pressure for acting like a supportive man toward the women around him. "He begins to think of himself geometrically, as being located at the center of a triangle. Its points are three women of his life, its sides the iron bars of duty. Naturally, he has placed Jean at the apex, with Touie and the Mam at the base. But sometimes the triangle seems to rotate around him, and then his head spins" (*A & G* 183). Arthur feels objectified by women because of the increasing attempt he has to make to conform to the norms of the chivalrous supportive man. By revealing George and Arthur's personal reasoning and the emotional difficulties behind their seemingly common sexist or supportive behavior, *Arthur & George* draws attention to the untold anxieties of men, and to how patriarchal privileges can harm them.

After Touie's death, Arthur goes through another type of pain in power caused by his own disloyalty: "The triangle within which he has lived – frettingly but safely – for so long in now broken, and the new geometry frightens him. His grieving exaltation fades and lethargy overtakes him. […] He goes daily to Touie's grave and returns exhausted. He imagines her comforting him, reassuring him that wherever the truth lies, she has always loved him and now forgives him" (*A & G* 202). This time, it is the guilty conscience that tortures Arthur. He tells himself "you lied about your love, you deceived your legal wife, and all in the name of honor" (*A & G* 220). Although he initially falls in love with Jean at the excuse of "love and chivalry" (*A & G* 167), the idea dishonors Arthur as a womanizer. The "microbe of guilt" (*A & G* 203) makes Arthur feel like a "hypocrite" (*A & G* 203); "if Touie knew, then he was destroyed" (*A & G* 247). Arthur's disloyalty contradicts his lifelong assumption of Victorian masculinity that was commonly believed to be based on strong commitment to family, and this nonconformity makes Arthur inactive and mad with himself. He perceives all his previous plans with Jean to be "entirely selfish" (*A & G* 201). Because of his guilty conscience, Arthur loses the defining force in his own masculinity. Confused by his own contradicting justifications for why he mistreated Touie, Arthur, like George, finds himself in a limbo situation, feeling both innocent and guilty regarding his relationship with his first wife.

The pain caused by his own earlier sexist behavior toward Touie changes Arthur's perspective toward himself and others. It is perhaps because of the similarity between

George's and his own condition that Arthur accepts George's request for help from among the piles of "requests and demands" that "have been coming in from all over the world" (*A & G* 209). By letting George out of the in-between situation, Arthur hopes to make a similar change in his own life. When Anson accuses George for his mixed blood, and describes George as a barbaric solicitor, Arthur feels a deep sympathy for George and thinks of himself as having a similar split personality in people's eyes. Weese explains the scene this way:

> When Anson expounds upon these theories, claiming that George's repressed sexual nature is responsible for his purported crimes, Arthur recognizes himself in Anson's description, clearly making a mental connection between George's purported double life as a day-time solicitor committing "barbaric" actions by night and his own not-so-secret deception of the ailing Touie, his inability to fulfill his sexual desires, and his semblance of respectability as an English gentleman. As we have seen, Arthur tries to couch his extra-marital love interest in the guise of English chivalry, but Anson's words make that self-deception difficult and taint him with what Anson perceives as the barbarity of the racial Other—breaking down the opposition between the detective and the "criminal Indian." (315).

In spite of all his former claims about the pure Englishman, after Touie's death, Arthur gets stuck in a state of confusion, feeling no distinction between himself and the racially abused Indian-English man.

Arthur's in-between-ness discloses the untold story of the actual historical figure. In the opinion of Schif, through elaborations the novel provides on Arthur's dual sense of guilt and innocence, Barnes' narrative unveils "Conan Doyle's black hole of emotions, this secret area of his life, which had never been written about before" (Schiff & Barnes 70). It seems that the silence about the emotional life of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle is created and maintained by the ever-continuing hegemonic masculinity of the time in order to highlight the significance of male supremacy and the emotional sterility of Englishmen, and to promote stiff-upper-lip models of manliness. According to Fletcher, "Emotional repression had become an essential aspect of the British masculine ideal" in prewar England (Fletcher 43). The fictional space *Arthur & George* creates, however, identifies the ongoing emotional constraints imposed on men, and tries to remove them by disclosing and exploring them.

The possibility of a similarity between the situation of Arthur and George creates a chance for the reversal of hierarchy between the two men. In fact, we may say, it is

George who saves Arthur. Arthur accepts to help George because of the improvement male bonding and homosociality (i.e. socialization with men) create in his own masculine self. Arthur has previously experienced a similar uncertainty (when he was younger) under the pressure of his mother's autonomy over him: At that time, he felt he "has become a pampered and rewarded fellow, who needs some cleansing of the spirit. He has been safe too long, has lost muscle, and requires danger. He has been among women too long, and too confusingly, and yearns for the world of men" (*A & G* 185). Those days, Arthur tried to solve the problem by going to war. Based on the Victorian model of masculinity that favored male bonding and perceived war as a rite of passage in the acquisition of militarism, Arthur was then thinking that socialization with men in a male-dominated context like a battlefield would empower him (*A & G* 185). At the same time that the participation in war would consolidate his sense of a self-sacrificial patriotic, conservative and royalist Englishman, the exclusive male companionship in the battle site would alleviate Arthur's distress over socializing with women or exercising power over them; it would therefore restore his image of the self-reliant and courageous British man. Once he returned from the war, for a while, Arthur had become resistant to his mother, as if the bond between men had given him the courage to reduce his dependence on her. By helping George, Arthur seems to plan for a similar independence from women.

Fighting to save an innocent man can help Arthur to overcome the inferiority caused by his failure in saving women. When he accepts George's request for help, Arthur feels tired of the straight and narrow insistence Victorian society has on the moral integrity and cleanliness of men. Through his cooperation with George, Arthur manages to unchain himself from the binary between guilt and innocence and "honor and dishonor" (*A & G* 190). Considering the general superiority of men over women in patriarchal societies, rescuing a man may even prove to be more worthwhile than protecting women. "Arthur gains more from George's reclamation than the persecuted George does himself. His nerves frayed by promises he has made to three women (so much for the Victorian straight-and- narrow), he needs a distraction at the time he hears of George's distress" (Wolfe 188). The apparent hierarchy assumed between the benevolent white and the helpless non-white is reversed once we understand the significance of George's case in the restoration of Arthur's sense of masculinity.

The representation of the problem of masculinity and the consequent disturbance in sexual hierarchies are intertwined in *Arthur & George* through extending and

overstepping racial boundaries. The mere presence of George and his family within the novel turns the story into what Burton calls a "contact zone" in which people of different nationalities and sexes interact (1). This coalition shatters the image of prewar England as "a white man's country" (Schwarz 47). The equal opportunity the novel provides for portraying the masculinization of the twin English and Indian-British protagonists, the one-on-one development of the two men, and the friendly relationship between them open the model of English masculinity to fundamental revisions. *Arthur & George,* as Berberich explains, explores the theme of being an Englishman in relation with race and gender "in order to express Edwardian anxieties that challenge, in particular, the mythical notion of a secure English identity," and thereby, the novelist problematizes the past ideals (123). What we assume, through historical accounts, as the old masculine certainties in the late Victorian England (by insistence on misogyny, chivalry, racism, deduction, etc.) are not necessarily true about every Englishman of the time.

Barnes' style is critical historiography in *Arthur & George;* i.e. he tries to re-interpret the recorded history and shows that history is neither intelligible nor solid. The heterogeneity of history turns the truth about the past to an irretrievable, inaccessible, and indeterminate construct. This elusiveness of truth brings about discussions on Barnes' uncertainty and his skepticism about referentiality. Also, the uncertainty the novel creates about historical accounts questions the illusion of pure manliness and opens the assumption of English masculinity to inclusion and diversity. Through historiographic metafiction, as Guignery states, Barnes' narrative shows that "the past is inaccessible to us except in textual form, that documents are bound to be fragmentary and that the historian or biographer necessarily selects information, emplots data and fills in the gaps in the record" (*The Fiction of Julian Barnes* 44). The attempt for identifying or addressing the problem of masculinity in Victorian England, therefore, proves to be intractable.

Arthur & George revises history to create "a moment of awakening" (Buxton 82). By the reference to the past, Barnes' narrative does not mean to remind English men of their collective identities or their shared past, but to create historical consciousness about the possible misunderstandings regarding their sense of self in a certain time and space. In its critical view, *Arthur & George* gives no definite answer to any question. In his video interview conducted on Feb 3, 2013, called "Converses a la Pedrera," Barnes confirms

that in his writings, he does not intend to provide his readers with a definite answer to epistemological questions, but to raise questions on "What would happen if things were like this, rather than like that" (ESCAC DOCS 15:34 to 16:20). Instead of giving a straight answer, Barnes' narrative disturbs the binary between the white and the colored men, and he insists on the interdependency between men and women to challenge the flawed assumption about the ideal prewar English masculinity and to open an ample space for accepting polyphony and multiplicity in forming masculine identities.

To return to our initial comparison between the crisis of masculinity and the scene of crime at the beginning of the present chapter, we may conclude that, in spite of incorporating elements of the classic detective fiction (the conservative masculine genre), *Arthur & George* proves to be anti-detective in that it gives no complete account of what has really happened to men. Also, it hinders the possibility of progress towards an objective understanding of true masculinity by revealing the artificiality of Englishness, contradicting the legacy of empiricism, incorporating historiographical metafiction, and by blurring the distinctions between the detective, the assistant and the victim. In this anti-detective novel, what victimizes and problematizes men is the desperate attempt the protagonists make for defining masculinity on the basis of racial and sexual hierarchies, and in isolation from femininity, irrationality, superstition, and/ or the fictional. Despite their interest in achieving certainty and clarity about their own manliness, both George and Arthur find themselves in an in-between situation that precipitates their experience of the crisis of masculinity. In reaction to the dire predicament of men, the novel integrates simulacrum, and manoeuvres its way through hyperreality to illustrate Victorian manliness as an arbitrary and unstable construct, a performative process of give and take, and a mixture of antithetical features that oscillate between opposites, and demands for interdependence and mutuality between the masculine self and the Other. By reconciling the opposites in his re-definition of masculinity, the novel seems to empower the marginalized colored man and the feminine.

CHAPTER 3

THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN *THE NOISE FO TIME* (*TNT*)

Barnes' biographical fiction, *The Noise of Time* is analyzed in this chapter as a representation of the problem of masculinity in Soviet Russia, a socialist state that renounced men's rights to economic, political, sexual and moral independence. In spite of the differences in the sociopolitical contexts of the novels, similarities can be found between the representations of masculinity in Barnes' *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time*. As in *Arthur & George*, the novel is set in the early 20th century, and it similarly analyzes the origins of the man problem by displaying two male characters' struggles to conform to the traditional ideals of maleness. Again Barnes' narrative makes use of a multiplicity of historical and biographical reports and documents to disclose the silenced and the untold emotional life of a historically-famous man and his pain in power in order to reveal his underlying dual sense of guilt and innocence. The novel questions the promoted stiff-upper-lip models of manliness to promote plurality in understanding the notion of maleness and to create tolerance for the marginalized patterns of masculinity.

Similar to *Arthur & George*, the plot in *The Noise of Time* is constructed on the basis of the real-life story of a known historical figure, namely Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich (1906-1975), the Russian composer-pianist, who was historically known for creating Stalin's soundtrack. As also depicted in *The Noise of Time*, the young Shostakovich receives musical training first from his mother, and then from his instructors at St. Petersburg Conservatory; identical to the real Russian composer, as Barnes' protagonist (i.e. Shostakovich) grows older, he quickly achieves national and international fame, and his musical genius draws the attention of the Russian men of Power to take political advantage of his art and to stifle his innovation. Very similar to the way Barnes' narrative depicts him in *The Noise of Time*, as people of power approach Shostakovich, the composer initially refuses to become a member of the Party because of his disagreement with the Soviet ideologies, and as a result, in spite of his initial great public reception, the composer's masterpieces are harshly criticized by the

Communist Party, and he is twice labeled as the enemy of the people. After WWII, under the firmer ideological control of the Cold War era, Dmitri Shostakovich gives up the struggle and reluctantly joins the Party as the People's Artist of the USSR, a position that arouses his guilty conscience and severely tortures him to the end of his life.

In *The Noise of Time,* the narrative uses the technique of Joycean interior monologue to provide details about the assumptions, emotions and sensibilities of his male protagonist, Dmitri Shostakovich, as a man. Through this technique, as Barnes explains in his BBC-Newsnight interview, the novel attempts to convey the "psychological truth" (or what the novelist himself assumes to be true) on what historians and biographers have kept silent about Shostakovich. The third-person narrator of the novel, as in *Arthur & George,* remains mostly limited to the protagonist's experiences and observations in the related historical era, and unveils the black hole of his emotions. In contrast to *Arthur & George,* Barnes avoids "continuous narration" in *The Noise of Time,* and tells the story in "epiphanic slices" or disorganized paragraphs in order to reflect the composer's shifting beliefs, and to "mirror the fragmentary nature of Shostakovich's life" (Freiburg 136-7). The disorder, contrariness and unresolvability in the narrative convey the psychological pressure and the extreme suffering Shostakovich withstands all through his lifetime (Nayebpour 7). The novel tries to express, by all its means, the deepest emotions of the protagonist. In "Julian Barnes: The Final Interview," in 2007, Barnes mentions "I sometimes think of narrative in a comparable way to musical narrative" (Guignery & Roberts 177). In his *The Noise of Time,* there seems to be a kind of relative harmony between what happens to the protagonist and how the narrative develops. The texts becomes more and more fragmentary as Shostakovich increasingly regrets his own submission to the Party.

In expressing the psychological truth, Barnes' narrative tries to avoid disparaging view of westerners to blame the oppressed Russians for their inaction, or to satirize the Soviet Regime for its absurdity or criminality. Instead of the mainstream western opinion that encourages the oppressed to stop submission, to disobey and to revolt against the regime for "individual self-emancipation" based on Western norms (Malia 397), Barnes feels a deep sense of empathy for the people oppressed by Soviet Russia, and explores, in *The Noise of Time*, the intense pain and suffering they have endured to illustrate their reasons for submission and the difficulty of resistance. It is well-known that Barnes feels emotionally connected to countries affected by Cold War. In his interview with Michael

March, Barnes mentions that he perceives his own relationship with these countries as "more of a fantasy emotional relationship" (March 25). He continues: "I am a child of the Cold War. I was born in 1946 – the whole of my childhood and adult life has been lived in the shadow of the Cold War, even if it is a less fierce and cold shadow than that experienced in Eastern Europe" (March 25). In his selected character-driven novel on the Cold War, *The Noise of Time*, Barnes writes about the emotional pressure individuals went through in this period to propose an alternative interpretation and the ways the Cold War shaped the personal, sociopolitical and the sexual identity of individuals.

Similar to *Arthur & George*, in *the Noise of Time*, maleness turns into a performative, unstable and negotiable process of give-and-take between the individual and the surrounding society, and it goes beyond the traditional either/or mentality, around which the hegemonic model of masculinity is usually constructed. Identical to *Arthur & George*, the novel blurs gender binaries and challenges traditional gender traits. It similarly criticizes the idea of separating maleness from emotionality, femininity, irrationality, and the fictional, and it questions the attempts to develop sexist or racist behavior in men (Segal 7). Yet, the contextual sociopolitical differences between the two novels impact the type and the extent of the possible modifications in the hegemonic model of manhood in each narrative. Unlike *Arthur & George*, in which the two male protagonists have the free will to cooperate with each other to reformulate traditional masculine traits (in opposition to the surrounding sociocultural frameworks), in *The Noise of Time* it is the despotic ruling system that forces such modifications and creates an oppressive power relation between the males. Unlike *Arthur & George* in which George becomes increasingly interested in and somehow adopts Arthur's model of masculinization, in *TNT* there is an increasing political disagreement between Stalin and Shostakovich (the two main protagonists), and the consequent sociopolitical pressure imposed by Stalin on Shostakovich ruins the chances for the artists' self-realization through art. In contrast to Arthur and George, whose collaboration facilitates the reversal of racial and sexual hierarchies in the construction of English maleness, in *The Noise of Time* men are kept under the strict control of the leading dictator, Stalin, and this results in their degeneration, hinders and obliterates the possibility of individuality in their assuming masculine characteristics, and it hampers their effort in challenging the gendered sociopolitical norms.

Barnes ironically takes the title of *The Noise of Time* from Osip Mandelstam's *The Noise of Time: the Prose of Osip Mandelstam* (1924), the autobiographical narrative that gives

an account of the heroic life and death of a "manly" (24) revolutionary Russian figure of the 1920s, who fought against Stalin's ideals and died a valorous death for his elevated goals. Although he lives in the same society as Dmitri Shostakovich, and although he almost endured a similar "noise of time", Mandelstam's protagonist, unlike Barnes' Dmitri, actively expresses his opposition to the regime and tries to suppress the noise of time with his louder protests. In his memoir, Mandelstam explains: "Congenital tongue-tie weighs heavily over me and many of my contemporaries. We have learned not to speak but to babble and only by listening intensely to the swelling noise of the age and bleached by the foam of its crest, did we acquire speech" (qtd in Freidin, 425). While Mandelstam admires manly resistance to rebuke submission and babble, Barnes' autobiographical account of Shostakovich explores the seemingly passive babble of the composer to disturb the boundaries between daring deeds/ cowardice, guilt/ innocence, treachery/ patriotism, protection/ harm, liberalism/ dictatorship, and farce/ tragedy to provide an innovative understanding of manly courage.

Like Mandelstam's autobiography, Barnes' *The Noise of Time* is set mainly in Russia, the country with "known tyrants" (*TNT* 84) and "tongue-tied" people (*TNT* 87). While critics often scrutinize Barnes' *The Noise of Time* as the testimony of a Soviet artist, the present study focuses on the gendered sociopolitical elements of the novel and explores the story as an illustration of the problem of masculinity in Russia. The current research analyzes Barnes' *The Noise of Time* as a representation of the alterations Russian men had to make un/consciously to the traditional model of manhood in Russia to be able to survive through the World Wars and the Cold War. To elaborate on this, I start with a historical overview of the traditional model of masculinity in Russia and how gender paradigms evolved after 1917 in line with the sociopolitical changes in the Soviet regime. Then, I make a brief survey on Shostakovich's personal perspective on the Communist ruling system of his time, and afterwards, I continue with an extensive textual analysis of how Barnes' narrative represents Shostakovich's life and Russian masculinity in his *The Noise of Time*.

3.1. A Historical Review of the Evolution of Hegemonic Masculinity in Russia

3.1.1. Masculinity in Russia before the Russian Revolution of 1917

From a political perspective, prior to the Russian Revolution, for centuries Russia was mainly an agrarian multicultural society, governed by absolute dictators who tried to

keep their heterogeneous and multilingual nation under a single authoritarian rule; people had no rights in the choice of government or in making national policies: "A word from the tsar was sufficient to alter, override or abolish any existing legislation or institution. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, several attempts had been made to draw up proposals for some kind of constitutional reform which would limit the tsar's powers, but none of them was successful" (Wood 4). From the emancipation of serfdom in 1861 onwards, class divisions became wider and while the government was exploiting the working class to transform Russia into a modernized capitalist society, the public resistance took the form of protest movements, and gradually the discontent at the autocracy of the tsarist regime turned into fully-organized and well-developed nationwide insurrections (Wood 16). Despite all their differences, the protesters wanted to stop the exploitations of the capitalist production system, and to destroy the tsarist sociopolitical order.

The construction of masculinity in such a revolutionary society was highly affected by individual and collective attempts to disobey, stand against and to object to the oppressive rulers of the time. By getting involved in antigovernment discussions and activities, men gained the chance to practice assertiveness and independence in judgement. The increasing sociopolitical pressure of the pre-Revolution era motivated the Russian men of the time to get more and more involved in random acts of social violence such as clashes with the police or the assassination of the men of authority. In this context, Russian masculinity "was characterized by the correspondence of word to deed, of stance to conduct" (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 51); i.e. the typical pre-Revolution Russian man was "a performative" who tried to assert his valor by his "deed" and "action" (51). He prioritized action over intellectual contemplations, and in the discussions on "a moral dichotomy between the turpitude of tyranny and the heroism of liberalism," the Russian man used to take the side of the liberal, the patriotic, and the heroic, and he displayed sound judgement to justify his reasons for such a courageous choice (51). The pre-revolution Russian masculinity was inseparable from valiant efforts against oppressive governmental power.

In the highly-charged political atmosphere of pre-Revolution Russia, male solidarity was also favored as it created sympathy and the unity of purpose between the males. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, because of the increasing dissatisfaction with the Russian autocracy of the time, Russian men developed, more than before, the habit of

gathering together, discussing the rights and wrongs of the ruling absolutist and autocratic system, and analyzing the possible solutions (Hickey 79). In this context, at the same time as retaining his individuality and "personal freedom" in making moral decisions, the Russian man practiced cooperation and friendship with other men, and he strongly supported and exercised male comradeship (80). For the pre-Revolution Russian man, the company of men could create a safe space within which he could easily demonstrate his "civic valor" and fulfil his own "potential for political protest" (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 51). What mattered was to put all his effort for "telling the truth" and "standing against despotism and tyranny" (51), either individually or in company with other men. This way he managed to express and strengthen his personal and social self.

At the same time with their partaking in the ongoing un/organized democratic movements of the time, the pre-Revolution Russia men felt an intrinsic sense of superiority to women. Only a limited number of females at the time were accepted to political gatherings, and the majority of them failed to go beyond the role of a mother/ nurturer or an agriculture/ factory labourer. Unlike men who were expected to be physically trained, politically vigilant and vigorous to protect others, women were mainly perceived as the "weaker sex," whose life and honor needed to be defended by men, sometimes even by performing the symbolic ritual of "a single combat, the duel" (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 50). Masculine duties and attributes were, in this setting, defined and naturalized in opposition to, and in supremacy over the feminine ones (Petrone125). Because of his supposed physical strength and because of the sexist stereotypes about women and their limited capabilities, the typical Russian man was usually considered as the breadwinner of his family, and therefore the head of the household, and this gave Russian men a space to act and express their masculine virility within their families. Women, in contrast, were doubly exploited in pre-Revolution Russia. They were expected to take care of the housework, raise children and "to provide comfortable homes and good meals for their husbands" (Schrand 201). Females, in fact, played the role of the males' assistants to highlight the significance of men's part. In this context, the practice of raising a family and strengthening family ties through working and earning money was necessary in the construction of masculinity (Lapidus 28). Families were formed through heterosexual marriages, and counted as durable (rather than fragile) entities by the endurance the wife and the husband were supposed to show for withstanding difficulties in managing the household.

The common views on the position of men and women, however, began to change with the formation of the first Russian Marxist group in Geneva in 1883. Applying the revolutionary theories of Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels on the establishment of a socialist society, Marxists came to the idea that women's emancipation (especially that of working class women) played a significant role in opposing capitalism and promoting equal rights for all classes (Marx 69). A large number of Russian revolutionists were drawn to Marx and Engels because, before Russia, the systematic understanding these two German philosophers (Marx and Engels) had developed on the forms of social oppression had successfully activated radical waves of social movements across Europe and they had already accelerated sociopolitical transformations in other European countries. Due to the promotion of women's rights, the number of women participating in anti-government movements increased in Russia, and the opposition to gender inequality turned into one of the core subject matters in the creation of the promised Marxist-socialist Utopia. Female revolutionaries engaged in a variety of political activities such as propagating social democracy among the working class and, sometimes, carrying out assassinations (Lapidus 29). They wanted to have a share in the construction of the promised Socialist society.

Through the rise of political awareness among the labour force and the growth of industrialization trends during the 1890s, workers' strikes under unions increased. Following the order of Lenin, the Bolsheviks joined all unionized groups together and founded a united Marxist party in 1903 that promoted long protest strikes in big cities, and guided workers in voicing their anti-government anger against the economic depression, the bloody massacres of the early 1900s and the military blunders of the Russian army (Steinberg 17). By the start of WWI, however, "a wave of primitive patriotism swept across the country impelling tsar, government, society and the people to unite briefly in the defence of Mother Russia" (Wood 39). Thus, the masculine interest in performing daring deeds, and the desire for practicing honesty, male comradeship and valor grew considerably. Although most Russian men had "no recent experience in mass warfare" and although they "knew nothing about [war] in practice," they initially took the Great War, similar to western men, as a chance for consolidating their own masculine selves, and for practicing patriotism, demonstrating courage and reinforcing physical strength in the company of their male mates (Mafi 155). According to Christopher Clark's *The Sleepwalkers*, WWI was at the beginning assumed as "a play

with only male characters," as it gave Russian men a chance to act out brave protective deeds in the name of their country (395). Despite inflicting high casualty, this aggressive war promoted the "conceptions of military-heroic masculinity" that displayed the common features of the soldier-hero archetype as "aggression, strength, courage, and endurance" (Petrone 173). Men initially felt like "physical defenders of their societies" by participating in WWI (Schrand 205). But, after a while, the increasing war damages, re-fuelled anti-government discontent

The protests and strikes restarted in big cities of Russia. "Increasingly the population began to voice its discontent, not only with the military reverses, but also with the domestic hardships which were directly attributed – rightly or wrongly – to the government's incompetence. The short-lived mood of national solidarity at the outbreak of war had now evaporated. Industry was battered by a renewed wave of strikes" (Wood 40). The protests paralysed the tsar and his men, and finally at the same time with the military involvement of the majority of Russian men in the Great War, in 1917 Bolshevik revolutionaries overthrew Czar Nicholas II and established instead the United Socialist Soviet Republic (USSR), promising "immediate 'Peace, Bread and Land'" (Wood 45). The Bolshevik Revolution managed to protect the country against the possible attacks of Germany and Austro-Hungary, and within eight months Russia turned into a republic bound by a Marxist ruling system that aimed to establish a utopian socialist society.

3.1.2. Masculinity in Russia after the Russian Revolution of 1917

Following Marxist ideologies on the need for the destruction of capitalism, the leaders of the Russian Revolution made claims about reducing inequalities of power and wealth, and establishing economic and sociopolitical independence among all classes throughout the country. Subsequent to the revolution, therefore, the whole society went through rapid and forced processes of industrialization and urbanization, believing that it would increase the political stability of Russia and liberate the nation (Schrand 204). Although these changes transformed the social context within which the agrarian Russian men used to socialize, the changes were initially welcomed and appreciated by Russian men as they supplied the Russians with more advanced equipment to recover from the damages of WWI. The modifications USSR made, however, turned into the main cause of trouble for men in the succeeding years.

The Russian Revolution together with the abrupt start of the modernization process in the country brought about new gender policies in Russia. As soon as the Bolsheviks rose to power in 1917, they tried different ways to distance the new socialist Russia from tsarist conventions, and they encouraged people to put aside the pre-Revolutionary lifestyle (Glass & Stolee 896). Mironov describes the Russian Revolution as the starting point of a violent "conflict between tradition and modernity" (79-80). Over the first few years after the Revolution, for instance, women's rights organizations were established with heated disputes over sexual equality. At the insistence of Bolshevik feminists, the legal restrictions upon divorce and abortion were partially removed, and criminal penalties for homosexuality were abolished (Schrand 206). As a result, a new perspective was developed on raising children, and men's and women's family commitments. Despite the disagreements over its probable adverse consequences, in the first few years after the Revolution, USSR leaders – following Marxist ideologies – put emphasis on the need for destroying the family unit and replacing it with collectivized childcare (Glass & Stolee 894). This was believed to protect children from the harmful "egotistical" influence of families, and help children learn and practice communist belief from childhood on (894). Although the idea proved to be erroneous in the coming years, abolishing the family was advocated by Bolshevik feminists as it liberated women from household chore and provided them with a chance to work outside.

Women's participation in the public sphere became particularly significant. According to Schrand, during the initial years of the Revolution, on account of Bolshevik feminist ideologies, "over 10 million women began wage-labor in the industrial and service sectors of the Soviet economy, raising their percentage of the non-agricultural workforce from 24 percent to 39 percent. The Soviet government actively recruited women for industrial employment, created affirmative action programs to train female technicians and skilled workers" (194). Soon after the increase in the employment of women, a variety of services were provided to support the female workers, and to help them maintain their jobs in the public sphere. The movement was believed to "free women by creating communalized social services – cafeterias, childcare centers, public laundries – that would liberate them from domestic labor and allow them to enter productive work on an equal basis with men" (Schrand 195). Once the domestic tasks were delegated to communalized social services, family life and parenting began to wither away as they seemed to be unnecessary. Gradually, the divorce rate and the number of out-of-wedlock relationships, unwanted children, and single-parent households increased.

By recruiting a large number of women to supposedly masculine jobs, gender binaries appeared to be challenged to the benefit of women. Being assigned to masculine occupations, women were conferred different titles and honors:

> In state socialist regimes, all women were exhorted to play an equal role with men in building a better future, as mothers and workers, as social and political activists (albeit without much real power). They were even cast as defenders of the idea of an egalitarian society, thus – in times of emergency – as potential defenders of the nation, a role identified with militarised masculinity and thus confined to men in the traditional nationalist discourse of National Socialism. (Einhorn 56)

Women's adopting masculine roles was believed to pave the ground for disturbing male domination and reversing gender hierarchies. The traditional notions of patriotism and valour that used to be appreciated mainly among males were no longer restricted to men (Petrone 172). Women's heroism, courage and social contribution seemed to be acknowledged by the authorities.

The extension of women's social rights disturbed men's domination in certain ways. Firstly, because of WWI and the industrialization programs of the new regime, men were mainly being sent to physically-demanding industries in mining, construction and textile fields, leaving relatively easier factory jobs for the females; so the working conditions of some men became more brutal by the start of Bolshevik feminism. Secondly, by the development of communalized social services, women could get out of their traditional family commitments, spend more time outside, work, earn money and become more independent of men. The empowerment and independence of women created a growing sense of confusion and uncertainty augmented among Russian men about their role and place in life that continued throughout (and even years after) the Soviet regime and profoundly challenged the traditional assumptions about Russian maleness. Conservatives blamed "the rise of the 'New Woman'" and the enforcement of women's rights for the start of the crisis of masculinity in Russia (Petrone 172); they held the recruitment of females responsible for the increasing rate of divorce and juvenile delinquency among the males.

As time passed, a great majority of Russian men, in the Soviet era, lost their confidence in fulfilling their old masculine duties, and gradually, the problem of masculinity that had started from the early years of the Soviet Union turned into a common

insurmountable difficulty throughout the country. “The indicators of the crisis were formulated as the low life expectancy of men compared to women, self-destructive practices expressed in what were called harmful habits (excessive drinking and alcoholism, smoking, ‘gluttony’), […] growing morbidity rates among men, and so on” (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 43-4). The problem gradually turned into a serious matter of concern. The majority of Russian men were no longer interested in socializing with others, expressing themselves, taking action, or getting involved in heroic patriotic group activities. They had departed from the traditional norms of masculinity, and preferred to stay passive and keep silent in the face of injustice.

Unlike conservatives, some critics held the opinion that the crisis of masculinity in Soviet Russia was not simply caused by the development of Bolshevik feminism or the changes in women’s social positions, because the feminist movement was terminated by the late 1930s, and the emancipation the movement promised was never achieved: “A 1936 law made divorce more difficult to obtain and outlawed abortion. Thus was the nuclear family reborn, simply with a new signifier: as the ‘socialist family’, in which gender role divisions went unquestioned as worker-mothers were required to bear and rear the socialist citizens of the future” (Einhorn 49). In fact, Bolshevik feminism proved to be detrimental to feminine assumptions of the time, and it made no actual attempt to challenge the underlying patriarchal principles of the society. Rather than fighting against misogyny, Bolshevik feminists were paradoxically promoting “antipathy towards the feminine,” displaying women’s concerns as “backwards and counterrevolutionary” (Schrand 196). At the same time that women’s recruitment was increasing the industrial productivity of Russia, the gesture was condemning the feminine roles, behaviors and attributes, labeling them “as ‘ahistoric’ and non-productive”; women were believed to detract men and disturb their devotion to the Party’s cause. They were assumed to be “contributing neither to human self-realization nor to the development of society as a whole” (Schrand 196). In other words, the feminist claims of the regime were reformulating the definition of femininity, not necessarily to the benefit of women.

The gender policies implemented by the state aimed, in fact, to create a sexless society. Bolshevik feminists integrated the discussions on gender with the Marxist notions over class stratifications, and they made no fundamental revision on the inequality between men and women. Due to “the primacy of economic and political transformation[s],”

sexual stereotypes were not effectively challenged (Colley 644). As a result, the pre-Revolution male-on-top model of behavior continued to be practiced in Soviet Russia "albeit in new forms and with new 'revolutionary' justifications" (Colley 644). For instance, they regarded the emancipation of women as a cause of their "moral degradation" and their deviation from the "true family purpose" (Voronina 97, 98). Extensive discussions were made on the "price of emancipation" for females and "they attach[ed] a disdainful connotation to the notion of 'emancipation'" (Voronina 98). To attain the revolutionary goals of the USSR, women were being guided toward raising their "own low cultural level" to the level of men's by getting politically and organizationally disciplined (Colley 646); as time passed, the "work organized specifically for women was derided as 'baba work,' devalued in comparison with men's efforts to organize the factory floor or increase production. Women's fundamental 'otherness' made them less than the equals of men: less fortunate individuals who had to be educated into political awareness and 'given' something 'practical' to do" (Colley 646). Gender binaries were, therefore, restored, and considerations for women's concerns were gradually halted in Soviet Russia from the late 1930s onwards.

Skilled working women were perceived as the substitutes of male workers in a state of emergency. As Schrand explains, in the letter Stalin wrote to Narendra (the Prime Minister), it was specified that the government needed to continue recruiting women "into fields that had previously been considered too skilled or physically demanding for women," not for women's empowerment but as "a defensive measure, since the threat of [the second world] war was inevitably growing"; the employment of women was made "in anticipation of a military crisis that would drain off skilled male workers" (204), and it aimed to turn females into "honorary or surrogate men" (Schrand 196). Regardless of the initial feminist claims about the emancipatory effects of women's employment, it was in fact only the success of the socialist homeland that mattered. Despite the increase in women's recruitment, "the state still relied on patriarchal structures that remained powerful in shaping and limiting women's roles" (Petrone & Lim 29-30). The restoration of patriarchal principles in Soviet Russia, however, did not make a positive impact on the overall situation of individual Russian men either.

At the same time that the perception of femininity was to be modified based on the recognized masculine frameworks, Russian men were suffering from the crisis of masculinity, resorting more and more to silence and inaction. Although both Lenin and

Stalin emphasized the significance of men's "intelligence and human will upon the course of history," their dictatorial ruling strategies "progressively restricted the function of decision making to a narrower and narrower circle of leaders" (Robinson 11). The discrepancy between what the Soviet regime claimed about gender equality and what they practically did, proved to be destructive to the whole nation. Rather than empowering men or women, the Soviet regime, in fact, alienated them from themselves and their family commitments to promote a universal gender marker in all; they thought they could achieve a collective classless Communist Utopia by making modification to the overall gender-based sociopolitical assumptions of the time.

Stalin believed that the destruction of the pre-Revolution traditions was the key to the start of his Communist Utopia. He tried to destroy all cultural and sociopolitical conventions to create what he claimed to be an entirely new social institution. In his writings about globalizing the idea of Communist Socialism, Stalin identified those human features that would actively contribute their ultimate goals, confirming that fostering those features would involve a "costly process of destruction and construction" (Robinson 13). In his opinion, in the process of change toward Communist Socialism, men and women needed to hold onto masculine values – such as courage, physical endurance, rationality, military discipline and violence – and put aside the feminine (Robinson 13). Cherishing masculine values not only contradicted the claims Bolshevik feminists had initially made about gender equality, it also harmed the construction of gender markers in individual men. Although the regime had failed to "raise the status of most individual Soviet males, it did heighten the cultural and symbolic value of masculine roles and activities while effectively restricting women's progress toward social equality" (Schrand 195). The denial of femininity, irrationality and the fictional normalized stoicism in men, and encouraged them to develop an antagonistic relation to the world, and to practice the stiff-upper-lip model of masculinity; they usually had difficulty in expressing their emotions in the face of adversity, and ended up in different types of depression (Schrand 195). As time passed, the problem of masculinity became more complicated and more difficult to tackle.

What maximized the crisis of masculinity in Russia was the failure of Stalin in implementing his own Marxist plans and the consequent socioeconomic problems that came up from the 1930s onward. The attempt Stalin made for creating a classless

productive society resulted in the termination of a wide range of occupations, it spread poverty and resulted in dispossession, mass starvation and the dislocation of a great number of men and women (Einhorn 49). Because of the consequent mass unemployment/underemployment and the labor unrest, men lost the virility they previously enjoyed through working and maintaining their financial independence. In this context, marital and family instability was almost inevitable. A large number of men overwhelmed with financial problems left their families or committed suicide. Studies indicate that during the Soviet period, men's suicide rate was 4.3 times higher than women's (Pridemore 415). Critics relate men's high rate of suicide to their unemployment, mental illnesses, isolation and their inability to establish and maintain effective or meaningful relationships.

The crisis of masculinity in Russia deepened over time. According to Stiazhkina, the Soviet model of masculinity that developed between the late 1930s and the mid-1980s was in a mood of "stagnation" i.e. the typical Russian man "exchanged the 'lofty aspiration of the mind' for the base satisfaction of personal wants" (64). Rather than expending valiant effort against oppressive governmental power (as in the pre-Revolution era), the Soviet man was following a monotonous routine for survival, sometimes even unable to fulfill his own basic needs. While Russian men felt to be "emasculated, living through a passive indifference" (Stiazhkina 64), women had to take responsibility for daily issues, and this contradicted with the pre-Revolution model of maleness that was based on male supremacy over women, and the protection of the lives and honor of women by men.

Some critics, in addition, relate the problem of Russian masculinity to Stalin's troubled maleness and his military techniques for purging the males of the time. Due to the continuing political rivalry between party members over who was to rule the country, Stalin felt a profound distrust of all his internal and external connections. In reaction to the political pressure, Stalin labeled himself as the "ultimate father" of Russia, and forced his men and the media of the time to similarly represent him as the father figure. In the opinion of Andrea Ciliotta-Rubery, this assumption of political paternity was a fictitious creation of Stalin and it had nothing to do with his relation to Christianity; i.e. it was not the image of the Church Father that Stalin wanted to manifest. By calling himself the "ultimate father," Stalin was, in fact, protecting himself through the strong gender bias that existed at the time in favor of fathers, as the authentic generative source

of order and life (Ciliotta-Rubery 84). Since patricide was one of the worst crimes in most cultures and religions of the time, Stalin believed that by displaying himself as the ultimate father of the nation, he would be protected from the cruel acts his rivals might do for political supremacy (86). Also, assuming the fatherly role added to Stalin's potential for giving birth to a modern political system that would depart from the traditional pre-Revolution Russia and establish Communist Socialism (86); the title of the "ultimate father" gave Stalin the chance to show self-confidence in his own political capabilities as the creator of modern Russia.

As studies indicate, in fathering Russia, Stalin was following his own father's footsteps to victimize others, practice retribution and expect excessive respect: "Stalin had an abusive, alcoholic father who victimized his family and deserted them, forcing his mother into housework, mostly for Jewish families. This likely influenced Stalin's incredible tenacity and competitiveness, as well as his tendencies toward vengeance and self-adulation" (Mir Zohair & Scott 25). It is believed that since Stalin had spent his whole childhood acting in passive obedience to his authoritarian father, he similarly relied on dictatorial ruling strategies to control his men and make them yield to his arguments and expectations: "Early concepts of authoritarian personalities posit that oppressive fathers stunt the emotional growth of children, who are unable to express aggressive compulsive needs. As a result, they project these feelings onto the vulnerable" (Mir Zohair & Scott 25). Stalin asserted his masculine authority by putting others under pressure and instilling fear in the people around him. Despite assuming a paternal role for himself, Stalin failed to overcome his paranoid feelings.

Stalin's authoritarian leadership problematized the assumption of masculine identity among Russian men. According to Suny, Stalin's growing paranoia and also the horrifying strategies he was using to preserve his position as the "ultimate father" of the nation left men inarticulate and impotent (16). Although Stalin had started by defending the rights of the working class and peasants in opposition to the tyrannical government of Tsar Nicholas II, from the time he replaced Lenin (in 1924), Stalin developed a constant fear and anxiety over losing his power and this turned him into one of the mass murderers of history. His strong and groundless suspicion about possible or potential traitors gave rise to unfounded allegations against different groups of men in Russia, which provoked a system of oppression in the country throughout and after his leadership. At the slightest excuse, Stalin accused a great number of his people of

treachery and purged the supposedly disloyal "undesirables" on different occasions, believing that purging would nip the increasing sociopolitical problems in the bud (Hoffmann 15). His anxiety rose increasingly as his economic plans proved to be ineffective and inadequate in creating what Marx called a true socialist society.

Stalin's attempt at identifying and eradicating the probable enemies of the people (especially after the assassination attempts of 1931, 1935 and 1938) resulted in the execution, incarceration and deportation of millions of Russian men; it was a "large-scale political terror against alleged enemies, including those within the Communist Party itself" (Hoffmann 15). At the same time with suffering financial problems, no one felt socially or politically secure to express his true self. Despite Stalin's attempt at "deifying" himself as communism's "man of steel," who was "not [to] fear either heat or cold" and although he claimed to temper himself like steel, Stalin proved to be increasingly vulnerable to political debilitation (Gilmour & Clements 215). The constant terror together with the unfortunate outcome of his national and international plans made people lose their trust in Stalin, and this contradicted with the "Soviet propaganda," according to which "much of the population" was supposed to "stand united behind Stalin and the Communist Party" (Hoffmann 163). To alleviate his personal anxiety, Stalin put psychological pressure on his people. He was "questioning the manhood of his opponents", for example, describing them, as the "castrated," "powerless" or "passive" forces (Schrand 198). His strategies turned Russian men into a group of submissive yes men who tended to agree uncritically with him.

Several studies are done on how Stalin's men acted obediently and fully accepted to get involved in the horrifying actions Stalin had assigned them to do. John M. Darley, for instance, goes through the interviews of the doctors who were responsible for selecting the "unfit" for death in Stalin's murderous gulags, and finds that although the doctors were always "likely to be confused, nightmarish, and self-contradictory," they knew that "the terrible machine would go on, whether or not the doctor participated in it" (518). Most of the doctors were always anxious, struggling to convince themselves that their tasks were defined in line with communist ideologies and for the benefit of all:

> [I]nterviews reveal that the doctors found it extremely stressful. They often did it drunk, or got drunk after it. Apparently, it caused them to face the moral implications of what they were doing, and did so in a particularly pointed way

> for the new doctors soon after their arrival in the camp. The task for the new doctor was to fit into this machine. Other doctors provided whatever rationalizations were necessary to promote this "adaptation." This being the task, then it was in some sense better to still one's doubts about what one was doing, to develop a network of beliefs that stilled the moral doubts. (519)

The examples provided in Darley's article suggest that despite their total obedience and submission, Stalin's men had difficulty in controlling their own anxiety, unhappiness, distress and feelings of discomfort. The examples also show "that human beings have the capacity to adapt to moral wrongdoing taking place within organizational settings" (519). Stalin's men followed the instructions the USSR machine produced under the name of Marxist ideology, but they ignored or were kept unaware of the implication of what they were doing.

Nothing could be trusted. Men "were frightened given the regime's proven willingness to punish, the strength of its punitive arm, its long and vengeful memory, and the unpredictability of its outbursts" (Fitzpatrick, "Everyday Stalinism" 168). Individuals were being unfairly punished. Analyzing the different coping mechanisms of Russian men, Fitzpatrick concludes that the "Soviet Man (Homo Sovieticus) assumed many different guises, from operator to conformist, but above all he was a survivor" (Fitzpatrick, "Everyday Stalinism" 163). Self-abnegation was the cost the Soviet man paid for holding on to life. He did not dare to express his true self. In the study Newman conducts on authoritarian regimes, following Foucault, the author calls the inaction of Russian men an outcome of their "voluntary servitude," and insists that domination, even in horrifying totalitarian ruling systems happens at the consent of individual members of the society:

> Power can only be exercised over a subject to whom is available a certain range of actions and choices, a field of possibilities that power seeks to limit, direct and control. Therefore, rather than seeing power as a top-down relationship of domination, or as involving coercion or violence, the operation of power is better thought of as 'conducting', or leading and directing, the behaviour of others: the 'conduct of conduct'. (Newman 126)

In this view, ruling regimes act like a set of apparatuses that have the power to turn individuals into their own subjects, yet "these apparatuses rely at the same time on a certain freedom on the part of the subjects, even, and especially, the freedom to renounce

freedom and allow oneself to be captured" (Newman 127). In this context, individuals accept to submit themselves to the ruling system, consciously and deliberately, through their "everyday behaviours and interactions" (Newman 131) and by exposing themselves to the dominant discourses and ideologies of the time.

It is true that the Soviet regime created the illusion of Power, but it was people who maintained the illusion. The Soviet regime, like any other ruling system was in fact "haunted by the possibility of their own disappearance" (Newman 129) and this vulnerability was the source of Stalin's paranoiac fear of political debilitation. Based on Foucault's idea, we can say, Stalin had no power other than the power the people had given him, and they could overpower him if they decided not to submit to his authority. Stalin knew that his power was unstable, and he was scared of losing the people's "ongoing free consent" (Newman 132). That's why he was keeping them under pressure:

> Power is an event rather than a transcendental, ahistorical essence – and all events can be reversed, superseded and transformed. […] In other words, if power depends at some level on the subject's free consent – on the will to obey – then this means that the overturning of power relations is also a matter of will, the will to be free, the will to disobey and to resist the various ways we have been subjectified. (Newman 129)

In this context, the reason behind inaction and servitude among Russian men might be the promises the Power gives for their freedom and enlightenment. It makes them believe that there is a sound reason behind whatever the authorities do, and that the promised day will soon arrive. Gradually, through continuous self-disciplining and collective re-educations, individuals become "habituated into servitude, such that they forget that they were ever free" (Newman 131). In this process, the media and the public representations allure the individuals to accept being placed under the yoke. Once the submission happens, the Power introduces systems of terror and dependency to keep the individuals under its own domination. After their voluntarily participation in revolutionary acts against tsar, and after their recognizing the power of the Bolsheviks, the majority of Russian men and women gave themselves over, first to Lenin and then to Stalin; in this process, people mystified these leaders as the superior sources of power, and internalized Marxist-Leninist ideologies in various collective occasions (such as Revolutionary Mass Festivals) all of which resulted in individuals' self-abnegation and their loss of individuality. The problem of masculinity was one of the main outgrowths of this submission and the loss of self-integrity.

Identifying men's inaction as one of the main reasons in the growth of the socioeconomic problems of Russia, the ruling Soviet regime developed different programs, in the postwar era, to solve the problem, and tried various strategies to encourage the "cultured" masculinity "which included such 'healthy' behavior as hard work, physical exercise, service to profession and nation, and devotion to family" (Gilmour & Clements 210). But, because of the insecurity and the unreliability of the society, the idea failed to influence a large group of Russian males, and the so-called "cultured" men were very few in number. Contrary to the expectations of the ruling system, a great number of Russian men developed the opposite features. The "Uncultured masculinity valorized self-indulgence (typically expressed in smoking, drinking, and sexual adventures) and aggressive physical self-assertion both in relation to other men and to women" (Gilmour & Clements 210). Media outlets of the Soviet regime used a variety of techniques to turn patriotic and diligent athletes into the socially accepted role models of masculinity, but they couldn't make the intended influence. The lack of the sense of agency was so deeply internalized in men, and the sociopolitical situation was so difficult that they could not practice the expected cultured masculinity even though it was closer to the pre-Revolution model of maleness.

In line with promoting the "cultured" masculinity, the old literary sources were re-introduced to the public to propagate the model of maleness that was the provider, the soldier and adventurer. Despite its initial attempts for distancing the nation from the traditional pre-Revolutionary behaviors and social norms, the Soviet regime came to the idea to alleviate the problem of masculinity by reviving "heroes from medieval epic poetry, characters of great courage, strength, and cunning who defended the Russian land against both foreign enemies and cowardly nobles" (Gilmour & Clements 212). These strategies, however, did not work, and because of the impotence of men, family structures began to fall apart: "The social repercussions also included the crisis in family relations as indicated by rising divorce rates and the psychological and social overload characteristically experienced by single mothers. […] Excessive drinking by married men has emerged as a primary motive for divorces initiated by women" (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 45). Because of the pressure imposed by the ruling political and socioeconomic structures, the majority of Russian men failed to escape the yoke the Power had placed on them (after their voluntary servitude), and they strayed away from individuality, civic valor and personal freedom.

In short, despite the claims the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) made about creating an egalitarian utopia for all men and women in Russia, the regime was focused on creating a universal gender in all; it forced both sexes to serve communism, and obliged them to facilitate the military and industrial goals of the regime, as a result of which masculine values were foregrounded, and individual men were atomized, silenced and subdued. Under the strict sociopolitical and economic pressure of the society, men deviated from the traditional (pre-Revolution) model of Russian masculinity that was based on practicing comradeship, developing family ties, maintaining their financial independence, opposing corruption and standing against the oppressors. Instead, stagnation, stoicism, powerlessness, lack of agency, self-indulgence in unhealthy habits, inaction and fatalism became the dominant features of the majority of Soviet men. The transformation from the active pre-Revolutionary model of maleness to the inactive and submissive Soviet type, however, happened over time, after a period of voluntary servitude during which individuals placed their faith in the empty promises of the Soviet regime for freedom and enlightenment, deified their ideologies, and re-educated and disciplined themselves according to their ideologies, to the extent that they forgot about the possibility of breaking away from their authoritarian system of government, and lost the courage to express their own individualities.

As the following sections illustrates, Barnes' *The Noise of Time* is set in a similar oppressive Soviet society, and the whole narrative displays a resembling male submissiveness. Dmitri Shostakovich, the main protagonist of the novel, goes through an identical process of voluntary servitude, and struggles to retain his individuality after the initial submission. To explain more on these, below, I continue with a brief overview of Shostakovich's relationship to the Soviet regime, and then, with a textual analysis of *The Noise of Time*, exploring representations of Shostakovich's and Stalin's troubled masculinities in the novel. The discussions on how the Soviet regime manipulates the masculinity of Shostakovich and the investigations on the artist's reactions to the oppressive situation, open the assumption of manhood in the novel to resignification. By highlighting the contradictions and ambiguities in the definition of maleness, the study puts emphasis on the multiple and indefinite nature of masculinity, and shows how the work promotes tolerance for accepting the marginalized patterns in masculinization. In this context, the attempt the Soviet regime makes for unifying or homogenizing masculinity, proves to be ineffective, and maleness turns into an unstable, negotiable and

incoherent social construct, which goes beyond the either/ or mentality based on which the personal, artistic, moral and political integrity of males is supposed to be shaped.

3.1.3. Shostakovich's Relationship to the Soviet Regime

Shostakovich was a man of morality, trying to conform to the typical pre-Revolution model of maleness. If anyone, "even a close friend, crossed the line into what he regarded as a genuine breach of manners or morality, Shostakovich would break off relations altogether. In that case he would make no attempt whatsoever to 'explain' or 'clarify'" (Glikman 238). Before the start of the Russian Revolution and even during the first few years after the start of the Soviet Regime, the composer has been one of the supporters of the Revolution and the mentality behind it. In his letters to Glikman, his close friend, Shostakovich mentions how he enjoys walking in the streets, seeing portraits of USSR figures and participating in the public celebrations after the Revolution: "Everywhere were portraits of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and also Comrades A. I. Belyayev, L. I. Brezhnev, N. A. Bulganin, K.Ye. Voroshilov […]. The streets are filled with flags, slogans, banners. I myself walked the streets until, no longer able to contain my joy, I returned home and resolved to describe to you, as best I might, Odessa's National Day of Celebration" (qtd. in Glikman 117-8). Like the majority of Russians, Shostakovich is happy for overthrowing the tsarist dictatorship, and waits for a democratic ruling system to replace the tyranny they have experienced before.

At the beginning, Shostakovich believes in the peace and freedom the Soviet regime promises, and he initially enjoys getting involved in political discussions on it: "In Leningrad before the war, Shostakovich and I often talked about social and political matters as well as artistic life" (Glikman 293). His passion for adopting Soviet ideologies continues during the 1920s. In the beginning years after Stalin comes to power (in 1922), Shostakovich writes a letter to Glikman to congratulate him:

> peace will reign over the whole world, and we shall live once more in peace under the sun of Stalin's Constitution. Of this I am convinced, and consequently experience feelings of unalloyed joy. At present you and I are far away from one another; if only I could be with you so that we might celebrate together the glorious victories of our Red Army under the supreme generalship of Comrade Stalin. (qtd. 68)

At this point, Stalin looks like a savior to Shostakovich and the majority of his countrymen. The composer seems to place abiding faith in the plans the regime proposes for creating a Socialist Utopia.

Things, however, change, and Communist leaders gradually make their minds on how to proceed. "Indeed, until the end of the 1930s, its leaders themselves were not sure what they were building, or where exactly they were headed; and the order they created emerged through a series of zigzagging improvisations" (Malia 294). As time passes, and the regime reveals its true cruel face, Shostakovich regrets his earlier optimistic thoughts, and "suffer[s] greatly over the terrible fate" of his countrymen (Glikman 252). In spite of the insistence of the Power on his joining the Party, Shostakovich tries not to get involved in the activities developed by the authorities. Glikman says, when the pressure increased, the opinion of himself and Shostakovich changed about what the regime claimed: "Whenever we heard Stalin speak, shared feelings of implacable revulsion instantly passed between us" (293). Glikman remembers how the composer felt "tired and overstressed to the point of exhaustion" after pernicious meetings with his colleagues who were Party members, such as Klemperer or Sollertinsky (xxii). The stress negatively impacts Shostakovich's health, his work and his relationship with others. In the concert attended by Stalin's men, Glikman describes:

> [H]e was under tremendous stress, and when a very young Nesterenko [his colleague], nervous as he might well be at being accompanied by the great composer himself, twice fluffed his entry, Shostakovich's face showed real panic. With a huge effort of will, he mastered himself and the performance continued. Overall the concert was very successful, and the new Eleventh Quartet was encored. But the appalling heat and the extreme nervous tension had taken their toll, and Shostakovich was taken ill during the night. It was diagnosed as a heart attack. (131)

As the pressure on his joining the Party increases, Shostakovich goes through multiple similar panic attacks. It is this stage of anxiety and trepidation in Shostakovich's life that Barnes focuses on the most in his *The Noise of Time*. Barnes' novel refers mainly to the years of the composer's disillusionment with the USSR.

3.2. The Realistic Representation of Russian Masculinity in *The Noise of Time*

As in historical accounts, in Barnes' novel Stalin is represented as the intimidating dictator whose "absent presence" (*TNT* 19) in/directly impacts all incidents of the story. He uses different mind control techniques for torturing people and keeping them under

pressure. In his office meetings, for example, Stalin makes men "more and more anxious" with his simple "ignorance," to the extent that most of the men "shat" themselves in response to his inattention and silence (*TNT* 143). This is such a common scene in Stalin's office that, as Barnes' narrator states, Stalin has hired a group of men helping his visitors with cleaning their pants during the meetings. "Such behaviour was not of course, abnormal. And you certainly did not despise a man for the weakness of his bowels when in the presence of a tyrant who could obliterate anybody on a whim," the narrator says (*TNT* 144). In these scenes, Stalin seems to enjoy an innate absolute superior masculinity, and his supremacy seems to be readily accepted by his surrounding men. As the narrative develops, Stalin's extraordinary maleness, however, proves to be forged and vulnerable.

Similar to historical accounts, in Barnes' novel, Stalin seems to perceive other men as his own rivals for exercising governmental authority; because of his apprehension over this rivalry, Stalin develops terroristic despotism as his model of leadership and maleness. Traces of his anxiety over political debilitation can be observed in some scenes; for instance, when Shostakovich complains to Stalin about his music being blacklisted by "the State Commission for Repertoire" for almost a year, Stalin gets shocked for not being informed before, and answers "Forbidden? Forbidden by whom? […] who gave such an order? […] No, […] We didn't give that order. It is a mistake. The mistake will be corrected. […] There will have to be an official reprimand" (*TNT* 81). Stalin feels distressed and uneasy to find his own men making a decision without asking for his permission. All decisions have to be affirmed by Stalin to assure him of the security of his position (Epitropaki & Martin). The narrator refers briefly to the victims of Stalin's "Cult of Personality" where he forces his men, especially authors and historians, to express extreme adoration in depicting his achievements and accomplishments (*TNT* 165). His inflated sense of self-centredness holds others in check. Relating Stalin's oppressive masculinity to his "harsh childhood" and the misbehavior of his "cruel father," David Hoffmann describes Stalin's maleness as an "aberration" since his masculine thirst for power remains unquenchable in spite of his frantic attempt at subordinating other men (70). He murders a large number of Russian men, labeling them as the enemies of the people.

Parallel with historical accounts, men are being purged in *The Noise of Time* for being perceived by Stalin as the disloyal undesirables. The punitive arm of the regime seems to

catch hold of many men. By the start of Stalin's regime, "[m]any of those around him [Shostakovich] began to disappear, some to camps, some to execution. […] his brother-in-law, his Old Bolshevik uncle, associates, a former lover" and others had all been arrested and never returned (*TNT* 57). As the number of widowed Russian women increases in the 1920s and 1930s, Shostakovich thinks to himself that if he is himself arrested, his own wife and mother would be living together in the same house to protect each other, like many other Russian women of the time. Shostakovich is shocked by Stalin's continuous attempt for subordinating men. He asks himself:

> [W]as it absolutely necessary to shoot all those engineers, generals, scientists, musicologists? To send millions to the camps, to use slave labour and work it to death, to make everyone terrified, to extort false confessions in the name of the Revolution? To set up a system where, even at the edge of it, there are hundreds of men waiting each night to be dragged from their beds and taken to the Big House or the Lubyanka, to be tortured and made to sign their names to complete fabrications, then shot in the back of the head? (*TNT* 83).

The tragic fate of men under Stalin terrifies Shostakovich. He finds that even his obedient Party members and musicologists, like Alexander Davidenko, are being purged for unreasonable excuses (*TNT* 94). The elimination happens illogically: Prokofiev tells composers, "Anything we cannot understand on first hearing is probably immoral and disgusting – that was their attitude. And they would do with his life what they wished" (*TNT* 178). Obsessed with the preservation of his own dictatorship, Stalin instils fear in his people, especially the males, and it is with this internalized terror that he displays himself as the unchallengeable man, "one whose mistakes could never be corrected" (*TNT* 18). He soothes his own pain in power by inflicting pain on his counterparts.

Unlike the pre-Revolution model of masculinity that promoted comradeship among men, in Barnes' novel, as in historical accounts, because of Stalin's despotism, men (have to) show mutual antagonism towards each other to survive. They are atomized, subservient, and available to shoot at each other voluntarily (*TNT* 9). Shostakovich cannot count on the help of his colleagues; during the time he was labeled as the enemy of the people, Shostakovich "noted which musicians now made public statements against his work, and which friends and acquaintances chose to distance themselves from him" (*TNT* 39). Due to Stalin's accusations and the fear he has instilled in the great men of the time, Marshal Tukhachevsky has to stop his own support of Shostakovich (*TNT* 13, 29). Instead of supporting each other, men are simply struggling to pull through their lives, even at the

cost of betraying each other. Under the pressure of the Power, Muradeli, the Gregorian composer, had blamed Shostakovich for misleading him: "Needing to save his career, if not his skin, Muradeli came up with the best explanation he could: that he had been misled by others. He had been seduced and deceived into taking the wrong path, specially by Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, and even more specifically by the composer's *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*" (*TNT* 77). Shostakovich uses the same technique once the need arises.

To save his life, Shostakovich betrays his favored colleague. When he becomes a member of the Party, as Nabokov publicly teases Shostakovich about Stravinsky's activities in the U.S., Shostakovich has no choice but to betray Stravinsky in spite of "his love and reverence for Stravinsky's music" (*TNT* 132). Under the strict system of surveillance, men have turned into spies and informers of the "carnivorous Power" (*TNT* 133). The pre-Revolution interest in male solidarity, civic valor, sympathy and the unity of purpose are no longer existing between men in Barnes' novel. In the opinion of Fairclough, it is this lack of comradeship that makes Shostakovich feel like an "isolated," "depressed" and "broken man" (158). The old mutual commitment between males is replaced with individual men's relationship to the Power. In his notes on Muradeli, the betraying composer, Glikman says: "A short while earlier, in February of the same year, Shostakovich, Prokofiev and other composers had been vilified as a consequence of the Decree on Vano Muradeli's opera *The Great Friendship*. The wounds inflicted on Shostakovich had by no means healed, and as he heard the triumphant howling of Stalin's butchers in the Lysenko camp, they reopened as wide as ever" (295). The struggle for survival keeps men apart from each other. Under the socioeconomic pressure, Russian men have to use "personal connections and illegal means to obtain the food and clothing necessary to survive" (Fitzpatrick, "Everyday Stalinism" 163). As a result, bribery and corruption become rampant. Shostakovich feels a considerable need for restoring the old sense of unity with his associates to feel courageous and strong.

At the same time with ruining the chances for practicing comradeship, the Power as in historical accounts, suppresses the individuality of men in making moral decisions, by engineering their souls, trying to create a universal Soviet identity in all: "They wanted to be engineers of human souls; but Russians, for all their faults, were not machines. So

it was not really engineering they were up to, but scrubbing. Scrub, scrub, scrub, let's wash away all this Russianness and paint a shiny new Sovietness on top. But it never worked – the paint began to flake off almost as soon as it was applied" (*TNT* 70). The modern society that the regime plans to create, rejects the pre-Revolution traditions and reformulates the personality traits of individuals to tighten its control over what they do, say and think. To preserve personal peculiarity in this situation sounds impossible.

By engineering human souls, the Soviet regime destabilized the traditional social order that defined gender roles in Russia, and modified the behavioural patterns of men and women based on the central principles of the communist regime that insisted on common ownership, social equality and classlessness. Schrand explains that after the Russian Revolution, "Soviet society experienced what might be described as a gender-quake, a seismic shift in sexual divisions of labor" (194). Accordingly, "the new Soviet person [either male or female] would, by default, be oriented toward a 'universal' gender identity" (Schrand 197), which was implemented to help the regime attain its long-term goals for transiting from Socialism to Communism, and constructing a global Communist Utopia. In the gender-quake, the Soviet Union tried to free both men and women from their family commitments and kept both sexes available to contribute to the construction of the communist utopia and to the military and industrial growth of the country.

As in Barnes' novel, toward the late 1920s, in line with the attempts made for creating a universal gender marker, Stalin redefined the primary relationship of individual men and women to be to the state rather than to each other. Under Stalin, "the full development of the individual was seen to be achieved through their engagement in the collective aspiration for a socially just egalitarian future" (Einhorn 35). Under his collectivization, as Barnes' novel also indicates (*TNT* 122), individual men had to give up a large proportion of their personal possessions and work for a collective cause to help the state gain the capital needed for the industrialization and modernization of the country. In this context, "a real man was first and foremost someone who participated in the industrialization of the country and in the Great Patriotic War, and this image was replicated in Soviet movies, literature, and art as a positive socio-anthropological type" (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 48-49). At the order of Stalin, the typical Russian man owed selfless obedience to the supreme leader. "Service to the state was his basic duty.

His life path was that of a soldier-liberator and a builder of the mighty Soviet nation" (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 48-49). Unlike the traditional model of masculinity that was based on men's autonomy, in the USSR, men were deprived of the old economic, political and moral independence, and masculinization was under the strict authority of the ruling system. These kept men under constant pressure.

As in historical accounts, in *The Noise of Time,* Stalin's programs for industrialization and urbanization result in brutal working conditions for the males. His plans are put into action at the cost of the life of a great number of men. Rather than being appreciated, the service is displayed as the public duty of all and the highest honour for men. The narrator says: "It was claimed that while constructing the canal," the Russian men "were not just helping the nation advance but also 'reforging themselves. Well, there had been 100,000 labourers; […] but a quarter of them were said to have died, and those clearly had not been reforged. They were just the chips that had flown while the wood was being chopped" (*TNT* 37). The regime expresses a dehumanized view of individual men, and at the same time, it expects them to be grateful and display the soldier-hero masculine values (like strength, courage, and endurance) in their attempt for achieving the intended Socialist Utopia. In this stiff-upper-lip model of maleness, there is no room to display a sign of weakness, or to object to the cruelty of the situation. However, as in historical accounts, in Barnes' fictional world, Stalin's plans fail, and this failure results in extreme hunger and a high mortality rate (*TNT* 107). Russians' dissatisfaction with the regime, therefore, deepens.

The cruelty of the situation and the consequent dissatisfaction gradually stop people from supporting Stalin and his Communist Party. As in historical accounts, in spite of the early claims Stalin makes about his own love of people, he fails to attract dedicated followers (*TNT* 119). His stiff-upper-lip model of masculinity is based on such a narrow set of political values that people and artists find it hard to hold on to. What makes men keep a greater distance from Stalin, is the immoral dishonesty embedded within what he dictates. "They didn't want you to fake adherence to their banal taste and meaningless critical slogans – they wanted you actually to believe in them. They wanted your complicity, your compliance, your corruption" (*TNT* 128). Rather than practicing Marxist ideologies for establishing the promised classless Communist Utopia, the ruling regime resorts to bribery, embezzlement and moral/ political corruption (Fairclough

159). Under the pressure of the Power, men have no choice but to submit to Stalin and mix up in the corruption he has created.

Unlike the traditional model of maleness that was highly dependent on devotion to one's country, due to the sociopolitical, moral and economic corruption of the regime, patriotism is not being practiced among most men in *The Noise of Time*. The old relationship between manhood and nation is replaced with dictatorial power relationships. The soldier singing on the train compares Russia to a "cruel," yet, "cherished mother" who takes advantage of the patriotic hero: "She doesn't take anything by force," as the song says, "She only takes things willingly surrendered/ While holding a knife to your throat" (*TNT* 70). It is out of fear of the knife that the son obeys, not because of his love for his caring mother. The soldier has to relinquish his autonomy to the ruling regime to survive. The fear and trepidation, as Glazov says, have "harnessed or tamed" the individuals (46). While the dissatisfaction of the people is increasing, the Power insists "that all was for the best in the best possible of worlds, that Paradise had been created, or would be created quite soon" (*TNT* 83-84). Considering the misadventures the country has gone through, the people can no longer believe such empty promises. Shostakovich thinks that the promised Utopia would be "achieved, in almost exactly 200,000,000,000 years' time" (*TNT* 10). The regime has become "sour, paranoid and carnivorous" and the composer's faith in Communism is already shaken (*TNT* 22). Despite his initial excitement for contributing to his country's success, Shostakovich has lost his sense of devotion to the ruling system.

To restore the destroyed unity within his nation, as historical accounts also verify, Stalin tries to attract musicians to his Party and manipulates their music to promote the truth he himself establishes. In his view, "arts was an integral part of mass education" and it could "satisfy the great cultural needs of the working population" (Boris Schwarz 12). To convince the artists of the time, as Shostakovich says, Stalin starts by displaying "himself [as] a patron and connoisseur of the arts" and a lover of "folk music" (*TNT* 18, 119), and he insists on the positive impact musicologists could make in creating his promised Utopia. In the words of Pierre Bourdieu (1986), we may say, in a political context like this, music works as an institutionalised creative and cultural capital, the holder of which can manipulate the sociocultural forces of the society (243). Stalin struggles to win the cultural musical resources to overcome his growing fear over

preserving his political power. Studying Marxist ruling systems in the light of Bourdieu's theory, Turner develops the idea that oppressive ruling systems exploit music to "reproduce themselves" and also gain a greater opportunity "to reinforce stereotypes" or to label their opponents, and "to judge and censor" those "who violate mainstream standards" (85). By exercising strict control over music, Stalin would have more considerable power to manipulate the nation and to purge those he labels as the "undesirable". In Kirpikli's opinion, Stalin's use of music "suggests the ways in which fascist authorities manipulate truth and shape its own reality to condemn anyone who does not comply with it" (268). Stalin wants to exploit music to cover up his own vulnerabilities in ruling. What convinces dictators more interested in art is its immortality and the autonomy music gives to the artists (Freiburg 154). Through controlling music and musicologists, Stalin aims to go beyond the transitoriness of his own power and to achieve the eternity of the artist's work. He does not want to leave artists unattended and let them triumph over Power.

In the oppressive context of *The Noise of Time*, at the same time that music gets reshaped based on the dictated style and taste of the Soviet regime, it acts like a potential defensive and stylistic means with which musicians try to articulate their true selves and preserve their autonomy over what they do and think. For Freiburg, music is precious to the artist and the nation trapped in the Soviet regime because it "can give [them] consolation; it may promise a way of existence real life never offered and never will. But even if art does not reveal this utopian character, it allows a kind of vicarious existence. In art, repressed essential aspects of the existence tormented by a totalitarian regime may resurrect in a new, aesthetic and sublime form" (154-5). Music is an outlet for the trapped artist and nation to release their inexpressible emotions, and live the life they are deprived of. In her "The Identity Paradox?" Kosmala explains that music makes the "identity of the artist fluid" and transforms the musician into a "societal ambivalence" (38). The process of musical creation, in this view, gives the artist the chance to go beyond the dominant structures of his society, and refashion or re-construct what is personal and political, public and private.

Another important point about music in Barnes' novel is the potential music has for disturbing masculine values. Considering Kristeva's association of music with the "feminine and enigma" (29), Harling-Lee draws our attention to the systemization of women's subordination in Shostakovich's society, and explains that, in this anti-feminist

context, music can satisfy the craving of the oppressed Russians for the missing femininity (6). In this view, we may take Stalin's manipulation of Soviet music as a strategy with which he tries to stifle the possibility of innovation and critical insight in art, and thereby eliminates chances for any possible rebellions through the feminine sphere. By controlling their music, Stalin "castrates" musicians of the time (Kristeva 51) and continually badgers them, forcing them to create what he assumes to be "authentic, popular and melodious" (*TNT* 28). Associating artistic autonomy with feminine energy and the harmony of life in a nation, Fitzpatrick in "Culture and Politics under Stalin" says: "[T]he Stalinist party rejected even the limited concepts of professional autonomy and academic and artistic freedom … and by imposing total control deprived cultural institutions and professional organizations of all powers of initiative and negotiation" (212). In line with his historical antipathy for the feminine and feminism, we may say, Stalin restrains musicians and suppresses femininity and irrationality to promote masculine values.

However the ruling system attempts to reinforce masculine values, as Barnes' *TNT* indicates, the Power is not qualified to make a judgement on the authenticity of a piece of music. In the opinion of Shostakovich, in spite of his claims, Stalin is "someone who knew as much about music as a pig knows about oranges" (*TNT* 27). He is certain that Stalin cannot decide on the authenticity of a piece of music because the regime does not have a proper understanding of the nature of art from the very beginning. In the USSR, especially during the late 1910s and the early 1920s (when most of people were voluntarily mystifying the power of the Bolsheviks and giving themselves over to their Marxist ideologies), there was an intense ideological rivalry among artistic groups, and authorities claimed that "Art belonged to the People, as Lenin had decreed" (*TNT* 75). The idea obliged artists to follow the principles of socialist realism to attract more and more people to the ruling regime and to reinforce unity and patriotism among them. In Barnes' novel, the sentence "Art belonged to the People" is written on an "enormous banner," and set on top of Shostakovich's classroom (*TNT* 90). Like every other musician of the time, he and his students are expected to follow the ruling ideologies.

As time passed, once the regime's corruption scandals are gradually revealed, some artists like Shostakovich question the notion of art belonging to the people, because despite all its liberalist assumptions, the idea forces art and artists to adjust themselves to

the needs of the ruling class and this contradicts the "Marxist-Leninist ideology" that aims to create a classless society. Considering himself an "anti-aristocratic" composer, Shostakovich believes that "Art belongs to everybody and nobody. Art belongs to all time and no time" (*TNT* 91); "[h]e wrote music for everyone and no one. […] he wrote regardless of social origin" (*TNT* 92). From Shostakovich's point of view, the definition the regime provides for art seems to be superficial. "They were determined to break the bourgeois stranglehold on the arts. So workers must be trained to become composers, and all music must be instantly comprehensible and pleasing to the masses. […] the slightest experimentation condemned as 'formalism'" (*TNT* 25). For Shostakovich, those who follow the Soviet principles violate the true nature of art. Listening to the work of a conformist artist, Shostakovich thinks to himself: "The composer had written not an opera but an anti-opera, with music deliberately turned inside out. He had drunk from the same poisoned source which produced 'Leftist distortion in painting, poetry, teaching and science'. In case it needed spelling out – and it always did – Leftism was contrasted with 'real art, real science and real literature'" (*TNT* 27). The USSR decides on what the "real" means in art, and this compromises socialist ideologies.

In spite of Shostakovich's disagreement with the claims of the Soviet regime, he is one of the artists Stalin chooses for being transformed into a "Russian composer". Shostakovich initially gets suspicious of what the Power expects of him and his colleagues. "Why, he wondered, had Power now turned its attention to music, and to him? Power had always been more interested in the word than the note: writers, not composers, had been proclaimed the engineers of human souls. […] And yet, it was not nothing: it could make the difference between death and life" (*TNT* 40). Gradually, Shostakovich learns about the reasons behind Stalin's interest in music: "Tyranny understood how some parts – the weak parts – of most people worked. It had spent years killing priests and closing churches, but if soldiers fought more stubbornly under the blessing of priests, then priests would be brought back for their short-term usefulness. And if in war time people needed music to keep their spirits up, then composers would be put to work as well" (*TNT* 67-68). As Shostakovich finds out, music needs to improve the relationship of the ruler with the nation.

Critics make various conjectures about why Shostakovich was selected by Stalin. Freiburg describes Stalin's interest in music and his reason for choosing Shostakovich as follows:

> As so many dictators, Stalin had no formal education in arts, not to mention music; nevertheless, he regarded himself as an expert in all matters concerning aesthetics; a conversation with him on questions of harmonies or melodies might end up deadly for the musician who was not willing to play the sycophant. Dictators are commonly suspicious of intellectuals and artists, and Stalin felt personally insulted when Shostakovich was called a musical genius in the early reviews of his compositions. (145)

At the same time that Stalin pretends to master music, he feels jealous of Shostakovich's fame and talent, and tries to keep his faculty under his own control. Stalin "intends to use him as an ideological tool for the orientation of the masses" (Nayebpour 13). Shostakovich's music can strengthen Stalin's relationship with the people. In Stalinism, "[a] composer was expected to increase his output just as a coal miner was, and his music was expected to warm hearts just as a miner's coal warmed bodies" (*TNT* 26). Like every other element in that society, music and musicians have to serve the regime. Unable to challenge Stalin's claim about music, Shostakovich makes guesses that the regime would "leach out of it [music] *the* freedom and imagination and complication and nuance without which the art grew stultified" (*TNT* 40). Whatever the state plans, Shostakovich promises himself to compose his music independently for the sake of serving his countrymen.

Unlike the majority of his colleagues who leave Russia to evade Stalin's intrusions and seek refuge in the US, and in spite of the constant pressure Stalin imposed on him, Shostakovich chooses to stay in Russia and serve his nation loyally; he is filled with compassion for the people of his country. "He himself had never been tempted by a life abroad. He was a Russian composer who lived in Russia. He declined to imagine any alternative. Though he had experienced his own brief moment of Western fame" (*TNT* 129). Also, Shostakovich knows about the restrictions of living in the west. He knows composers like Stravinsky who lived in the US, without feeling safe to express the truth: "Did he [Stravinsky] utter a single public word of protest while breathing the air of freedom?" (*TNT* 133). Shostakovich knows how westerners can harm his self-esteem by blaming him and his countrymen for inaction; the composer, therefore, does not seek refuge in the west, and bravely chooses to stay in Russia and courageously express the truth in his music.

Despite the attempts the US and the Russians living in the US make for protecting Shostakovich against the Soviet regime, the composer feels devoted to his country

throughout the narrative, saying that his ultimate life goal is to create a music that "would continue to make men weep" (*TNT* 178). For Shostakovich, music is a means to reconcile the men of his country with their suppressed affections. Rather than denying emotions and the feminine, the composer uses music as an apparatus to help males achieve emotional expressiveness, in a society that normalizes stoicism in men and forces them to build an antagonistic relationship to the surrounding world. In his *Shostakovich Studies,* Fanning refers to the torrent of "feminine sentimentality" with which Shostakovich was trying to revise Russian music of his time (3). While Russian musicians were "de-mythologising their own history […] Shostakovich's music provided an emotional safety-valve for tragic experiences which for decades could not be written about - indeed they could hardly even be talked about" (Fanning 3). His works express the unspeakable feelings through using "subtexts and ambiguities" (Fanning 4). Shostakovich's music incorporates a layer of imaginary implicit meaning that connects to the deepest feelings of his audience.

Rather than adhering to the patriarchal Soviet principles that rejected the irrational and the fictive and promoted stoicism in men, Shostakovich's music implicitly conveys expressiveness, empathy, affection and tenderness, the features that were stereotypically associated with the feminine. In the opinion of Taruskin, the key element in the success of Shostakovich is the genuine emotions his music manages to create within the restrictive framework the ruling system defines. The author refers to the strong emotional reaction of Shostakovich's audience, and explains why his listeners used to burst into tears:

> This was classic 'Aesopian' language, describing what was undescribable: a symphony that spoke the unspeakable. We can understand it only if we make the requisite adjustments, translating 'people of the thirties' as 'people in the grip of the Terror'; 'explicit content' as 'official interpretation'; 'general feeling' as 'unstated message'. And that is why they wept, then stood up and cheered, grateful for the pain. There are contemporary witnesses to this reaction. (36)

Taruskin connects the emotional reaction of Shostakovich's audience to the difficult sociopolitical context of the time, and explains how Shostakovich's music created an outlet for the repressed pain and suffering of the nation. According to what his contemporary witnesses state, Shostakovich's music produced the sense of "genuine tragedy" or an "inwardly motivated struggle," through which the listener was going

through a "catharsis" and attempted "to find a way out of existential 'loneliness'" (Taruskin 37). The music soothes the modern man in his desperate search for meaning, and cleanses and purifies his emotions; it also creates a sense of connection between the socially-alienated members of the oppressed society. Shostakovich uses art to help his audience cope with the pressure Power placed on individuals by foregrounding masculine values. His notion of masculinity is closer to a reconciliation with femininity.

Like Stalin, Shostakovich knows about the immortality and the potential autonomy embedded within music, and believes that by composing an "authentic" piece of music (going beyond what the Power dictates), he would be able to reaffirm his own existence and reinforce his own masculinity. Composing music is an "existential self-making" process, and an "alchemical transformation" through which Shostakovich would acknowledge his own being, identity and individualism (Harling-Lee 6). Through his art, the composer hopes to construct and maintain "an ahistorical self," which is "autonomous, absolute" and "strong" (Harling-Lee 8). In this view, music is inseparable from Shostakovich's gendered identity as a man. It is an instrument through which Shostakovich can object to the injustice caused by the Power, and to practice the honesty and the valor favored in pre-Revolution Russian masculinity. Music gives the composer the power to practice comradeship and patriotism, to achieve unity with his nation, to oppose the oppressor, to express his own critical insight independently, and to actively respond to what he observes around him, daring deeds that were commonly practiced among men before the start of the USSR.

Music is the source of integrity and sincerity for Shostakovich. It makes him feel braver and more honest, features that also align with the pre-Revolution model of masculinity in Russia:

> because you cannot lie in music. […] Music – good music, great music – had a hard, irreducible purity to it. It might be bitter and despairing and pessimistic, but it could never be cynical. […] What could be put up against the noise of time? Only that music which is inside ourselves – the music of our being – which is transformed by some into a real music. Which over the decades, if it is strong and true and pure enough to drown out the noise of time, is transformed into the whisper of history. This was what he held to. (*TNT* 125)

Music, as Shostakovich believes at this point, can stand "clear of the noise of time" (*TNT* 180) and outdo the institutional structures. By composing a good music, he thinks he would go beyond the sociopolitical boundaries the ruling system imposes.

Shostakovich perceives himself as a warrior armed with music. As his Piano Concertos titled *The Soldier's Tale* (1915-16) and *Longing for the Homeland* (1915-1917) indicate, through his music, Shostakovich thinks of himself as a composer soldier-hero who can rescue his oppressed countrymen through composing an actual, pure and ahistorical piece of music (Fanning 26). In *The Soldier's Tale*, he identifies himself with a young warrior who goes through various misfortunes but resists the Devil's temptations for the sake of his sincere love for his nation. His selfless devotion to his countrymen gets deeper in his *Longing for the Homeland* where he displays himself as a banished soldier detained in jail, singing songs about the Great Russia, promising to try all his means to restore the lost peace and tranquility (26). Through his music, the composer tries to convey his own "burning hatred of evil in whatever form it might present itself to him" (Glikman 19). He perceives music as an effective defence against the evils of the Soviet regime. In Barnes' *The Noise of Time*, as the narrator says, Shostakovich "could always work, regardless of chaos and discomfort around him. This was his salvation. Others were distracted by the sound of normal life. […] he himself was impervious to noise. All that bothered him was the barking of dogs" (*TNT* 74). To find salvation, Shostakovich tries to keep up his hard work, and to hold his music independent of what Stalin dictates to him. As Glikman confirms, the integrity of identity and work has been highly significant for Shostakovich since youth, and he has always tried to create his works based on what he believes in: His "character and art made up an indivisible unity" (18-19). From the beginning, he tries not to contradict himself in his music.

Another factor that makes music so special to Shostakovich is its nonverbal and multilayered nature. Based on Kristeva's concept of *ecriture feminine*, we may say, Barnes' narrative is taking music as a semiotic mode of articulation through which the musician is trying to "pluralize meaning" (65), go beyond the "symbolic function (sign and syntax)" (63), and to express his opposition to the regime in a nonverbal, "feminine and enigmatic" way (29). Shostakovich believes that the plurality of meaning and the ambiguity embedded within music would protect him. As the sociopolitical pressure of the regime increases, Shostakovich's need for resorting to the femininity of music increases. "Let Power have the words, because words cannot stain music. Music escapes from words: that is its purpose and its majesty" (*TNT* 58). He believes that music can immortalize him (*TNT* 179) and liberate him from the restrictions of time and place.

Music is the only source of energy to Shostakovich: "When all else failed, when there seemed to be nothing but nonsense in the world, he held to this: that good music would

always be good music, and great music was impregnable" (*TNT* 124). Shostakovich's idea about the liberating nature of music seems to align with Kristeva's description of music as the "unfettered, irreducible to its intelligible verbal translation" (29). Shostakovich relies on his music to courageously speak aloud about the great terror of his time, transcend the noise of time, stand against the oppressive USSR and preserve his own integrity as a soldier-hero composer. "For Shostakovich, music is the only way to leave Stalin behind, to transcend the 'Great Terror' and to enter a proto-mythological sphere called the *aevum* by some critics, immune against any earthly, political or ideological interferences" (Freiburg 152). Music is a means of survival for Shostakovich; "music may shield the artist from oppressive Communist regimes" (Harling-Lee 19). With his music, Shostakovich wants to get the upper hand over Stalin and his men. "He was, for all his anxieties and fearfulness and Leningrad civility, at base a stubborn man who had tried to pursue the truth in music as he had seen it" (*TNT* 150). He wants to voice the unpleasant experiences he and his nation go through under the Soviet regime.
There are different views about how the composer manages to pluralize meaning under the strict control of the Power. Taruskin, for instance, says: "The changes wrought in him by his ordeals lent his voice a moral authority perhaps unmatched in all of twentieth-century music. But the impulse to communicate urgently in an atmosphere of threat did lead, at times, to an over-reliance on extroversive reference as bearer of essential meaning, and a correspondingly debased level of musical discourse" (55). The term "extroversive" refers to the composer's intertextual use of external musical sources, and "introversive" refers to the internal interdependence of the constituent elements in his music. Shostakovich's precise calculations in the choice of his musical elements, and his intentional attempt for creating interconnections with the works of various other artists (from Haydn, Beethoven and Mozart) make his music so vigorous and multilayered that he thinks he can disregard the Power and convey his own intended meaning to his audience independently.

For protecting himself against Stalin, Shostakovich also armours his music in irony. In the opinion of Kirpikli, "in his struggle with Power his only tool to defend his identity and art is irony which he uses in his music and public speeches to imply his actual but hidden defiance of tyranny" (269). Men of authority, Shostakovich assumes, would never perceive the irony embedded within his works. He "permitted those with asses' ears to hear in his symphony what they wanted to hear. They missed the screeching irony

of the final movement, that mockery of triumph. They heard only triumph itself, some loyal endorsement of Soviet music, Soviet musicology, of life under the sun of Stalin's constitution" (*TNT* 58). He believes that his music is conveying a plurality of meanings, and it is the listener's capacity that decides what the music expresses. Shostakovich considers irony as "a defence of the self and the soul; it lets you breathe on a day-to-day basis" (*TNT* 173). Irony is a safety valve that gives Shostakovich a space to fulfill his manly desire for protecting his family, himself and his nation. Thinking to himself, Shostakovich says: "irony – perhaps, sometimes, so he hoped – might enable you to preserve what you valued, even as the noise of time became loud enough to knock out window panes" (*TNT* 86). Irony, Shostakovich hopes, will bring him individuality. "In *The Noise of Time*, Shostakovich believes irony can preserve the 'truth' of his thoughts while protecting his 'music' (metaphorically his self)" (Harling-Lee 9). Here, music acts like what Kristeva calls "an asocial drive" (71) that creates a chance for a revolution and resistance. It may enable him to achieve self-actualization, and to preserve his own autonomy and control over life.

Under the guise of irony, Shostakovich pretends to collaborate with Power: "Irony allows you to parrot the jargon of Power, to read out meaningless speeches written in your name, to gravely lament the absence of Stalin's portrait in your study while behind a half-open door your wife is holding herself against forbidden laughter" (*TNT* 173). Since his soul is protected by irony, toward the middle of the novel, the artist feels safe to pretend to support the regime in his music:

> He [Shostakovich] had never joined the Party – and never would. He could not join a party which killed: it was as simple as that. But as a 'non-Party Bolshevik' he had allowed himself to be portrayed as fully supportive of the Party. He had written music for films and ballets and oratories which glorified the Revolution and all its works. His Second Symphony had been a cantata celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Revolution […] He had written scores applauding collectivism and denouncing sabotage in industry. […] Currently – perhaps always, and certainly for as long as was necessary – he was at work on a symphony dedicated to the memory of Lenin. (*TNT* 52)

Irony is the main source of relief for Shostakovich. Barnes himself believes that political pressure "would be intolerable without a sense of irony (Candles for the Living, 7), and he takes irony "as a political strategy of destabilisation" (Guignery's *The Fiction of Julian Barnes* 94). He highlights the same view in his *Noise of Time,* where "irony

functions as an act of subversion of his [Shostakovich's] apparent compliance with Power and also a means to preserve his dignity" (Kirpikli 270). Shostakovich expects his countrymen to perceive the coded revolutionary message behind his seemingly supportive works of music. "The symphonies he wrote in his middle period … are full of hidden messages, in-jokes, and allusions through which Shostakovich could phrase his frustrations, alienation, doubt, hope, and yearning, for an informed group of listeners" (Gerstel 44). By pretending to support the regime, Shostakovich assumes, he would distract the watchful and suspicious eyes of the Power, and gain a chance to create his desired radical works.

Things, however, do not go as Shostakovich expects. Due to his veiled act of defiance in composing music, Shostakovich is repeatedly troubled by the ruling system. Despite devoting his whole life and music to his countrymen, paradoxically, the Soviet regime labels Shostakovich, for two times, as the "enemy of the people" (*TNT* 39, 122) and consequently his works face "official disapproval," and "suspension of pay" (*TNT* 56). The first time, he made "no public statement, no apology" and thus "his career had simply stopped" (*TNT* 43). The second time, he finds that his artistic bravery has put the life of his whole family and acquaintances at a real risk. He has to "make a public apology, recant his errors, and explain that while composing his opera he had been led astray by the foolish excesses of youth" (*TNT* 41). The unfair decrees of the Power keep Shostakovich, throughout the narrative, between the two poles of the binary of patriotism and treachery. It makes him feel like a "hysteric" political apparatus that needs to be controlled (*TNT* 33). Time, nevertheless, proves that his intended resistance and autonomy are almost impossible. He will be wiped out by the Power if he refuses to abide by the orders of Stalin. Because of his in-between relationship with his nation, the composer gradually feels disappointed with his own struggle, and feels incapable of conforming to the pre-Revolution model of masculinity that favored manly courage and patriotism.

Under the pressure of the men of Power, Shostakovich finds that irony is not enough in standing against the increasing pressure of the regime: "Irony, he had come to realise, was as vulnerable to the accidents of life and time as any other sense"; you cannot make sure whether your audience "noticed" your language or not: "you woke up one morning and no longer knew if your tongue was in your cheek; and even if it was, whether that mattered any more, whether anyone noticed" (*TNT* 174). As the social, economic and

political situation of the country gets more and more critical, Shostakovich accepts that he cannot expect his audience to decipher exactly what he means. The impact of irony, as Goffman says, depends on the existence of a "mutual understanding" between the musician and the audience (515). Shostakovich's audience are under too much pressure to understand his indirect expression of the truth. Irony, as the composer finds out toward the end of the novel, cannot protect Shostakovich's true self either. According to Cherlin "a pervasively ironic attitude toward the world leads to a […] lack of earnestness, and to a condition that ultimately contradicts and destroys itself" (12). Irony cannot protect the personal or the artistic honesty of the composer. Shostakovich comes to the idea that, "irony had its limits. For instance, you could not be an ironic torturer; or an ironic victim of torture. Equally, you couldn't join the Party ironically. You could join the Party honestly, or you could join it cynically" (*TNT* 175). He has to accept that irony cannot protect him from the unreasonable demands of the regime. Corruption is so rampant that gradually Shostakovich gives up his hope for expressing his true self as an autonomous individual man through art. Music proves to be insufficient in his intended struggle against the oppressive Power.

What disappoints Shostakovich the most is the failure of his masterpiece, *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*, the "Russified" version of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* in which a strong female character named Katerina commits adultery with a man named Sergei, and once her husband finds out, she poisons the husband and kills a few more people to be able to continue her life with Sergei; once revealed, both Katerina and Sergei are sent to exile in Siberia where Katerina kills her rival and commits suicide (*TNT* 18). Although for two years, the opera was being "applauded everywhere – from New York to Cleveland, from Sweden to Argentina" (*TNT* 26), Stalin bans it the day after he watches the performance. They say, he left the theater after a few scenes, saying that he felt displeased with Shostakovich's work. Shostakovich is interrogated afterwards at "the Big House on Liteiny Prospekt" (*TNT* 43), and the opera remains banned for more than twenty years because of creating disharmony and displaying "glaring artistic and ideological faults" (*TNT* 137). They say, Shostakovich has openly acted against the regime in his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*, but the composer is not convinced with the given obscure reason, and feels dishonored:

> He may have got things wrong; but he was not a fool, nor altogether naïve. He had been conscious from the beginning that it was necessary to render unto

> Ceasar that which was Ceasar's. So why was Ceasar angry with him? No one could say he was not productive: he wrote quickly and rarely missed a deadline. He could turn out efficiently tuneful music which pleased him for a month and the public for a decade. […] Why, Comrade Shostakovich, does your new symphony not sound like your wonderful 'Song of Counterplan'? Why is the weary steel-worker not whistling the first theme on his way home? (*TNT* 54)

Despite his wholehearted attempt to serve his nation, the Power claims that his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* is not attractive to the people of the working class. Shostakovich cannot believe the excuse. Considering his own hard work and his previous productive musical works for Stalin, the composer expects the supreme leader to appreciate his dramatic skills and to give him space for expressing his creativity. Unlike *Arthur & George* in which George gradually develops a growing interest in Arthur's worldview and adopts it in his masculinization, in *TNT* as the novel develops, the political dissent between the two main male figures (Stalin and Shostakovich) increases, and the sociopolitical pressure Stalin imposes on Shostakovich destroys his self-realization as a man/ artist.

Historical accounts also verify that by stifling his innovation, Stalin deprives Shostakovich of his virility in composing music and dishonors him among his colleagues. "The *Pravda* article 'Muddle Instead of Music', published at the end of January 1936 [the time Stalin watched the performance], toppled Shostakovich from the dizzy heights to which his magnificent opera had taken him" (Glikman 19). After Stalin's contempt, the well-known musicians of the time, who were initially encouraging the composer for his magnificent work in *Lady Macbeth*, changed their minds: "former devotees of the opera were loud in their condemnation of its defects" (Glikman19). Being closely in touch with Shostakovich during those difficult years, Glikman explains that Stalin's negative feedback destroyed Shostakovich's self-assurance in socialization and ruined his artistic confidence to continue his work: "When the *Pravda* article came out, Shostakovich deliberately kept away from the debating sessions which went on for days in the Leningrad Union of Composers. There were some in authority who took this as a mark of arrogance. The discussions were difficult, tedious and painful - depending, of course, on who you were" (Glikman 20). The pain and the difficulty of the situation confuse Shostakovich about how he should proceed.

Similarly, in Barnes' *TNT,* after *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* Shostakovich becomes asocial, refuses to compose operas and limits his work to simple symphonies. "They had

already killed his career as a composer of opera. In his early years, many thought – and he had agreed with them – that this was where his best work would be done. But since they murdered *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk,* he had not had an opera produced; nor finished any he had begun" (*TNT* 108). Shostakovich blames the banning of *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* for his loss of artistic self-esteem. The incident of banning holds his artistic power in check and restrains his creativity. By banning *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* Stalin deprives Shostakovich of his procreative artistic power, based on which the composer struggled to establish his gendered identity and achieve self-realization. During the subsequent twenty years that the composer strives to rewrite the opera and to convince the regime into accepting it, Shostakovich loses his enthusiasm for composing a better work of art, and this harms his sense of self.

There is no way for Shostakovich to regain the excitement he previously had in composing his works. He compares his disappointment to "what it was like to have your spirit, your nerve, broken. Once that nerve was gone, you couldn't replace it like a violin string. Something deep in your soul was missing, and all you had left was – what? – a certain tactical cunning, an ability to play the unworldly artist, and a determination to protect your music and your family at any price" (*TNT* 155-6). The incident of banning *Lady Macbeth* and the consequent reactions of the men of authority leave Shostakovich demotivated and scared. He finds that he needs to concentrate more on the endurance of his work and the survival of his family members, rather than displaying manly courage in serving his nation through music. Music fails to facilitate his self-actualization.

Considering the feminist theme of Dmitri's opera, and his incorporation of the New Woman of the time, we may take the banning of *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* as a symbolic measure with which Stalin reaffirms his increasing antipathy toward feminism and his lack of care for women's concerns and rights. Taking the opera as a portrayal of "Russian womanhood," Boris Schwarz takes "the initial acceptance and subsequent rejection *of Lady Macbeth* within a span of a few years" as an example of the growing antifeminist tendencies of Stalin that illustrates how the ruling system was imposing tighter restrictions upon women toward the late 1930s (142). Banning *Lady Macbeth* in 1936 coincides with the time when emancipation movements of women were stopped in Russia, divorce law became more difficult, and female workers were asked to return to the domestic sphere. After Dmitri rewrites the opera and appeals to the ban, the Power

rejects it a second time, claiming that Katerina's reasons for committing adultery are "morally reprehensible" and that the whole work "justifie[s] the actions of a murderess and a whore" (*TNT* 137). In spite of the early claims Bolshevik feminism made for liberating Russian women, the regime criminalizes Dmitri's artistic attempt for illustrating women's needs and desires, displaying the opera as a threat against the patriarchal integrity of Russia.

From the point of view of feminist psychoanalysts, Shostakovich's *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* is a representation of the autonomous expression of female sexuality, and Stalin's objection against the play is strong evidence of his opposition to women's right to pleasure, to passion and speech. Following Irigaray's "The Bodily Encounter with the Mother," we may say, the banning of *Lady Macbeth* displays the rigidity of gender expectations in the patriarchal Soviet regime, and illustrates how the Power disempowers women, manipulates their function, and distorts their social role and identity (36). In Irigaray's view, women's silence or subjugation harms both men and women by perpetuating social fragmentation and leaving human potential unfulfilled. It impedes reciprocity between men and women, prevents both sexes from developing and preserving their true identities, and obstructs plurality in their perception of the world (36). Shostakovich voices women in his work to re-establish the reciprocity between males and females in his society, to promote inclusivity, and to help people of both sexes to represent their true selves.

Dmitri's ongoing obsession with the unbanning of his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* highlights the composer's interest in incorporating femininity and emotionality within the masculine frameworks of Power. In the opinion of Kholopov, *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* embodies the delicacy and the softness associated with the feminine. In this masterpiece, Shostakovich tries to increase the "emotional pressure" of his work by incorporating "dramatic symphonism of the Romantic era" and imitating "the rhythm of folk song and folk dance" (Kholopov 68, 58). In fact, it is Shostakovich's innovative use of rhythmic flow, ambiguity, mythology, and his emotional depth and lyricism on the themes of love and introspection within his opera that scares the Power. "Art, according to the Stalinist line, belongs to the people, so any artist whose work was considered experimental, esoteric, or otherwise non-populist was deemed 'anti- Soviet'" (Jonathan Clark 849). *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* was far from the socialist realist style that the regime expected.

At the same time with his interest in fostering femininity and emotions in his works, unlike Stalin, Shostakovich cares about women's rights. Since his early youth, the composer used to think about "how the sexes were entirely equal" (*TNT* 17). In his opinion, "marriage ought to be abolished as an institution, but that if it continued in practice, the woman had the full right to an affair if she so desired, and if she then wanted a divorce, the man must accept it and take the blame" (*TNT* 17). Women deserve respect and recognition in Shostakovich's view, and in his masterpiece the composer intentionally violates the patriarchal values of the regime to display his concern for women's needs. He calls his own *Lady Macbeth* "the piece that offended" (*TNT* 18), and he states that he has created it based on his deep "honesty" and "respect" for women (*TNT* 33). The opera incorporates his sincere perspective on the regime and the autonomy of women.

Out of helplessness in removing the ban on his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk,* and to save his life and work, Dmitri finally surrenders, expresses sorrow and tries to compensate for his assumed fault. But, to his disappointment, there is no end date for his punishment. The retribution continues even after the death of Stalin (in 1953) when Dmitri appeals against the ban once more:

> He had committed a great fault in writing *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk,* and Power had properly castigated him. Repentant, he had composed a Soviet artist's creative reply to just criticism. Then, during the Great Patriotic War, he had written his Seventh Symphony, whose message of anti-Fascism had resounded across the world. […] The sinner might have been rehabilitated, but this did not mean that the sin itself had been expunged from the face of the earth; far from it. If the country's most famous composer could fall into error, how pernicious must that error be, and how dangerous to others. So the sin must be named, and reiterated, and its consequences eternally warned against. In other words, [Shostakovich's mistake] had become a school text, and formed part of conservatoire course in the history of music. (*TNT* 73-74)

In spite of his repentance, the Power repeatedly reminds Shostakovich and his colleagues of his fault in composing *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* to prevent the possibility of revolution in other works of art. The continuation of the punishment turns Shostakovich's mistake into a dreadful sin from which the composer and other artists need to learn an unforgettable lesson on being fully compliant. Historical accounts similarly indicate that, after the artist's repentance, Stalin treats Shostakovich in a contradictory and unpredictable manner to keep the composer under his control: "Stalin

inflicted severe trials and public humiliations on Shostakovich; yet almost simultaneously he rewarded him with the highest titles and honors" (Volkov, xxxi). The paradoxical behavior of the Power confuses Shostakovich over what he is expected to do. The persistence of retributions results in chronic stress and emotional repression in Shostakovich. He seems to fail in his attempt to set up a more flexible notion of masculinity through his music.

For years Shostakovich reads and rereads Stalin's words published in *Pravda* about his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* to understand the logic behind the banning of his opera. Stalin labels his music as "Petit-bourgeois, formalist, Meyerholdist, Leftist" (*TNT* 27). The compulsion to conform to what the ruling system defines as "real art" distresses artists and throws art off balance. Shostakovich remembers that when Stalin came to watch his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk,* "both conductor and orchestra were understandably nervous" and two of the musical instruments, in that performance, played too loudly; something that had never happened in their previous performances (*TNT* 19). Although the opera was being performed for two years before Stalin's visit, his presence unsettled the work and the players, and disturbed the fluidity of the music. Stalin's strict insistence upon the need for conformity sterilizes Shostakovich's music in challenging ruling ideologies and countering oppression. The masculine framework of Power is not open to innovation.

Disappointed about overpowering the regime, Shostakovich wonders how long the negative influence of prevailing ideologies would last on the message each piece of music conveys:

> What he hoped was that death would liberate his music: liberate it from his life. Time would pass, though musicologists would continue their debates, his work would begin to stand for itself. History, as well as biography, would fade: perhaps one day Fascism and Communism would be merely words in textbooks. And then, if it still had value – if there were still ears to hear – his music would be … just music. That was all a composer could hope for. Whom does music belong to, he had asked that trembling student, and though the reply was written in capital letters on a banner behind her interrogator's head, the girl could not answer. Not being able to answer was the correct answer. Because music, in the end, belonged to music. (*TNT* 179)

Despite its pluralized, immortal and asocial nature, as Shostakovich learns, music cannot work independently from the ruling ideologies. The composer wants his music to be "clear of the noise of time" (*TNT* 180) so that it can "outlive everyone and everything" (*TNT* 180). In continuation of her words about the irreducibility of music, like

Shostakovich, Kristeva says: "musicality is not without signification; indeed it is deployed within it. Logical syntheses and all ideologies are present" (63). In other words, music "exists in practice only within the symbolic and requires the symbolic break to obtain the complex articulation we associate with it in musical and poetic practices" (68). Music is the outcome of the interconnections between the symbolic and the semiotic. Although it crosses "the inner boundary of the signifying process" (70), music remains somehow dependant on the signifying process (the symbolic) within which it is being produced. Because of the misfortunes that befall him, Shostakovich comes to the idea that his music cannot go beyond the noise of time, and that he cannot act independently from the ruling ideologies.

The more Shostakovich learns about the impediments the Soviet regime constitutes to his self-realization through music, the more he gets confused about his own work, social role, personal relationships, and his own identity as a man. Music is, in fact, the only area in which Shostakovich feels confident for practicing masculinity. He says: "[u]nderstanding the piano, and music, had come easily – at least compared to understanding other things" (*TNT* 24). The continuity of the regime's retributions over his music arouses and heightens feeling of inadequacy in Shostakovich as a man. What does manhood mean in a context where the Power manipulates his works of music, his words, thoughts and feelings? Is he a man if he cannot act like his forefathers to express his honest opposition to the tyrannical Power, serve his nation, or protect his family and friends? To become a man has been, in fact, one of the major and lasting concerns of Shostakovich, as Barnes' novel and historical accounts show. In his teens, once his father passes away, as the narrator says, all "those years of cheerfulness, hope and invulnerability" (*TNT* 55) are replaced by a growing anxiety of masculinity:

> On his [father's] death his widow had been left with no income, two daughters and a musically precocious son of fifteen. […] Sometimes he wondered if all his anxieties had not begun with his father's death. But he preferred not to believe this, because it came close to blaming Dmitri Boleslavovich. So perhaps it was true to say that all his anxieties were redoubled at that moment. How many times had he nodded agreement to those gravely encouraging words: 'You must be the man in the family now'. They had frightened him with an expectation and a sense of duty he was ill equipped to bear. And his health had always been delicate […]. He kept waiting for this promised manliness to develop in him. But he was, he knew, easily distracted; also wilful rather than continuingly assertive. (*TNT* 22-23)

Like Arthur in *Arthur & George*, Shostakovich feels confused and unprepared for accepting the role of the man of the family after his father. He thinks the confusion will be cleared up as he grows older, and the promised manliness will one day arrive.

In contrast to Arthur who intentionally tried to keep away from his father's model of masculinity, Shostakovich reviews what he remembers from his father to be able to understand what others expect him to do as a man. "His father, after whom he had been obediently named, was often in his mind. That gentle humorous man who woke each morning with a smile on his face: he had been 'an optimistic Shostakovich' if ever there was one" (*TNT* 169). While Shostakovich tries to follow the masculinity model of his father, the composer notices that time has changed; the Russian Revolution has proved to be ineffective, and the consequent sociopolitical predicaments prevent him from following his father's optimistic way of life. Under the oppressive Soviet regime, Shostakovich has no hope for an ultimate improvement in his surrounding world. He thinks it is good that his father died young because, "Had he lived any longer, he would have watched the revolution turn sour, paranoid and carnivorous" (*TNT* 22). Shostakovich knows that the problems caused by the Communist regime could have plagued his father in the same way that they did to him and his countrymen.

Rather than the memories of his father, it is music that finally comes to his help in his teens, and paves the ground for proving his protective masculinity in some ways:

> As the years passed, it [music] seemed all the more miraculous because it gave him a way of supporting his mother and sisters. He was not a conventional man […]. Sometimes after a successful concert, when he had received applause and money, he felt almost capable of becoming that elusive thing, the man in the family. Though at other times, even after he had left home, married and fathered a child, he could still feel like a lost boy. (*TNT* 24)

Despite all his attempts, throughout the narrative, masculinity remains as the "elusive thing" for Shostakovich. In contrast to what the traditional Russian men practiced, Shostakovich does not feel affluent or strong enough to support his family properly all the time. His confusion and sense of insecurity in fulfilling the society's expectations of a man continues throughout his life.

One of the causes of his sense of insecurity is his financial problems. After the death of his father, Shostakovich almost never lives in affluence (except after his joining the

Party in his old age), and this undermines his confidence as a man, personally and socially. After the start of USSR, the composer tries to support his family by playing the piano in cinemas, but since the audience are not appreciating his innovative music, he is dismissed and left unemployed for months (*TNT* 55-56). Because of being blacklisted by Stalin's men, he is not hired to proper jobs, and he is not paid well for the musical pieces he writes for radio programs. Witnesses of Shostakovich's actual house and family life are shocked by his poverty and his dire life situation: "How terrible. Poor Dmitri Dmitriyevich! How many times can they smash him? How much must a man bear? Why is he continually prevented from working, composing the music generated by his genius? What will happen to him?" Freiburg quotes one of the visitors to his house in 1948 (141). Lack of financial stability emasculates the artist for shaking his sense of self-worth and efficiency as a man. Unlike the typical pre-Revolution man, Shostakovich cannot act as a provider and this challenges his family dynamics. The struggle for fulfilling the basic needs of his family makes him feel irritable, anxious, depressed and asocial. Financial problems make it more difficult for him to survive the political pressure or to have a healthy relationship with others as a man.

Money, however, is not the only source of trouble for Shostakovich in performing his supportive masculinity. With or without money, Shostakovich always "lacked the self-confidence" to support others, especially women, the so-called weaker sex (*TNT* 14). Females, in *The Noise of Time*, prove to be stronger than Shostakovich. In fact, it is females who always support Shostakovich and protect him in difficult situations. Nina Vasilyyevna, his first wife, "protected him from many things he was unable or unwilling to deal with himself" (*TNT* 140). Nina and his mother used to take Shostakovich's suicidal attempts "seriously" (*TNT* 96, 97). Things became unbearable the year after Nina's death: "Nina had died, and then, barely a year later, his mother had died. The two strongest female presences in his life: his guides, instructors, protectresses. He had been very lonely […]. He knew that he was incapable of frivolous relationships with women; he needed a wife by his side" (*TNT* 145). Shostakovich does not follow the stiff-upper-lip model of masculinity to display stoicism or fortitude in his relationship with women, and accepts his need for women's presence in his life for his mental well-being. Women's care and nurturing provide Shostakovich with a safe space to destress and express his anxieties and feelings openly. It is only with the care and continuous support of his third wife (Irina) that his intense thirst for sentimentality and feminine love is

somehow satisfied (*TNT* 169). Women's emotionality and affection have a direct impact on Shostakovich's psychological and mental health as a man.

Feeling desperately lonesome after the death of Nina and his mother, Shostakovich goes through a second unsuccessful marriage, with Margarita: "He had put Margarita in an impossible position. In his loneliness, he had panicked. Well, that was nothing new" (*TNT* 146). He accepts he is "anxious," "annoying," "egotistical and bad company" to women (*TNT* 71). Yet, he tries to gain women's support because he feels secure and protected in women's company, especially when he is under political pressure. Once he joins the party, Shostakovich goes away to his sister's house for protection: "But he was enough of a coward to run away, like the little boy […]. He signed the application form to join the Party, then fled to Leningrad and holed up with his sister. They could have his soul but not his body. […] He would stay with his sister until it was all over" (*TNT* 156). Shostakovich's need for having female company challenges the male-on-top social assumptions of the time. At the historical point where authorities display women as the counterrevolutionary and the backwards who disturb men's devotion to the Party, Shostakovich admits that he cannot survive without females' support. In the oppressive society the artist lives where the relationship between individuals is based on rivalry and antagonism, women's support replaces the traditional protection men used to receive from male comradeship and brotherhood.

What shakes Shostakovich's confidence as a man (especially in his relationship with women) and keeps him more dependent on females is his physical infirmity and his delicate health. Like George in Barnes' *Arthur & George,* Shostakovich believes that a real man should be robust and vigorous, as his forefathers were, and similar to George, the composer admits that his own body is not physically made for fighting in a war or playing sports: "he did not train his body; he merely inhabited it […] he was neither robust nor coordinated enough for sport" (*TNT* 72). His physical health deteriorates as he gets older. "He was stoic as an invalid; what troubled him was not so much his condition as people's reactions to it. Pity embarrassed him just as much as praise ever had" (*TNT* 167). Because of his frail body, Shostakovich never feels confident about his own manhood or his own capabilities in supporting women. He thinks his physical traits are not even comparable to the bodily characteristics of his first wife, Nina, let alone other men. Comparing himself to Nina, Shostakovich thinks:

> Nina loved skiing and mountaineering; he was put in a state of mortal fear as soon as he felt the treacherous snow beneath his skis. She enjoyed boxing matches; he could not bear the sight of one man beating another nearly to death. He even failed to master the form of exercise closest to his own art: dancing. He could write a polka, he could play one jauntily on the piano, but put him on the dance floor and his feet would be ineptly disobedient. What he enjoyed was playing patience, which calmed him; or card games with friends, as long as they played for money. And though he was neither robust nor coordinated enough for sport, he liked umpiring. (TNT 72)

In contrast to the traditional model of masculinity that was associated with vigor and robustness, Shostakovich feels dissatisfied with his own appearance and physical capabilities, and this adds to his feelings of vulnerability and inefficiency in his relationships. His degeneration seems to disturb gender distinctions. While Nina improves her athletic skills, Shostakovich gets more and more uncertain about his own physical capabilities as a man. Nina's sportive interests and motivations disappoint Shostakovich, even more, with his own masculine role as her husband.

While Shostakovich is practicing soft (or feminine) masculinity, his wife seems to display features of masculine femininity. Nina is a socially active woman, with features similar to the attributes of the "New Woman" of the time. She does not, in fact, act like a woman of the weaker sex who may need the support or the help of Shostakovich as a husband. Nina's self-sufficiency contrasts with Shostakovich's effeminate masculinity, and this blurs gender binaries and turns gender traits into inconsistent social constructs. Nina's autonomy in her relationship with Shostakovich, and her devotion to her education and employment also remind one of the egalitarian perspective that Marxists used to promote in Russia: In their *The Communist Manifesto,* Marx and Engels criticised the social norms for representing women as "a mere instrument of production" and encouraged ways for liberating women along with other members of the working class from all forms of oppression and dependence (Marx & Engels 25). In Bolshevik feminism, in contrast to the past, women were capable of living independently from men, and they were not always there to take care of the household, raise children, and comfort their husbands or to assist them in building enduring family ties, and this was counted as a source of distress in Russian men: "Without families, male heads of households would lose their remaining authority and prerogatives, a prospect that may partially explain the lack of enthusiasm among male Party members" (Schrand 197). The changes in the duties and responsibilities of women troubled men.

Nina's irresponsibility as a mother/ wife, similarly, adds to Shostakovich's confusion over his own role as a father/ husband. Nina is not like the women of the pre-Revolution era to do the housework or to assist Shostakovich in strengthening his family ties. Historical notes indicate that "Nina Vasiliyevna was an astrophysicist and participated in many scientific expeditions to Armenia which took her away from home for prolonged periods" (Glikman 314). In Barnes' *TNT,* Nina is identically "away a lot, for work or pleasure, or both at the same time. She was not fitted for domesticity, Nina, neither by temperament nor habit" (*TNT* 139-40). In the letters Shostakovich writes to Glikman, the composer continually talks about Nina's absence and her adventurous trips to other countries or cities. For example, in the letter he wrote on 12 Oct. 1946, Shostakovich says: "Nina is still away in Armenia, where she is taking part in a scientific expedition" (78). She, in fact, disturbs gender norms for her lack of concern for her marital responsibilities, and also for her interest in science that contrasts with her husband's interest in music and emotionality. "Nina had as usual been spending a lot of time traveling between her permanent post in Moscow and the physics research center in Armenia" (Sollertinsky 136). To Nina, scientific explorations were more important than getting married to Shostakovich. Sollertinsky says: "in May 1932, they got married. There was no ceremony or costly celebration. Nina, who had just graduated from the most demanding faculty of Leningrad University and who had taken up the far from feminine profession of experimental physicist, was again holidaying at Pushkino. Shostakovich traveled out to join her and they registered their marriage in the village" (69). Nina seems not to value her marital life. She is not interested in joining her family in their summer trips to Komarovo: "Sometimes Nina would accompany them but more often she was not present, having gone instead to Armenia, where groups of physicists were doing research on cosmic rays" (Sollertinsky 134). The same lack of interest can be observed in *The Noise of Time.* By showing strong commitment to her job in science, her physical strength in playing sports, and by her detachment from housework and her husband, Nina violates the association of femininity with emotionality and nurturing. This highlights the instability of gender binaries, and challenges gender stereotypes on the "intrinsic" features of men and women.

In contrast to the traditional expectations in patriarchal societies, Nina is not sexually modest, and she seems to keep Shostakovich under her own control by not paying attention to him and by refusing to acknowledge his reliability as a male figure. In

Barnes' novel, Shostakovich knows about Nina's relationship with a man named "A." but he does not know what to do in reaction to her infidelity. Because of his failure in controlling his wife's sexual desires and emotions, Shostakovich sometimes feels objectified by his wife and her out-of-wedlock relationship to "A.". He asks Nina "if she was planning to leave him. She had laughed and replied, 'Not unless A. discovers a new particle and wins the Nobel Prize'. And he had laughed too, not being able to calculate the likelihood of either event. Some would not understand that he had laughed. Well, this was no surprise" (*TNT* 140). Unlike the pre-Revolution model of masculinity in which men defended the life and honor of women by performing the symbolic ritual of the duel, Shostakovich does not object to his wife's unfaithfulness, taking it as her expression of free love – "love without boundaries, love without thought for the morrow" (*TNT* 141). As in Soviet Russia, family life has withered away in *The Noise of Time*, sexual morality has diminished and traditional sexual ethics is not seriously taken into account. Nina does not display the endurance the typical pre-Revolution wife was expected to show for withstanding difficulties in managing the household.

Shostakovich seems not to dislike the lasting and happy relationship Nina has had with "A.". The only time Shostakovich gets quite concerned is when Nina dies:

> She was away in Armenia with A. at the time and suddenly fell ill. He had flown out with Galya [his daughter], but Nina had died almost as soon as they arrived. To state just the facts: he had returned to Moscow by train with Galya [his daughter]. Nina Vasilievna's body was flown back, escorted by A. At the funeral […] red roses provided by A. At the grave-side he held A. close to him. And stayed near to him – or rather, kept A. near to him – for the next month or so. And thereafter, when he went to visit Nina, there often red roses from A. strewn all over the grave. He found the sight of them comforting. Some people would not understand this. (*TNT* 140)

Shostakovich's friendly relationship with "A." contradicts the traditional model of maleness. Shostakovich's relation with Nina is already ruined, and their family structures has by that time fallen apart. It seems Shostakovich accepts his own inefficiency in supporting his wife, and voluntarily delegates the task to "A.". Similar to Russian men at the start of the Soviet regime who got confused by the arrival of the New Woman, Shostakovich is puzzled for not having a firm family bonding. Without a family, he cannot feel like the head of a household and exercise his authority and prerogatives. The problem may justify, to some extent, Shostakovich's lack of enthusiasm in making changes in his lifestyle.

Rather than trying to improve his mental and physical health to get closer to what was assumed as the healthy and vigorous model of masculinity, Shostakovich takes "the Vodka Cure" treatment whenever he feels anxious about being humiliated by others (*TNT* 49, 62, 64,138, 155, 168). He indulges himself, like the majority of the men of his time, in excessive drinking and smoking to calm himself down. He follows the pattern of passive and stagnant masculinity that the majority of the men of his time developed in reaction to the constant pressure of the Power. Shostakovich feels he has no control over the development of his life, and he repeats the sentence that "There is no escaping one's destiny" (*TNT* 87, 169, 147). Similar to what historical accounts describe about the Soviet men of the mid-20th century, Shostakovich suffers from lack of agency and he has developed the fatalistic belief in his own impotence for controlling the surrounding world (Zdravomyslova & Temkina 50). Sometimes, he acts like a "meticulous" man, busying himself with issues related to "water, electricity, plumbing" in his house, emptying ashtrays or fitting candles in the candlesticks: "If this at times became a slight mania, it was a necessary one. If the wider world becomes uncontrollable, you must make sure to control what areas you can. However tiny they might be" (*TNT* 138, 161).
In a context where the modern Russia has collapsed politically and culturally, and in the absence of a coherent ideological value system, the composer finds the human life and existence to be meaningless. To overcome his uncertainty about the surrounding world, like the majority of the men of his time, Shostakovich tries to gain a sense of agency by taking care of trivial issues. "His only concern was to get to the end of each day. He had become a technique for survival. Below a certain point, that was what all men became: techniques for survival" (*TNT* 1). Instead of active participation in his surrounding society, like most of the men of post-Revolutionary Russia, Shostakovich suffers from passivity and stagnation in life.

The stagnation and the existentialist apprehension Shostakovich experiences were very common to the Russian men of his time. According to historical accounts, under Stalin's murderous ruling system and the concurrent socioeconomic pressure, the majority of Soviet men went through identity crises, lost their sense of agency, and failed to make a genuine commitment to their society. "Totalitarian theorists believed that the extreme brutality and terror of the Soviet system cowed people into complete subservience, leaving them atomized and unable to resist" (Hoffmann 162). Instead of the pre-Revolution unity and perseverance, fatalism was prevalent among men, and the despotic

regime gave men the sense that they had no control over their own fate; things, as a result, became precarious and unpredictable for them. Zdravomyslova & Temkina explain the reasons behind Russian men's reliance on fatalism in this way: "Times had changed; no one was encroaching on the motherland; women and children needed no protection from anyone; and Soviet ideals were threadbare. Finally, the faith in communist utopia that had characterized paternal values had been significantly shaken by the critique of the Stalinist regime" (50). The majority of Soviet men are inactive because they find no space for practicing patriotism, protecting the weak, or developing their liberal or heroic potential.

Because of the widespread system of retribution in the country, as time passes, Shostakovich, similar to the majority of his countrymen, loses his courage to oppose the Power. In spite of his early claims about standing bravely against injustice as a soldier-hero, Shostakovich feels that he has no endurance in the face of the pressure the Power may impose on him:

> When the threats against him had first begun, he told friends: 'even if they cut off both my hands, I shall continue to write music with a pen in my mouth'. They had been words of defiance intended to keep up everyone's spirits, his own included. […] They might want to torture him, and he would agree to everything they said immediately, as he had no capacity for bearing pain. Names would be put in front of him, and he would implicate all of them. No, he would say briefly, which would quickly change to Yes, Yes, Yes. (*TNT* 48)

Shostakovich knows that he would easily surrender to the regime in case they arrested him. He has no stamina to endure any form of punishment. Sometimes, Shostakovich compares himself to other men to make guesses about his own tolerance level: "If the Red Napoleon had been outmanoeuvered by Sofya Vasilyevna, what chance did he ever have??" (*TNT* 32). He has no willpower to fight, and gradually gets self-assured about the impossibility of resistance in front of the Power. "The customs officers at the Soviet border were not sophisticated; further their minds were filled with notions of sabotage and spies and counter-revolution" (*TNT* 42). The ease with which Stalin's men label and purge men is highly discouraging to Shostakovich.

3.3. Challenging the Notion of Russian Masculinity in *The Noise of Time*

In order not to be trapped by the ruling system of retribution, and in line with his lifelong anxieties and fears over being a man, Shostakovich arrives at an ambivalent

understanding of manly courage, and finds himself tanding in between the binary of the protective vs the feeble man. At the same time as he accepts his timidity and his personal need for being protected by women, Shostakovich tries his best to protect his wife and children in the face of the difficulties the regime causes; for example, once he learns about the possibility of being arrested, Shostakovich leaves his family at home, every night, and waits for the NKVD officers by the lift, outside his apartment. At the beginning of the novel, after hearing the news about the shooting of musicologists, Shostakovich

> began his vigils by the lift. He was not unique in this. Others across the city did the same, wanting to spare those they loved the spectacle of their arrest. Each night he followed the same routine. […] It made him look as if he were in charge of events rather than a victim of them. Men who left home with a case in their hands traditionally returned. Men dragged from their beds in their night-clothes often did not. Whether or not this was true was unimportant. What mattered was this: it looked as if he was not afraid. This was one of the questions in his head: Was it brave to be standing there waiting for them, or was it cowardly? Or was it neither – merely sensible? He did not expect to discover the answer. (*TNT* 51)

Because of the changes in the political situation of his country, Shostakovich is puzzled about what to do to look brave and to protect his family properly. He is afflicted with paranoia, like many other men in the novel. By the side of the lift, he feels he looks like "a man, like hundreds of others across the city, waiting, night after night, for arrest" (*TNT* 21). Doing the same thing that other men do makes Shostakovich feel confident about his own manly potential for protecting his family. Yet, he knows that his courage is "transitory courage," not wholehearted (*TNT* 110). He feels that, under oppression, he cannot act like a genuinely brave man.

His overwhelming fear of being arrested by the men of Power continues and gets repeated throughout the whole novel, but the arrest never happens. Freiburg compares Shostakovich's continuous waiting for the Soviet officers to Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (1952), and elaborates that in this context, the Soviet men of the Party play the role of Godot or a representative of the hegemonic model of masculinity as they seem to own a superior power and autonomy in the society; Shostakovich, like Vladimir and Estragon, suffers from submissive manhood, because the absurdity of his situation, his fear, anxiety, and despair convey his lack of masculine aptitude (138). This waiting makes the composer, like the other men of his time, feel helpless. Shostakovich knows that he is being manipulated by Stalin, the supreme puppet player, even when he is

voluntarily waiting outside his apartment to protect his family from seeing his probable arrest scene. In the opinion of Jeffers, "Godot's constant absence shows the impossibility of a return of the masculine authoritative tradition" (95-96). Like Vladimir and Estragon in *Waiting for Godot*, Shostakovich seems to have no hope for acquiring the "ideal" masculine features of bravery and honesty. "The emblematic image of Shostakovich standing by a lift, nervous, anxious, tortured by premonitions and expectations alike can be interpreted as a microscopic miniature of life in Russia under Stalin's regime" (139). Men under Stalin wait endlessly for being taken away by the men of Power. Though they cannot control what the Power decides (or retrieve masculine autonomy in Freiburg's words), they think doing the same thing as other men do (waiting) is a kind of bravery and autonomy. Their conformity to the prevailing model of maleness of the time seems to give them a sense of fraternity.

Overwhelmed by his continuous fear of Power, Shostakovich develops an ambivalent perception of a courageous man: "Under the pressure of Power, the self cracks and splits. The public coward lives with the private hero. Or vice versa. But that was too simple: the idea of a man crushed into a hundred pieces of rubble, vainly trying to remember how they – he – had once fitted together" (*TNT* 155). Power's attack on his integrity is so brutal that Shostakovich feels totally lost, unable to resume his prior strength and autonomy. In this confusion, Shostakovich finds cowardice and courage to be on the same continuum. In contrast to the traditional model of Russian masculinity that prioritized daring deeds to fear and trepidation, Shostakovich reverses the hierarchy of the hero and the coward, and assumes supremacy for the coward. He thinks to himself:

> But it was not easy being a coward. Being a hero was much easier than being a coward. To be a hero, you only had to be brave for a moment. […] But to be a coward was to embark on a career that lasted a lifetime. You couldn't ever relax. You had to anticipate the next occasion when you would have to make excuses for yourself, dither, cringe, reacquaint yourself with the taste of rubber boots and the state of your own fallen, abject character. Being a coward required pertinacity, persistence, a refusal to change – which made it in a way, a kind of courage. (*TNT* 158)

In Shostakovich's opinion, ignoble fear is even more protective than courage. Regardless of how contradictory it would sound, Shostakovich chooses to be the selfless brave coward to be able to protect others. His disposition oscillates between that of the heroic savior and the timid traitor, and this proves that there is no singular or fixed model of heroic masculinity.

In his flexible and ambivalent notion of protective masculinity, the western understanding of valor is of no value. Reviewing the words of his western supporters who encouraged him to tell the truth and to ignore how Power does, Shostakovich thinks to himself: "These supporters didn't know that if you are declared an enemy of the people, as he had once been, all those around you are tarnished and infected. Your family and friends, of course. But even a conductor who plays, or has played, or suggests playing, a work of yours; the members of a string quartet; the concert hall, be it ever so tiny, that stages your work; the very audience" (*TNT* 108). He knows that his act of courage will put others' lives at risk, and therefore he chooses not to look like the "brave man" a westerner desires. A western outsider can never understand his pain and suffering to help him properly. For Shostakovich, things have become so confusing that he cannot say what the truth is, as his supporters expect (Tory & Vesztergom, 154). The sociopolitical situation of the country has put everything into disorder; what seems to be clear or fixed, has turned into a tangled meaningless mess.

At the same time that he feels guilty conscience about his serving the USSR, at some points, Shostakovich suspends knowability and compares himself to Galileo, the brave scientist of the 17th century, quoting the poem that "He was well aware that the Earth revolved. But he also had a large family to feed" (*TNT* 150). The paranoiac protagonist of *The Noise of Time* proposes a heroic justification for his own inaction and treachery, thinking that, like Galileo, his apparent cowardice will be appreciated by the people of the next generations as a heroic deed. Shostakovich prefers to stick to his own ambivalent perception of manly courage, and practices his moral freedom in decision-making by not following other's ideals. In the opinion of Shostakovich, his liberalist and idealist supporters

> did not grasp one simple fact about the Soviet Union: that it was not possible to tell the truth here and live. […] In other words, they wanted your blood. They wanted martyrs to prove the regime's wickedness. But you were to be the martyr, not them. […] they wanted the artist to be a gladiator, publicly fighting wild beasts, his blood staining the sand. That's what they required […] Well, he would try to disappoint such idealists for as long as possible. (*TNT* 107)

Shostakovich is not willing to follow the socially accepted norms about the heroic death of men and this reinforces plurality in understanding Russian masculinity. He continues: "What they didn't understand, these self-nominated friends, was how similar they were

to Power itself: however much you gave, they wanted more" (*TNT* 107-8). In Shostakovich's opinion liberalists and dictators are not opposite each other, but they are people with identical mindsets because both groups expect the composer to be obedient to them, imitate the normalized model of protective masculinity, against his own will. By refusing to follow the ideas of both groups, Shostakovich proves maleness to be a negotiable construct. This way, he also retains his individuality and personal freedom in making moral decisions, and this aligns with the assumption of independence of thought in the hegemonic model of pre-Revolution Russian masculinity. The logic political movements follow in defining the typical gladiator-artist male figure makes no sense for Shostakovich as it contradicts his ideas on protecting himself and others.

Baffled over the distinction between courage and fear, or liberalism and dictatorship, Shostakovich, like the majority of his contemporary men, intentionally chooses to look weak and ineffective in order to assure the authorities of his own passivity and powerlessness. As time passes, the practice, however, internalizes the sense of inferiority in Shostakovich. To gain the satisfaction of the tutor of the regime, for example, Shostakovich has to repeat "I am a worm in comparison with His Excellency [Stalin]. I am a worm" (*TNT* 126). Initially, Shostakovich refuses to take the sentence to be true and ironically uses it for self-protection. Gradually, he finds himself easily repeating the same sentence in different occasions (*TNT* 149). And finally, Shostakovich is so brainwashed by the idea behind the sentence that he finds himself obediently accepting Power's offer for joining Communism. After signing the papers, Shostakovich thinks he "had proved himself a true worm. […] they could announce his moral death" (*TNT* 156). By pretending to be powerless, Shostakovich's life ends up in actual loss of autonomy.
In her "Everyday Stalinism" Fitzpatrick similarly points out how most of the men in the Soviet regime tried to "assure the authorities of one's own powerlessness" to escape the obvious and hidden political traps of the regime (164). Being strong and effective, as in the pre-Revolution style, could easily turn into a life-threatening problem for any Russian man in the Soviet regime. Submissiveness, at the same time, results in loss of ethical or moral integrity.

To Shostakovich's dismay, once he joins the Party, the Power entitles him as the "Hero of Socialist Labour" (*TNT* 162). To be called "Hero" by an oppressive regime has no meaning for Shostakovich as it contradicts the pre-Revolutionary assumptions of

heroism. It involves corruption, betrayal and lack of independence in action and thought. In his online article, James Adams calls Shostakovich's submission to the Party as the moral death of the composer, continuing that *The Noise of Time* is "the story, really, of a man who loses his soul. I think it's a tragedy". By joining the Party, Shostakovich loses his chances for repenting and saving his soul. It is the tragedy of becoming habituated into servitude and being placed under the yoke of the Power. Shostakovich is not the only man to go through this. Despite their antagonism toward communism, a majority of Russian men identically choose submission and inaction as their main strategies for self-protection. Ervin Staub calls their refusal to protest a "bystander" strategy, in which the individual "fail[s] to intervene, perhaps because they are stunned into passivity" or because they know that they cannot intervene in "the continuum of destructiveness" (202). Since they cannot effectively alter or hinder the general flow of action, men remain inactive in reaction to the unpleasant social circumstances.

> In most cases, then, resistance to Stalinism remained passive. Average Soviet citizens resented the Party elite and complained about food shortages, but they did not rise up against the Stalinist regime. Confronting the fierce repression and economic hardship of the Soviet system, people sought to get by as best they could. This meant outward conformity and even supplication to Soviet authorities in order to receive benefits of the expanding Soviet welfare state. (Fitzpatrick, "Everyday Stalinism" 163)

In contrast to the typical pre-Revolution Russian man who protested and expressed his "civic valor" in the face of injustice, the Soviet man prefers outward conformity to the regime's expectations.

Masculinization under dictatorship proves to be a contradictory and destructive process as it leads to the annihilation of individual men. Describing the "personal erosion" of Shostakovich, Freiburg says: "The psychological aspect of Shostakovich's survival under Stalin could be defined as a cruel vivisection of his personality, with attacks on him as a musician first, then threats to his physical integrity, and finally with the utter destruction of the vital functions of his very soul" (144). Under the dictatorship of Stalin, the psychological and physical health of Shostakovich is severely harmed. Thinking to himself, Shostakovich comes to the idea that, under the pressure of Power, "people were always in danger of becoming less than fully themselves. If you terrorized them enough, they became something else, something diminished and reduced: mere techniques for survival" (*TNT* 87). They cannot think beyond the needs for holding on to life, and this

results in the loss of their personal and social integrity. By joining the Party for survival, Shostakovich turns into a guise or a living dead man. Freiburg says:

> The 'dead survivor' is an oxymoron describing the pitiable existence Shostakovich was compelled to endure. His biography exemplifies the traditional *topos* of 'death in life', of being alive and dead simultaneously. Shostakovich had the smile of a 'condemned', of 'a dead man'. And he was not alone; in his memoirs, the composer's friend Solomon Volkov spoke of many men who could no longer be regarded as human beings, but as cadavers instead, because they dared not remember their lives. (150)

Life under the dictatorship of Stalin proves to be destructive to the men of Soviet Russia. "[F]or the composer, it is terribly impossible to return to his former state of honesty, innocence and purity. The Stalinistic ideology has successfully poisoned his being, the toxic surrounding has turned him into a person alive and dead at the same time" (Freiburg 156). Joining the Party destroys all Shostakovich's hopes for masculine autonomy. Shostakovich feels like a "prisoner" whose dreams of becoming a man has shattered; all he can do is to obey and pretend to enjoy what the prisoner commands (*TNT* 147). Once Shostakovich gets older, as he reviews his own initial claims about using music for countering social injustice, he feels disappointed with himself; he can no longer convince himself of his own innocence and heroism.

Based on the research conducted on men experiencing failed suicide bids, masculinity studies consider suicide as the ultimate solution some men may adopt to show manly courage by ending their lives. According to Khan et al., suicide provides men with a last chance to display their conformity "to fulfil hegemonic masculine demands" or to show their objection against the "loss of self-respect and respect from others" (1). In Barnes's world, Shostakovich contemplates suicide several times, but as time passes, the humiliation Shostakovich goes through for joining the Party gets so deep that suicide cannot help him anymore. Initially, when the Power criticizes his works, Shostakovich grows so angry with being undervalued by the authorities that he occasionally attempts suicide to express his frustration with the Power's lack of respect for him:

> How many times over the years had he made threats of suicide? Countless. And how many times had he actually tried? None. It wasn't that he didn't mean it. He felt, in the moment, genuinely suicidal, if it were possible to feel genuinely suicidal without passing to the act itself. Once or twice, he had even bought pills to do the job with, but never managed to keep this fact to himself- whereupon, after hours of tearful argument, the pills were confiscated. (*TNT* 96)

At the initial stages of his frustration with the USSR, his attempts for suicide are obliterated by his wife and mother. Gradually, however, when he gets involved in the regime's dehumanized acts, Shostakovich finds it ineffective and futile to try to kill himself in anger. In one of his interior monologues on suicide, Shostakovich imagines holding a conversation with the Power. In this conversation, "he was threatening Power. He was saying to the Union of Composers [..]: Look what you have reduced me to, soon you will have my death on your hands and on your conscience. But he realized it was an empty threat, and Power's response hardly needed articulation. It would be this: Fine, go ahead, then we shall tell the world your story" (*TNT* 97). Suicide would aggravate the situation if the Power ignored his actual reasons for suicide and spreads false stories about him afterwards. The Power's dehumanized indifference to the composer's true feelings harms his self-esteem, and makes him feel a deeper sense of incompetence.

As time passes, the composer becomes more habituated to the Power's mistreatments. He gets "used to threats and intimidations and vile abuse" and he does not show any extreme reactions to the regime's disrespectful behavior toward himself (*TNT* 146). After joining the party, the sense of incompetence and worthlessness gets so profoundly internalized in Shostakovich that suicide loses its meaning for him. He "thought of suicide, of course, when he signed the paper put in front of him; but since he was already committing moral suicide, what would be the point of physical suicide? It wasn't even the question of lacking the courage to buy and hide and swallow the pills. It was rather that now, at this juncture, he lacked even the self-respect that suicide required" (*TNT* 156). He thinks there is no need for suicide as his own guilty conscience has tortured him to death.

Shostakovich is emasculated, and his soul is severely harmed under Stalin's regime. Bollinger says: "Taking to heart a full awareness of a castrating relationship between art and power, the main character undertakes a stoic precept to continue living in disturbing desolation, experiencing a destructive feeling of a man sentenced, psychologically, to death. […] A creative life, when lived in full awareness of one's finitude, becomes a metaphor for a wasted self and a desolated artistic self" (141). The immortality and fruitfulness he expected his art to produce, are never achieved, and Shostakovich cannot forgive himself for acting against his own true intentions and ethics. From the time he joins the Party, life turns into a futile shameful struggle; he is "dismayed by himself" (*TNT* 177). He thinks he does not deserve even death.

Shostakovich is in agony because of his own moral neutrality and inaction; unlike the typical pre-Revolutionary Russian men, Shostakovich observes no correspondence between his own words and deeds. He is wondering why his claims for resistance have ended in submission:

> Shostakovich had to shoulder the unbearable task of becoming a walking contradiction: he is an apostate of his own beliefs, simultaneously a disciple of a quasi-religious Stalin-cult he detests from his heart. Self-betrayal, which is probably incompatible with any forms of aesthetic achievements in music, is the *sine qua non* of survival under Stalin. It brings about a harsh cognitive dissonance, painful and tragic in its essence. (Freiburg 148)

Shostakovich feels that his struggle for survival has contradicted his personal beliefs about liberalism, justice and honesty. He is estranged from his true self and what his society and culture had defined, before the start of Soviet regime, about manliness. Although Shostakovich is himself somewhat critical of pre-revolutionary ideas of maleness (especially about the superiority of men over women), he struggles to hold onto those sociocultural values that related masculinity to practicing comradeship, fighting corruption and opposing the oppressors. Yet, his attempt at not being trapped by Power dismisses his initial claims about identifying himself as a soldier-hero; he has failed to resist the Devil and restore peace in his country.

Regardless of Shostakovich's mental and psychological wellbeing, Power continues imposing guises on the composer, displaying him as a fully-compliant man of the regime. They publish articles in his name and dictate to him what and how he should think:

> Not long after his return to Moscow, an article appeared under his name in the magazine *New World.* Interested to find out what he was supposed to think, he read of the congress's huge success, and of the State Department's furious decision to cut short the Soviet delegation's stay. 'On the way home I thought much about this,' he read of himself. 'Yes, the rulers of Washington fear our literature, our music, our speeches on peace – fear them because truth in any form hinders them from organizing diversions against peace'. (*TNT* 111)

His trip to the US has been so humiliating and stressful that Shostakovich cannot believe himself thinking the way the article dictates. He gets so tired of the mind-controlling techniques of Power that he chooses to keep silent and inactive in reaction to all. From time to time, Power sends him "the text of an article he had written for the next

morning's *Pravda.* An article he hadn't written, of course, but which required his signature. He would not even glance at it, merely scribble his initials" (*TNT* 165). When he is asked about what his ignorance means, he says: "It will mean that they are not worth reading" (*TNT* 165). But how could his readers guess his ignorance? From the time his music has failed to go beyond the reach of the ruling ideology, it seems Shostakovich has lost his belief in the expressive power of words. Gradually, Shostakovich's silence and inactivity deteriorate his situation, and put his honor and also the life of others at substantial risk:

> But there was worse than this, much worse. He had signed a filthy public letter against Solzhenistsyn, even though he admired the novelist and reread him constantly. Then a few years later, another filthy letter denouncing Sakharov […] Part of him hoped that no one would believe – no one could believe – that he actually agreed with what the letter said. But people did. Friends and fellow musicians refused to shake his hand, turned their backs on him. (*TNT* 166)

At the same time with being continually appreciated by the regime as the "Hero of Socialist Labour" (*TNT* 162), Shostakovich loses his social image, despite his lifelong attempt at serving his countrymen. He gradually turns into an instrument in the hands of Power. He was "sounding like Power itself. He was confident, fluent, convincing. 'Soon, happier times will come,' he promised his fellow artists, parroting Stalin" (*TNT* 68). Like a puppet, Shostakovich has to repeat what the exploiter stipulates. The composer assumes this as his own official corruption, and compares himself to a maze rat: "he had been led through the maze to the final room, the one containing no food as a reward, merely a trapdoor beneath his paws" (*TNT* 102). Shostakovich feels degraded to the rank of a trapped or a lost animal.

Shostakovich's traumatized situation turns his life into a futile and empty struggle. In Antakyalioglu's opinion, Shostakovich "carried this burden in a most Sisyphean sense. We watch him as he tries his best to save his personal integrity while undergoing severely distressing events, continuously distracted by the noise of his time as he is perseveringly composing his masterpieces despite it" (381). Like Sisyphus of the Greek mythology who was punished for a wrongdoing and was eternally sentenced to push a big piece of stone up a hill and see it roll down, Shostakovich is condemned to a fruitless never-ending torture for annoying authorities with his innovative art. The impossibility of standing against the oppressive regime keeps torturing him. The vanity of his efforts

has severely demotivated the composer. The control of Power over his music, words and thoughts is so tight that Shostakovich can no longer sooth himself with creating new pieces of music. “To keep his sanity, he decided to write a series of preludes and fugues, after the example of Bach […] He could not forget the words –some his own, others provided for him – which had come out of his mouth in the past weeks. He had not just accepted the criticism of his [own] work but applauded it. He had, in effect, repudiated *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*” (*TNT* 78-79). While parroting the words of others, Shostakovich betrays not only himself, but also his own masterpiece, the opera for which he has put tremendous effort and was punished for long. “He had betrayed himself, and he had betrayed the good opinion others still held of him. He had lived too long” (*TNT* 166). He has lapsed into political inertia, and he has grown completely submissive to the regime. Like Sisyphus, Shostakovich wishes for the termination of his own life to stop the torture.

Rather than condemning Russian men for their moral decline or stagnation, *TNT* tries to create a chance for inclusivity and diversity in the assumption of Russian masculinity, and negotiates the possibilities for accepting the marginalized maleness. Condemned to his Sisyphean torture, Shostakovich arrives at the idea that masculinity is elusive, contradictory, unknowable and constructed, and that there is no specific definition for manhood. Shostakovich compares his own fruitless endeavour for becoming a protective hero or a man, to Stalin’s endless and vain effort for displaying himself as the ultimate father of the whole nation. In this comparison, as he thinks about the unreal essence of maleness, Shostakovich perceives that the attempt he and Stalin have made for becoming a man have paradoxically been both tragic and farcical: “tragedies in the hindsight look like farces” (*TNT* 115). As he looks back, the composer finds more about the absurdity of manly efforts. All anxieties, distresses and trepidations Shostakovich and Stalin have experienced under the USSR look like a foolish exploitation of a set of inane situations. “That was what he had always believed. And his own case was no different. […] And now that he had lived too long, he was even beginning to see his own life as a farce” (*TNT* 164). Considering heroic manliness as an ambiguous construct, Shostakovich takes Stalin’s and his own struggle for acquiring Russian masculinity as an absurd and foolish mockery. Toward the end of his life, the composer finds that the construction of masculinity does not have a rigid core or a certain path to follow or to break away from. Maleness, as Shostakovich observes, proves to be diverse and multiple in nature.

There is no certain way to assume maleness. Shostakovich compares his past with his present self and finds that the great expectations he initially had for acting like a Russian soldier-hero and expressing the truth or protecting others, were not genuine attempts for expressing his true self as a man, but a set of meaningless attempts made in imitation of his forefathers. Freiburg compares Shostakovich's situation at the end of the story to that of a disabled soldier briefly presented at the introductory scene of the novel. In this scene, Shostakovich is on a train accompanied by two other men. When he

> looks out of the window of his train stopping at a lonely station in Russia, he observes an invalid, who lost both his legs in war. The invalid — himself the son of another unhappy survivor, who was severely injured in World War I — sings bawdy military songs to the passengers in order to scrounge some money. This crippled and lonesome soldier, doomed to move around on the platform on a shabby trolley, becomes the symbol of Shostakovich's life. This veteran is the incarnation of both the idea of suffering and of the instinct of survival. The parable of the amputated warrior denies the primitive association of survival with happiness; it rather illustrates the notion that survival may imply mutilation and it discloses those dimensions of absurdity, grotesqueness and grim humour, which often go hand in hand with survival. The mutilated loner, whose only interest is to stay alive and who bellows obscene songs to passengers briefly stopping to listen, is an appropriate image for Shostakovich's career. (137)

Shostakovich, similar to the disabled soldier feels disillusioned. The struggle for survival has left him lonesome, crippled, diminished and unhappy. He has confronted the existentialist fact that there is no meaning behind his life, actions or choices, and this obviates the need for conforming to the prevailing societal norms on manliness. He understands that his works have failed to convey the intended meaning to his audience, and therefore, accepts not being appreciated for his effort to save the country. Shostakovich admits that under the pressure of Power, even his ambivalent passivity has, at some points, harmed others, such as Solzhenistsyn and Sakharov (*TNT* 166). He admits not being a hero: "he could not fail to see that he was being reproached by those who felt he had declined the political struggle. He saw that people expected him to speak out openly, to fight for his soul and creative freedom as Solzhenitsyn had done" (Elizabeth Wilson 428). Compared to his contemporary men of courage, Shostakovich admits looking like an ignorant artist whose attempts for performing manliness re absurd and farcical.

About the absurdity of Stalin's attempt for preserving his manly authority over the country, Shostakovich similarly compares Stalin's claims in his initial and final stages of

his leadership. In Stalin's case, the attempt for acting like a man has cost the life and honor of a great number of people, and this, Shostakovich thinks, deepens the futility of Stalin's struggle. Thinking about what Stalin has done for displaying himself as the man of steel, Shostakovich comes to the idea that "Stalin's constitution" was nothing more than a "comedy" in which "over-complicated manoeuvers to achieve the simplest of ends; stupidity; self-congratulation; imperviousness to outside opinion; repetition of the same mistakes" have impacted "millions and millions of lives" (*TNT* 171-2). In his contemplations, Shostakovich makes fun of Stalin's egotistic attempt for preserving his supreme leadership, and blames his empty struggle for the misfortune of his nation. Stalin's regime was, in Shostakovich's opinion, "a vast catalogue of little farces adding up to an immense tragedy" (*TNT* 172). The futility of Stalin's masculine gestures has gradually put all Russians to sheer misery. Toward the end of his life, Shostakovich becomes aware of the fabricated nature of claims behind masculine courage and autonomy in individual men, and he finds the struggle for conformity to gender norms or models of masculinity meaningless and ludicrous.

As his life draws toward its close, Shostakovich problematizes the old standards in masculinization and arrives at a deeper understanding of the contradiction, ambiguity and the ambivalence embedded within the assumption of manly heroism. To him, becoming a hero looks like a continuing and inconsistent transformation from one pole of the binary to its opposite. What he initially assumed as heroism contradicts the hero the regime made out of him. Comparing his past and present, the composer wonders, "how would he now appear to his younger self, standing by the roadside as a haunted face in an official car swept past? Perhaps this was one of the tragedies life plots for us: it is our destiny to become in old ages what in youth we would have most despised" (*TNT* 162). Shostakovich finds that under the yoke of the Soviet regime, he has turned into a man antithetical to what he had assumed to become in his youth. His life story has proved that he has "a spirit of contradictoriness within him" (*TNT* 36), and it is impossible to find consistency in his thoughts, feelings and behaviors.

The sense of contradiction in Shostakovich's personal and sociopolitical image opens the definition of heroic masculinity in Russia to ambiguity. Shostakovich incorporates the same paradox and ambivalence in his musical works. He represents binaries, and then he displays the two poles of the binary located on the continuum of the same scale:

> In 'The Portrait' there was a clear, two-way choice: integrity or corruption. Integrity is like virginity: once lost, never recoverable. But in the real world, especially the extreme version of it he had lived through, things were not like this. There was third choice: integrity *and* corruption. You could be both Chartkov and his morally shaming alter ego. Just as you could be both Galileo and his fellow scientist. (*TNT* 163)

Shostakovich perceives his own torturous/ heroic life as a paradoxical mixture of integrity *and* corruption. Historical accounts of Shostakovich's life also describe him, like Barnes' protagonist, both as a true Communist and also a concealed dissident of the Party whose relationship to Stalin alternates between the praise and the personal dislike of the composer's works.

Discussions over Shostakovich's ambiguous political commitment have become so virulent since the late 20th century that David Fanning compares his case to the confusing case in western judicial systems, saying that: "with such profusion of 'evidence' on all sides there is every prospect of an endless cycles of appeals, new submissions and retrials" (3). There is no final word to determine the relationship between the composer and the ruling system of the time. Glikman also confirms that Shostakovich's life was a mixture of daring deeds and cowardice: "The utter fearlessness Shostakovich exhibited in his creative and artistic life coexisted with the fear Stalin's terror had bred in him" (137). It is difficult to draw a line between the supposedly opposite emotions and reactions in Shostakovich's personal, political and artistic life. It is the same about Stalin: Although Stalin begins communism as a benign form of government to counter the tsarist regime, his idea of constructing a socialist Utopia turns him into an irresistible dictator. As *TNT* indicates, disparity, inconsistency and unpredictability are indispensable in individual humans and social movements. Therefore, the attempt to act out patriotism, political wisdom or undaunted manly intentions does not necessarily build up immunity against viciousness, psychosis or paranoia. Human beings are too complicated to categorize their intentions and actions. The desire to conform to the traditional stereotypes of heroic masculinity does not safeguard them against cowardice, corruption or treachery, neither in a supreme leader nor in an intelligent artist. The ways individuals take to develop and maintain their gendered identities may, therefore, contradict not only the prevailing social assumptions about maleness/ femaleness, but also each person's initial beliefs and expectations. As they have grown older, both Shostakovich and Stalin have contradicted their own early suppositions on how heroic manhood can be acted out.

Regardless of how Shostakovich himself perceives the contradiction in his own historical image, his music achieves victory over the Power and succeeds as it timelessly continues to have a profound hold on Soviet and non-Soviet audiences, even those who have no information on the composer's background or on the sociopolitical situation of his time. "Shostakovich's music speaks to listeners who have never heard of Stalin's Great Terror or read *Testimony*" (Fanning 6). Although most of the critics of the 1950s and 1960s considered Shostakovich as a true Communist composer (especially after his joining the Party in 1960), in the early 1970s and together with the radical anti-Soviet movements of the time, revisions began to be made on Shostakovich's music. In the final years of his life, while the composer "seemed to retreat more and more into his own inner World," Western and Russian critics made new interpretations on the composer's use of harmonic language, his metrical/ rhythmic schemes, and the ambiguity embedded within his works; studies were done on his use of irony, satire, parody and the grotesque to explore what Shostakovich really meant to convey through each element in his works (Elizabeth Wilson 428). These revisions have altered Shostakovich's artistic and social image, and created a deeper understanding of his music.

In their aesthetic revisions, critics have found that despite the composer's self-denigration, and despite the claims about his submission and treachery, Shostakovich's works, in fact, incorporate a firm sense of solidarity with his traumatized countrymen, and resonate with their aspirations for freedom and morality. In McCreless' study, Shostakovich's music connects not only to his contemporary nation, but also to all his listeners from different time periods. The critic believes that, due to their resistance to linguistic discourse, Shostakovich's symphonies and concertos display an enduring resonance and a dreamlike amplification that go beyond the limitations of time and place, and create an expansive impact (114). His music self-consciously incorporates a variety of organized resistance techniques that produce endless interruptions in the interpretive process of the audience, leave the listeners in a continuing ambiguity, and create a sense of suspense that protect them from the cruel actual world.

Psychoanalytical studies similarly admire Shostakovich's use of ambiguity and suspension. In their Lacanian studies on the artist's works, Shepherd & Wicke locate Shostakovich's music within the realm of the symbolic, and state that similar to language – but definitely not adopting the linguistic model – Shostakovich's works incorporate a symbolization process through which he represents the traumatic

experience of his nation, and this symbolization process goes beyond the reality constructed by sociolinguistic conventions of his time to display traces of the inherently undefinable realm of real that cannot be grasped through the symbolic order (162). Zizek's metaphorical understanding of Lacan also indicates that in Shostakovich's music "the real is…contained in the very symbolic form: the real is *immediately rendered* by this form" (39). In spite of the imposed restraints and his apparent submission to the Power, Shostakovich's music conveys glimpses of the ungraspable real, and that's how it continues to have a profound lasting hold on the audience. The attempt to interpret Shostakovich's music, therefore, ends up in an uncanny signification, or an endless sliding of the signified (meaning) under the signifiers (Zizek 32). The chain of signification, as critics say, continues endlessly in his works. In this view, we may say, Shostakovich wins the battle against the Power as the unintelligible nature of his works surpasses the imposed sociopolitical restraints of his time, and relates itself to the people of all generations. The truth Shostakovich intended to convey is received and has remained immortal.

What further connects Shostakovich's music to his diverse group of listeners and facilitates its victory over the Power, is the existential anxieties of the modern man that resonate in his works. At the same time with confronting the modern man with the impossibility of achieving final meaning, Shostakovich brings his audience face to face with articulations of their own existential loneliness and distresses. In Lacan's words on modern art we may say, the subject of the signifier in Shostakovich's music proves to be ex-centric (rather than concentric) with the subject of the signified (434). i.e. his art conveys and affirms the message that man is no longer a transcendental being to achieve existential affirmations through his deeds and words. One can identify the articulations of the ambiguities of life in every element of Shostakovich's music, because each and every element in his works "all carry with them a sense of hollowness, alienation or irony, and so a certain disconcerting shadow inevitable hangs over anything he composed" (Griffiths 214). This ambiguity and the existential loneliness in Shostakovich's works convey a tinge of ecstasy and grief, and confront his audience with the subjectivity of truth (214). Reality, therefore proves to be elusive, constructed, senseless and arbitrary. In other words, Shostakovich's music creates the impression that it is impossible to categorize, order or examine the surrounding world based on conventions of rationality.

Barnes' *The Noise of Time* similarly resonates with the ungraspable nature of truth by voicing Shostakovich's inner confusion through his interior monologues. The indefinability of reality in the composer's life and music can be observed throughout the novel. As Nayebpour states, Barnes accounts Shostakovich's story like that of "a living martyr who gives away the purity and virginity of his soul to the authority so that his art might survive" (23). Nayebpour explores the ways Barnes' protagonist (Shostakovich) manages to disturb the classifications established by the Soviet regime, and affirms that "Barnes's narrative, therefore, should be read as an account of the victory of art over tyranny, censorship, and the manipulations of Power" (23). In the picture Barnes' narrative creates of Shostakovich, despite his servitude under the yoke of Soviet regime, and despite his tragic submission to Stalin, the composer proves to be the actual hero as he achieve his goal to express the truth and attend to his countrymen independent of the Power. Though he was a marginalized man, his works dishonor his puppet player (Stalin and his regime), and this reverses the hierarchy of the strong vs feeble man.

Through his creative art, Shostakovich overpowers Stalin and his men. What he has done as a musician, is a remarkable examples of manly courage in Freiburg's view:

> Even if Shostakovich himself may have had the feeling to have betrayed his art, posterity proves him wrong. By using art as a *refugium* for his unlived life, by transferring his most personal, most intimate emotions and beliefs into the region of the *aevum*, Shostakovich managed to survive Stalin and his bloodhounds. In other words, despite the lifelong shipwreck he suffered on the sea of life, he has left traces. […] Although Shostakovich could neither defend his family, his acquaintance, his friends, nor himself, he— despite his own beliefs—was able to defend his music. He did not allow the regime to take possession of all his compositions. (155)

Contrary to his personal assumptions, as Freiburg confirms, Shostakovich has managed to surpass and go beyond the noise of time. He has proved to be a soldier-hero whose bravery in expressing the truth to his audience is admirable. Although Shostakovich does not die the valorous death of Osip Mandelstam's protagonist, and although he does not openly fight against Stalin's ideals, the self-abnegation the composer goes through immortalizes him and his music.

By impersonating Shostakovich, Barnes' narrative raises historical consciousness about the construction of masculinity in Soviet Russia, and clears up the prevailing

misunderstandings about masculinization in that historical period. As Scammel states, the novelist feels empathy for the actual concerns and distresses of Shostakovich and inspires the same understanding and emotion in his readers (89). In his review of Barnes' *The Noise of Time,* Jonathan Clerk says: "Music won't change the history of the world either, but it is one of the few means we have of transcending the noise of time, the cloudy, corrupted fog of history, and if we try to listen as closely as Barnes has learned to do – with intelligence, with sympathy, with love – we can hear its whisper" (851). The victory of Shostakovich's art against Power, in *The Noise of Time,* subjects the traditional perception of patriotism, comradeship, heroic courage, supportiveness and moral independence in men to a fundamental revision, and reaffirms the need for multiplicity and plurality in understanding masculinity within the context of Soviet Russia.

TNT, furthermore, disputes the assumption of stability and cohesion in Russian masculinity by drawing attention to the fictionality of historical records and biographical notes. At the same time with raising ambiguity and juxtaposing opposites in the masculinization process of Shostakovich and Stalin, Barnes highlights the subjectivity of his own text with an abrupt comment in the "Author's note". He questions the possibility of verisimilitude in his novel, when he says:

> Shostakovich was a multiple narrator of his own life. Some stories come in many versions, worked up and 'improved' over the years. Others – for instance, what happened at the Big House in Leningrad – exist only in a single version, told many years after the composer's death, by a single source. More broadly, truth was a hard thing to find, let alone maintain, in Stalin's Russia. Even the names mutate uncertainly. […] All this is highly frustrating to any biographer, but most welcome to any novelist. (*TNT* 184)

By drawing our attention to the possibility of mistake, deviation and plurality in the grand narrative of history, Barnes' narrative puts emphasis on the possibility of misunderstanding about Shostakovich's life story, and he ironically undermines the credulity of all accounts about masculine heroism in Russia. The novelist's interest in uncertainties blurs the boundary between fact and fiction to criticize widespread assumptions on the masculinization of Shostakovich and Stalin.

After explaining the sources he has used in writing *The Noise of Time,* Barnes refers to how Elizabeth Wilson provided him with the biographical information on Shostakovich:

"She supplied me with material I would never otherwise have come across, corrected many misapprehensions, and read the typescript. But this is my book not hers; and if you haven't liked mine, then read hers" (*TNT* 184). His words on the existing competing historical narratives on the musician's life story questions the ideal of universal history, and underlines the textuality of historical accounts. This way, Barnes' narrative thwarts the readers' attempt for discovering an objective description of Shostakovich's life story and hence an ultimate definition of maleness in the composer's life. The novelist, in this view, seems to emulate Shostakovich's attempt for incorporating ambiguity and contradiction in the construction of masculinity.

The unreliability of the narrative opens the overall understanding of Shostakovich's life, the concerns we assume he had in common with his countrymen, and the solutions he adopts for the problem of masculinity into a multilayered unfinalizable negotiation, because

> most of the evidence of history, most of the evidence of lives of people who have lived and what they did and what happened to them, has disappeared, that what we think of as historical evidence is a very, very tiny fragment of all the total evidence that was there during the lifetime of most of humanity. And, therefore, inevitably there is bias; there are one of two sorts of bias. Either you only write the history only for which there is evidence, or, if you try to write more than that, if you try to write a more complete history, then you have to fictionalize or imagine. And, so to that extent, history, if it attempts to be more than a description of documents, a description of artefacts, has to be sort of literary genre. (53)

By referring to the possible biases embedded within historical accounts, Barnes turns his own fictionalized description of Shostakovich in *TNT* into one of the moderately acceptable variations of the characters' life stories. The man problem his biographical stories narrate might be somehow true, yet the ambiguity remains irresolvable and this suspends knowability about the topic. Through historiographical metafiction Barnes' novel aims to show that there is not one single truth or one unquestionable myth about the construction of masculinity in Russia, but a multiplicity of indefinite truths. His novel "reflects the mutability, discontinuity, arbitrariness and chaos of history" (Guignery *The Fiction of Julian Barnes* 71). Barnes' "incredulity towards metanarratives," as Jean-François Lyotard would say (xxiv), opens the process of masculinization to contradictions and inconsistencies, and puts emphasis on the absence of the origin and essence in the definition of masculinity in Soviet Russia. The plurality

embedded within Barnes' narrative highlights "the polyphony of voices," and celebrates "heterogeneity" to reject "any monologic discourse" in the definition of maleness (72). This way, the fact about the construction of masculinity, remains unverifiable and changeable. This frustrates the characters' attempt for conformity to the established norms of maleness, and opens room for incorporating the stereotypically non-masculine features (such as cowardice, silence, femininity, the fictional, and submission) within the definition of manliness to replace it with the stiff-upper-lip model of masculinity. The plurality creates inclusivity and tolerance for the marginalized masculinities.

In his writings about communist societies, Barnes' narrative focuses on the impact of historical disastrous incidents on people, thinking that understanding catastrophic moments in history would help us to remain historically present, learn from the past, and forgive it without letting the history get forgotten. In *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* Barnes explains that the idea of turning historical catastrophes into works of art "is no reducing process. It is freeing, enlarging, explaining" (137). It opens the eyes of the audience to a set of vivid details that affects their perceptions of the whole historical period, and helps them to give up resentment against that era.

> Nowadays the process is automatic. A nuclear plant explodes? We'll have a play on the London stage within a year. A president is assassinated? You can have a book or the booked film. War? Send in the novelists. […] We have to understand it of course, this catastrophe; to understand it, we have to imagine it, so we need the imaginative arts. But we also need to justify it and forgive it, this catastrophe, however minimally. Why did it happen, this mad act of Nature, this crazed human moment? Well, at least it produced art. Perhaps, in the end, that's what catastrophe is *for*. (*A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters* 125)

Great works of art are produced about historical catastrophes, and in the opinion of Barnes, it is worth thinking about them and exploring the reasons behind each misfortune. In his *The Noise of Time,* the novelist tries to broaden the outlook of his readers onto the pressure the Soviet regime imposed on its nation and the reasons behind it, probably to justify the long process of compliance, subordination and servitude in Russian men of the time, perhaps to help his audience to cease judgemental views on this historical period and to develop, instead, the compassion for the individuals enduring pain and suffering under the USSR.

In short, similar to what historical records indicate about the development of gender markers in the USSR, in *The Noise of Time,* the attempt Stalin makes to soothe his own

troubled masculinity and the techniques he and his men use for manipulating individuals' thoughts and deeds confuse the majority of Russian men of the time about their own relationship to themselves, to women, to society, and to the ruling ideologies. Under the consequent sociopolitical pressure, men fail in their attempts to conform to the pre-Revolutionary model of masculinity that was based on male solidarity, honesty, heroic bravery, patriotism, liberalism, and the independence of thought. In this context, Barnes's protagonist, Shostakovich, like a pre-Revolutionary Russian man, initially struggles to serve his nation heroically and to express his opposition against the tyrannical Power through creating pure and ahistorical pieces of music. He believes that because of its multilayered and enigmatic nature, music can reconcile the stiff-upper-lip model of Soviet masculinity with the suppressed power of femininity, and help his contemporary troubled Russian men to achieve emotional expressiveness. To his dismay, however, Stalin stifles his innovation by banning his *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk,* and this adds to Shostakovich's lifelong concerns over being a man, forces the composer to practice passivity, self-abnegation and inaction. Meanwhile Shostakovich develops an antithetical understanding of masculinity and manly courage, in which maleness proves to be a constructed concept, and the attempts to conform to a specific model of masculinity seem farcical and absurd. This, added to the unreliability of historical accounts turn the definition of manliness into a pluralized or unfinalizable concept that goes beyond the either/ or mentality around which hegemonic models of masculinity are built.

CHAPTER 4

THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT* (*TMRC*)

Barnes' recently-published biographical fiction, *The Man in the Red Coat* (*TMRC*) explores the problem of masculinity in the Belle Époque (1871 – 1914), a culturally rich historical period during which Frenchman-ness was mocked and disliked by the majority of English people for Frenchmen's overreliance on emotionality and their temperamental socialist-liberalist tendencies. Because of the sociopolitical tensions it generated between European countries in the Belle Époque, the notoriety of pleasure-seeking frivolous Frenchmen was then taken as a matter of growing concern. Compared to the white middleclass Englishman of the time who was generally admired for his honesty, bravery and faithfulness, the average Frenchman was, in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, commonly perceived to be arrogant, inefficient or effeminate; his idealist mentality and his fanciful enthusiasms were criticized, mainly by the English, for his insisting on non-pragmatic approaches to life.

The present chapter focuses on the representations of French masculinity in Barnes' *The Man in the Red Coat* in order to see how the novel challenges the notorious generalizations of Frenchman-ness in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, and to draw attention to the constructed nature of gender markers; the chapter argues that *The Man in the Red Coat* is critical of prevailing normalization attempts in masculinization, and it goes beyond the typical racial and sociocultural boundaries in the construction of maleness to challenge the monocultural understanding of French masculinity in Belle Époque. As the present study indicates, at the same time as showing commitment to historical accounts on the man problem in the fin-de-siècle era, Barnes' narrative promotes rebirth, transformation and innovation in understanding maleness, and creates a polyphonic space for celebrating diversity in masculinization, thereby increasing tolerance for the marginalized patterns in Frenchman-ness. The novel portrays the traditional assumptions on French masculinity in order to challenge them and to establish inclusivity between the proliferating models of maleness.

Having studied French art and culture in different historical periods, Barnes explains that his own special interest is in France of the Belle Époque, and says:

> The cultural period I am constantly drawn back to is roughly 1850–1925, from the culmination of Realism to the fission of Modernism: a wondrous stretch not just for French culture but also for French cultural hospitality. It still seems miraculous that a well-connected Parisian could, within the space of fifteen years, have examined the still-wet *Demoiselles d'Avignon,* attended the première of *The Rite of Spring,* and bought a first edition of *Ulysses,* all without having to catch the Métro, let alone a steamer. (*Something to Declare* 13-14)

It is the abundance and the "stretch" embedded within the modern sensibility of the Belle Époque that interests Barnes. The author idealizes the radical break the French make in this era from the traditional representations of sexuality, human desires and consciousness in art, and believes that the "enviable ease" with which French culture flourished in the late 19th century is "morally superior," "cheerful" and more peaceful than the harmony "the repressed English" claim to have created at the time (*Something to declare* 15, 21). "Such differences ought to survive in the name of biodiversity. We are losing human languages almost as fast as we are losing animal species; we are also losing something much less quantifiable, human difference" (15). In his writings about France in *The Man in the Red Coat*, Barnes reflects, examines and appreciates the differences. In reaction to Britain's antipathy toward the French at the time, Barnes tries to be more understanding of both cultures, and considers himself as "Europhile but Bureausceptic, internationalist but culturally protectionist, liberal-left" (16). It could be argued that he is doubtful of denying differences, and proposes a more inclusive view.

In his *The Man In The Red Coat*, Barnes incorporates the life story of multiple (mainly male) historical figures of France in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, highlighting the reasons for the notoriety of Frenchmen in the Belle Époque, and exploring their "unmanly" personal traits and nonconformist sociopolitical tendencies to arrive at an innovative understanding of masculinity in that era. Rather than blaming Frenchman-ness, the narrative adopts a wider perspective on the gender chaos Frenchmen went through in Modern France. This critical representation of French masculinity opens space for innovation in the assumption of gender markers through reversing gender hierarchies, refuting the hegemonic understanding of manliness, and juxtaposing opposites in the definition of manhood. Rather than comparing French maleness to the feminine whimsiness of the flighty Marianne – contrasted with the English patriotism of

the solid John Bull (Bell, *France and Britain* 20) – the novel creates a sense of uncertainty and multiplicity to pave the ground for a more profound reconsideration of the English understanding of Frenchman-ness.

While some sources categorize *TMRC* as a "Biography/ Memoir," others describe the book as a work of "Nonfiction" for its incorporating "a mixture of theory, criticism, art, and the scandals of the Belle Époque" (Tang 97). In his interview with *The Guardian,* in 2019, Barnes himself affirms that in *TMRC* he has tried to prioritize the actual to the fictional, and explains his reasons in this way: "He [Pozzi] is known to us by a real portrait […] I somehow felt that if I did it as a fiction it might be more ordinary, you might think these melodramatic Technicolor episodes were just invented by the writer. It is good to get back to the rigor of non-fiction occasionally" (Allardice). Despite the attempt Barnes' narrative has made to borrow facts from historical sources, studies indicate that fiction forms an inseparable part of his factual accounts, and in his writing on Dr. Pozzi "he still constructs a novelist's vision of Pozzi's life and world" (Tang 99). Considering this and taking into account Barnes' genuine interest in "trans-genre" writing (Guignery 38), in the present study, I take his experimental narrative in *TMRC* as biographical fiction and treat it as a novel, because in addition to developing the plot, setting and characterization around historically-true figures (namely Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi and his contemporary fellow men) and in addition to his narrative's overreliance on the events taken from chronicled documents in their biographies, as in *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time*, the novel concentrates on the undocumented gaps in the biographies to explore the historically untold realities, and to discuss questions on the formation of the protagonist's personal and social characteristics. Similar to *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time*, the metafictional account of the historical figures' life stories in *TMRC* disturbs the line between fact and fiction with respect to maleness, and it opens space for negotiations on the definition of true masculinity, and the inclusion of the othered masculine self.

Furthermore, Barnes' representation of the protagonist's life story in *The Man in the Red Coat* resembles, in some ways, the characterization technique implemented in *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time*. As in the case of George, Arthur and Shostakovich, the in-between-ness Dr. Pozzi is suffering from is rooted in associating the essence of masculinity with misogyny, racism, heroism and deductive rationality, and it calls for a

reconsideration in the established hierarchical parameters of maleness. Similar to the other two works, the hero/ enemy position of the protagonist opens space for the reconciliation of the opposites within the novel, in different sociocultural dimensions. Resembling *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time*, *The Man in the Red Coat* problematizes the illusion of pure manliness by foregrounding the internal conflicts of the protagonist and by challenging social, racial and gender hierarchies of the time.

What, however, differentiates *The Man in the Red Coat* from the other two novels is the overall leniency and the lack of significance of the historical male characters represented within the novel. Regardless of his scientific achievements, Dr. Pozzi, "the most eminent surgeon in France" (*TMRC* 257) is introduced to the readers in the initial pages of the story, as a "commoner," and the "subject" of an old painting, remembered today just because of the red coat he was wearing in Singer Sargent's painting, *Dr. Pozzi at Home* (*TMRC* 3-4). Also, the masculine figures of the novel seem not to be seriously interested in following the traditional models of French masculinity. In the society Dr. Pozzi lives in, the male characters enjoy getting involved in the irrational, the feminine, the immoral, the fictional and the superstitious, concepts that were mainly discussed in *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time* as the unmanly. Despite being descendants of revolutionary historical figures in France (like Napoleon), they do not seem to acknowledge the conventional need for men's conformity to military-heroic masculinity or to heterosexual norms of Frenchman-ness. Most of them unchain themselves, also, from pursuing religious assumptions in the construction of their own gender markers. Yet, despite the distance they take from the traditional assumptions of masculinity, the males, in *TMRC,* more than in the previous two novels, assume maleness to be dependant and over-reliant on suppressing women. In some parts, it looks like it is by silencing women that males try to act like a man.

To elaborate on Barnes' view on the construction of French masculinity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, I start with a historical review of Frenchman-ness before and during the Belle Époque, and then continue with extensive discussions on the realistic representations of French maleness in *TMRC.* After analyzing the factual representations of Frenchman-ness in the novel, I focus on how Barnes' narrative challenges the facts to arrive at a more profound understanding of the assumption of masculinity in the Belle Époque. In my analysis of the novel, as in previous chapters, I apply Judith Butler's

theories on the performativity of gender, Baudrillard's concept of hyperreality and Bakhtin's ideas on Carnival and Heteroglossia to examine the ways in which Barnes' narrative thwarts the attempts for normalization in the acquisition of gender markers, and to subvert and liberate assumptions about masculinity in the Belle Époque. Through my discussions on the lively polyphonic atmosphere of the novel, I elaborate on how Barnes revives and values Gallic virtues of gaiety, impertinence, and bodily pleasure in the construction of French masculinity.

4.1. A Historical Review of Hegemonic Masculinity in Belle Époque France

Taking place between the hit-and-miss years of the mid-19th century and the terrible years of World War I in the early 20th century, the Belle Époque is, generally speaking, known as the European Golden Age or the time of joy, distinguished for its international fairs, shows, and festivals, acclaimed for its economic, industrial and scientific prosperity, and characterised by affluence, artistic and cultural innovations and modern entertainments. While some take the "mass urban entertainment" of the era as "a liberating release of sensations and experiences" (Accampo & Forth 134), gender historiographers perceive the period as a scene of gender chaos, or the era of widespread confusion over the definition of masculine and feminine identities and gender roles in France. Since the gender chaos in the Belle Époque is rooted in the sociopolitical, artistic and scientific transformations of the preceding decades of the 19th century, I start my historical review with discussions on the predominant perception of gender norms and identities in the early and mid-19th century, and then delve into the definition of manliness in the Belle Époque.

4.1.1. French Masculinity in the Early 19th Century

The assumption of French masculinity in the early 19th century was highly influenced by the earlier philosophical, scientific and sociopolitical movements of the late 18th century that insisted on Lockean rationality, conservatism and physical toughness in men, and the hierarchical nature of human relationships. The typical Frenchman of the early 19th century was, therefore, resilient and relied more "on reason and the law rather than deploring his own sufferings" (Datta 223). He took physical difficulties as a means for consolidating his own manliness. Gender binaries were highly valued, and male

supremacy was legally officialised: Based on the French Constitution of 1793 that proclaimed Universal Manhood Suffrage, Republicanism in the 19th century was "founded on the principle of universal male suffrage" (Surkis 2), and it was therefore believed that, compared to others, only men were able to enforce their political rights, and only men were capable of acting and thinking independently.

In this context, discussions on women's emancipation were not tolerated. Although French Civil Code (1804) "had originated in the fiction of the equality of all," the civil, commercial, criminal and conjugal laws approved by Napoleon's commission proved to be "non-egalitarian" and exploitative to women (Gerhard & Meunier 255). As Accampo & Forth explain,

> [i]t was not a question of hypocrisy. Republicans believed sincerely in equality, but when they translated their discourse of equality into reality, they viewed the actual citizen as embodied male. Some republicans, of course, transcended this vision, but the vast majority did not. Republicans disappointed expectations of women's political rights because citizenship was gendered male: it was men who were to enjoy "the Rights of Man". (20)

Based on a Napoleonic set of rules, in the early 19th century, men were assumed to have "natural" superiority over non-males. Being a man was perceived as a special privilege, and patriarchy was normalized. According to Sowerwine, "the exclusion of women was not accidental to but inherent in the discursive construction of the citizen, which proceeded by embodying the citizen as public man in opposition to private woman, constructing a masculine universal by creating a feminine 'other.'" (21). Because of social perceptions on the superiority of men, the request French women had submitted in 1789 to the National Assembly of the French Revolution for having "the same liberty, the same advantages, the same rights and the same honours as the masculine sex" was rejected by the authorities (Foley 1). Men instead had exclusive entitlement to social benefits.

What reinforced gender binaries was the predominance of the martial spirit in the early 19th century. In line with the sociopolitical upheavals provoked by the abolishment of the feudal system (in 1789), the French Revolution (1789 – 1799), the Reign of Terror (1793 –1794), and the Napoleonic era (1803 –1815), the French Army turned into one of the main regulatory social forces for men (Michael Wilson 194), and Frenchman-ness

became more dependent on chivalry and military values, according to which the "true French man" was identified as a brave, honest and loyal "soldier" acting like a resilient, quarrelsome, resistant, revengeful and selfless defendant of the nation (Heuer 20). Maleness therefore became inseparable from martial qualities. Bertaud explains that the process of masculinization of the time was mainly starting from the military, and within the military system men began from being the valiant figure, moving to the politicized citizen-soldier, then to the glorious Napoleonic soldier, etc. (311). Each of these stages, as the author defines, was giving the individual the chance to experience maleness by expressing his patriotism, and by cultivating bonds of homosocial friendship with men of different positions in the military.

Military values highlighted the significance of masculine honor and heroism in the early 19th century. "As a national institution, the military was widely thought to be above social and political conflicts. Martial imagery also evoke[d] older notions of male honor" (Michael Wilson 194). Pursuing military hegemonies, the typical man of honor learned to preserve his public esteem by suppressing his own conflicting emotions, and by avoiding the irrational. Otherwise his social and personal dignity as a man would be at risk: "the 'dishonored' could not easily re-attain sexual wholeness or honor through short-term efforts" (Nye 15). As a social construct, the code of honor facilitated male supremacy. "Honor was invented to sustain order in a patriarchal and violent world, but it has ended by perpetuating both violence and patriarchy" (Nye 14). It promoted gender inequality.

Beside following the code of honor, the typical Frenchman of the early 19th century was expected to have a heterosexual marriage and to take his familial duties as seriously as soldiering, because since long, in the discourses of French Law and the Church, family formed the fundamental structure for the establishment of the whole society (Heuer). Placing men's military, social and familial duties first, the sexual relationships between men and women were derogatively counted as "the pleasures of the flesh," and they were performed mainly for the purpose of reproduction (Bertaud, 310). Sexual desire was taken as the "anarchic force constantly besieging the gates of collective order and individual self-control" (Breitenberg 1), and therefore it was required to be suppressed. Within the family structure, the typical Frenchman of the time was counted as the only breadwinner, and he was required to show sensitivity to others' concerns, especially to women's, and to act as a high-principled protective figure. Yet, as in Rousseau's

categorization of public man and private woman (Breitenberg 1), the relationship between males and females was mainly based on gender binaries and male chauvinism. The medical science of the time was at the service of the ruling male-on-top social structures and reaffirmed Enlightenment beliefs about biological determinism, according to which masculine and feminine capabilities, actions and behavior were defined by individuals' inborn sex; in this view, gender binaries were strictly set based on "polarity of reason and emotion" that defined feminine emotion as the source of "unreasoned and uncontrolled behavior" and as a "threat" that could "emasculate reason" (Shields 93). Masculinity was, therefore, dependent on men's self-control and their suppressing emotionality. What intensified gender binaries was the predominance of empiricist and positivist ideologies, based on which individuals refused the irrational non-empirical subjective ways of knowing (such as theology, intuition or metaphysics), and searched for truth through experimental science (Pratt 55). The idea re-affirmed the subordination of imagination to sensory experience, and highlighted the assumptions on associating masculinity with reason, political and physical prowess, and femininity with irritability, moodiness and the sentimental (Pratt 53). The opinion reassured men's exclusive participation in the public sphere.

Despite all assumptions on men's higher cognitive capacities and social capabilities, the anxiety of masculinity was also common among Frenchmen of the early 19th century. Like their forefathers, they were scared of being overpowered by women and their sexual drives (Nye 19). By the gradual emergence of feminist activities in France in the early 19th century, men's apprehension over women's sexual liberty and their possible rebellion against men grew stronger. Another factor that aroused the anxiety of masculinity, at that time, was Napoleon's defeat in 1815, which crumbled men's secure military identity and challenged their assumption of manliness through soldierly discipline and gallantry. Toward the mid-19th century, the path to manhood, therefore, deviated moderately from military masculinity, and the army could no longer provide young men with the privileged or ideal space for acquiring masculine features. This deviation harmed the majority of Frenchmen's self-image, and as Michael S. Kimmel states in his "Contemporary 'Crisis' of Masculinity," the anxiety impelled men to exercise masculine bravado and aggression in other non-military fields (143), such as hunting games, pistol duels, fencing, fistfights or sometimes brawls, as they helped men to practice a kind of domination over natural resources or to overcome the physically or

mentally “immature” men and prove their own superior manliness (Low 92). The sociopolitical and cultural transformations in France were, in fact, calling for a more complicated perception of manliness.

The confusion over the assumption of manliness deepened as the rapid wave of modernization, industrialization and urbanization developed and spread in France from the 1830s onwards, and reshaped the social frameworks within which masculinity and femininity used to be constructed. As a result of industrialization, automatic large-scale machines replaced skilled artisans and agrarian workers. Men’s muscular strength and physical endurance were no longer counted as the only source of power (O’Boyle 473). Based on the requirements of the urbanized and modern marketplace, a large number of men joined commercial and industrial associations, unions and secular societies that were being established at that time in big cities of France. Literacy and the intellectual capabilities of individual men were, therefore, foregrounded, and the knowledge of science and technology replaced the significance of physical dexterity and army fitness. Schooling became compulsory for boys and girls, and the majority of educational centers became independent of conservative instructions of Catholic Church that prioritized obedience, traditionalism and hierarchical social relationships. While girls were given the permission to attend secondary schools, the majority of boys in France received training in higher educational centers specifically designed for sales and manufacturing (Grew & Harrigan 215).

The industrial and commercial growth of the country toward the mid-19th century, and the separation of the educational system from the Catholic Church, inspired, more than ever, the development of rationalism and secularism, and encouraged men to improve their own skills in critical thinking, accounting and communication. Accordingly, the nature of jobs changed as time passed. Following the improvements Napoleon had made in the administrative system of France, office jobs were created in the 1840s, exclusively for literate men. While a limited number of men (mainly the illiterate or lower class) were labouring as miners, boilermakers or stokers of steam engines, the majority were being hired for positions in offices, from tax-office typists to clerks, bookkeepers, telegraphists, etc. (Grew & Harrigan). Based on the demands of the market, service-oriented jobs became highly significant, and men practiced soft skills to handle customer interactions in a professional way to be able to buy or sell more products.

4.1.2. French Masculinity in the Mid-19th Century

The mid-19th century was a chaotic time because of individuals' distancing themselves from the conventional and for explorations on the authenticity of human identities. While scientific studies such as Darwin's laws of heredity and evolution of species insisted on the normalization of gender dichotomies in private/ public spheres and tried to preserve superiority of men over women (Reed 73), new ideas were developed on the material and social dimensions of selfhood. In this era,

> the subjective experience of 'selfhood' was in flux. In the second half of the nineteenth century an array of modern sensory stimuli challenged the bodies, minds, and spiritual well-being of French men and women, and offered different ways of being. Train travel – its sensory experience as well as the horizons it opened – and a bustling urban street life inundated with colorful advertising promised entertaining escapes, brought together the sexes and disparate social classes, and offered new ways to imagine one's self. (Accampo & Forth 65)

The new ways French men and women pursued for inquiring about their own "subjective singularity" encouraged individuals to transcend the normative social conventions and to try unfamiliar ways to independently negotiate their own distinctiveness in the face of the new sciences.

The keen sense of singularity accompanied by the development of radical social movements on the rights of social minorities (such as Gay Rights Movement) created an extensive space for innovative and unconventional models of masculinity and femininity, as a result of which men's anxiety over the violation of gender hierarchies and the possibility of demasculinization increased. Conforming to the evolving models of masculinity in modern France was a big challenge as social conventions were transforming continually, and masculinity was "no longer based on wealth or on lineage through birth" nor on military values (Accampo & Forth 17). As the media of the time indicates, the typical Frenchman of the 1850s and 1860s was increasingly scared of losing his autonomy or getting feminized; he accused females of monstrosity and lunacy (Patterson, 101), perceived "the female body [as] a locus of contagion, of either excessive (hysterical, nymphomaniac, and sado-masochistic) or repressed (frigid, hostile, and exploitative) sexuality" (Gammel 3), and he tried to keep female sexuality under control by acting like the "prostitute's customer, the womanizer, the fetishist, and the

sexually predatory employer" (Gammel 2). Masculinization was still highly dependent on men's supremacy over women and their sexual desires.

In the mid-19th century, the ongoing discussions on the construction of a just society and the public debates on who had the rights to civil freedom and political power, paved the ground for the rise of the middle class and the development of bourgeois masculine attributes that were entrepreneurial and individualistic, ready to take risks in business, and insisted on practicing honesty and pursuing moral ethics (Maza 12-13). Following the promises the French Revolution had made in 1789 for establishing and pursuing the principles of equality, fraternity and liberty in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, the bourgeois promised to realize a public social utopia by acting against the clergy and aristocracy, and by rectifying the unfair economic and sociopolitical situation through "embrac[ing] developments in science, medicine, economics, and political thought" (Accampo & Forth 2). Toward the mid-19th century, bourgeois masculinity turned into the ideal model of modernized urban maleness because they claimed that all men, regardless of their talents, abilities and virtues, were supposed to be treated equally based on the same moral obligations, and to enjoy the same civil rights; in this view, the individualistic values of citizens of all social classes were to be respected, appreciated and oriented toward a common egalitarian cause (Watkin 15). The positive view on bourgeois masculinity, however, shifted from the 1860s onwards. Although some scholars were initially appreciating bourgeois men for their plans for ending economic inequality in Europe, critics such as Marx disclosed the capitalist intentions of bourgeois men, and therefore, bourgeois masculinity lost its growing appeal toward the late 19th century and acquired notoriety for their materialist self-interest in money making.

Another social element that affected the notions about masculinity was the development of multiculturalism in France. In the mid-19th century, by the growth of anarchist Republican parties (under the leadership of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon) and their triggered freedom of expression, large groups of artists, immigrants and refugees, especially those with non-binary sex characteristics or sexual orientations, from various parts of the world came to France, and turned the country into the second most populated country of the world, promoting new lifestyles and cultivating innovative forms of art and literature, each of which confounded the cultural expectations about the appropriate male/ female

behavior, and progressively opened the space for negotiating traditional gender stereotypes in France. Multiculturalism violated the overall perception of gender roles and resulted in the development of nonconformist views on masculinity and femininity, questioning the responsibilities of men toward people of the same/ opposite sex; the new perspectives challenged the need for male competitiveness, rationality, independence, aggression, conservatism and physical toughness (Palmer 77). Thus, the uncertainty about the proper state of masculinity increased, and the boundary between the ideal and deviant patterns of maleness became more unstable.

Through society's insistence on new sexual orientations and novel socialization and sexualisation habits, new leisure activities began to develop among men. Frenchmen preferred to spend their off-work time in cafés, cabarets, festivals, carnivals, theatre, orchestra or art exhibitions, socializing with people of different backgrounds, rather than getting involved in physically-demanding tasks. Although "the emergence of leisure" was counted as an "unmanly" disposition, it gradually turned into a "part of the process of modernization," and a large number of men got involved in individual and collective amusements, music, dance and drinking habits to adapt themselves to the evolving social context of the time (Burke 137). Instead of displaying physical toughness or suppressing his emotions, the modern Frenchman seemed to enjoy the relief the new socialization habits offered for articulating his feelings. The overall pattern for acquiring masculinity seemed to be changing.

Meanwhile, social concerns over the degeneration of men increased. Conservatives criticized not only the modern sexualisation and socialization habits, but also women's increasing participation in the public sphere for the debilitation of the modern man. In the mid-19th century, women were granted "greater access to education and various forms of employment" that

> contributed to the image of the 'New Woman' who, compared to men, displayed stronger tendencies for asserting their own independence and acquiring qualities that were traditionally perceived to be masculine and this threatened to overturn rules about gender by manifesting independence from the conjugal and maternal obligations that had acquired heightened significance in the modern era. (Accampo & Forth 65)

Women's increasing access to educational and occupational opportunities paved the ground for their nonconformity to traditional gender norms, and this was believed to

aggravate the problem of masculinity by violating gender binaries and reversing sexual hierarchies.

The arguments concerning the problem of masculinity became more compelling after the disastrous defeat of France in the Prussian war (also named Franco-German war) in 1870 – 1871, right before the start of the Belle Époque (Foley 215). In spite of the imperialist advances the French Army had made in the 1830s in Algeria and Indochina, in the Prussian war the French army failed to exercise its past sovereignty and suffered great misfortunes. Although France was initially planning to wage this war against Prussia to reaffirm its dominance in Europe, the result of the Prussian war was the opposite, and this substantiated the claims about the inefficiency of French men, especially the men of the military (Merriman 155). The masculinist myth of the patriotic courageous soldier in France was dispelled during the two months the German Communes seized power in Paris and killed French army-generals and priests.

The traditional ideals of heroic masculinity proved to be unattainable in the Franco-Prussian war. Pointing to the devastating result of the war, Datta says: "Perhaps the crisis of masculinity was due less to the rise of women in the public sphere than to the loss of the war" (221). While the Germans were provoking anarchists and socialists to create internal conflicts in France, the French men-at-arms were struggling with their poor equipment to protect the government stock and dealt with problems such as the absence of the commanding officers and the lack of physical and mental stamina in soldiers (Berenson 113). The inefficiency of the army men in the Prussian war frustrated all hopes for resuming the traditional standards of maleness that were based on bravery, honesty, resilience and national loyalty. The German Communes were finally suppressed, but the Franco-Prussian war marked the end of France's dominance in Europe as it consolidated German forces and resulted in the establishment of a unified Germany.

The failure of France in the Franco-Prussian war and the concerns over the idealistic softness of men in France, brought Frenchmen notoriety in the Europe; it also developed the "dislike and distrust of France" among their neighboring countries especially in England (Bell, *France and Britain* 20). While a limited number of the intellectual elite in England were admiring Frenchmen for their Parisian artistic taste and their

progressive social-liberalist tendencies, and while the English, in general, idealized Napoleonian morality and fraternity, toward the end of the 19th century there developed a growing explicit dislike of French masculinity (Bantman & Faucher 13). It was, in general, believed that Frenchmen "were revolutionary by temperament, emotional and excitable, changing their form of government at the merest whim" (Bell, *France and Britain* 20). They were therefore disloyal and not trustworthy in the opinion of the English. This distrust and dislike toward Frenchman-ness increased toward the turn of the century.

4.1.3. French Masculinity in the Late 19th Century (the Belle Époque)

Belle Époque or the "French Third Republic" refers to the period of time starting from the collapse of the Second French Empire in the Franco-Prussian War (in 1870) to the defeat of France in WWII (in 1940). For Williams, the Belle Époque was the age of "cultural anxieties" as it was witness to the defeat of the conservative and royalist Jean-Marie Boulanger (in 1889), the rise of unions in defence of the rights of workers (in the 1880s), the emergence of organized movements for women's rights, the widening clash between the upper and the lower class, anarchist protest bombings of public places (in the 1890s), anti-Semitic cycles (in 1880s and the 1890s), etc., each of which added to the "French fears of national degeneration and decline" (90). In fact, the Belle Époque was a continuation of the contradictions and the revolutionary ideologies post-industrialism had created in the earlier decades in France. Social deviants and the radical challenges they had provoked in the mid-19th century were putting France's sociopolitical state at risk in fin-de-siècle.

Some critics relate the cultural anxieties of the Belle Époque to the disturbance in the gender norms and the consequent reversal of social hierarchies at the time. As Williams says, cultural anxieties "unsettle[d] the everyday lived experience of demarcated gender roles" and "undermine[d] traditional thinking about differences in the basic nature of males and females" (91). The fundamental changes made in the traditional gender politics of the time exposed men and women to new ways of exploring their own gender markers. As a result, it became "virtually impossible to force 'modern' men and women and their families back into the molds of early nineteenth-century patriarchy; some concessions had to be made for the wave of innovations in behavior, taste, and personal

freedom" (Nye 82-83). Alternative gender attitudes and non-normative lifestyles became more attractive to explore. Cross-dressing and transgressive gender performances, for instance, became accepted, especially among bohemian communities of intellectuals and artists.

Intensified feminist activities of the late 19th century multiplied the gender confusion. By the establishment of the Women's Union in 1789, feminist parties, newspapers, journals, pamphlets (like Marguerite Durand's *La Fronde*) and exclusively-female societies (such as Société des républicaines révolutionnaires) thrived more effectively toward promoting equality in male-female relationships (Mesch 86). Feminists acknowledged women's right of divorce, vote, secular education and wage equality, and drew attention to women's disregarded capabilities and men's vulnerabilities. They objected to men's legitimized involvement in toxic habits, and "denounced men for failing in their fundamental protective duty to women and sought to expose the harmful effects of male sexual irresponsibility on the family" (Mansker 170). They were shaming sexually corrupted men, and they criticized the French code of masculine honor for its domination over women: "feminists in republican France (and elsewhere in Europe) began to openly critique militarism, war, and demonstrations of physical strength and unnecessary killing in the interest of dominance. They even began to challenge male sexual habits and practices, calling for a single standard of morality for both sexes". (Offen, "Is the 'Woman'" 52). Feminism targeted the traditional assumptions that used to justify male supremacy.

The traditional assumptions on gender norms and gender behaviors were revised by feminists. In the late 19th century, men were disturbed to see educated women "wearing masculine clothing" (Holmes & Tarr 55) or the woman "who made forays outside the home, who had more input on courtship and marriage arrangements, and who might by the late 1880s have a 'separate but equal' education to her husband or brothers" (Nye 90). The growing gender imbalance was distressful for many. In order to restore male monopoly, antifeminist books and articles were published, expressing the fear for the reversal of gender hierarchies, domestication of men, and more importantly, the fear over the increase in male feminization. According to Berlanstein, the most popular Parisian journals of the 1890s (*Gil Blas illustré* and *Le Grelot*) were inundated with caricatures of smoking or cycling women, leaving their houses to attend feminist

gatherings, while their male partners were left alone at home, doing housework (15). The threat of men's subjugation to females hung over most men, like Damocles' sword.

At the same time with the development of feminist and antifeminist groups and activities, profeminist males advocated the women's movement for creating a true democratic republic. According to Offen in "Is the 'Woman'," by the 1890s, the number of men opposing "masculinisme" increased, "by which they meant the presumption of male privilege and male rule" (46). For profeminist men, social rights and advantages could not depend on one's biological sex:

> Male feminism was, in fact, a 'genre' that developed substantially during the Third Republic, encompassing significant political and intellectual figures such as Victor Schoelcher, Auguste Vacquerie, Jules Ferry, Jules Favre, Léon Richer, René Viviani, Léon Blum, Paul and Victor Margueritte, Ferdinand Buisson, Léopold Lacour – the list could go on and on. […] This is not to say that, for many men, usually of more conservative political persuasions, the crisis of masculinity and the affront to male honor was not real, but it reminds us that other currents, more favorable to women's advancement, also existed within the world of French men. (Offen "Is the 'Woman Question'" 47-48)

Profeminists tried to modernize male-female relationships, and promoted changes that would benefit both men and women. While antifeminists struggled to preserve the male-on-top social structures, profeminist men were gaining further social acceptance. They were considered as

> 'new men' who supported – and helped to shape and promulgate – the feminist rethinking of the relations between the sexes in accordance with the 'republican' principles of liberty and equality. […] French feminists of both sexes in the belle époque did think that the 'Woman Question' was largely a 'Man Problem,' or in any case a problem of outmoded institutions that privileged men. They were determined to bring the institutions and laws of the Third Republic into harmony with its stated principles. (53)

Profeminist men believed that gender equality could solve the problem of masculinity. Rather than foregrounding the traditions of male integrity or brotherhood, profeminists valued egalitarianism.

Despite pro/feminist attempts, as social critics later discussed, the women's rights movement in the late 19th century could not, in fact, make a fundamental change in male supremacy. James McMillan admits that French fin-de-siècle is famous for turning

gender order upside down, but, as he says, “the conditions under which the great majority of middle-class women lived their lives bore little resemblance to the emancipated existence imagined by troubled male minds” (142). Despite rising gender panic, the first-wave feminism in France was restricted to women of higher social classes, and failed to modify the underlying patriarchal sociocultural frameworks, or to go beyond the goal of women’s right to vote (Hause & Kenney 15). Sowerwine confirms the idea and says: “female agency in the public sphere d[id] not challenge the cultural dynamic by which man was constructed discursively as destined for public life and woman as destined for private life” (26). In contrast to what antifeminists claimed, gender binaries were not profoundly questioned. In the opinion of Surkis, “despite some clear improvements in women’s legal status and the expansion of their professional possibilities, their status as individuals remained vexed” (3). So, at the same time with the development of feminist activities, patriarchy was running its course in the Belle Époque.

Social critics believe that not only was the first-wave feminist movement ineffective in challenging patriarchal frameworks, it even reinforced them. Taking the New Woman’s avoidance of the traditional conventions of femininity as the main cause of degeneration in males, conservatives promoted misogynistic lifestyles more “aggressively” in the Belle Époque: “After 1880” there was a “mounting sense of crisis which surrounded the gender identity of many bourgeois men. For some, this led to a growing incomprehension and reduced sympathy for the woman question, for others to a deep antipathy and misogyny” (Stone 46). Terrified by the increased risk of women’s empowerment and men’s degeneration and political downfall, the state set a network of policies and instructions on gender control in various contexts (such as family environments, schools, offices, insane asylums and prisons) to reinforce gender binaries, heterosexuality and straight marriage.

Gender confusion and the problem of masculinity were counted as the main causes of depopulation in the Belle Époque. Comparing its decreasing population rate with neighboring countries highly concerned France: “the growing populations of its neighbors and strategic competitors – especially across the Rhine, where the German birth rate outpaced France by almost six to one during the period from 1872 to 1911” caused anxiety and uneasiness (Reed 72). In this context, “children were a form of biological capital” (Nye 72), and therefore, the state proposed medical care and financial

assistance to families with “numerous children”; also, heavy penalties were put in force for abortion and birth control users (Nye 80). In line with these misogynistic policies, studies continued on men’s and women’s roles in reproduction, putting an increasing insistence on conjugality. Some scholars, like Durkheim, developed innovative models for modern family structure to harmonize the relationship between married couples. These models aimed to naturalize heterosexuality and to display incest, exogamous marriage and same-sex relationships as a rupture of nature and social principles (Surkis 162). The strategic status of France was believed to depend on restoring gender norms and improving men’s potentialities. As Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish* asserts, in the Belle Époque, masculinity and men’s sexed bodies turned into manifestations of France’s capacity for survival and growth (12). As a result, the attempts for solving the man problem and justifying male chauvinism continued.

Despite the attempts made by the state, the problem of masculinity remained unresolved. Individuals lost their trust in what was previously displayed as the universal and objective truth; the idea of the death of God brought about the collapse of Christianity and destroyed the grounds for morality, individuality and the system of meaning (Schaberg 23). The idea provoked a deep sense of nihilism and existential pain due to which man’s actions, existence and choices became meaningless; this disorder turned the majority of men into “patients bedridden with no desire to do anything at all” (Forth “Moral contagion” 64). The manly will was believed to be nullified by the urbanized modern life, and the idea was that the degeneration of men was drawing France to the brink of a moral collapse. Rather than suppressing his emotions, the typical Frenchman of the Belle Époque was easily being driven to the so-called sensual and irrational impulses of the flesh and the crimes of passion. Newton says, in the Third Republic, the majority of men suffered from “what might be termed the ‘Baudelaire syndrome,’ that is to say they were prone to lethargy, ennui, despair and ultimately inaction” (177). Traditional masculinity was rarely practiced. In his *Discipline and Punish,* Foucault reviews the studies conducted on men’s hereditary degeneration in the Belle Époque, and explains that the degenerated selfhood of the time appeared in men in four patterns: the madman, the pervert, the criminal and the hysteric (14). The idea of the degenerate became part of modern selfhood in Frenchmen.

Since moral contagion was easily transmitted among men and since it could end up in more serious social disorder (Reed 73), as time passed, investigations on the formation

of gender markers became more heated and intense, and action was taken to counter degeneracy in men:

> [Therapists] generally cautioned young men about a range of dangerous influences which must be carefully avoided, including the reading of novels, oversleeping, sitting for too long, overeating, eating spiced foods or excessive meat, alcohol, coffee, and consorting with 'libidinous comrades. All of these nefarious influences tended to produce a 'scattered' or 'dispersed' personality that was ill-equipped to remain committed to a particular goal in life. (Forth, "Moral" 71-72)

To resume traditional maleness, "self-help manuals" were produced and distributed to raise men's awareness about the disadvantages of sedentary white-collar jobs. Men's health centers, like Maison de Saint-Remy, were opened to provide mental and physical assistance to discipline men's will power. Individuals were being reminded of the words of Rousseau about retaining masculinity and gender binaries, such as: "The weaker the body, the more it commands; the stronger it is, the more it obeys. All the sensual passions lodge in effeminated bodies" (Rousseau 54). It was believed that the disturbance in the gender binaries had troubled men, and the solution was to encourage men to suppress the so called "feminine" emotionality and passivity.

The desperate attempt the ruling system made to cure masculinity, however, made an adverse impact because the nature of their endeavour proved masculinity to be a fragile sociocultural construct. For some, self-help manuals and health centers were, in fact, affirming that "there is really nothing 'natural' about masculinity itself" (Forth "Contagion" 72). The struggle to solve the man problem turned Frenchman-ness into a set of intentional actions and conventional assumptions that could be redirected in any different ways: "In effect the public accepted implicitly the notion that manliness was a constructed identity because a male had to 'prove' repeatedly at work and at play that he was a 'man'" (65). The assumption of gender marker was not the same in men and women. "To be a man required effort and labour that was not required of women. One did not goad on a woman by force of will to 'be a woman'; she was born one. Exertion and activity was required to 'be a man'" (McLaren 33–4). In contrast to femininity, maleness needed a deliberate intention and constant vigilance against possible moral contagion.

The insistence on restoring masculine virility opened the assumption of maleness to an increasing doubt. The state "repeatedly stressed the need for a male to *be a man*, as if

manliness were the result of an act of will" (Forth "Contagion" 65). The need for deliberate intention in the assuming masculinity increased the confusion over gender behaviors and turned maleness into "a telos that men experience[d] as a necessary but permanently unattainable goal" (Nye, *Masculinity and Male Codes* 13). The constructed nature of maleness and its unattainability demotivated men from following the traditional model of masculinity; as a result, the man problem remained unresolved in France, and gradually French masculinity gained further infamy and suffered intense humiliation in Europe. Although modernization might have affected the assumption of maleness in all other western countries, France was perhaps relatively more affected due to the ongoing radical movements within the country and the consequent peculiar sociopolitical conditions.

Rather than practicing pragmatism or rationality favored by the European (especially the British public), an increasing number of nonconformist groups in France pursued alternative ways for understanding and performing manliness. In line with philosophers' (such as German idealists including Kant, Hegel, and Schopenhauer, etc.) critique of practical reality and the increasing interest in the transcendental, the subjective and the intelligible, a variety of nonconformist activities and radical avant-garde movements flourished, each of which raised various epistemological questions on the conventions of meaning and criticized the growing industrialist tendencies of the time that created the illusion of reality (Schaberg 24). Avant-garde intellectuals tried, in different ways, to go beyond the material to challenge the idealized economic achievements through creative acts and experiences. In their works, they replaced classical subject matters on sexuality and gender with topics on men and women's personal emotions in daily-life issues (Kovacs 135). They sharpened the sense of being disoriented or uprooted in the modern man, and highlighted feelings of displacement and diffusion of identity.

In fin-de-siècle era, the growing concerns over male degeneration and the need for restoring the traditional gender norms drew public attention to historical and artistic models of masculine bravado and gallantry. Among all available models, the memory and image of Napoleon proved to satisfy best "the era's obsessive quest for heroes":

> [Napoleonic] heroism was founded, above all, on courage, both physical and moral, and on the supposedly male qualities of self-control and scorn of danger. Although heroism was not limited to males (witness the popularity of Joan of

> Arc), heroic virtues were seen as specifically masculine. Heroes were depicted as having a great strength of will and a strong sense of self. They also had a highly developed belief in honor and duty. (Datta 219)

Although the Napoleonic era was already over, modern France of the late 19th century with its unpolished and worldly masculine figures felt a desperate craving for having (or turning someone into) a brilliant masculine hero: "At a time when heroes were destabilized and transformed, as were Napoleon and Joan, into more human and accessible figures, contemporaries still wanted them to have 'star' quality, that is, to be better, improved versions of themselves" (Datta 226). The need for finding a true masculine hero and following his acts of heroism preoccupied the majority of men in the late 19th century, and drew them to theatrical representation of heroism.

One of the significant social incidents of the Belle Époque that revealed Parisians' fascination with theatrical heroism was the trials of Alfred Dreyfus (1894-1906), the French artillery officer (of Jewish descent) who was falsely convicted of revealing military secrets to Germans, and consequently sentenced to life imprisonment on an uninhabited island out of France. Although Alfred Dreyfus "in the eyes of some supporters, conformed to an earlier, more classical model of male heroism" (Datta 221), the majority didn't take Dreyfus as a "hero" not only because of his Jewish background, but also because of his lack of theatrical features: "it was because he was not theatrical enough that Dreyfus was seen as having performed badly, like a bad actor who didn't know his lines or who couldn't deliver them convincingly" (Datta 222). Unlike the dramatic heroes of the time and against all public expectations, in his trials Dreyfus refused to cry or to talk about his personal emotions and appealed, instead, to reason and law in answering question. The artillery officer couldn't convince his audience of his patriotism, and thus he was unmanned in a degradation ceremony: "the stripping of Alfred Dreyfus's military insignias and the breaking of his sword was a metonym for the stripping of his manhood and a loss of his honor" (Datta 222). The unmanning of Dreyfus had sociopolitical impact in understanding masculinity in the Belle Époque.

Following the miscarriage of justice against Dreyfus, discussions on racism merged with the ongoing debates over the crisis of masculinity. Anti-Semitic riots occurred in different cities in France. The rioters objected to why non-French men were believed to have more "potential for further degeneration and eventually insanity" or treason (Reed 75). Despite public riots, authorities kept Dreyfus under pressure for years to make him

confess, and they rejected his request for appeal. Dreyfus' accusation, as studies later clarified, aimed to conceal the truth about the possibility of unmanly behaviors (such as treason) among Frenchmen. Yet, because of the continuing public pressure, Dreyfus was pardoned as the guilty Frenchman was arrested, and this marked the authorities' admitting the truth about the degeneration of Frenchmen in the Belle Époque.

In short, having started in the early 19th century, the problem of masculinity exacerbated in the Belle Époque because of the challenges modernization, industrialization and urbanization introduced to the ruling sociocultural frameworks of the society. Under the influence of radical social activities (such as Feminism, Profeminism, Marxism, Gay Rights movement), the fear over the increase in male feminization/subordination and the reversal of gender hierarchies increased. The attempts these movements made for modernizing male-female relationships, together with the growth of Nihilism, distanced individuals from the conventional norms of sexuality, and increased the notoriety of Frenchmen in Europe, comparing them to frivolous women due to their inefficiency and temporality. Despite the development of therapeutic centers for disciplining men's will, and despite the state's misogynistic policies, men's "degeneration" persisted, and "demasculinization" carried on. In the light of avant-garde movements, however, a personalized understanding of sexuality intensified and gender-blurring attitudes (like cross dressing and androgyny) prevailed. The unattainability of true masculinity drew the public interest to visual and unrealistic representations of traditional maleness, and proved the earlier hegemonies on assuming masculinity (based on rationality, patriarchy, heroism, conservatism, etc.) to be illusory.

4.2. The Realistic Representation of French Masculinity in *The Man in the Red Coat*

Barnes' *The Man in the Red Coat,* is studied here as a loosely-structured biofiction centered on the life story of an actual historical figure, Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi (1846-1918), the celebrated surgeon and gynecologist of Belle Époque France. From time to time, the narrator interrupts the account of the doctor's personal, professional and social life in order to provide us with a wide range of theories, letters, documents, pictures or quotations from the known literary, philosophical and scholarly resources of the time, to make elaborations on the actual sociocultural context of the era. What further disturbs the flow of the narrative about Dr. Pozzi's life is the novel's random reference to a

diverse set of accounts about Dr. Pozzi's circle of contemporaries in Paris, such as Count Montesquiou (the eccentric writer, collector and the closeted homosexual dandy), Gabriel Yturri (Montesquiou's favorite secretary), Prince Edmond de Polignac (the aristocratic composer), Guy de Maupassant (the Naturalist writer), Gustave Flaubert (the Realist novelist), Jean Lorrain (the homosexual journalist, poet and novelist), Léon Delafosse (the composer, violinist, and pianist), Oscar Wilde (the homosexual Anglo-Irish poet and playwright), Joris-Karl Huysmans (the Naturalist novelist), Marcel Proust (the homosexual novelist and essayist), etc.. Although most of these historical figures are somehow connected to Dr. Pozzi (as a friend, acquaintance, relative, colleague, etc.) and provide us with a more comprehensive view of the doctor's life, sometimes the narrator gives so much space to an account of their lives that it is difficult to have a proper grasp of Dr. Pozzi's own life and challenges.

Because of incorporating multiple male historical figures, and because of constructing the plot, setting and characterization based on the life stories of these figures and the real incidents taken from their biographies or related authentic documents, *The Man in the Red Coat* arouses great expectations about representing a realistic account of the gender chaos and the problem of masculinity in France and depicting instances when traditional roles are seriously questioned among Frenchmen of the Belle Époque. Although the novel does not represent all men from the Belle Époque to create a thorough account of what it was to be Frenchman at the time, since most of the selected and frequently-discussed historical figures in the novel are subversive personas (historically known for undermining the ruling ideologies of the time in their own works and/ or actual lives) mostly with non-binary gender markers, the novel seems to offer a fairly reasonable prospect for illustrating the degenerated image of a Frenchman who is historically criticized for being whimsical, temperamental, and featuring unmanly traits (Bell, *France and Britain* 20). In the following pages, I start my textual analysis on *TMRC* by examining the conformity of the novel to the already discussed historical accounts on the problem of French masculinity in the Belle Époque.

After analyzing the continuity of the novel with historical accounts in depicting the "degeneration" of Frenchmen in the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, similar to the previous chapters, I make use of the theories of Judith Butler on the performativity of gender, Baudrillard's theory of the hyperreal. I do also refer to Bakhtin's ideas on

Carnival and Heteroglossia to explore how the author challenges the common understanding of French masculinity by disturbing gender binaries, disrupting the heterosexual matrix, questioning gender roles, and by disenchanting the physical masculine body to create an open anti-authoritarian space for celebrating diversity in the construction of French masculinity. The consequent air of gay relativity and festivity within the novel, unchains the typical assumption of French masculinity from the arbitrary gender norms, and turns maleness into a rootless negotiable construct with no origin or essence to be explicated or categorized. This way the novel goes beyond racial and sociocultural boundaries in the assumption of maleness during the Belle Époque and welcomes abundance and diversity in developing individualized patterns in masculinization.

In the light of the theories of Butler, Bakhtin and Baudrillard, in the present study on Barnes' novel, maleness turns into a continuous play of replicas or a polyphony of simulations, where resignification is facilitated, the attempts for assuming a unitary authentic pattern for defining French masculinity are invalidated, and the cultural homogenization policies that categorize and create hierarchies between the various models of maleness in the Belle Époque are revoked, in order to establish equality, and to promote mutuality and reconciliation between the masculine self and the Other. The multiplicity of replicas, and the multilayered identity of the masculine figures turns Barnes' *TMRC* into a heteroglossia (or a decentralizing coexistence of varieties) of diverse masculinities, and this confirms Forth's idea on the Belle Époque as "an arena for the contest of masculinities" (237 *The Dreyfus Affair*). In line with the French heritage of festivity and relativity in the modern era, the novel appreciates the coexistence of multiplying models of masculinity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and orchestrates an ongoing dialogue or a dynamic interaction between them, giving each an equal right for expression.

The picture Julian Barnes' *TMRC* develops of the Belle Époque seems to correspond to the already-discussed historical accounts on English views of a Frenchman in that era. *TMRC* repeatedly pinpoints how in the Belle Époque the "common English knowledge" was based on "the fact that France was generally a source of Filth" (*TMRC* 18), and a refuge for the socially-rejected people from other countries because in France they would "escape scandal (and be able to carry on in their scandalous ways): it was the

place to go for the upper-class bankrupt, bigamist, cardsharp and homosexual" (*TMRC* 37). As in historical accounts, due to the prevalence of sexual nonconformity in France, the country was "thought of as the world capital of Sex" (*TMRC* 133). The sexual confusion historical accounts provide on the Belle Époque is vividly depicted in Barnes' *TMRC*. Characters openly discuss their sexual needs and potentials, and as historical records show, the private becomes publicized. Huysmans for example, as the narrator quotes, holds a mourning ceremony for his own loss of potency, and invites guests to "a 'black' dinner": "Invitations are sent out in the style of funeral notices; the decor, flowers and tablecloths are all black; so is the food and wine" (*TMRC* 22). By discussing their own sexual capabilities or relationships, Barnes' characters seem to examine their own understanding of gender markers to arrive at sexual self-discovery.

As in historical accounts, secularism is seen as one of the causes of the gender confusion of the time, for detaching men from religious and sociological traditions and the worldview of their forefathers. Unlike Shostakovich in *The Noise of the Time*, or George in *Arthur & George*, the tradition of sons following the masculinity model of their fathers seems to be broken in *The Man in the Red Coat*. Dr. Pozzi is described by the narrator as "a member of a generation inevitably in conflict with its predecessor: not about clothes or hair length or idleness or sexual morals, but about the entire history and origin of the world" (56). The intergenerational gap creates a new sense of identity and agency in men. Although Pozzi and his father (the Pastor) are both members of the Anthropological Society of Paris, Dr. Pozzi's translation of Darwin stands in opposition to his father's publication on the Biblical truth (*TMRC* 56). As "a committed rationalist" (*TMRC* 189), Dr. Pozzi devotes a considerable effort to refute his father's theological perception of spiritual faculties in man (*TMRC* 220). Pozzi's brother, Benjamin, "born three years after Samuel Pozzi," experiences a similar conflict with his father (*TMRC* 57). Both sons seem to seek autonomy and independence from their father in order to explore their own life paths independent from him. Under the influence of the secular affairs of the time, Gabriel Yturri, like Dr. Pozzi, acts against his father who was one of "English priests in Lisbon," and, yet, he feels confused about what a "real" Frenchman looks like (*TMRC* 59). Rather than trying to fulfill the expectation of their fathers, the males in *TMRC* attempt to shape their own understanding of maleness individually.

As historical accounts confirm, the desire for autonomy in masculinization has its roots in the wide wave of modernization, industrialization and urbanization that profoundly

revolutionized individuals' understanding of themselves and the surrounding society in the Belle Époque:

> the nineteenth-century transformations [were] wrought by industrialization, migration, imperial conquest, the rapid growth of cities, and the changes in everyday sensory stimuli. These phenomena, among numerous others, included the increased speed and frequency of train travel and rapid transit systems (both under and above ground) that transformed the social, psychological, and geographical space of human encounters. Phenomena from the rise of the mass press and the literacy to consume it to the multiple wonders of electricity transformed perceptions of reality, particularly in the instantaneous spread of words and of images. The press had the power not just to represent 'reality,' but to create its own, and to empower groups that had previously been voiceless – workers, feminists, bohemian artists, anarchists, and others who had the potential to, and often did, upset the social order. (Accampo & Forth 1)

In this context, the formerly hierarchical social structures were no more being trusted, and the majority of men defined their individual pathways to manhood by distancing themselves from the traditional social norms. Modernization altered the long-established criteria based on which French masculinity used to be acquired. Yet, the departure from the traditions of their fathers was, for some males, so confusing that they hesitated about breaking with them.

In *TMRC,* at the same time as getting separated from the long-lasting traditions of the time, some men feel the desire to return to them to make their own lives more meaningful and predictable. Some of them "attempt to live away from the world, surrounded not by false people but by genuine intellectual and artistic interests," yet, whenever they miss the support of their forefathers and struggle to return to the past traditions, they find the return to be "both completely impossible and the only feasible solution" (*TMRC* 99). The increasing interest in modern art and science on one hand, and the stability promised by the long-established social institutions on the other, keep some of Barnes' characters in an unending limbo and result in nihilistic inclinations. The limbo develops a "fever which is the mark of the heady life of Paris" (*TMRC* 79). The state of uncertainty about the traditions of their own fathers disturbs the characters' fragile balance of life.

Barnes' reference to the modernity "fever" and the "heady"-ness of life in Paris (*TMRC* 79) reminds us of conservative historical accounts on the Belle Époque, that blame the

development of modernity for exposing the public to deviation and moral decline: "The modernity that gave individuals the subjective power to fashion themselves also created its opposite in the pervasive perception of degeneration, and the need to define what was normal, discover the abnormal, and to cure the sick and 'mad'" (Accampo & Forth 65). In this view, the urban modern lifestyle is perceived as a form of seduction that ends in men's feebleness or softness, and spoils their traditional sense of agency and willpower, the main signifiers of masculine virility. The idea conveys the sense of resistance and reluctance of the modern man to challenge or change the traditional societal values. In this view, modernity is believed to be "fraught with seductions and excitations that could cause young men to abandon themselves to their own sensuality" (Forth "Contagion" 71); modern life violates the social principles, based on which the acceptable masculine attitude has been defined, and may enhance men's involvement in toxic "environment and habits—alcohol, tobacco, venereal disease, or unhygienic living or working conditions," all of which were labelled by Catholics as men's "sinful" choices (Nye 75). Despite the predominance of the conservative sense of resistance to sociocultural reforms, the majority of Barnes' characters try to keep away from gender stereotypes and show interest in alternative ways of defining selfhood. They seem to acknowledge the fluidity of human identity and the need for authenticity in self-expression.

As in historical accounts, the desire for following individualized pathways to manhood, encourages men in *TMRC* to get involved in Avant-garde activities. Dr. Pozzi and a few other males in Barnes' novel are invited to an exclusively-male avant-garde "utopian group of artists and writers called L'Abbaye de Créteil" (*TMRC* 220) where men act as Nietzsche's Ubermensch (or Superman), unapologetically pursuing their own personal desires with vigor, gaiety, and impertinence (Schaberg 32). By acting like a Superman, the participating characters try to be true to themselves and this creates a possibility for creativity, resilience and adaptability within the novel. It challenges the restrictive traditional morality codes that stifle individuality in men.

The collective cultural norms are already broken by the majority of males in *TMRC*. Jules, one of the active members of L'Abbaye de Créteil group, for instance, informs Flaubert that they have "form[ed] the entrenched camp of art for art's sake, of the morality of beauty, of indifference in political matters, and of scepticism with regard to the other nonsense, I mean religion" (*TMRC* 79). Although art is traditionally believed to belong to the "feminine" realm and described as the femininely-gendered field, in

TMRC, parallel with historical accounts on the late 19th century, a great number of men in Barnes' novels perceive themselves as "artists" (220) for devoting themselves to aesthetic innovation on unorthodox topics, and showing keen appreciation for music, photography, literature and painting. Elizabeth Wilson says, "To be an artist in this context meant more than, and was not dependent upon, the production of art, literature, or music. Rather, an artist was one who possessed certain philosophical and social attitudes and expressed them through particular forms of behavior" (193). Barnes' males are attracted to art, not necessarily for producing a work of art, but for refusing to get involved in practical social life. "Art becomes a refuge of and for the elect. Flaubert said that he had always tried to live in an ivory tower, but that 'a tide of shit' kept breaking against its base and threatening to collapse it. […] Others build their ivory towers higher, and either hold their noses or install extractor fans" (*TMRC* 97). The men interested in art are so obsessed with exploring the intensity of their own personal desires and emotions that they perceive the outside world as an invader.

By pursuing art and following the Avant-garde artists, males try to explore the truth about life and themselves independent of collective experience. For them, masculinity is no longer dependent on conjugality or family tradition (Surkis 144). Michael Wilson says, Avant-garde male artists were, in the Belle Époque, counted as feminized men because of their artistic "sensitivity, sympathy, and selfishness" (193). Though their artistic lifestyle was not counted as a socially-accepted way for masculinization, it developed a new perception of French masculinity that "deliberately and explicitly rejected the hallmarks of bourgeois masculinity: productive labor, marriage and family life, and participation in civic life" and claimed to be "genuinely connected to the 'real' French heritage; unlike their 'modern' counterparts, they understood the Gallic virtues of festivity, irreverence, bodily expression and exuberance" (Michael Wilson 194). Being a man, from the perspective of the Avant-Gardes, was inseparable from the irrational, the emotional, and the sensual.

Uninterested in actual social circumstances, as in historical accounts, intellectual males in *TMRC* get attracted to different transcendental worldviews that go beyond the material world. While Dr. Pozzi and his colleagues develop skeptical views on anthropological studies to highlight the irrationality embedded within scientific discussions (*TMRC* 117), Lorrain, Huysmans, Flaubert get involved in "the occult," "satanism and black magic"

and they enjoy "meddling with the immortal soul" (*TMRC* 76-77). By joining the "artistic-occultist commune" (*TMRC* 189), they try to use the occult as a guide in inquiring into their own subjective singularities. Following the spiritualist writings of Gustave Moreau, Flaubert, in another example, follows the occult to create "a moment of inspiration"; he would regularly "shut himself up in his studio, to ignore exterior goings-on, and create his own bustling, burnished visions" (*TMRC* 103). In his moments of inspiration, Flaubert believes he would transcend the "petty modern civilisation far behind, he conjured up the Asiatic glories of distant epochs, their mystic ardours and doldrums, the aberrations resulting from their idleness, the brutalities arising from their boredom" (*TMRC* 103). Men are drawn to the irrational (phenomena formerly perceived as "feminine") to arrive at a deeper understanding of their own identities and the surrounding world.

According to historical accounts, there was an increasing interest in the late 19th century in experiencing aesthetic pleasure through supernatural and occult phenomena like mesmerism and spiritism. Emerging in 1854 from Société philanthropico-magnétique de Paris, French Mesmerists promoted the significance of metaphysics in strengthening the masculine body and mind, and popularized the power of unseen forces in assuming manliness (Warne Monroe 67). Toward the start of the 20th century, the Society created connections with psychotherapy centers, and won a broad official appeal in the Fourth International Congress of Psychology of 1900 in Paris, claiming that mesmerism can improve men's mental and physical stamina through "electro-homeopathy" and "magnetism and hypnotism" (Allen 120). Thus, mesmerism, which was previously taken as a supernatural means for empowering women against men, made claims about placing men in a new power dynamics within which they could "influence people and … control their actions against their will" (Rebry 1). In the anti-clerical context of the fin-de-siècle that was suffering from the loss of Catholicism and the growth of materialism, the occult and its non-sensory means of perception were believed to provide men with alternative ways of self-realization (Allen 113) as it unchained men from empiricist intellectuality.
"Occultism offered men an escape from the routine hegemony of bourgeois culture without the scrutiny of the medical and psychiatric professions; it also afforded them another means to dominate women and reassert their superiority" (Accampo & Forth 66). The alternative states of consciousness the occult offered, fostered counterculture beliefs and values in men and provided them with innovative perceptions of life. While

some admired the occult for taking men beyond conventional manly wisdom and prudence, others blamed it for violating masculine autonomy by occult forces (Warne 67). In the 1910s, however, the liability towards occultist trance was found to diminish masculine virility and weaken manliness, and thus the idea gradually lost its appeal among men.

Rather than getting involved in actually-heroic "manly" deeds, and in line with the artistic tendencies of the time, in Barnes' novel, as in historical accounts, men treasure the visual and unrealistic representation of traditional heroism. Dr. Pozzi, for instance, has his paintings done by John Singer Sargent, in a highly "theatrical" style, with a "noble, heroic" pose (*TMRC* 5). To Dr. Pozzi, to appear like a heroic man in a painting matters more than performing heroic acts. Identical to the typical Frenchmen of the Belle Époque (Pavlik-Malone 36), Barnes' characters entertain themselves with colorful graphic illustrations of traditional masculinity found in newspapers, journals, wax museums, and works of art. They amuse themselves with the "visual" or "theatrical" representation of heroism as if their real-life unpolished manly acts and behaviors do not fulfill the growing social expectations about Frenchman-ness. It is by imitating dramatic acts of valor illustrated in paintings/ photographs, or wearing military-inspired clothing styles, and assuming manly body expressions and postures that the characters feel like true men (Reinach 504). Datta calls the Belle Époque "a time when French men and women, weary of such infighting, increasingly sought refuge in the fictions of the theater and the glories of the past enacted therein to find a unity 'beyond' politics" (226). The unreal representations of manhood looks like a tool to help the characters overcome the gender chaos of the time. Similar to Dr. Pozzi, Jean Lorrain takes a cover photo, posing for "a Dying Warrior" (*TMRC* 76). On the other hand, theatricality is one of the outstanding features of Wilde; he usually takes others as "a dressed-up theatre audience" and he "thinks himself a star, and consequently overreaches" (*TMRC* 17). The characters seem to somehow suffer from a lack of self-esteem to refuse to express their own true selves; it is perhaps because only the idealized models of masculinity are valued in their conservative outside society.

In Barnes' novel, men with no theatricality are reproached, as in historical accounts. Describing the Dreyfus affair and the reaction of the audience (including Dr. Pozzi) to his trials, for instance, the narrative explains that they all expected Dreyfus to display a

theatrical representation of manly valour: "'We were prepared to die for Dreyfus,' commented the poet Charles Péguy, 'but Dreyfus wasn't'" (*TMRC* 30). Unlike the dramatic heroes of the time and against all public expectations, in his trials, Dreyfus refuses to cry or to talk theatrically about his personal emotions and appeals, instead, to reason and law in answering questions. Due to refusing to present a vivid dramatic description of his own heroic acts, Dreyfus's claims about heroism is disputed, he is falsely convicted of treason, and thus unmanned (Datta 222). In his *The Dreyfus Affair and the Crisis of French Manhood* Christopher E. Forth explains that Dreyfus' false conviction was an attempt at preserving gender binaries and restoring male supremacy in the Belle Époque. The author elaborates that treason was at that time considered as a cowardly effeminate act, and justifies how the officer's accusation and banishment aimed to deny effeminacy in Frenchmen, and alleviate the growing anxiety of the time about the "unmanly" pattern of behaviour that was developing among army men. After the failure of France in the Franco-Prussian war, the legal system of the time was, in fact, trying to conceal the truth about the violation of masculine norms among men of the military.

According to historical accounts, documents were forged against Dreyfus highlighting his Jewish roots to display him as the nation's enemy, and the court refused to reopen his case until 1898 so as to display him as the main cause of discredit to the French Army. Meanwhile, medical comments were being fabricated by several neurologists of the time on hereditary diseases in Jewish communities, and these made Dreyfus look like an inborn "aberrant, troublesome, ill" man (Hacking 119) who deserved to be banished, excluded and suppressed so that the courageous French men of the army would be cleansed from defilement. Dreyfus was labeled as the Other to create a contrasting image of pure French masculine identity that was loyal, brave and patriotic. The abjection of Dreyfus aimed to exonerate the typical Frenchman of the time from cowardice and effeminacy. In spite of all these attempts, because of the ongoing riots and the pressure of the media, Dreyfus' case was reopened in 1898, the true guilty Frenchman was caught, and the Jewish officer was pardoned years later in 1906. As Forth's *The Dreyfus Affair* concludes, by reopening the case and disclosing the truth, the court admitted the possibility of major flaws in the character of French army men, which were taken as "the feminizing pitfalls of modernity" in France (237). Dreyfus' pardon suggested the states' acknowledgement of "unmanly" traits in Frenchmen.

In Barnes's novel, following the societal norms of the time that prioritize the unrealistic and visual heroic acts against actual deeds of valour in men, the majority of males display theatrical representation of heroic masculinity. It is as if the possible weaknesses in men or their unmanly features should be kept out of sight. At times, the miserly apprehensive Montesquiou acts like "a Byzantine emperor who murdered his way to the throne in 602" or "a fourth-century Christian martyr who helped the poor and who, when denounced for his faith, first dug his own grave, and then handed himself over to his executioners" (*TMRC*164). Montesquiou and Wilde have the habit of dressing up for displaying manly physical features in photographs, imitating army men's bodily expressions, and making sartorial gestures in different postures (*TMRC* 36). Barnes' characters display an increasing tendency to fake (rather than practice) masculine power in photographs and paintings. The old stereotypical masculine behaviors and attributes in the military – such as being physically fit or quarrelsome – have lost their significance. Unlike Napoleon's French Empire, there is no need for men to act as the honored "Knight of the Empire" or to fight in wars to prove their national and political loyalty to the supreme leader, or to gain glory and distinction in the society (Colin 196). Through feigning heroism and creating an impeccable image of their own apparent strength and power in the public eye, Barnes' characters conceal their true selves and the possible inconsistencies in their behaviors and attitudes as a man.

In *TMRC*, at the same time with creating and maintaining the illusion of an unerring authentic masculinity, as in historical accounts, theatricality fosters flamboyant dandyism (especially among the men of the aristocracy) and promotes a frivolous lifestyle among males; as a result, shopping and collecting items for personal grooming become highly favored among Barnes' male characters. For example, at the beginning of the novel, Dr. Pozzi, Montesquiou, and Polignac travel to London for the purpose of "intellectual and decorative shopping" (*TMRC* 3). The two aristocrats have taken Dr. Pozzi because of the "nature of shopping. All shoppers—from the High Street to the 'intellectual and decorative' end of the spectrum—love and need other shoppers, especially those, like Pozzi, who go about it in a zealous, companionable, tasteful (and equally well-funded) manner" (*TMRC* 21). In the opinion of Dillon, shopping and collecting restore in men the old sense of "chasing" and "hunting-gathering," and help them feel a kind of control over resources (256). This way, men try to create meaning, and to reshape their purpose of life in the increasingly confusing modern era. Dandyism

proves to be “the last outburst of heroism in decadent times” (*TMRC* 61) and it seems to help men “escape the suffering of life” (*TMRC* 62). Dandyism looks like an indispensable part of masculinization in the novel. Because of putting emphasis on personal charm, physical appearance and self-grooming, dandyism distances the modern man from the heroism and pragmatism traditional masculinity used to treasure in men.
To dress and behave like a dandy, nevertheless, proves to be destructive to the dandy himself. However exciting it may look, the illusionary world the dandy constructs to shy away from actual life is considerably prone to collapse because of others’ frequent imitation: “the dandy is excited by his own self-creation and self-celebration (and it is always ‘his own,’ female dandies being held not to exist). The dandy is excited to be wittier and better-dressed, and to have better taste, than the rest of humanity. […] Though of course, if too many were to copy him, the dandy would have to move on, and make himself special again” (*TMRC* 61). To act like a self-created dandy, in Barnes’ novel, involves an endless struggle to reinvent and redefine one’s own public face. This struggle to maintain a polished unique appearance, however, fails to help the modern man to achieve self-realization or to express his own individuality as a man. Despite defying the traditional understanding of maleness and adding to the desired images of manhood, the overwhelming pressure a dandy experiences in adopting his extravagant choices or unconventional attitudes prove dandyism to be futile, meaningless and shallow.

The significance of dandyism in *TMRC* points to the historical accounts on the widening clash between the men of upper, middle and lower classes, and it highlights the role of classism in the construction of masculinity in the Belle Époque. Compared to Barnes’ *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time,* being a man of lower/ middle class in *The Man in the Red Coat* seems to afflict men more severely. Dr. Pozzi, for example, is initially victimized, especially by the French men of upper class, for his Italian bourgeois origin and his anti-semitic tendencies. The struggle Dr. Pozzi takes up in his youth to ascend the social ladder through hard-work, rationality, and self-advancement, is continually mocked and humiliated in the novel as typical signs of bourgeois masculinity. “Pozzi came from the provincial bourgeoisie, whom Montesquiou would instinctively look down on. The Count delighted in displaying ‘the aristocratic pleasure of displeasing’ (the phrase is from Baudelaire). But Pozzi escaped his censure and, most of the time, his snobbery. He had what might be called ‘the bourgeois pleasure of pleasing,’ and was

from the start an adroit social tactician" (*TMRC* 22). The pressure Dr. Pozzi faces as a bourgeois man in Barnes' novel, restores the historical context of the late 19th century in France, when Marx and his followers criticized bourgeois men's claims for social justice and blamed them for exploiting the working class and for ripping off the proletariat by usurping the means of production and denying the rights of workers (Baker et al. 103). In his 1867 *Capital*, Marx criticizes the patriarchal bourgeois sociocultural assumptions that normalized gender divisions, and instead proposes furthering the interactions between men and women for achieving true equality (621). Barnes' novel parallels the historical accounts on late 19th century, where the discussions about the capitalist intentions of bourgeois men turned them into politically narrow-minded conformists who were mainly struggling to acquire riches and social prestige at any cost (Baker et al. 103).

The class struggle Barnes' middle-class characters go through prompts the historical point where the progressive attempt the bourgeoisie made "to impose order on the 'maelstrom' of the body politic, women, proletarians, sexual deviants, or the insane" proved to be erroneous and biased (Accampo & Forth 2). Dr. Pozzi's non-French origins makes him "a natural target for the anti-Dreyfusard, anti-Semitic, royalist, nativist, Catholic right" (*TMRC* 214). Yet, he gradually manages to "progress from Bergerac boy to Parisian high society" thanks to his "triumph of intellect, character, ambition, professionalism and, yes, a seductive charm that worked on both men and women" (*TMRC* 88). The progress Dr. Pozzi makes in his social/ intellectual life, undermines the monocultural assumptions on the construction of French masculinity that assume cultural homogeneity in defining manhood and restrict the definition of the Frenchman to a single and unified category of men from the same class or cultural background; Dr. Pozzi's progress enhances chances for inclusivity and diversity in the construction of maleness in the novel, and prevents oversimplifications that may result in the disregard for the marginalized men of the middle or lower classes. But, a progress similar to Dr. Pozzi's advancement rarely happens to the other male characters of the novel.

Unlike Dr. Pozzi, the other bourgeois men of the novel fail to climb the social ladder successfully, or to conform to the socially-admired upper-class manliness of the time. Lorraine "wants to be a dandy but is outclassed by Montesquiou" (*TMRC* 188-9). His misbehavior is believed to be rooted in his "bourgeois virtues" (*TMRC* 233), and this

makes him hate his own social class: "he despised the middle—the middle being where he had come from. His father ran a marine insurance company and a brickworks in Fécamp. The young Paul Duval dropped both his names when reinventing himself as Jean Lorrain"; he thinks he has to take up a way of life different from the men of middle class to feel like a "real man" (*TMRC* 73). In another instance, novelists like Bourget, Hervieu, Lavedan are not appreciated by the readers because their works are not "produced by a man who truly belongs to high society—born, nourished and raised within it" (*TMRC* 132). To become socially accepted is difficult for the men of middle class, not only in the community of intellectuals and artists, but also in their daily life. The public has a more positive perception of the men of the upper class.

In this strictly stratified social context, things are even more difficult for the males of the lower class. They have to submit to the aristocrats in the hope of overcoming class conflicts; they are commodified, traded and exchanged between the men of upper social classes:

> [C]onsider the case of Léon Delafosse. He was a piano virtuoso from a modest background (his mother still gave piano lessons), who had won first prize at the Conservatoire at the age of thirteen. A willowy, charming boy, he had been taken up by Proust around 1894. The novelist planned to offer Delafosse to Montesquiou as—what?—bonne bouche, plaything, Ganymede, Antinous? The stratagem would benefit all parties, Proust imagined. He would gain the Count's gratitude, and their friendship would be strengthened. The Count, whose younger intimates had lately been proving troublesome, would have a new object of attention. And Delafosse, by performing at the Count's house, would enjoy such a career bounce that concert halls would open up to him. (*TMRC* 137)

At the same time that the patronage system helps men to climb the social ladder, it also humiliates them and wrecks their self-respect. Delafosse similarly seeks patronage from Montesquiou, and ascends to the position of "the Angel" in the presence of Montesquiou, but soon the Count decides to smash him, saying "You have only ever been an instrument of my thought, you will never be more than a musical mechanic" (*TMRC* 139). Men of lower class cannot fully trust the support of the aristocratic males to advance socially, and this conflicts with the traditional assumptions on the need for brotherhood and fraternity among men. Rather than making close bonds against non-males, or promoting a sense of heritage and continuity among men, Barnes's characters in *TMRC* construct their own maleness by outperforming each other, and depriving one

another from power, recognition, and a lasting legacy. This contrasts with the close companionship Arthur in *Arthur & George* provides George with (despite the difference in the social classes of both men), or the true camaraderie Shostakovich attempts to create among people of his country in *The Noise of Time,* mainly from middle or lower classes.

As in historical accounts, in the class-based society of *TMRC*, social class is closely tied to manly "honor" or a man's willingness to maintain his own personal dignity and public reputation. In the case of Dr. Pozzi, his progress to "Parisian high society" brings him financial success, an extensive social network, reputation and a high social standing (*TMRC* 88). For years, he tries to protect his achieved manly honor by concealing the truth about the ongoing problems with his wife and mother-in-law. Parallel with historical notes on the significance of male supremacy in acquiring masculine honor, Dr. Pozzi attempts to uphold his own personal and public dignity by practicing misogyny in his relationship with Therese, his wife. From the beginning of their marital life, Dr. Pozzi tries to "bend" her and turn her into an obedient wife so that he may feel like a real man (*TMRC* 174). Analyzing masculinization norms of the 19th century in France, Nye says:

> Honor is a masculine concept. It has traditionally regulated relations among men, summed up the prevailing ideals of manliness, and marked the boundaries of masculine comportment … Women had no real place in this system of honor. They were only permitted to safeguard their sexual honor, which in truth belonged to their husbands, fathers, and brothers, who were ultimately responsible for its integrity and defense. (vii)

The assumption of masculine honor puts emphasis on the men's domination over women, under the pretext of defending women' social reputation. Honor is the defining element of French manliness in Barnes' novel, and it regulates men's relationships with people of the same or opposite sexes. Maintaining masculine honor is an ongoing challenge for Barnes' male characters.

In the absence of military honor that associated maleness with bravery and loyalty, men in Barnes's *TMRC* follow the model of the upper class Frenchman to defend and maintain their own honor by dueling. In reaction to any insults or challenges to their reputation, men quickly invite each other to duels to settle grievances. Throughout the

novel, Dr. Pozzi is "present in a medical capacity" in most duels; he is "a scientific observer of these supposedly romantic exchanges of bullets and sword points" (*TMRC* 53). Despite his lack of interest, Dr. Pozzi has fought and survived a duel with Devillers (*TMRC* 54). But, not everyone survives. Most of the male characters of the novel are killed/ wounded in duels. It is believed that "a duel [i]s both quicker and cheaper than a lawsuit for libel or slander" (*TMRC* 50). Berenson says the convention of dueling reached its zenith in the Belle Époque, due to the increasing need for reviving the masculine "spirit of combat" and in line with the states' democratization of politics (170). Dueling works as a symbolic means for solving honor-related issues in a manly way. Examples of discussions on manly honor can be traced in Jean Lorrain's dueling with Maupassant (*TMRC* 161), the Count with the son of Mme Ernest Stern (*TMRC*163), Yturri with a journalist (*TMRC* 163-4), Louis Grégori with Edouard Drumont (*TMRC* 196), and Daudet with Georges Clarétie (*TMRC* 247). Dueling is the primary means for conflict resolution between men, and they know that to refuse the invitation to a duel may result in a greater loss of manly honor.

In Barnes' novel, dueling is also a strategy for men to show their own concern for contemporary social incidents; duels, for instance, become more frequent in politically tense situations, for example, "during the eruption of Boulangism" or "when the Dreyfus Affair blew up" (*TMRC* 51). Unlike Englishmen who "disdain" dueling and prefer "practical" and "useful" courage (*TMRC* 45), the French believe that dueling would "morally reinvigorate the nation after the catastrophic defeat of 1870. Duelling was not just the highest form of sport, it also required the highest form of manliness" (*TMRC* 245). The official discourse promotes dueling in the hope of restoring the traditional and uniform notion of masculinity. Psychosocial studies relate the prevalence of dueling in decadent historical periods to the decline of social values, the growth of individualism and the lack of economic or sociopolitical stability in these eras (Mansker 174). Rather than being interested in restoring the traditional notion of masculinity, and regardless of the assumptions of the official discourse, individuals in Barnes' novel take dueling as an alternative way for expressing and maintaining their own sense of public identity when modern France seems to collapse culturally and politically. In a context where there is no reliable answer to the ideological conflicts, men get involved in prearranged fights with lethal weapons to display their own concern over the sociopolitical incidents taking place in their surrounding society.

In the absence of a consistent ideological and sociocultural value system, Barnes' characters feel a deep sense of emptiness. The anxiety concerning the meaning of life, human existence, or the self is an inevitable feature of the modern Frenchman. Due to technological transformations and the changes caused by secularisation, globalization and urbanization in the Belle Époque, individuals feel a sense of rootlessness, as if they are lost or cast adrift in a meaningless world with no predictable or coherent frameworks. In Barnes' characters, the existentialist apprehension and the anxiety over the futility of life are represented in different ways in male characters: Dr. Pozzi, for instance, participates in and contributes to the Parisian intellectual circles that explore nihilistic views on human experience (*TMRC* 117). Montesquiou, on the other hand, seems to go through an identity crisis for his uncertainty about his own selfhood and his confusion over his purpose in life. He ponders about the absurdity of life by "christen[ing] himself 'the sovereign of transitory things'" (*TMRC* 244), and presents himself to be "dedicated to death" (*TMRC* 66). For him, life has no inherent meaning.

The futility of life promotes pessimism. Some of Barnes' characters come to the idea that "the world is packed with fools and scoundrels" and therefore they feel they have lost their sense of social support, which results in lower resilience and depression (*TMRC* 96). In reaction to the futility of life, some like Wilde develop suicidal thoughts (*TMRC* 198); some turn into conspirators (*TMRC* 53), and some, like Polignac, feel "whimsical and rather hopeless, […] content, as in Tissot's painting, to sit at the edge of things, lost in thought" (*TMRC*126). The belief in decadence encourages inaction, and makes men amuse themselves by imagining the activities they desire to do, rather than doing them. "'What was the point of moving,' he asks himself, 'when a fellow could travel magnificently just by sitting in a chair?'" Huysmans writes (*TMRC*14). As in historical accounts, in Barnes' book, modern tendencies encourage "strange and corrupting tastes" (*TMRC*11). "As a young man—ten years before he wrote *Madame Bovary*—Flaubert described himself as 'merely a literary lizard basking the day away beneath the great sun of Beauty. That's all'" (*TMRC* 198). Barnes' characters confront the existentialist fact that there is no meaning behind their lives, their actions or choices, and this sinks them to the depths of despair. As a result, the societal gender norms and the need for conforming to traditional gender roles lose their meaning; individuals keep re-assessing their own responsibilities in relation to the people of the same/ opposite sexes to arrive at a proper understanding of their own place in the world. The bitter

disappointment they go through in this process leads to a lingering sense of irreversible decline.

As in the historical accounts of the Belle Époque, in *TMRC* the gendered human body has profound sociopolitical implications. While France is struggling to empower its military forces by promoting manly traits and idealizing the elegant male body, most of the male characters of the novel develop soft masculinity, they prove to be highly "vulnerable" and adopt qualities or traits that used to be associated with femininity (*TMRC*243). Dandies like Whistler, Lorraine, and Wilde "disdain" sports and sportsmen (*TMRC* 87), and some of them compare themselves to delicate and feeble beings such as a "butterfly, as short-lived as it is decorative" (*TMRC*243). The degeneration of men in Barnes' novel reminds us of historical discussions on the changes in gender attitudes in modern France. Accampo & Forth refer to the reasons behind the growing development of soft masculinity in the Belle Époque, and elaborate on the consequent disturbance in gender binaries:

> concerns that the urban lifestyles and opportunities associated with modern bourgeois culture had a gender-blurring effect that threatened to minimize differences between the sexes. Men who worked at desks and rarely exercised, who used their brains rather than their muscles, and who allowed their manners to be softened for the purposes of increased sociability may have made good citizens, but they did not always measure up to traditional masculine ideals of action, bravery, and aggression that continued to circulate throughout the fin de siècle. Such men were also especially vulnerable to the enervating temptations of the big city. By the same token, women who pressed for and benefited from increasing educational and employment opportunities were seen as potentially 'unsexing' themselves by shirking their traditional roles as wives and mothers. (133)

The degeneration of men resulted in the disturbance in the gender distinctions. Following discussions on sexual indeterminacy, psychological studies of the late 19th century affirmed that human beings might have a combination of masculine and feminine characteristics, and this sparked off considerable public debates on the possibility of disorder in the formation of gender markers. Demographical studies identified an increasing common tendency for practicing feminine masculinity and masculine femininity among large groups of men and women from different sociocultural backgrounds: while the former "exhausted their sexual economies through sexual excess," the latter received the required education and "entered the male work

force" (Nye 94-95). Cross dressing and androgyny were also widely practiced and individuals' appearance or behavior could no longer distinguish their femininity or masculinity. In this context, androgyny was perceived as an "unnameable gender" (Holmes & Tarr 215) because "they [we]re attempting to go against Nature" (Holmes & Tarr 244-5). As a result, according to historical accounts, the hope for restoring the traditional gender norms, gradually faded away.

Barnes' novel reflects similar ideas about the degeneration or softness of men and the consequent disturbance in gender norms. Although the Count is one of the descendants of D'Artagnan the Musketeer (Napoleon's chivalrous knight), and although Montesquiou's father was "Minister of State in Charles X's government" (*TMRC* 9), both men find sociopolitical issues "too fatiguing and withdrew" (*TMRC* 29). Lorrain is the typical example of degenerated figures in the novel: he is "scandal-monger, rumour-driver, etheromaniac and duellist" (*TMRC* 73); he is known as "a hysterical, duplicitous" man (78) whose literary works mislead other men: After reading Lorraine's *Monsieur de Phocas*, Greuling loses his moral sense, and killes a girl (*TMRC* 201), and another man commits "sexual abuse of minors" for the same reason (*TMRC* 202). Men are mentally frail, gullible and easily deceived. Also, they avoid facing the truth and prefer to kill, escape or commit suicide after each wrongdoing. Pozzi's killer, for example, "shoots himself in the head" after killing the doctor (*TMRC* 258). Men do not shoulder responsibility for their own deeds. Tasso "shot himself in the head" after shooting his new director (*TMRC* 242). The men in Barnes' novel represent the patterns of degenerated selfhood Foucault identifies for the Belle Époque: the madman, the pervert, the criminal and the hysteric (*Discipline and Punish* 14). Men, in that sense, have "declined" from the perspective of the dominant patriarchal discourse, and the decline in men seems to go rampant and widespread. Rather than insisting on the homogenization of males or blaming the declined Frenchmen, Barnes' narrative incorporates ample representations of degenerated masculinity in his novel to pave the ground for accepting the possibility of deviation from traditional masculinity, and appreciating diversity in maleness.

The sense of inaction in men, as historical sources account, has its roots in the epistemological challenges of the time. Lethargy is, in fact, the by-product of "the concept of Nothingness and modern man's fundamental existential experiences of

loneliness" (Kovacs 135). He is in the process of giving up the traditional and facing the insignificance or emptiness of life. He is bereaved of his "intellectual roots" and the "core" that used to give him the sense of order (Reed 69). Describing this state as "death within life," Kovacs makes the point that in modernization, the individual man "look[s] through the insignificance of life," learns about "the nothingness of the world," and accepts to pass his "own life in the midst of this Nothingness" (137). Being witness to the society's fundamental departure from long-established traditions, the modern man seems to choose to remain toneless and disinterested in life. Inaction replaces his initial curiosity and anxiety over expressing selfhood in innovative ways.

In *TMRC,* similar to historical accounts on the Belle Époque, degenerative masculinity, inaction and irresponsibility can be observed even among the men of the military. Barnes' novel, for instance, refers to the failure of the French army in the Fashoda incident of 1898 where the French withdrew from an imperialist war with Britain over ruling Sudan. The novel explores how the inefficiency of the French men of the military and their imperial failures in Sudan, have affected the masculinization of great French figures such as François Mauriac (the novelist) and Charles de Gaulle (the army officer) (*TMRC* 32). These failures are unforgettable to Frenchmen; the narrator says: "The British have long forgotten Fashoda (but then it was they who forced the tiny withdrawal). In French eyes, however, it was a key moment of national humiliation and dishonour, one that made a profound impact on a certain eight-year-old French boy, who in later years remembered it as a 'childhood tragedy'" (*TMRC* 32). The traditional ideals of heroism and knighthood seem to be betrayed by the men of the military in France. Not only the French army men but also French politicians (such as the prime minister) display illogicality in their words and actions; they express their own delusions with "a kind of thinking—a magical, free-floating logic, yet one blithely aware of its own contradictions" (*TMRC* 38). The words and promises of political figures sound to be hollow and unreliable.

Parallel with the inefficiency of men of authority and the military, the civilian Frenchmen display no sense of patriotism or nationalism in wars either. During the Franco-Prussian war, for example, groups of Frenchmen "had held forth at the Café Brébant on the superiority of the German mind and of German workmanship, ending with a cry of 'Yes, gentlemen, the Germans are a superior race!'" (*TMRC* 80).

Frenchmen, in Barnes' novel, avoid taking the side of the French army, and admire the resilience of Germans. They do not show a sense of devotion to their own country or countrymen, perhaps because the defeat in the Franco-Prussian war has made the Frenchmen feel "a lingering sense of impotence" (Berenson 114); they don't feel confident enough about the efficiency and strength of their own compatriots. Unlike the previous wars, in Franco-Prussian war, the French army men couldn't earn the reverence that wars used to bring before.

Analyzing the inefficiency of French military men in the Prussian war, Merriman comes to the idea that what created a persistent sense of impotence and emasculated the French men in the this war was the striking contrast between the cowardly French militaries and the large group of daring French women who voluntarily joined the army, some cross-dressed as soldiers, to defend Paris against Germans and take care of the wounded fighters (156). By bearing arms, leading troops, and expressing patriotism, women violated the association of military heroism, leadership and physical toughness with maleness. Examples of such female fighters were already observed in the French Revolution, but always ignored as "unnecessary women" (Knott 14). The undeniably significant role of female warriors in the masculine military zone of the Franco-Prussian War disrupted the assumption of the military as an exclusively-male domain, and challenged the gender stereotypes predefined based on the "intrinsic" qualities of men and women. Gender binaries, therefore, proved to be fabricated and thus changeable.

Unlike Arthur in *Arthur & George* who volunteered to go to war to empower his own maleness, and in contrast to Shostakovich in *The Noise of Time* who tried to help his nation under the Soviet Regime, in *The Man in the Red Coat*, all significant male figures except Pozzi, his two sons and Emma Fischoff's sons (*TMRC* 258) avoid going to the battle field. Most of the men in Barnes's novel delight in staying safe, pampered and rewarded during the war. At the time of WWI, they cannot overcome their own growing fear for personal safety, and the despair over the probable loss of their own possessions: "Montesquiou, when war broke out in 1914, briefly imagined himself being shot by Uhlans on the steps of his final, much-loved house, the Palais Rose, before they proceeded to burn his collection; but it would have meant a long (and eventually fruitless) wait" (*TMRC* 243). Montesquiou is alienated from his own society, and he seems to have no sense of national loyalty to worry about his country's situation. It

seems the social pressure that a man should participate in warfare does not, also, exist in Barnes' novel. As a result, disastrous social phenomena like wars fails to unite or bond males together against a common enemy. While some critics relate men's lack of interest in warfare to the rise of pacifism in the Belle Époque and the development of ideas on the triviality of wars or political struggles between war leaders (Berenson 114), I believe the issue also has its roots in the emotional numbness and the profound sense of loneliness the modern man experiences in relationship to himself and the surrounding world. In contract to the previous two novels, in *TMRC* men feel disconnected and lost, and this negatively affects even the men who choose to fight in the war, such as Dr. Pozzi.

As biographical records also confirm, in Barnes' novel, Dr. Pozzi is killed in WWI, not by men of enemy forces, but by one of his own patients, Maurice Machu, who initially approaches the doctor expressing considerable "worry about his scrotum" and asks Dr. Pozzi to fix it because, in his society, men's impotence is not tolerated, and sterility is perceived to be equal to losing his dignity (*TMRC* 255). According to the historical studies of Nye on French masculinity, in the late 19th century, "The worst fate of all, and the last stage of demasculinization, was impotence, in which a man forfeited both his sexual identity and his chance for a natural heir" (62). To reduce Machu's psychological pressure, and despite his responsibility for treating hundreds of wounded men in the war, Dr. Pozzi accepts to perform the delicate operation on Machu's genitals (*TMRC* 254). For months after the operation, Machu keeps writing to the doctor about his despair over the heaviness he feels in his testicles, the lack of erection after the operation, and his problem in urination (*TMRC* 256); finally, out of depression, and due to observing no improvement in his own fertility, as historical accounts also verify, Machu shoots Dr. Pozzi and himself "as a warning to doctors who do not respect the wishes of their patients" (*TMRC* 260), creating the impression that Dr. Pozzi "had deliberately rendered Machu impotent so that he could sleep with Mme Machu" (*TMRC* 262). Rather than prioritizing heroism, militarism and self-sacrifice in males, Machu is concerned about his own sexual potential, and he seems to be totally disconnected from the tragic incidents happening in the war time.

Machu's claim about Dr. Pozzi's sleeping with Mme Machu, reminds us of the growing uneasiness of the dominant discourse of masculinity over the diminishing sexual

morality in France where, as historical accounts say, males engage in polygamy and do "not feel an imperative to limit their sexual behavior to the family" (Mansker 173); they satisfy their own sexual appetites by out-of-wedlock relationships with each other's wives. Dr. Pozzi, for example, is suspected of seducing his patients (*TMRC* 115). Count Greffulhe, similarly, is known to have multiple women to sleep with every night (*TMRC* 44). The manly willpower in controlling sexual desires is weakened. Lorrain (*TMRC* 75) and Montesquiou (*TMRC* 83), for instance, indulge in excessive sexual relationships that were traditionally admonished as pleasures of the flesh (Bertaud, 310). Men in the novel fight over sex, seeking to achieve "open-ended" pleasure (*TMRC* 85). The majority of Barnes' characters seem to perceive traditional sexual ethics as impediments to men's happiness and growth.

Sociological studies indicate multiple reasons for the diminishing sexual morality in men during the Belle Époque. Holmes & Tar, for instance, explain that it was because of the transformations inspired by radical sociocultural movements of time, and also because of the development of new leisure activities that less acceptable sexual behaviors became gradually accepted and normalized (245). Mansker refers to the prevalence of secularization and the emergence of scientific studies on sexuality (sexology) as the main sources of men's introduction to the previously-banned sexual activities and human desires (173). In Barnes' novel, some of men, like Baron Jacques and Count Albert commit sodomy; they "lured young boys from some of Paris's best schools" to practice sodomy (*TMRC* 201-2). Some seek pleasure in sex to the extent that they undergo "satiety, nervous strain and a collapse into lethargy," and as a result, they suffer from "impotence" (*TMRC* 22). Men keep flirting with each other, trying to make "homosexuals' mouths water" (*TMRC* 85). Despite the state's attempt for restoring gender norms, there seems to be a growing liberal view on sexual ethics and morality among Dr. Pozzi's circle of contemporaries in Paris.

Barnes' account of the Belle Époque, furthermore, aligns with historical accounts over the development of homosexuality in France. The novel represents the time when same-sex (especially male-to-male) relationships that were previously perceived to be deviant, immoral and unlawful for centuries, are analyzed by psychiatrists, and categorized as sexual inversions or hereditary pathological conditions (*TMRC* 214). According to historical accounts, by the emergence of Gay Rights movements and the legalisation of

same-sex relationships at the time, some same-sex male couples, especially from the aristocratic class of the society – like Marquis Astolphe de Custine – gained the chance to come out of the closet and live the life of a free happy man (Muhlstein 378); this, marked the possibility of breaking away from the traditional norms of heterosexual masculinity, and obviated the need for having a heterosexual marriage or raising children. Discussions on same-sex relationships "contributed to contemporary fears of and fascination with women and men who did not conform to the gender and sexual prescriptions of conjugality" (Surkis 5). In Barnes' novel, similarly, the public awareness of homosexuality has heightened, and as the sexual orientation of selected historical figures in the novel indicates, the number of men and women identifying themselves as homosexuals has already increased. The necessity of conforming to the norms of traditional masculinity and preserving gender binaries is, therefore, obviated.

Much the same as historical accounts, at the same time with men's radical departure from traditional ideals of masculinity, the authorities in Barnes' novel provoke a widespread social anxiety over men's degeneration, and they insist on remasculinization policies by disciplining men's will power and sexual desires. *TMRC* refers to the extensive psychological and physiological examinations that were conducted on men, in the Belle Époque, to identify indicators of soft masculinity. The "reliable indicators of homosexuality" in these studies, are found to be: "a mincing walk, an inability to whistle, a funnel-shaped anus, fatty deposits on the buttocks and thighs, the shape of the hand, a supposedly higher skin temperature (hence the double meaning in German of the expressions 'warm brother' and 'warm friend'), and so on" (*TMRC* 86). Treatments are administered on individuals with these indicators to keep men's degeneration under control. Pozzi's son, Jacques, for instance, who was described to be "absurd, fat-bottomed, impotent, pederastic, angry, friendly when the whim takes him, banal and repugnant" (*TMRC* 224), was sent to Hove in England "to boarding school in order to learn self-discipline" (*TMRC* 203). Mental asylums assign men to practical tasks like making "bread, brooms and shoes" for therapeutic purposes (*TMRC* 222). In order to keep the sexual drive of the public under control, "Obscenity trials" (*TMRC* 19, 20) are held to prevent people from reading and spreading topics (such as androgyny). The authorities' attempt to control, adds to the gender confusion of the time and fosters discrimination and stigmatization against individuals with non-conforming sexualities.

Though France of the Belle Époque has the reputation of being the capital of non-binary gender options (Accampo & Forth 133), in Barnes' novel, as in historical accounts, the

state's effort for disciplining men's sexual desires results in homophobia. Polignac, for example, prefers to be "a closeted homosexual" (*TMRC* 21). Homosexuals are often distressed and not socially received:

> Though homosexuality had been legalised in France in 1791, there were still many associated dangers: of blackmail, of a related criminal charge (public indecency, the corruption of minors); also, of a squalid end. Montesquiou used to recall for the instruction of the young the story of a head waiter arrested in the Champs-Elysées during a 'homosexual conversation.' Put in a cell, he smashed his pince-nez and swallowed the broken glass, rather than face public shame and disgrace. (*TMRC* 85)

The prevailing public opinion on non-heterosexual relationships is unfavorable. Surkis relates this to the development of medical theories in the late 19th century that tried to pathologize homosexuality as a mental disorder (5-6).

Although the public awareness about non-binary sexual orientations was highly increased in the Belle Époque, and although France proved to be a true pioneer among Western European countries in decriminalizing non-heterosexual individuals, the widespread perception of homosexuality in the late 19th and early 20th century was not positive. Shapiro's explains that the radical movements of the time promoted innovation in gender norms, but they failed to create a positive understanding about the unconventional gender markers in the public mind. The author refers to representations of same-sex relationships in the arts, theater, and literature of the fin-de-siècle and highlights how homosexuality was depicted as a cause of shame, humor or humiliation in that time (35). The same perception seems to be reflected in the social context presented in Barnes' novel. Lorrain, for example, is usually received "with moral (and homophobic) disgust" by the public (*TMRC* 73). There are other "quieter homosexuals who valued privacy and feared the police van" (*TMRC* 75). Due to the "deteriorating degeneration" in men, the authorities develop antipathy toward the nonconformists, and this negatively affects the public view toward non-binary individuals.

In line with the attempts at disciplining men's desires, in Barnes' novel, as in historical accounts, misogyny and gender control techniques heighten in this period, and the emphasis on heterosexuality and heterosexual marriage increases. Similar to George's, Arthur's and Shostakovich's society in the previous novels, in *The Man in the Red Coat* it is commonly believed that marriage would make males feel "man enough". According

to historical accounts, in the Belle Époque, it was believed that the conventions of heterosexual marriage would subside the gender panic in men:

> As an expression and extension of this heterosexual desire, marriage consolidated the citizen's masculinity. It instituted both men's sexual difference from women and a kind of free choice, purportedly cleaved from worldly considerations. It also, and just as importantly, bound men to the social interests embodied by women. In marriage, then, citizens were both theoretically independent and articulated to the social order. (Surkis 3-4)

Sociologists, demographers, and hygienists described conjugality, in the late 19th century, as the main step in empowering men and the state, for its improving the diminishing birth rate and for disciplining men's will power. Because of the significance of conjugality, the unmarried/ sterile men were denounced by conservatives as modern egomaniacs: "young men's unwillingness and inability to embrace marriage and paternity were, at this time, potent symbols of the morbid effects of unbridled egotism in modern society" (Surkis 134). Heterosexual marriage was historically counted as the upholder of Frenchman-ness. Through promoting straight marriage and restraining men to heterosexual relationships, the state also meant to raise a new generation of males who would defend the country, practice heroism, and replace the dying/ impotent soldiers and military leaders in the wars against rivaling countries of the time (Accampo & Forth 2). Conjugality was believed to benefit not only the individual men but also the whole nation.

In Barnes' novel, however, heterosexual marriage proves to be devastating to men, and do not end in reinforcing their manliness. The marriage of Dr. Pozzi to Therese proves to be as fruitless as Duke of Marlborough's marriage to Gladys (*TMRC* 181) or Bourdet's to Catherine (*TMRC* 183). Ironically, the only successful civil marriage in the novel is Ploignac's arranged marriage to Winnaretta, for which they "considered the market" and tried to benefit "both parties: she would regain status; he would regain money" (*TMRC* 126). The marriage is believed to fail at the very beginning because "Polignac all his life had been a discreet but known homosexual" and Winnaretta "in her turn, was a discreet but known lesbian" (*TMRC* 127). Yet, Polignac finds himself happy with the relationship because

> the couple, against all the normal rules and expectations of such an aristocratic horse trade, made a success of their marriage. The Polignac family had warned

> Singer that she would be joining herself to "an unbearable maniac." But the couple seemed genuinely happy with the arrangement—perhaps starting with low expectations helped. They liked and amused one another. […] But they also took separate holidays, which was socially acceptable, and allowed them space for their separate sexual explorations. (*TMRC* 127)

Rather than taking Polignac as "an unbearable maniac," Winnaretta admires and commemorates him even 42 years after his death (*TMRC* 185). In contrast to Pozzi's conjugal problems, Polignac feels emotionally satisfied throughout his marital life: "Here were the Polignacs, beginning from a social and financial arrangement and ending in genuine affection; there were the Pozzis, beginning in what felt like passionate love, and quickly ending in social arrangement" (*TMRC* 129). Unlike Polignac, "Pozzi complains to a friend about being torn to pieces by 'marital maenads'" (*TMRC* 178). He cannot regain his peace of mind, not even after his separation from Therese (*TMRC* 223). The young men of the novel have no interest in marriage (*TMRC* 175) due to the hypocrisy embedded within the French tradition of marriage.

In the typical model of conjugality of the Belle Époque, the construction of masculinity is dependent on the husband's ability to manipulate and control his wife's feelings and desires:

> There was a line of sexual advice given to men (by other men) which went: it is dangerous for a wife to experience sexual pleasure, because once she has discovered that sex can be pleasurable, she is much more likely to run off and commit adultery. […] So it became normal for men of a certain social rank to believe that a wife was for dowry, children and social status, while a mistress (or prostitute) was for pleasure. (*TMRC* 249)

In this context, masculinity is invigorated by woman's abstinence and willingness to submit. In his exploration on French masculinity Nye says: "For this dual sexual regime to function smoothly, women were obliged to be sexually modest. This was so because Rousseau had discovered that women's sexual capacity was considerably greater than that of men. Though they are the weaker sex, lascivious women could dominate and exhaust men by sexual manipulations, thereby reversing the 'natural' relations of power" (49). Masculinity was dependent on keeping women's sexual desires under control. Because of the security it inspired, according to historical records, Frenchmen tried "to contain and channel the power of women" by marrying "much younger women, to isolate them from their family networks, not to mention their female friends" (Offen "Is

the ‘Woman’” 50). For example, when Dr. Pozzi fails to “bend” Therese (*TMRC* 174), he starts an enduring relationship with Emma, “Sixteen years younger than Pozzi” (*TMRC* 152). Amélie Gautreau, in another example, “was brought to Paris as a child and married off, at nineteen, to a banker twice her age” (*TMRC* 109). Heterosexual marital relationships depend on men’s ability to control their wives’ emotions and sexual desires.

In the misogynistic context of the novel, as in historical accounts, medical science is also at the service of patriarchal assumptions. The significance of Dr. Pozzi’s profession as a gynecologist, and the growing appreciation he receives – from authorities and the public – for his scientific achievements in manipulating the “technologies” of sexuality (*TMRC* 134), reminds us of France’s struggles for increasing the birthrate in the late 19th century, and the public policies of the time for improving women’s reproductive capacity. In Barnes’ novel, a chronicler calls gynecologists “the masters of the universe” as “[t]hey correct and constrain nature; they trim, suppress, add, diminish, make straight. And it is often thanks to their timely intervention that we see women older than half a century giving—and sharing —the impression that they are in the bloom of youth” (*TMRC* 91). For the authorities, paying attention to gynecological studies is “a way of increasing the quality and quantity of the whole population” (Nye 90). In Barnes’ novel, the majority of females are ill, in need of treatment for medical problems in their reproductive organs (*TMRC* 217), and because of the incompetency and the inefficiency of other male gynecologists (*TMRC* 249), Dr. Pozzi gains considerable fame and fortune in his job.

The doctor has helped a large number of women in childbirth, treated their ovarian cysts and provided them with quality services for improving reproductive health (*TMRC* 91). But these services are mainly at the service of male chauvinism, not for valuing women’s lives or for empowering women in making decisions about their fertility power or bodies. They do not (and are not allowed to) have access to any type of birth control methods (*TMRC* 176), and Dr. Pozzi’s special hospital for women is to increase the manipulative power of men over women. In return for Montesquiou’s artistic gift, for example, Dr. Pozzi promises “to keep Bed Number 1 in my hospital service at the disposition of any sick woman, whether needing surgical or gynaecological treatment, who presents herself as coming from the part of Count Robert de Montesquiou” (*TMRC* 89-90). This makes Montesquiou feel a sense of autonomy over women. In reaction to this favor,

> Montesquiou writes in his memoirs: Naturally, I did not abuse such munificence by taking it literally, otherwise by now this man would have sacrificed to me half the fortune of Croesus. But I did make use of it. Many poor suffering women have rightly called me their saviour and do not know that an artistic fantasy [Montesquiou's gift] which was successful enough to provoke the favour of a man of science is what they owe their recovered health to. (*TMRC* 90)

Dr. Pozzi's expertise in gynecology and the favor he bestows on Montesquiou, the typical representation of aristocratic men in the novel, help the doctor build a stronger and continuing reciprocal relationship with the men of upper class. Even during the WWI, "the private patients who still come to him [Montesquiou]" are welcomed to Bed Number 1 in Dr. Pozzi's hospital (*TMRC* 254). This way, both men feel like protective saviors in relationship to the "suffering women". As in *Arthur & George* and *The Noise of Time* acting like a protective man is an effort in reinforcing male supremacy and absolving oneself from assuming feeble masculinity.

Pozzi's social and scientific achievements, however, fail to reinforce his manliness in his marital life. Like George, Arthur and Shostakovich, Dr. Pozzi believes "that life was comprehensible, and the best course of action" seems "obvious to him, in all areas except those of love and marriage and parenthood" (*TMRC* 54). Despite his scientific achievements in gynecology, Dr. Pozzi suffers from an ever-continuing emotional black hole in his marital life. Like the majority of men in his society, the doctor builds his masculine sense of self based on female submissiveness and women's display of affection, expectations that are never realized in his marital life. He cannot feel man enough due to the disagreeable behavior of his wife, mother-in-law, and daughter: "He has discovered that even a masterful man cannot bend everyone to his will; still less can he bend money, and religion, and certain expectations of society, to his will. […] And charm—that very charm which works so well on society women— is never going to mollify a pious, provincial Catholic widow [the mother-in-law]" (*TMRC* 178). Deeply disappointed with Therese, Dr. Pozzi tries to satisfy his own increasing thirst for sentimentality, love and admiration through building intimate lasting friendships with different women and sucking in their love and approval.

In his letter to Catherine, Jean Pozzi justifies his father's out-of-marriage relationship with Mme. F as Dr. Pozzi's reaction to Therese's ignorance and lack of affection:

> he doesn't absolutely love Mme F: what he seeks from her is what he doesn't get at home—a smiling face, friendly words, *admiration*, words which flatter his

> amour-propre, and the respect due to someone who has attained the position that he has in the world…You mustn't expect that our father will now drop Mme F: he makes it a point of honour that he owes her gratitude for the *love* she has shown him. But do you not, for your part, think that Mother ought to have been able to tolerate this inevitable liaison…and show him, instead of recrimination, a smiling face, and to make for *us*, with him or if necessary without him, a house, a home, a family…. (*TMRC* 205)

Although Therese knew that "he so loved to be loved!" (*TMRC* 263), she is said to treat Dr. Pozzi with "harshness", and to torture him with "her pride" and "her commitment to 'all or nothing'" (*TMRC* 205). From the early days of their marital life, the doctor struggles to detach his wife from her mother, and thus the clash between the wife and husband increases as the novel develops. "In a letter to their matchmaker," Dr. Pozzi confirms the idea:

> Ah, if only Thérèse loved me! But she merely cherishes me, that's all, and she also cherishes her mother, and has been doing so for twenty years before I came on the scene…From the day my wife coldly weighed me in the balance against her mother, from the day she coldly imagined the possibility of a separation and only rejected it after much examination, my love for her was mortally wounded…Since then, despite what I've tried, and what she's tried, it has only languished, and is now dead…I shall always be the best of friends to her, but I wanted to be more, I wanted to be everything to her; why did she not want that? (*TMRC* 68)

To continue an intimate relationship is not possible for Dr. Pozzi without feminine love. Similar to Dr. Pozzi, Hervieu believes that "love" is the core constituent of marital relationships (*TMRC* 132). Montesquiou looks for motherly love in women (*TMRC* 194). As in *The Noise of Time* and *Arthur & George,* masculinization proves to be dependent on women's show of affection and care for men. Otherwise, men seem to lose their mental and psychological balance in life.

Therese moves Dr. Pozzi to a miserable ground because she does not acknowledge the doctor as an idol, or an object of desire. Despite all his scientific, social and financial achievements, Therese does not give him the position of an omnipotent figure and this shatters all the parameters in his social life because it make him stake his reputation and go to other women, and try to build lasting relationships with them. By depriving the doctor of her attention and care, Therese destabilizes the doctor's identity markers. Similar to Arthur (in *Arthur & George*) in his relationship with Jean, his mistress and second wife, and identical to Shostakovich (in *The Noise of Time*) in his relationship

with Nina, his first wife, Dr. Pozzi tries his best to grab Therese's attention and achieve emotional connection and intimacy with her. Again similarly, the females' inattention and neglect makes men feel undervalued, frustrated and unsatisfied and this negatively affects their sense of self-esteem.

The male characters' distress and anxiety in reaction to females' lack of feminine care and concern for their husbands, reminds us of historical accounts on the negative views on woman empowerment in the Belle Époque. According to Forth's "Contagion", majority of men in the late 19th century, perceived women's neglect and inattention to men and their increasing independence from males as the outbreak of a gender war that aimed to depreciate men's intellectual and occupational capabilities, and undermined the need for male protection. "The rise of the women's movement and the emergence of the career-minded New Woman at the end of the century suggested a migration of women from what many men considered their 'proper' sphere in society, an occurrence that infringed upon the traditionally male domain of public life" (67). Men feared the consequent reversal of gender hierarchies and the possibility of men's subjugation to females. In his article published in *La Revue des revues* in 1898, Frédéric Loliée complained about the malicious ways in which feminists could exploit and belittle the males. Drawing attention to the consequent social disorder of the time, Loliée demanded an extensive reconsideration in the so-called "unfortunate" trend among females (8). Similar antifeminist articles and books were produced at the time in reaction to the insecurity the empowerment of women was creating in men.

In the three selected novels of Barnes, Jean's, Nina's and Therese's inattention to their partners reminds us of the growing New Woman ideology of the 19th century that detaches femininity from practicing tender affections, maternity or conjugality, and this makes men feel insecure in their relationships to women. Like Arthur, Shostakovich and Dr. Pozzi, the typical man of the late 19th and early 20th century believes that they would get emasculated if women deprive them of maternal affections or kept emotional distance from men. In the context of *TMRC,* the idea seems to be based on Rousseau's words in the fifth book of his *Emile* that says: "When the time comes that women are no longer concerned with men's well-being, men will no longer be good for anything at all" (trans. in Bell & Offen, *Women, the Family, and Freedom*, vol. 1). The construction of masculinity, in this view, is highly dependent on women's nurturing and their concern

for the domestic. As in *Arthur & George* or *The Noise of Time,* the patriarchal model of the gaze (in which the male onlooker turns women into his own objects of desire) is reversed in *TMRC,* and it is the female's care and attention that define and maintain the assumption of masculinity in men. Similarly, maleness proves to be interdependent with and not separate from femininity.

The reliability of Dr. Pozzi's complaints about his marital life cannot, however, be ensured because the narrative blurs the boundary between truth and falsity. At the same time as pointing at Dr. Pozzi's dissatisfaction with his conjugal life, the narrator insists that "We have no testimony from Therese, only explanations from Pozzi" about why their marriage went wrong so soon (*TMRC* 67). "Would Thérèse's reading of the situation have been the same? It's hardly likely. Would any wife—there, then—say, 'I didn't feel strongly enough and this made him stop loving me'?" (*TMRC* 69). Therese's voiceless-ness makes the readers lose their trust in the truthfulness of Dr. Pozzi's story:

> One of the problems of telling Pozzi's story—let alone of attempting to judge him in some late-assembled court of morals—is the lack of female evidence. His wife Thérèse was mocked in society as "Pozzi's mute" (the nickname adapted from the title of Auber's opera La Muette de Portici), and has remained largely silent, apart from some touching letters to her son Jean after Pozzi's death. The influential Mme Loth-Cazalis has left not a syllable on the biographical record. All Pozzi's archived love letters were burnt, including those from Emma Fischoff; so her voice is heard only in the travel diaries she co-wrote with Pozzi, which consist mainly of awed annotations of European and North African sites. (*TMRC* 171)

Having no trustworthy evidence about Therese's perspective reduces the reliability of Dr. Pozzi's complaints about his conjugality. This way, all the accounts about the doctor's compelling need for intimacy and emotional connection with Therese turn into a partial or perhaps biased perspective on Dr. Pozzi's life that can be reshaped based on others' viewpoints.

What adds to the uncertainty is the contradictory comments the narrator occasionally makes on Therese's relationship to her husband and children. At one point, the narrator describes her as a "provincial, pious, unintellectual, brought up for marriage" woman (*TMRC* 69) or a "reserved, religious and morally correct" lady who did not know how to express herself in reaction to Dr. Pozzi's unreasonable demands (*TMRC* 215), and at the other, the narrator refers to Therese as a frivolous lady who has the habit of using "a

mixture of flattery, tears and emotional blackmail" to convince her family members into doing what she herself wants against their will; "Mme Pozzi, however mute, is far from a passive actor in these family dramas," the narrator says (*TMRC* 207). "She is discreet, and knows how to put on a social face" (*TMRC* 179). It is only after Pozzi's death that we read a few somehow inconsistent sentences from Therese: "'I no longer loved him but I am nonetheless torn apart…I try to forget all the dreadful years and remember only the beginning, when we were happy'. In a subsequent letter, she writes: […] 'As for me, who still loved him so deeply, I feel that I shall always suffer; his presence, even when far away, was indispensable to me'" (*TMRC* 262). What the source of Therese's sense of dread was or what happened to their initial happy years is never discussed.

Despite the attempt Dr. Pozzi makes to keep up appearances to conform to the accepted norms of the society for a successful happy man, the ambiguity about Therese's ideas keeps Dr. Pozzi in an in-between relationship to his family. Sometimes, Catherine, his daughter, admires him for his great scientific and professional achievements (*TMRC*91), and sometimes criticizes him as "the well-known adulterer" (*TMRC*176). The narrator, however, invalidates Catherine's comments by describing her as a "far more than just a censorious daughter provoking a self-righteous father to violence" (*TMRC*203). Catherine proves to be an unreliable and moody commentator. Yet, generalization is impossible, and as the narrator states, one can definitely find "occasional, or more than occasional *tendresses* in unhappy, or formal, or social marriages" (*TMRC* 248). We, however, have a tenuous grasp of reality about Dr. Pozzi's conjugal life because of the unreliability of the narrative.

There is, in fact, no line between truth and untruth in Barnes' novel. The narrator insists that although the novel is set in a patriarchal society, "[n]ot all husbands were beasts, not all wives martyrs" (*TMRC* 249-50), and confirms that there are many other factors that may impact Dr. Pozzi's marital life, such as, his social class, religion or family relations: "Money is a great divider as well; so is religion; so too is a mother-in-law to whom one is no longer speaking" (*TMRC* 251). His non-French origin, the doctor himself believes, might be the source of his marital problems: At the beginning of his conjugality, Dr. Pozzi "has talked to her [Therese], as most lovers do, about the part of the country he comes from, the Périgord; but a priori she has shown no taste for it, and no inclination to visit. 'She is not in the slightest degree touched by all the childhood memories I laid

before her. There is an absence of sentimentality in her which sometimes amounts to a larger absence of feeling'" (*TMRC* 68). Dr. Pozzi thinks that his relationship with his wife could have been more harmonious and happy if he himself was originally from France.

Similar to Arthur and Shostakovich in the previous novels, Dr. Pozzi is in an in-between relationship to his nation as well. Pozzi is highly appreciated for his deep knowledge of gynecology and his dexterity in doing surgeries (*TMRC*133). Yet, he is seen by some as someone merely involved in "chopping up the tender flesh of women" (*TMRC*108), or as a "rootless cosmopolitan" and "an enemy of the people" (*TMRC*215). At the same time that "Pozzi is remembered, described and painted as a 'society doctor'" (*TMRC*132), admired for "transform[ing] French gynaecology" (*TMRC*133) and saving a great number of women's lives, "Pozzi had a reputation as 'an incorrigible seducer,' a doctor who slept with his patients, who may even have used his consultations as foreplay" (*TMRC*115):

> [H]e was 'not only the father of French gynaecology but also a confirmed sex addict who routinely attempted to seduce his female patients.' […] the doctor who helps women but also exploits them. The man of science who brings comfort and relief from mental and physical pain, whose innovations and techniques saved women's lives, who helped the poor numerically more than the rich, but who in his private life behaved like a caricature of a sophisticated Frenchman. (*TMRC* 168)

The unreliability of historical accounts and the silence of Dr. Pozzi's patients make things even more undecidable: "But there is not a single recorded note of female complaint against him. […] there were other men who ended up in the scandal sheets and libel courts […] Pozzi never emerges from documents of the time as the kind of ruthless libertine—indeed, 'sex addict'" (*TMRC* 168-9). Almost all patients of Dr. Pozzi (except for Sarah and Catherine Pozzi) remain anonymous and this namelessness suspends the reliability of accounts on Dr. Pozzi's high social standing.

Dr. Pozzi's professional reputation is also ambivalent. He is perceived as the first to add a human side to the gynecological studies of his time. In addition to insisting on the significance of "woman's comfort," the sterilization of medical facilities, "[h]e also stresses that the patient's modesty must always be considered; so, for instance, the doctor should avoid eye contact while making examinations" (*TMRC*135). Despite the

widespread fame Dr. Pozzi and his hospital gain for advanced and humane treatments, there are unconfirmed rumors about his way of caretaking:

> Although Pozzi's hospital is one of the best in Europe, Lorrain describes his own experience of being hospitalized there differently: 'He tells me about this house of death, where four women died during his stay there, where the talk is of nothing but the removal of ovaries and uteri, where there is a training course for women so that they may learn the Pozzi method of suturing, which leaves not the slightest trace that might repel either a husband or a lover. (*TMRC*193)

Although the reliability of Lorrain's account is never ensured in the novel, his negative descriptions of the doctor and his hospital distort the continuity of historical accounts about Dr. Pozzi's excellent well-earned reputation, and tarnishes the fame his scientific studies have brought him since the late 19th century. What leads to further uncertainty over historical accounts on the doctor's life, is the unfinalizable nature of human identity, and the inability of biographers in incorporating all human aspects in one account. At the same time with giving explanations on the unreliability of rumors on Pozzi's personal and professional life, the narrator points to the endless dimensions based on which one can approach Pozzi's life story:

> So I became less interested in Pozzi the amorist, and more in Pozzi the fraught family man, Pozzi the ever-curious doctor, Pozzi the traveller, Pozzi the urbane figure (Pozzi the snob?), Pozzi the internationalist, the rationalist, the Darwinist, the scientist, the modernist. Pozzi, the man who never lost a friend (unless they were an anti-Dreyfusard). Pozzi, a sane man in a demented age. (*TMRC* 170)

The narrator draws attention to the limited capacity of historical accounts in incorporating all facts and details in telling the truth, and underlines the impact of a biographer's personal preferences in downplaying or excluding some specific factors or incidents in a historical figure's life account. At the same time with suspending the reliability of the narrative about Dr. Pozzi, the narrator's comment encourages us to stop looking for a single unified account on historical figures and expands our capacity to understand the complexities and accept the possibility of multiplicity of identities a single person can assume in history.

Despite the attempts Barnes claims to make for creating a factual genre in the novel, as the narrative develops, the boundary between fact and fiction gets blurred, and it is conveyed that "there are more uncertainties in nonfiction than in fiction" (*TMRC*241).

The narrator's pickiness in writing (*TMRC* 63), his distrust in biographies (*TMRC* 164-5), and his attempt to draw attention to his list of "*Things We Cannot Know*" (from page 247 to 252) highlight the considerable indeterminacy in grand narratives and biographical studies. Tang takes Barnes' insistence on the unknowable as the breach of factuality and the reliance on the imaginary:

> If the truth of the past cannot be fully known, it should be imagined, which becomes the unwritten rule of *The man in the red coat.*[…] The integration of fictional discourse within authorized zones of invention nudges readers into realizing that reading a biography not only entails the passive acquisition of facts but is an active, highly emotive exercise that involves gathering factual information and empathetically engaging with the same. Although Barnes does not apply novelistic discourse to the representation of Pozzi's life, he still constructs a novelist's vision of Pozzi's life and world, borrowing from history to ameliorate disbelief and spark fascination among his readers. In this sense, when viewed rhetorically, fictionality plays a strategic role in Barnes's nonfictional work. (Tang 99)

Fictionality is inseparable from the factual discourse in *The Man in the Red Coat*. Barnes' skepticism toward the grand narrative of history opens the novel to further uncertainties and invites the readers to keep a critical distance from the accounted historical incidents. The unreliability of the narrative challenges forces of socialization and paves the ground for achieving a greater truth by criticizing and questioning widespread assumptions (Hutcheon 2). In terms of gender and sexuality, we may say, *The Man in the Red Coat* simulates the prevailing presumptions about masculinity in the late 19th and early 20th century in order to challenge them and to provide us with a deeper insight into the development of gender identities during the Belle Époque. To be more specific on this, below I continue my textual analysis of *The Man in the Red Coat* based on Judith Butler's theorizations on the performativity of gender, Baudrillardian hyperreal, Bakhtin's ideas on Carnival and Heteroglossia.

4.3. Challenging the Notion of French Masculinity in *The Man in the Red Coat*

Barnes' reliance on historiographic metafiction turns his representation of the problem of masculinity in France into an ironic inversion of manliness. Though the images Barnes' narrative creates of Frenchmen at the Belle Époque display a kind of continuity with historical accounts and reproduce the gender-based behavioral traits of the time, they also give rise to a growing feeling of uncertainty that creates a potential sense of

transformation or innovation, and encourages revision in understanding the notion of the Frenchman. By incorporating various representations of men's "degeneration" and "demasculinization" in his narrative on actual Frenchmen of the era, Barnes' narrative does not mean to insist on the homogenization of males or their adopting gender norms, or to blame the Frenchmen from the perspective a British author, but to create a space for accepting and appreciating the variety underlying men's deviation from the traditional assumptions of maleness. Barnes' novel, in fact, invites the reader to keep a critical distance from historical generalizations on the flightiness of Frenchmen, insisting that "reality is not as fixed as we generally assume it to be" (Butler *Gender* xxiii-xxiv). For him, the reality about gender and sexuality is multifaceted and varying, and this nullifies the attempt for finding a singular or unitary model of maleness.

In Barnes' *The Man in the Red Coat*, the binaries predefined for the gender traits of males and females are inverted, therefore, gender coherence loses its meaning, and masculinity and femininity turn into unstable and arbitrary social constructs. At the same time with their arbitrary heterosexual tendencies, many of the male and female characters in *TMRC* exhibit gender hybridity, and display gender-blurring attitudes and characteristics: Montesquiou, for instance, calls himself a "sexually indeterminate" person (*TMRC*62); he gets emotional, like women, and experiences temporary infatuation (*TMRC*161). Sarah Bernhardt is described as an "androgyne" (*TMRC*62) with a male genital organ because of which she does not feel orgasms like other women: "it was rumoured that 'instead of a clitoris she has a corn'" (*TMRC* 167). Lorrain is, on the other hand, described as a "special kind of maniac, who belonged to two if not three sexes" (*TMRC* 74). To categorize Barnes' characters on the opposite poles of the gender binary becomes impossible, and being a man therefore proves to be a construct on a spectrum.

In the absence of gender coherence, the heterosexual matrix, based on which heteronormative relationships are defined, gets disturbed, and one can no longer assume a particular fixed sexuality to act upon. Thus the individual no longer takes for granted the existence of a "grid of cultural intelligibility" for embodying a stable sex or performing a stable expression of gender (Butler *Gender* 208). In Barnes' novel, Lorrain displays effeminate masculinity as he "dye[d] his moustache with henna and wore mauve powder" (*TMRC*74). He lacks the self-confidence the surrounding patriarchal

society builds in men; in his relationship to women, "[h]e senses that he is tolerated rather than valued" (*TMRC*188-9). By distancing himself from the conventions of traditional masculinity, and by performing feminine acts, Lorrain struggles to get accepted. Yet, the strategy occasionally proves to be overwhelming, and he sometimes fears to be "ravished" and "stalked" by women (*TMRC*190). In a similar case, Alphonse's younger son, "known as Zézé," is described as "a pretty boy, curled, pomaded, painted and powdered, who spoke in a low voice" (*TMRC*150). Alphonse is concerned about Zézé's overreliance on femininity and the consequent troubles in his relationship with females (*TMRC*163). The lack of gender coherence and the confusion over the heterosexual matrix create a carnival space within the novel, and opens gender categories in the story to new interpretations.

In Bakhtinian theory, "carnival" or "carnivalesque" is used "to refer to the varied popular—festive life of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance […]. But it is possible to go further than this, and talk of carnivalized writing, that is, writing which has taken the carnival spirit into itself and thus reproduces, within its own structures and by its own practice, the characteristic inversions, parodies and discrownings" (Dentith 63). The carnival space created in Barnes' novel, is a festive anti-authoritarian context within which gender norms are reinterpreted and reversed, and the individualized nontraditional approaches are celebrated in the construction of gender markers. According to Dentith, in carnival, "the high, the elevated, the official, even the sacred, is degraded and debased, but as a condition of popular renewal and regeneration" (66). The reversal of gender hierarchies in Barnes' novel, we may say, aims to foster regrowth and inclusivity in understanding femininity and masculinity.

In the topsy-turvy world of the novel, sexual hierarchies are overturned, gender roles are inverted and men do not necessarily have the capacity to take their own familial duties seriously, or to act as high-principled protective figures in marriage. Married men display a remarkable irresponsibility of character, toward their own wives and children. Unlike the traditional model of masculinity, husbands live on their wives' support. Describing the enormous wealth Prince Edmond de Polignac acquires by getting married to Winnaretta Singer, the narrator says: "It's strange that the term 'gold digger' is reserved exclusively for women who attach themselves to men for upward financial mobility. The biggest gold diggers of the Belle Epoque were English and French male aristocrats who married American heiresses to renew their bloodline, revive their sense

of entitlement, and bolster their bank balance" (*TMRC*144). Rather than supporting Winnaretta, the Prince gets dependent on her support. This inversion of gender roles paves the ground for unchaining men from the hegemonic model of masculinity.

The social structure, based on which men used to be in positions of dominance and privilege gets disturbed, and men are not valued in the novel by their surrounding society, not even the well-known historical masculine figures. Sarah Bernhardt has "a chimpanzee called Darwin" (*TMRC*165) to mock the naturalist biologist of the time. Dr. Pozzi, the great surgeon and gynecologist of the late 19th century is initially presented in the novel with the coat he wears in a portrait. The narrator asks: "Is it unfair to begin with the coat, rather than the man inside it? But the coat, or rather its depiction, is how we remember him today, if we remember him at all" (*TMRC*3). Thus the novel starts with five pages of detailed descriptions of Dr. Pozzi's coat in the portrait named "Dr. Pozzi at Home," and then it briefly provides information on his personal and professional life in bits and pieces.

Another example for the depreciation of men of honor within the novel is the death-in-life status of the only Sergeant of the story: "Under the new government, the Prince's father was sentenced to 'civil death,' so that legally he did not exist. Frenchly, however, the non-existent man was permitted conjugal visits during his imprisonment, one of which resulted in Edmond" (*TMRC* 9). The Sergeant's statutory, social and diplomatic rights are all abolished during his lifetime. The suspension of death in literary works is, in Bakhtin's view, a symbolic means for creating an anti-authoritarian context where societal regulations are suspended and authorities are subverted; death, in this view, is in cyclical relationship with life and innovative perspectives on life (Dentith 75). In Barnes' novel, without being provided with further details, we are informed that the Sergeant silently remains (and perhaps dies) in the limbo situation, and there are no more discussions on the possibility of his being released or appreciated for his acts of valor.

Although this death or lack of reverence for renowned men turns males into instances of disparaging or belittlement, it creates increasing chances for rebirth, revision and transformation in the understanding of maleness that gradually prevails the whole book. Unlike Shostakovich's death-in life in *The Noise of Time* that results in his Sisyphean torture and degeneration, the Sergeant's death-in-life situation in *TMRC* promotes renewal and facilitates the possibility of innovation in the understanding of maleness.

In the gay relativity promoted in Barnes' *TMRC*, men's belittlement is accompanied with grotesque images of the masculine body. Rather than displaying the ideal strong male body as an unbreakable whole, the novel reveals physical impairment in a vast variety of male characters. Unlike misogynistic works of literature that exempt male sexuality and body from scrutiny, and overexpose the feminine body (Coward 229), Barnes' novel scrutinizes the masculine body, displaying men suffering from various illnesses in their genitals: Montesquiou , for example, suffers from "sexual failure—either impotence or perhaps premature ejaculation" (*TMRC* 21). Huysmans "had also suffered from impotence" (*TMRC* 22). Like women, men are also being mistreated by doctors. Some men are "pointlessly martyred and mutilated" by surgeons who "ignoring his patient's request, insisted on operating immediately" (*TMRC* 226, 225). Herrero, for example, has turned into an "unbalanced" man and "he had been crippled and unable to work" after Dr. Guinard's operation on his testicles (*TMRC* 226). Yet, the humor contained in Herrero's physical impairment and his retaliation disclose the absurdity of the normative assumption of masculinity, and bring to life a set of social transformations.

As the novel develops, the narrative displays a further downward degrading movement into the bodily, and it keeps confronting the reader with different exaggerated images of the ugly male body – such as the "appalling" dying bodies of Lorrain and Wilde (*TMRC* 212) – that lead to a strain of disgust or a mocking laughter. In *The Man in the Red Coat,* men are physically imperfect and frail, and they repeatedly suffer and die from diseases or "unheroic" wounds they usually receive in duels, in their buttocks or guts (*TMRC*54). For example, Dr. Pozzi is shot by Machu in his gut (*TMRC*258), the head surgeon is shot four times in the groin and abdomen (*TMRC*225), Ollivier is "shot six times in the abdomen" (*TMRC*242), Henriette fired at Calmette, "in the pelvic cavity" (*TMRC*235), Wingfield was shot in the lower abdomen (*TMRC*95-96), etc., and this adverse trend continues. In each shooting incident we are provided with details on the injured genitals of men, the number of stitches they receive or a report on their deteriorating or healing bodies.

Through foregrounding the grotesque in the male body, Barnes' novel may be said to disenchant the masculine physique and emphasizes its corporeality. In the words of Dentith, we may say, the discussions the novel provides on "genitals, bellies, defecations, urine, disease, noses, mouths, and dismembered parts" of men turn the

masculine body into a space for "becoming," rather than "entirely finished" (228). The ugly and the uncompleted masculine body promotes gay relativity that contradicts the traditional assumptions on associating masculinity with logic and reason. Such strategies open the novel to a potential sense of transformation in the definition of French masculinity.

By revealing its grotesque and unfinished aspects, Barnes' narrative changes the masculine body into a means for the dramatic representation of maleness. In gender theories, the human body is highly significant. Butler, for instance, writes, "The body is not a self-identical or merely factic materiality; it is a materiality that bears meaning, if nothing else, and the manner of this bearing is fundamentally dramatic" ("Performative Acts" 272). In other words, as Butler clarifies, the body goes beyond the material to "materialize" possibilities through performing gendered behaviors (272). Thus the body turns into an open space for an innovative understanding of gender markers. However humiliating it sounds, in Barnes' novel, the impairment and degradation of men "is not merely a negative process" (Dentith 65). It is, on the contrary, the source of growth and expansion. The reversal of gender hierarchies and the humiliation of men, in this context, resonate with the already-discussed "Gallic virtues of festivity, irreverence, bodily expression" that were favored by modern France as the "'real' French heritage" (Michael Wilson 194). It can be argued that the reversal creates a space for a reconsideration of what it means to be a Frenchman. The traditional assumptions on maleness are undermined, and gender identities become increasingly prone to indeterminacy.

The indeterminacy in the assumption of masculinity turns men into flickering images or crude caricatures of traditional masculinity, and this reinforces plurality and suspends knowability in understanding French masculinity. In Barnes' work, men are obsessed with looking like true Frenchmen. Some of them struggle to perform behaviors expected from a real warrior (*TMRC* 76) or from a literary (*TMRC* 36) or military hero (*TMRC* 227), and this intensifies the novel's critical view of maleness. In her *Gender Trouble,* Judith Butler explains that "the gender that is introduced through the simile [acting *like* a man, or looking *like* the males] lacks 'reality,' and is taken to constitute an illusory appearance" (*Gender* xxiii). The assumption of real/unreal masculinity naturalizes gender norms and, at the same time, opens them to further reconsiderations by revealing their simulated nature (*Gender* xx-xxi). Despite the attempt Montesquiou makes to look

like a real man and to consolidate the impression of being a man, as Jean Lorrain says, he is nothing more than "a great lady" (*TMRC* 164). Rather than being an intrinsic reality, masculinity proves to be an external illogical and negotiable construct.

What adds to the unknowability of masculinity is its confusing rootlessness. Butler compares fe/maleness to a "masquerade," or an endless chain of masks and appearances (Butler, *Gender* 63). Following Lacan, Butler pinpoints that "both masculine and feminine positions are signified, the signifier belonging to the Symbolic that can never be assumed in more than token form by either position" (*Gender* 45). Based on the idea of gender parody, "the original identity after which gender fashions itself is an imitation without an origin. To be more precise, it is a production which, in effect—that is, in its effect—postures as an imitation" (Butler *Gender* 188). Similarly, in Barnes' *The Man in the Red Coat,* the original or primary masculinity to imitate is always missing, and the male characters seem to get stuck in cycles of imitating each other. While Whistler, for instance, builds his masculinity based on literary sources (*TMRC* 99), Montesquiou takes Whistler as a role model, and the chain of imitation spreads like perfume to Proust, Boni de Castellane, Robert and others:

> When Montesquiou met Whistler during that visit to London, the Count started imitating the artist, copying his facial hair, dress, gestures, voice, wit and taste. When Proust met Montesquiou, he started copying the Count, consciously or unconsciously, in his letters and gestures, and in a way of tapping the foot. Proust even began to raise his hand to his mouth when he laughed—though Montesquiou only did this to hide his unsightly teeth. The dandy is self-created; the aesthete too. Both pursue taste, and the perfection of taste. Do they in this way complete themselves, or construct something inherently false? Or both at the same time? Count Boni de Castellane, a heterosexual version of Montesquiou […] puts it this way: 'Robert pushes his gift for imitation to the extreme of imitating himself. […] As Huysmans puts it: 'One aspect of this art of perfumery had fascinated [Des Esseintes] more than any other, and that was the degree of accuracy it was possible to reach in imitating the real thing.' […]. However, it is not just the dandy who gets imitated. (*TMRC* 100-1)

The chain of imitation in the narrative continues with examples about how Dr. Pozzi's assistant copies the doctor (*TMRC* 101), and how Dr. Pozzi mimics a fictional Byronic hero: "Pozzi, who viewed himself, and was often viewed by others, as a Byronic figure. He would sign letters (to women, obviously) 'Your Giaour' in reference to Byron's poem of that name" (*TMRC* 155). Men's habit of duplicating actual or imaginary masculine figures turns manhood into a continuous play of baseless shadows, and it

shows that there is no pre-existing definition of maleness with which we can measure individual masculine acts or behavior. In this view the "postulation of a true gender identity would be revealed as a regulatory fiction" (Butler, *Gender* 192). This would explain the futility of the attempt the authorities make to identify and discipline degenerated men in the novel, and it would undermine the insistence of artists such as Edmond and Jules on idealizing the images of masculinity from "the elegant eighteenth century" (*TMRC* 78-79). The attempt for normalization is ineffectual when the origin is missing.

As in *Arthur & George*, and I may say, even more obsessively than that novel, in the absence of the origin, the sense of self of the selected historical figures in *The Man in the Red Coat* is influenced by fictional elements and the Baudrillardean hyperreal, i.e. a state of flux where the boundaries between the real and the simulation are blurred. Some male characters feel insecure because of their fictional shadow selves, and they spend all their time and energy to prove that they are beyond those shadows: "All through his life, [Montesquiou] had to compete with parallel, invented versions of himself: from Huysmans (1884), Jean Lorrain (1901), Edmond Rostand in his play *Chantecler* (1910), and finally Proust (from 1913)" (*TMRC* 227). Montesquiou had spent all his life struggling "to prove that he was 'not'—or not just—Des Esseintes or Monsieur de Phocas or Chantecler or Baron Charlus" (*TMRC*232). He continually attempts to distinguish himself from the literary characters people confuse him with, in order "to prove that he was, above and beyond these shadows, Robert de Montesquiou, poet, prose-poet, novelist and now memoirist" (*TMRC*232). The same problem happens for the other men of upper class in the novel as they are copied in literary works of the time: "Edmond de Polignac appears twice under his own name: renting the Prince of X's castle for the Bayreuth Festival, and lounging in the foreground of Tissot's *Le Cercle de la rue Royale*. Pozzi is said to be distantly refracted in the figure of Dr.—later Professor—Cottard," the Parisian neurologist in Proust's *In Search of Lost Time*, (*TMRC* 229). To have no distinctions between the real and the manufactured challenges the authenticity of these characters' identities and their gendered selfhood. The masculine self is thus replaced with a proliferation of shadows, images and simulations.

What terrifies the shadowed men and encourages them to fight off their own simulations in the media in the works of art is the fact that the hyperreal shadow can negatively

impact the person, and it can gradually gain the power to put him to death by replacing the person. Describing the paintings of historical masculine figures of the Belle Époque, the narrator says: "Art may commemorate the sitter, but may also change him, even cancel him, despite the wishes of both parties. At the lowest level of competent representation, there is less of a problem. But when high talent, let alone genius, comes in, the painter is preparing an image which will represent the sitter after death, and thus in some way replace the living person" (*TMRC*123). A strong pictorial or theatrical representation of a person and his attitudes may replace that actual living person it tries to represent, and this may negatively affect individuals' public image. Due to the impressions made by his shadows and simulations, the Count "was being transformed into a monster of turpitude" (*TMRC*229-30), and this changed people's view toward the Count: "a rare and unenviable fate was already beginning to close in on the Count: that of being confused in the public mind—or at least the readerly mind—with an alter ego. His life, and afterlife, were to be dogged by shadow versions of himself" (*TMRC*11). The multiplicity of replicas, and their potential for replacing each other, suggest the pointlessness of the attempt for defining the unique authentic Frenchman, and paves the way for accepting and valuing equally the varying versions of maleness from different social classes and racial backgrounds.

The manifold nature of the idea of the Frenchman proves to be highly inconsistent and variable in Barnes' novel. Yet, by incorporating a polyphonic picture of maleness, Barnes' narrative creates a space for a dynamic interaction between these diverse patterns of manhood. As Butler says, this multiplicity "suggests an openness to resignification and recontextualization" (Butler *Gender* 188), and affirms that "it is extraordinarily difficult to subdue certain expectations" on gender traits and behaviors (Cameron 270). In other words, gender does not have an "ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality" (Butler *Gender* 185), and the same goes for masculinity. It cannot be categorized or explicated because of its innate diversity. The absence of the origin and essence turns the truth about French masculinity into a multilayered polyphony or a disorganized dialogue in which all voices are allowed an equal right for expression. The novel's appreciation of heteroglossia and diversity aligns with Dr. Pozzi's "maxim" that says: "Chauvinism is one of the forms of ignorance" (*TMRC*54) and encourages everyone to abandon unreasonable prejudices about the superiority of a single group over others, and promotes mutual understanding and

equality. The inclusivity incorporated within the novel develops an increasing tolerance for the marginalized and unfavoured patterns of French masculinity.

The heteroglossia or the coexistence of varieties (Dentith 196) created in Barnes' *The Man in the Red Coat*, develops an enormous potential for accepting and compassionately understanding everyone the way they are, even the madman. In the visit Dr. Pozzi makes to an asylum, "the asylum's director, Dr. Cabred" tells Dr. Pozzi: "The raving lunatic should exist only on the stage or in a novel. It is violence committed against them that makes them rave" (*TMRC* 222). Dr. Cabred's idea absolves the typical Frenchman of the Belle Époque from all the blames historical accounts put for his flightiness and unmanly behavioral traits. As Dr. Cabred confirms, it is the violence inflicted by the sociocultural situation of the time that makes one mad, depressed, lethargic or ignorant of contemporary incidents. "We remember Dr. Cabred arguing that it was institutional cruelty and restraint that caused a violent response in patients" (*TMRC* 225). Although the ruling system of the time excluded the "mentally ill" men (Reed 71), Barnes's inclusivity shows that, the Frenchman's mental problems and his lack of conformity to the traditional model of masculinity are reactions to the social constraints imposed on men, and a response to the gender confusion reigning in modern France.

Barnes' critical representation of French masculinity and the consequent sense of transformation, multiplicity and inclusivity encourages a reconsideration in understanding Dr. Pozzi as a Frenchman. Despite the unconfirmed rumors about his personal and professional life, gradually, the gay relativity of the novel turns Dr. Pozzi into a hero. At the end of the novel, the narrator says:

> Time spent in the distant, decadent, hectic, violent, narcissistic and neurotic Belle Époque has left me cheerful. Mainly because of the figure of Samuel Jean Pozzi. […] who filled his life with medicine, art, books, travel, society, politics and as much sex as possible (though all we cannot know). He was, thankfully, not without faults. But I would, nonetheless, put him forward as a kind of hero. (*TMRC*268)

Being a hero, is no longer associated with rationality, resilience, conservatism or the denial of emotionality. A hero, as the narrator says, is a person who, despite living in a chaotic world, manages to create a peaceful life for himself and others: "What is surprising, given the frenetic, rancorous, bitchy nature of the age, is how comparatively

few enemies he [Dr. Pozzi] made for much of his career" (*TMRC* 89). Considering his confusing social context, Dr. Pozzi, the narrator believes, deserves to be commemorated as a hero.

A similarly gradual sense of appreciation and recognition can be observed, through the development of the novel, in the behavior of the characters toward Dr. Pozzi. Though, at the beginning of the novel, Montesquieu looks down on Dr. Pozzi for his bourgeois background (*TMRC*23), toward the end, Montesquieu envies him. For Montesquiou, "Pozzi is not just someone he admires, but for whom he feels that most unfamiliar of emotions, envy. […] Montesquiou envied Pozzi his daily cheerfulness, his direct approach to life and his usefulness; but also the way his willpower controlled his temperament" (*TMRC*234). Dr. Pozzi seems to successfully transcend his own bourgeois background and constructs an honorable social life for himself. "As the century turns, Pozzi is in his prime. He is rich, famous and successful; he has been elected senator for the Dordogne and mayor of his village. […] He has many affairs, but has found a life companion in Emma Fischoff. He looks every inch a prime example of a successful man with his life held in balance between his delicate surgeon's hands" (*TMRC*178). As in the previous two novels, Barnes takes Pozzi's victimization for his non-French bourgeois origin as a chance to overstep racial boundaries and to question monocultural constructions of maleness. The way the novel challenges the assumption of the pure or true Frenchman obviates the need for defining an objective and reliable perception of the doctor's masculinity. Following the discussions on *Arthur & George,* we may say, *The Man in the Red Coat* is another "contact zone" for interactions between men of different nationalities and social classes. It is a moment of awakening that problematizes the old standards in masculinization, and questions the mythical perception of masculine identity in pre-war Europe. In this view, the traditional assumptions about masculinity prove to be insufficient and unreliable.

In short, Barnes' *The Man in the Red Coat* illustrates different types of men's "degenerated" selfhoods in the Belle Époque and provides a new perspective on the problem of masculinity in France. The novel orchestrates a wide variety of masculinities in a carnival space that creates a gay anti-authoritarian context for reversing sexual hierarchies, disturbing gender coherence and celebrating diversity in masculinization. Like a safety-valve, the carnival turns masculinity into a set of multiple illusory

appearances, and nullifies normalization attempts in the construction of masculinity. The novel's tolerance for marginalized patterns of manhood opens manliness to resignification, and proves it to have no ontological status apart from the dramatic acts which compose its reality. At the same time with creating continuity with factual accounts on gender traits in the Belle Époque, Barnes refuses to introduce us to a unitary and singular model of masculinity, and turns the assumption of gender markers in men into a play of rootless shadows that involves mutuality, reconciliation and interdependence between the seemingly opposite poles of the self and the Other. From Barnes' British viewpoint, the wondrous abundance and unconventionality in the assumption of French masculinity in the Belle Époque is a rich source of enlightenment that should be celebrated as the unique French heritage of festivity.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The present dissertation has contributed to masculinity studies regarding Barnes' fiction by exploring the representation of maleness in Barnes' biographical novels, *Arthur & George*, *The Noise of Time* and *The Man in the Red Coat*, all of which are set in the post-industrial era (in the late 19th and/ or early 20th centuries). Each analytical chapter in this dissertation has started with a historical and sociological review of the notions of masculinity at the time and place the respective novel is set in. These historical reviews have pointed to a common ground concerning the significance of supremacist and phallocentric ideologies in the construction of masculinity in England, Russia and France, and they have suggested that the discourse of masculinity works in these countries through highly similar mechanisms of binary oppositions and racial/ sexual hierarchies, insisting on the need for objectivity, rationality, self-reliance, and the denial of emotions in the construction of maleness.

The textual analyses conducted following the historical reviews in each chapter have indicated that Barnes' selected novels somehow align with historical records and they seem to present a realistic account of the gender norms and traits of the time for making references to historically-true points on the problem of masculinity in England, Russia and France. As in historical accounts, Barnes' protagonists are traditionally (and somewhat similarly, though to different extents) expected to practice the hierarchical stiff-upper-lip model of masculinity that marginalizes the non-Whites, others the non-males, and relegates the non-heterosexual men of the lower classes. By underlining hierarchical stereotypes in the masculinization process of Barnes' protagonists, the present dissertation questions the separatist social stratifications that favor antagonistic models of masculinity, and create the illusion of omnipotence in males to deny men's need for building humane relations with others.

Despite the constant struggle George, Arthur, Shostakovich and Dr. Pozzi make (usually at the initial stages of their masculinization process) to conform to the hegemonic model

of maleness in their own societies, at some points, the characters all feel disillusioned with manipulative masculine ideals, and they begin to question the naturalness of the common frameworks of maleness in order to break the toxic cycle of hyper-masculine behaviors that harms the protagonists themselves and the people around them; the in-between situation the characters experience in this process encourages them to go beyond the rigid stratifications, based on which traditional masculinity is constructed, and to resist the pre-existing gender ideologies; in this way they develop, at their own conscious will, more flexible or changeable patterns of manhood. The alternative male subjectivity that results from this resignification gradually transforms into an entity that stands in a more affirmative and effective relationship with the self, the surrounding world and the non-self, and thus helps the protagonists to achieve a quiet complete participation in selfhood.

As the textual studies on each novel have shown, the selected works of fiction heighten the reader's expectations about presenting realistic accounts of gender norms and traits by adopting phrases and lines from authentic documents, biographies, letters, and newspapers of their respective time and place, and by incorporating incidents and individuals adapted from the life stories of actual historical masculine figures in their characterization, plot and setting. Yet, as the present research has indicated, the selected novels of Barnes keep a critical distance from and go beyond the factual representations of maleness in order to question the claims to veracity in masculinization, and to promote multiplicity in the construction of masculinity. Rather than trying to find and hold on to the authentic pattern of manliness in the related sociocultural contexts, as this dissertation has shown, Barnes' narratives challenge the need for conformity to gender ideologies, and they highlight the notion of plurality in the assumption of gender markers. The narratives blur the border between the factual and the fictional accounts to engender a skeptical view about historical records and the representation of gender norms and traits in the seemingly-realistic accounts.

In his *Keeping an Eye Open*, Barnes talks about his own skepticism about referentiality in historical records, and explicates that the genre of biofiction is not truly "transformative" as "it too involve[s] choice, organization and imagination" (6-7). In spite of his frequent reference to factual information in his biofictions, Barnes approves that, as a novelist, he has been selective and creative in writing his works on historical

figures. Barnes elaborates further on this in his interview with Guignery, saying that before writing his biographical fiction, he does "a lot of research, yes, that's true. But… it's a mixture of principles and self-indulgence, you see. It's why it comes out as a novel. It's a mixture of not really approving of the biographical format, and also being a novelist in any case, and then also wanting to write about what you really want to write about" (54). What his selected biofictions account about the actual historical figures (Arthur Conan Doyle, Dmitri Shostakovich and Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi), their reactions to gender confusion, or the overall norms for the construction of maleness in their respective time and place, is a subjective account Barnes himself chooses to present to us, not necessarily the absolute truth about the manliness of these figures or the hegemonic masculinity of the time. The novelistic discourse in Barnes' biofictions, therefore, bring up discussions on the historically-untold black hole of emotions of the mentioned masculine figures in order to challenge the official discourses on the construction of manliness.

Following the methodology of historiographic metafiction that subverts the totalizing grand narratives of history, the present dissertation has explored each of the three biographical novels of Julian Barnes as one of the multilayered reflections of empirical reality where the text (or novel) involves plurality and, it does not really have the intention of representing historical contexts/situations about which the selected novel is written, with full accuracy. By drawing attention to the emphasis Barnes' biofictions put on the subjectivity of historical accounts and the unreliability of narrative, this thesis has suggested that it is almost impossible to get at the truth about maleness through exploring the life stories of real-life figures, or through examining historical accounts. Also, the poststructuralist and pro/feminist approaches this thesis takes toward the performativity of gender suggests equally strongly that there is perhaps no need to find a historically reliable pattern of masculinization in these narratives. Such sceptical notions about life-writing have paved the way, in this thesis, for debates on the unfinalizable, unverifiable and negotiable nature of masculinity, which also appears as multilayered and relational in the three discussed biofictions.

Through the explorations the present dissertation has made on the irrational, hyperreal, and ambivalent features of maleness, this study has shown masculinity as a sociocultural construct that may contradict the essentialist assumptions about the past ideals of

maleness and dispute the ideas on a secure superior masculine identity; this way it advocates diversity, mutuality and polyphony in masculinization. By reversing sexual/ social/ racial hierarchies, highlighting the internal conflicts of the protagonists and by juxtaposing and reconciling the opposites, Barnes' biofictions, as this study has demonstrated, point at the incoherent nature of maleness, and create inclusive contact zones in different sociocultural contexts to challenge ruling prejudices in the construction of manliness, and to develop reciprocal relationships between men and women of different social, racial and cultural backgrounds. The possibility for reconciliation presented in this dissertation has followed poststructuralist discussions on the fluidity of gender markers. In this view, Barnes' narratives have proved to promote tolerance toward the peripheral forms of masculine subjectivity.

At the same time that this study has highlighted the multiplicity of masculinities in Barnes' novels and examined the ways the narratives have reversed the hierarchies between the superior and threshold masculine features, it has also affirmed that men with marginalized patterns of maleness play a constructive role in the self-realization of the famous masculine figures, examples of which would be George's positive impact on the masculinization of Arthur in *Arthur & George*, women and femininity's prominent role in the masculinization of Shostakovich in *The Noise of Time*, and gay men's beneficial influence on Dr. Pozzi's social advancements in *The Man in the Red Coat*. Through examining blurred hierarchies and the possible inconsistencies in the assumption of masculinity in these novels, this dissertation has explored the idea that there is no final word or measuring stick in categorising or evaluating masculine behavioral traits in individuals. This critical approach to maleness turns masculinity into a modifiable heterogeneous construct that may oscillate between opposites; it has no biological essence or a rigid gender core to be preserved. This, as a result, questions the monologic discourses on manliness, and nullifies the claims to "manly" efforts as absurd and futile.

By reversing the widespread assumptions about common/ uncommon or manly/ unmanly masculine behaviors, Barnes' narratives affirm that every individual pattern in masculinization counts. Instead of blaming individuals for their nonconformity to the hegemonic models of masculinity, Barnes' novels question the discriminatory sociocultural systems that restrict individuals to illusory images of coherent masculine essence, and insist on maintaining these illusions. In this poststructuralist approach to

maleness, the expected ideal assumptions of masculinity prove to be simulated and discursively produced (rather than monolithic), and it is impossible to enact them. Through analyzing the uncertainties and the gender confusion Barnes' protagonists experience in the face of social changes in the post-industrial era, the present study has demonstrated that although in each novel, the respective official discourses try to alleviate the sense of insecurity among men (either by insisting on gender binaries or by applying gender control techniques and remasculinization policies), masculinity remains as a plural subjectivity that cannot be firmly shaped, disciplined or stabilized based on the narrow frameworks of patriarchal or racist discourses. The detailed textual analysis of Barnes' biofictions in this thesis have shown that all these novels similarly open the definition of masculinity to resignification and recontextualization, indicating maleness as a fluid and changeable (not fixed) entity, and they illustrate each individual as a heteroglossia of diverse masculinities, continually reconstructing their own understanding of gender markers in negotiation with the surrounding people and society.

Despite the similarities discussed so far in the representation of masculinity in the biofictions of Barnes, it has been observed that they also differ from each other in some aspects: Compared to the dictatorial and oppressive atmosphere in *The Noise of Time,* the chances that exist in Barnes' novels for negotiating or modifying masculinization trends are relatively high in the pragmatic context of Britain in *Arthur & George,* and even much stronger in the experimental context of France in *The Man in the Red Coat*. At the same time that this difference can be taken as a testimony to the assumptions of masculinity as a social construct, it verifies that even in a dictatorial context (such as *The Noise of Time*) there are chances for individuals to actively challenge gender ideologies and enact maleness differently, though to different extents. This leads to the other difference that exists in the narrative style of the novels: the wider the opportunity the sociocultural context provides the characters for innovation in assuming their own gender markers, the less the respective novel focuses on their internal thoughts. In *The Man in the Red Coat,* for example, Barnes's narrative on Dr. Pozzi is continually interrupted by a large body of letters, pictures, intertextual references to different literary or philosophical resources and historical figures of the time to the extent that Dr. Pozzi's life is sometimes presented only in short glimpses. This contrasts with Barnes' predominant use of the interior monologue in *The Noise of Time* for exploring the psychological truth about Shostakovich and his assumption of manhood. Yet, in both

novels, Barnes' narratives manage to convey almost the same message about the possibility for innovation in masculinization. This way, Barnes seems to convey the idea that in totalitarian societies where individual men are socially atomized and silenced, without gaining insight into individuals' thought processes, one cannot detect traces of transformation and change in their lives and their perception of gender markers. It is through focusing on the mental process of his protagonist that we can learn about his breaking away from the authoritarian ruling system and his attempt to express his own individuality.

Although this thesis has tried to merge literary studies on Barnes' biofictions with sociological, psychological and pro/feminist approaches to arrive at an intersectional understanding of maleness, I believe that studying the novels more extensively from each single perspective can be a topic to be explored in further comparative studies. For instance, the present dissertation has touched upon psychological aspects in assuming masculinity briefly, but a comprehensive psychological study could elaborate more on repressed male sexuality or the roots of masculine desire for domination or autonomy.
Also, in investigating the problem of masculinity, the primary concern of the present study was the concerns of the male protagonists. In doing so, some significant points were missed about the marginalized silenced characters of the novels (such as George's mother in *Arthur & George*, or Dr. Pozzi's wife in *The Man in the Red Coat*) that require further explorations and go beyond the present focus of this dissertation. Further studies could also compare Barnes' representation of Russian or French masculinities with similar works written by novelists originally from Russia or France to see what kinds of differences and similarities there are between them and what such a comparison may suggest about gender construction in general and the representation of these through literature.

Future studies may also compare and contrast the anxiety of masculinity and the prevalence of supremacist ideology in the late 19th centuries with what the contemporary neoliberalist and capitalist social institutions promote about manliness in order to find similarities and differences between the ways ruling ideologies take in each historical era to categorize and homogenize the personality traits of men and women. Such a study may arrive at more complicated alternative democratic behavioral patterns for masculinization. The claims the present dissertation has made about neoliberalism and

capitalism and their essentialist assumption of masculinity, need to be supported with lots of evidence from relevant resources which could be a topic to be explored in another study on Barnes's works. Last but not least, considering the considerable lack in masculinity studies in fiction, further similar studies could focus comparatively on other novelists and the representation of male protagonists in their work.

REFERENCES

Accampo, Elinor, and Christopher E. Forth. "Introduction: Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France". *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 1-14.

Adams, James. "In New Novel, Julian Barnes Tests the Noise of Time Through Art and Biography". *The Globe and Mail*, 2016. https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/books-and-media/in-newnovel-julian-barnes-tests-the-noise-of-time-through-art-and-biography/article30260780/ [Last accessed 15 April 2020].

Adams, Rachel, and David Savran. *The Masculinity Studies Reader*. Blackwell, 2002.

Allardice, Lisa. "Interview Julian Barnes: 'Do you expect Europe to cut us a good deal? It's so childish'". *The Guardian*. 2019, October 26 https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/oct/26/julian-barnes-europe-deal-interview-man-red-coat

Andrews, Jonathan, and Ann Digby. *Sex and Seclusion, Class and Custody Perspectives on Gender and Class in the History of British and Irish Psychiatry*. Clio Medica, Volume: 73.

Antakyalioglu, Zekiye. "Julian Barnes's The Noise of Time as a Narrative of Trauma". *Pamukkale University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*. 2018, pp. 381-386. DOI: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/476162

Ashe, Fidelma. *The New Politics of Masculinity: Men, power and resistance*. Routledge, 2007.

Baker, et al. *The French Revolution and the Creation of Modern Political Culture*, vol. 4, Pergamon, 1991-1994.

Balbus, Isaac D. "Masculinity and the (M)other: Toward a synthesis of Feminist Mothering Theory and Psychoanalytic Theories of Narcissism". Ed. Gardiner, Kegan J., *Masculinity Studies & Feminist Theories.* Columbia University Press, 2002, pp. 210-234.

Bantman, Constance, and Charlotte Faucher. "'French lady seeks...': finding work as a French governess inlate Victorian and Edwardian England (1870–1914)".

Women's History Review. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group, 2023, VOL. 32, NO. 3, 271–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/09612025.2022.2125634

Barnes, Julian. *Arthur & George.* Jonathan Cape, 2005.

---. *A History of the World in 10 1/2 Chapters.* Random House of Canada, 1989.

---. "Candles for the Living: Julian Barnes in Bulgaria". *London Review of Books*, 12:22 22 November 1990.

---. *Cross Channel.* Jonathan Cape, 1996.

---. *Flaubert's Parrot.* Jonathan Cape, 1984.

--- *Something to Declare: Essays on France and French Culture.* Vintage ebooks, 2003.

---. *The Noise of Time.* Jonathan Cape, 2016.

Barsham, Diana. *Arthur Conan Doyle and the Meaning of Masculinity*. Routledge: 2016.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Glaser. University of Michigan Press, 1994.

BBC-Newsnight interview. "Julian Barnes: The FULL INTERVIEW - BBC Newsnight". *Youtube.* Feb 7, 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gBAgKTtZMMQ

Bell, Susan, and Karen Offen. *Women, the Family, and Freedom: The Debate in Documents, Volume I, 1880-1950*. Stanford University Press, 1983.

Berberich, Christine. "'All Letters Quoted Are Authentic': The Past After Postmodern Fabulation in Julian Barnes' *Arthur & George*". *Julian Barnes: Contemporary Critical Perspectives.* Ed. Groes, Sebastian, and Peter Childs. Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011.

---. "England? Whose England? (Re)constructing English identities in Julian Barnes and W. G. Sebald". *National Identities.* 10:2: University of Derby, 2008, pp. 167-184, https://doi.org/10.1080/14608940801997242

Berenson, Edward. *The Trial of Madame Caillaux*. University of California Press, 1992.

Berlanstein, Lenard. "Ready for Progress? Opinion Surveys on Women's Roles and Opportunities in Belle Époque France". *French Politics, Culture & Society*. 2009. 27: 1–22. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42843578

Berlant, Lauren. *The queen of America goes to Washington City: Essays on so: and dtipenship.* Duke University Press, 1997.

Berlatsky, Eric. "'Madame Bovary, c'est moi!': Julian Barnes's 'Flaubert's Parrot' and Sexual 'Perversion'". *Twentieth Century Literature*. Duke University Press, 2009. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25733406

Bertaud, Jean-Paul. "Military Virility," *A History of Virility*, ed. Alain Corbin et al., trans. Keith Cohen. Columbia University Press, 2016, pp. 303–24.

Bhabha, *The Location of Culture.* Routledge, 2004.

Bly, Robert. *Iron John: A Book About Men.* 25th Anniversary Edition. DA Capo Press, 2015.

Bollinger, Elena. "'Life Comes as Spring Comes, From All Sides': Constructing and Reconstructing Silence in The Noise of Time". *Sociology Study*, March 2018, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 138-145. DOI: 10.17265/2159-5526/2018.03.004

Bonnell, Marilyn. "Sarah Grand and the Critical Establishment: Art for [Wo]man's Sake". *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature*. Spring, 1995, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 123-148.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Forms of Capital". Ed. Richardson, John. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Greenwood, 1986, pp. 241-58.

Boyd, Stephen. *The Men We Long' to Be: Beyond Domination to a New Christian Understanding of Manhood.* HarperSanFrancisco, 1995.

Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious masculinity in early modern England*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Brenton, Myron. *The American Male.* Fawcett Premier, 1966.

Brittan, Arthur. *Masculinity and Power*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

Brod, Harry. "The Construction of the Construction of Masculinities". Ed. Horlacher S.. *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 19-32. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137015877_2

Broom, Martha. "Constructing an Identity Of 'Relation' In Régine Robin's 'L'immense Fatigue Des Pierres.'" *Romance Notes*, Volume 48, Number 3, 2008, pp. 335-343. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/471934/summary

Buisine, Alan. "La Biographique". *Revue des Sciences Humaines*. 224/1991, pp. 7-13.

Buckle, Stephen. "British Sceptical Realism. A Fresh Look at the British Tradition". *European Journal of Philosophy*. April 1999, pp. 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0378.00071

Burke, Peter. "The Invention of Leisure in Early Modern Europe". *Past & Present.* No. 146. Oxford University Press: Feb., 1995, pp. 136-150.

Burton, Antoinette. *At the Heart of the Empire*. University of California Press, 1998.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 2006.

Buxton, Jakie. "Julian Barnes's Theses on History (In 10½ Chapters)". *Contemporary Literature*, University of Wisconsin Press, spring 2000, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 56-86. http://www.jstor.com/stable/1208964.

Caballero, Chamion. "Interraciality in Early Twentieth Century Britain: Challenging Traditional Conceptualisations through Accounts of 'Ordinariness'". *Geneology*, 3(2), 21, 2019, pp. 1-24. https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy3020021

Calafat, Caterina. "Je Sois Autre Moy-Mesmes: Generic Blending and French Heritage in Julian Barnes's Levels of Life*". Canadian Review of Comparative Literature / Revue Canadienne de Littérature Comparée*, Volume 43, Issue 3, Septembre 2016, pp. 461-476. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/crc.2016.0036.

Cameron, Deborah. "Performing Gender Identity: Young Men's Talk and the Constmction of Heterosexual Masculinity". *Language and Gender: A reader*. Ed. Jennifer Coates. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd., 1998, pp. 270-84.

Carrigan, Tim & Connell, Bob & Lee, John. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity". Ed. Harry Brod. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies.* Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1985, pp. 91-97.

Carroll, Bret E. "The Religious Construction of Masculinity in Victorian America: The Male Mediumship of John Shoebridge Williams". *Religion and American Culture*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1997, pp. 27–60, https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.1997.7.1.03a00020

Carter, Philip. *Men and the Emergence of Polite Society: Britain, 1660–1800*. Oxford, 2001.

Carter, Cynthia, et. al. *The Routledge Companion to Media & Gender*. Routledge, 2014.

Cavalie, Elsa. "Constructions of Englishness in Julian Barnes's *Arthur & George*". *American, British and Canadian Studies* 13. 2009, pp. 88-100

ESCAC DOCS. "Converses a la Pedrera - Julian Barnes". *Youtube.* Video recorded interview. Feb. 3, 2013. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oexg0NODrL8.

Cherlin, Michael. *Varieties of Musical Irony: From Mozart to Mahler*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316493441

Childs, Peter. *Julian Barnes*. Manchester University Press, 2013.

Ciliotta-Rubery, Andrea. "Gender and Fathers: The Rejection of Spiritual Fathers in Machiavelli's Castruccio Castracani of Lucca". *Journal of Political Science.* Vol. 28. No. 1. 2000, pp. 83-104.

Clare, Anthony. *On Men: The Crisis of Masculinity*. Chatto & Windus, 2000.

Clark, Christopher. *The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914*. Penguin Books, 2012.

Clark, Jonathan R. "Review: *The Noise of Time* by Julian Barnes". *The Georgia Review*, Vol. 70, No. 4. 2016, pp. 847-851. URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/44077776

Colin, Jones. *The Cambridge Illustrated History of France (1st ed.).* Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Colley, Helen. “A ‘Rough Guide’ to the History of Mentoring from a Marxist Feminist Perspective”. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy·* November 2002, https://doi.org/10.1080/0260747022000021403

Connell, Robert W. *Masculinities*. University of California Press, 1995.

---. *The Men and the Boys*. Allen & Unwin, NSW, 2000.

Connell, Robert W., and James Messerschmidt. “Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept”. *Gender & Society, 19*, 2005, pp. 829–859. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639

Cook, Matt. *London and the Culture of Homosexuality, 1885–1914*. Cambridge, 2003.

Cornwall, Andrea, et al.. *Masculinities under neoliberalism*. Zed Books, 2016.

Cramb, John. A. *Reflections on the Origins and Destiny of Imperial Britain.* Macmillan, 1900.

Culbertson, Philip. *New Adam: The Future of Male Spirituality*. Fortress Press, 1992.

Curry-Stevens, Ann, and Amanda Cross-Hemmer. *Communities of color in Multnomah County: An unsettling profile*. OR, 2010.

Darley, John M. “Social Organization for the Production of Evil”. *Political Psychology: key Readings.* Ed. Jost, John T. Psychology Press, 2004.

Datta, Venita. “From Devil’s Island to the Pantheon? Alfred Dreyfus, the Anti-Hero”. Ed. Accampo, Elinor, and Christopher E. Forth. *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Davidoff, Leonore. “The Legacy of the Nineteenth-Century Bourgeois Family and the Wool Merchant’s Son”. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 14, 2004, pp. 25-46.

De Visser, Richard, et al. “‘That’s not masculine’ Masculine Capital and Health-related Behaviour”. *Journal of Health Psychology*: SAGE Publications. Vol 14(7). 2009, pp. 1047–1058.

Deane, Bradley. *Masculinity and the New Imperialism: Rewriting Manhood in British Popular Literature, 1870–1914*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought: An introductory reader*. Routledge, 1995.

Dillon, Andrew. "Collecting as routine human behavior: motivations for identity and control in the material and digital world". *Information & Culture*· October 2019. https://doi.org/10.7560/IC54301

Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Trans. W D Halls.

University of Chicago Press, 1892.

Dworkin, Andrea. *Woman Hating*. Penguin, 1974.

Einhorn, Barbara. "Mass Dictatorship and Gender Politics: Is the Outcome Predictable?" Ed. Lim, Jei-Hyun, and Karen Petron. *Gender Politics and Mass Dictatorship: Global Perspectives*. Palgrave McMillan, 2010, pp. 34-62.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. "The Decline of Patriarchy". *Constructing Masculinity*. Ed. Berger, Maurice et al. Routledge, 1995, pp. 284-290.

Epitropaki, Olga, and Robin Martin. "Implicit Leadership Theories in Applied Settings: Factor Structure, Generalizability, and Stability Over Time". *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 89, No. 2, 2004, pp. 293–310. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230283275_3

Everts, William Wallace. *Manhood: Its Duties and Responsibilities*. Hull, 1854.

Fairclough, Pauline. "The Russian Revolution and Music". *Twentieth-Century Music*. 16(1), 2019, pp. 157–164. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1478572219000148

Fanning, David. *Shostakovich Studies*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1995.

Fathallah, Judith M. "Moriarty's Ghost: Or the Queer Disruption of the BBC's Sherlock'". *Television & New Media 16* (5), 2014, pp. 490–500.

Ferrebe, Alice. "Credit for Confession — Gendered Addressivity in the Contemporary Male-Authored Novel". *Masculinity in Male-Authored Fiction, 1950–2000*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2005, pp. 152–194.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. “Culture and Politics under Stalin: A Reappraisal”. *Slavic Review*, vol. 35, no. 2, 1976, pp. 211-231.

---. *Everyday Stalinism: Ordinary Life in Extraordinary Times*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2003.

Fletcher, Anthony. “Patriotism, the Great War and the Decline of Victorian Manliness”. *The Historical Association and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.* 2014, pp: 40-73.

Ferry, Peter. *Masculinity in Contemporary New York Fiction*. Routledge, 2015.

Foley, Susan. K. *Women in France since 1789: The Meanings of Difference*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

Forth, Christopher E. *The Dreyfus Affair and the Crisis of French Manhood.* The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books, 1977.

Freiburg, Rudolf. “’That was what all men became: techniques for survival’: The Paradoxical Notion of Survival in Julian Barnes’s *The Noise of Time*”. Ed. Freiburge, Rudolf & Bayer, Gerd. *The Ethics of Survival in Contemporary Literature and Culture*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2021, pp. 133-166.

---. “‘Novels Come Out of Life, Not Out of Theories’: An Interview with Julian Barnes”. Ed. Guignery, Vanessa, et al. *Conversations with Julian Barnes.* University Press of Mississippi, 2009, pp. 31-52.

Freidin, Gregory. “The Whisper of History and the Noise of Time in the Writings of Osip Mandelstam”. *The Russian Review*, Vol, 37, No: 4. 1978. pp: 421-437. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/128508

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. W. W. Norton.1963.

Friedman, Dustin. *Before Queer Theory: Victorian Aestheticism and the Self*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019.

Galbraith, John S. “The pamphlet campaign on the Boer war”. *Journal of Modern History*, 1952, pp. 111–26.

Gammel, Irene. *Sexualizing Power in Naturalism: Theodor Dreiser and Fredrik Philip Grove*. University of Calgary Press, 1994.

Gediman, K. Helen. "Premodern, Modern, and Postmodern Perspectives on Sex and Gender Mixes". Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association. JaPa, 2004, pp. 1059-1078.

Gerhard, Ute, and Valentine Meunier. "Civil law and gender in nineteenth-century Europe". *Clio. Women, Gender, History , No. 43, Gender and the Citizen*. 2016, pp. 250-275.

Gerstel, Jennifer. "Irony, Deception, and Political Culture in the Works of Dmitri Shostakovich". *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal*, vol. 32, no. 4, 1999, pp. 35-51.

Ghosh, Durba. "Gender and Colonialism: Expansion or Marginalization?". *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 3, 2004, pp. 737-755. https://www.jstor.org/stable/4091763

Giddens, A. *The third way*. Cambridge, Polity, 1998.

Gilmour, Julie, and Barbara E. Clements. "'If You Want to Be Like Me, Train!': the Contradictions of Soviet Masculinity". Ed. Clements, Barbara E.; Friedman, Rebecca; Healey, Dan. *Russian Masculinities in History and Culture*. Palgrave, 2002.

Glass, Becky, and Margaret Stolee. "Family Law in Soviet Russia, 1917-1945". *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Nov., Vol. 49, No. 4. 1987, pp. 893-902.

Glazov, Yuri. *To Be or Not to Be in the Party Communist Party Membership in the USSR*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.

Glikman, Isaak. *Story of a friendship: the letters of Dmitry Shostakovich to Isaak Glikman, 1941-1975/ with a commentary by Isaak Glikman*. Trans.by Phillips, Anthony. 1st ed. Cornell University Press, 2001.

Goffman, Erving. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harvard University Press, 1974.

Goldrick-Jones, Amanda. "Men and Feminism: Relationships and Differences". *Gender, Race, and Nation: A Global Perspective*. Ed. Dhruvarajan, Vanaja. University of Toronto Press, 2002, pp. 184-204. https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442675193-010

--- *Men who Believe in Feminism.* Greenwood Publishing Group, 2002.

Goode, Mike. "Knowing seizures: Julian Barnes, Jean-Paul Sartre, and the erotics of the postmodern condition". *Textual Practice* 19, 2005, pp. 149-171.

Grand, Sarah. *The Heavenly Twins.* University of Michigan Press, 1893.

Graves, Robert. *Goodbye to All That.* Jonathan Cape & Harrison Smith, 1929.

Grew, Raymond, and Patrick J. Harrigan. "The Catholic Contribution to Universal Schooling in France, 1850-1906". *Journal of Modern History 57.2*. 1985, pp. 211-247.

Griffiths, Paul. *The String Quartet.* Bath: The Pitman Press, 1983.

Griffin, Penny. "Gendering Global Finance: Crisis, Masculinity and Responsibility". *Men and Masculinities*. 2012, pp. 9-34.

Guignery, Vanessa. *The Fiction of Julian Barnes.* Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Guignery, Vanessa, and Ryan Roberts. *Conversations with Julian Barnes*. University Press of Mississippi, 2009.

Gullace, Nicoletta. *The Blood of Our Sons: Men, Women and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship During the Great.* Palgrave, 2002.

Guppy, Shusha. "Julian Barnes: The Art of Fiction CLXV". *Conversations with Julian Barnes.* Ed. Guignery, Vanessa, et al. University Press of Mississippi, 2009.

Hacking, Ian. *Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses*. University Press of Virginia, 1998.

Hall, Stuart. "Keynote Lecture at *The Missing Chapter*". May 2008, Autograph ABP, Rivington Place [unpublished]).

Hansen, Per Krogh. "Reconsidering the unreliable narrator". *Semiotica*, 2007, pp. 227–246. https://doi.org/10.1515/SEM.2007.041

Harling-Lee, K. "Caught in the Regime: Classical Music and the Individual in the Contemporary Novel". *Open Library of Humanities*. 7(2): 5, 2021, pp. 1–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.4685

Hause, Steven, and Anne Kenney. *Women's Suffrage and Social Politics in the French Third Republic*. Princeton University Press, 1984.

Hearn, Jeff. "Autobiography, nation, postcolonialism and gender relations: reflecting on men in England, Finland and Ireland". *Irish Journal of Sociology* ISSN 0791-6035. Vol. 14(2) 2005, pp. 66-93.

Hearn, Jeff, and Keith Pringle. *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Approaches*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2006.

Heuer, Jennifer. N. "Citizenship, the French Revolution, and the Limits of Martial Masculinity". Ed. Fuchs Rachel, and Anne Epstein. *Gender and Citizenship in Transnational Perspective*. 2016, pp. 19-38.

Hickey, Michael C. *Competing voices from the Russian Revolution fighting words*. Greenwood, 2011.

Hobbes, Alex. "Masculinity Studies and Literature". *Literature Compass*. Volume10, Issue 4. Wiley-Blackwell, 2013, pp. 383-395. https://doi.org/10.1111/lic3.12057

Hoffmann, David. *Stalinism: The Essential Readings*. Berlin: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Holmes, Diana, and Carrie Tarr. "New Republic, New Women?: Feminism and Modernity at the Belle Epoque". *A Belle Epoque?: Women in French Society and Culture, 1890-1914*, ed. Holmes, Diana, and Carrie Tarr. Berghahn, 2006, pp. 11-22. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780857457011-004

Holmes, Frederick Michael. *Julian Barnes*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

hooks, bell. *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity and Love*. Washington Square Press, 2004.

Hopkins, Patrick. "Gender Treachery: Homophobia, Masculinity, and Threatened Identities". Ed., Seidler, Victor. *Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism, Second Edition*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1996, pp. 95-118.

Hoquet, Thierry. "Is Sociobiology Amendable? Feminist and Darwinian women biologists confront the paradigm of sexual selection". *Diogenes*, 57(1), 2010, pp. 113–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192110369426

Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody***.** Methuen, 1985.

Huysmans, Joris-Karl. *À rebours.* Charpentier, 1884.

Irigaray, Luce. "The Bodily Encounter with the Mother". *The Irigaray Reader*. Ed. Margaret Whitford. Blackwell, 1991.

Jeffers, Jennifer M. "Embodying Lost Masculinity in *Waiting for Godot*". *Beckett's Masculinity*. St. Martin's Press LLC, 2009, pp: 95-118.

Johnson, Allen. *Unraveling- our Patriarchal Legacy***.** Temple University Press, 1997.

Jones, Paul. *Raymond Williams's Sociology of Culture: A Critical Reconstruction.* Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

Jordan, Ana. *The New Politics of Fatherhood: Men's Movements and Masculinities*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

"Julian Barnes' Interview". Apr 16, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-6AVtDsCtxk&t=658s on 08-05-2020.

Kapoor, Nisha. "The advancement of racial neoliberalism in Britain". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Vol. 36:6. 2013, pp. 1028-1046. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2011.629002

Kaufman, Michael. "Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power". *Theorizing Masculinities.* Sage, Thousand Oaks, 1994, pp. pp. 142-164. https://www.michaelkaufman.com/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/men_feminism.pdf

Keener, John F. *Biography and the Postmodern Historical Novel*. Mellen, 2001.

Kestner, Joseph. *Sherlock's Men: Masculinity, Conan Doyle, and Cultural History*. Ashgate, 1997.

Khan Anisur, et al. "Masculinity and Suicide in Bangladesh". OMEGA—*Journal of Death and Dying*. 2020, pp. 1-23. 10.1177/0030222820966239 journals.sagepub.com/home/ome

Kholopov, Yuriy. "Form in Shostakovich's instrumental works". Ed. Fanning, David. *Shostakovich Studies*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1995.

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

--- "The Contemporary 'Crisis' of Masculinity in Historical Perspective". Ed. Brod, Harry. *The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Routledge, 2015.

Kingsley, Susan. *Gender and Power in Britain, 1640–1990.* Routledge, 1999.

Kirpikli, Deniz. "Irony and (Dis)Obedience to Authority in Julian Barnes's The Noise of Time". *CUJHSS*. Çankaya University. 2020, pp. 263-76.

Knott, Sarah. "Narrating the Age of Revolution," *William and Mary Quarterly 73*. 1, 2016, pp. 3–36.

Koprivova, Monika. "Women Characters in Arthurian Literature". Thesis submitted to Masaryk University, Brno. 2007.

Kosmala, Katarzyna. "The Identity Paradox? Reflections on Fluid Identity of Female Artist". *Culture and Organization,* 13:1. 2007, pp. 37-53. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759550601167271

Kovacs, Andras B. "Sartre, the Philosophy of Nothingness, and the Modern Melodrama". *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism.* Winter, Vol. 64, No. 1, 2006, pp. 135-145.

Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Trans: Waller, Margaret. Columbia University Press. 1984.

Lacan, Jacques. "The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious or Reason Since Freud". *Ecrits: The First Complete Edition In English.* Trans: Fink Bruce & Grigg, Russell. W.W. Norton and Company. 2006, pp. 412-443.

Lackey, Michael. *Biographical Fiction: A Reader*. Bloomsbury Academic, 2017.

---. "Locating and Defining the Bio in Biofiction." *Biography Studies,* vol. 31, no. 1, 2016, pp. 3-10.

Lapidus, Gail Warshofsky. *Women in Soviet Society Equality, Development, and Social Change*. University of California Press, 1978.

Laqueur, Walter. "Fin-de-siecle: Once More with Feeling". *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 31, No. 1, Jan., 1996, pp. 5- 47.

Linsley, Brett. “Feeble to Effeminacy: Race and Gender in the British Imperial Consciousness 1837-1901”. *Grand Valley Journal of History*, Vol. 2: Iss. 2, 2013, pp. 1-11. https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/gvjh/vol2/iss2/1

Loliée, Frédéric. “Comme elles nous jugent!”, *La Revue des revues,* 1 April 1898, pp. 7-18.

Low, Jennifer. *Manhood and the Duel: Masculinity in Early Modern Drama and Culture.* Macmillan, 2003.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Mafi, Malcolm. “The Crisis of Masculinity and the Outbreak of the First World War.” *Journal of the History Student at San Fransisco State University* 25, 2016, pp. 154-172. https://sfsu.app.box.com/s/2x1sywc6gll8p3m7ar21h4r8jn65yto9/file/915875399080

Malia, Martin. *Russia Under Western Eyes: from the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum.* The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

Mandelstam, Osip. *The noise of time: the prose of Osip Mandelstam*. Trans. Brown, Clarence. North Point Press, 1986.

Mangan, James. A. “Duty unto death: English masculinity and militarism in the age of the new imperialism”. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*. 12:2, 1995, pp. 10-38. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523369508713893

Manning, Frederic. *The Middle Parts of Fortune*. The Piazza Press, 1929.

Mansker, Andrea. “Shaming Men: Feminist Honor and the Sexual Double Standard in Belle Époque France”. Accampo, Elinor, and Christopher E. Forth. *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. pp.169-191. 10.1057/9780230246843_9

Manstead, Antony S. R. “The psychology of social class: How socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour”. British Journal of Social Psychology. 57, 2018, pp. 267–291. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5901394/pdf/BJSO-57-267.pdf

March, Michael. “Into the Lion’s Mouth: A conversation with Julian Barnes”. Ed. Guignery, Vanessa, and Ryan Roberts. *Conversations with Julian Barnes.* Mississippi, the University Press of Mississippi, 2009.

Marx, Karl. *Capital*, vol. I. Penguin Books, 1976. (Originally 1867).

Marx, Karl & Engel, Fredrick. *The Communist Manifesto*. 1st ed. Progress Publishers, 1848.

Maza, Sarah. *The Myth of the French Bourgeoisie. An Essay on the Social Imaginary, 1750-1850.* Harvard University Press, 2005.

McCreless, Patrick. “The Cycle of Structure and the Cycle of Meaning in the Piano Trio E minor, Op. 67”. Ed. Fanning, David. *Shostakovich Studies*. Cambridge University Press, 1995, pp. 113-136.

McDevitt, Patrick. *May the Best Man Win Sport, Masculinity, and Nationalism in Great Britain and the Empire, 1880–1935*. Palgrave, 2004.

McMillan, James. *France and Women 1789-1914: Gender, Society and Politics.* Routledge, 2000. pp. 145-148.

Messner, Michael. *Men Freeing Men*. *Changing Men*. Jersey City: New Atlantis Press, 1985. McLaren, Angus. *Trials of Masculinity: Policing Sexual Boundaries, 1870–1930*. University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Merriman, John. *Massacre: The Life and Death of the Paris Commune by John Merriman.* Basic Books, 2014.

Mesch, Rachel. “A New Man for the New Woman? Men, Marriage, and Feminism in the Belle Epoque”. *Historical Reflections*. Winter 2012, 38: 85–106.

Mir Zohair, Husain & Scott, Liebertz. “Hitler, Stalin, and Authoritarianism: A Comparative Analysis”. *The Journal of Psychohistory.* 47 (1) Summer 2019, pp. 18-36.

Morgan, David. “CLASS AND MASCULINITY”. Ed. Michael S. Kimmel, Jeff Hearn & R. W. Connell. *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities*. SAGE Publications, Inc. 2005, pp. 165-177. https://uk.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-assets/5179_book_item_5179.pdf

Moseley, Merritt. *Understanding Julian Barnes*. Paperback ed., University of South Carolina Press, 2009.

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

Mowlabocus, Sharif. *Gaydar Culture: Gay Men, Technology and Embodiment in the Digital Age.* Routledge, 2016.

Muhlstein, Anka, *A Taste For Freedom: The Life of Astolphe de Custine*. Trans: Waugh, Teresa. Helen Marx Books, 1999.

Mullaly, Bob. *Challenging Oppression: A Critical Social Work Approach*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema". *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings.* Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP, 1975, pp. 833-44.

Nasson, Bill. *The South African War 1899-1902*. Oxford University Press, 1999.

Nayebpour, Karam. "Representation of Trauma as a Political Apparatus in Julian Barnes's *The Noise of Time*". *IUP Journal of English Studies*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 2017, pp. 7-24. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3220197

Newman, Saul. "Power, Freedom and Obedience in Foucault and La Boe´ tie: Voluntary Servitude as the Problem of Government". *Theory, Culture & Society*. Vol. 39(1), 2021, pp. 123–144. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/02632764211024333

Newton, Joy. "The Atelier Novel: Painters as Fiction". Ed. Richard Hobbes, *Impressions of French Modernity*. UBC Press, 1998, pp. 173-189.

Nye, Robert A. *Masculinity and Male Codes of Honor in Modern France*. Oxford University Press, 1993.

O'Boyle, Lenore. "The Problem of an Excess of Educated Men in Western Europe, 1800-1850". *JMH* 42, no. 4. Dec. 1970, pp. 471-495.

Offen, Karen. "Is the 'Woman Question' Really the 'Man Problem'?" Accampo, Elinor & Forth, Christopher E. *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 43-62.

Olsen, Stephanie. “Raising Fathers, Raising Boys: Informal Education and Enculturation in Britain, 1880-1914”. PhD Thesis submitted to Department of History, McGill University, Montreal, September, 2008.

Outram, Dorinda. *Panorama of the Enlightenment*. Getty Publications, 2006.

Palmer, Robert Roswell. *A history of Europe in the modern world*. Colton, Joel, Kramer, Lloyd S. 2013.

Pateman, Matthew. *Julian Barnes*. Northcote House in Association with the British Council, 2002.

Patterson, Anthony. “Naturalism, Female Evil and the Body: A Comparative Study of Emile Zola’s Nana and Henrik Ibsen’s Hedda Gabler”. *Transgressive Womanhood: Investigating Vamps, Witches, Whores, Serial Killers and Monsters*. Inter-Disciplinary Press, 2014, pp. 101-109.

Pavlik-Malone, Lisa. *Minding Dolls: An Exercise in Archetype and Ideal.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018.

Pease, Bob. *Recreating Men. Postmodern Masculinity Politics.* SAGE Publications Ltd., 2000.

--- *Undoing Privilege: Unearned Advantage in a Divided World*. Zed Books, 2010.

--- “Beyond The Father Wound: Memory-Work And The Deconstruction Of The Father-son Relationship”. *A.N.Z.J. Fam. Ther*. Vol. 21, No. 1, 2000, pp 9-15.

Petersen, Alan. *Unmasking the Masculine: Men and ‘Identity’ in a Sceptical Age.* SAGE Publications Ltd. 1998.

Petrone, Karen. “Between Exploitation and Empowerment: Soviet Women Negotiate Stalinism”. Ed. Jie-Hyun, Lim & Ptrone, Karen. *Gender Politics and Mass Dictatorship: Global Perspectives*. Palgrave MacMillan, 2010, pp. 125-141.

Petron, Karen, and Jei-Hyun Lim. *Gender Politics and Mass Dictatorship: Global Perspectives*. Palgrave McMillan, 2010.

Pratt, Dale J. *Signs of Science: Literature, Science, and Spanish Modernity since 1868.* Purdue Studies in Romance Literatures Series. West Lafayette, 2001.

Pridemore, William Alex. “Heavy Drinking and Suicide in Russia”. *Social Forces*, Volume 85. 2006, pp. 413–430.

Pronger, Brian. “On Your Knees: Carnal Knowledge, Masculine Dissolution, Doing Feminism”. Ed. Digby, Tom. *Men Doing Feminism*. Routledge, 1998, pp. 69-80.

Proust, Marcel. *In Search of Lost Time*. Grasset and Gallimard, 1913.

Ramday, Morna. *Man up: A study of gendered expectations of masculinities at the fin de siècle*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Rebry, Natasha. “Playing the Man: Manliness and Mesmerism in Richard Marsh’s *The Beetle*”. *Gothic Studies*, Manchester University Press. Vo. 18, No. 1, May 2016, pp. 1-15.

Rectenwald, Michael. *Nineteenth-Century British Secularism: Science, Religion, and Literature*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

“RedStockings Manifesto”. New York: 1969. From https://www.redstockings.org/index.php/rs-manifesto

Reed, Matt, T. “From *aliéné* to *dégénéré*: Moral Agency and the Psychiatric Imagination in Nineteenth-Century France”. Ed. Accampo, Elinor & Forth, Christopher E. *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 67-89.

Reinach, Joseph. *Histoire de l’Affaire Dreyfus,* Vol. 2. Editions Robert Laffont, 2006

Risinger, D. Michael. “Boxes in Boxes: Julian Barnes, Conan Doyle, Sherlock Holmes and the Edalji Case”. *International Commentary on Evidence*. Volume 4, no. 2, 2007. https://doi.org/10.2202/1554-4567.1044

Roberts, Andrew Michael. *Conrad and Masculinity*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2000.

Roberts, Ryan. “Inventing a Way to the Truth: Life and Fiction in Julian Barnes’s *Flaubert’s Parrot*”. Ed. Groes, Sebastian, and Peter Childs. *JULIAN BARNES: Contemporary Critical Perspectives.* Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011, pp. 24-36.

Robinson, Geroid. T. “Stalin’s Vision of Utopia: The Future Communist Society”. *The Symposium of Ideology and Reality in the Soviet System.* Columbia University. Nov. 11, 1954, pp. 11-21.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. *Emile, or On Education*. Trans. Allan Bloom. New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Rutherford, J. "At War". *Cultural Studies*. Vol. 19, no. 5, 2005, pp. 622-642.

Sassoon, Siegfried. *Memoirs of an Infantry Officer*. Coward, McCann Inc., 1930.

Sawyer, Jack. "On Male Liberation". *Liberation Journal*. Volume 15. 1970s, pp. 32-33.

Scase, Rose. *Britain Towards 2010.* Economic Social Research Council, 1999.

Schaberg, William. *The Nietzsche Canon*. University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Schmiechen, James A. "The Victorians, the Historians, and the Idea of Modernism". *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 93, No. 2. Apr., 1988, pp. 287-316

Schiff, James A. & Barnes, Julian. "A Conversation with Julian Barnes". *The Missouri Review*, Volume 30, Number 3, Fall 2007, pp. 60-80. https://doi.org/10.1353/mis.2007.0142

Schneider, Ralf. "The Invisible Center: Conceptions of Masculinity in Victorian Fiction-Realist, Crime, Detective, and Gothic". Ed. Horlacher S. *Constructions of Masculinity in British Literature from the Middle Ages to the Present*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, pp. 147-168.

Schrand, Thomas. G. "Socialism in One Gender: Masculine Values in the Stalin Revolution". Ed. Clements, Barbara E. et al.. *Russian Masculinities in History and Culture*. Palgrave, 2002, pp. 194-209.

Schwarz, Bill. *The White Man's World.* Oxford University Press, 2011.

Schwarz, Boris. *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia: Enlarged Edition, 1917-1981*. INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1983.

Segal, Lynne. *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men*. Third edition. Virago, 2007.

Seidler, Victor. *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language and Sexuality*. Routledge, 1989.

--- *Men, Sex and Relationships*. Routledge, 1992.

Sexton, Patricia C. *The feminized male: classrooms, white collars, & the decline of manliness*. Random House, 1969.

Shapiro, Louis-Ann. *Breaking the Codes: Female Criminality in Fin-de-Siecle Paris*. Stanford University Press, 1996.

Shepherd, John & Wicke, Peter. *Music and Cultural Theory*. Polity Press, 1997.

Shields, Stephanie. "Passionate men, emotional women: Psychology constructs gender difference in the late 19th century". *History of Psychology* · 10(2): May 2007, pp. 92-110.https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17645126/

Showalter, Elaine. *The Female Malady: Women, Madness and English Culture, 1830–1980*. 1987.

Skeggs, Beverley. *Formations of Class and Gender*. Sage, 1997.

Smith, Johanna. "Hard-Boiled Detective Fiction: Gendering the Canon". *Pacific Coast Philology*. Vol. 26, No. ½, Jul., 1991, pp. 78-84.

Sollertinsky, Dmitri and Ludmilla Sollertinsky. *Pages from the Life of Dmitri Shostakovich.* Trans. Hobbs, Graham, and Charles, Midgley. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979.

Sowerwine, Charles. "Revising the Sexual Contract: Women's Citizenship and Republicanism in France, 1789–19441". Ed. Accampo, Elinor & Forth, Christopher E. *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 19-42.

Staub, Ervin. *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence.* Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Steinberg, Mark. *Voices of Revolution, 1917*. Yale University Press, 2001

Stiazhkina, Elena. "The 'Petty-Bourgeois Woman' and the 'Soulless Philistine'". *Russian Studies in History*. 51:2, 2012, pp. 63-97, https://doi.org/10.2753/RSH1061-1983510203

Stoltenberg, John. *Refusing- to Be a Man*. Breitenbush Books, 1989.

Stone, Judith F. "The Republican Brotherhood: Gender and Ideology". Ed. Elinor A. Accampo, Rachel G. Fuchs, and Mary Lynn Stewart. *Gender and the Politics of Social Reform in France, 1870–1914*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995, pp. 28-58.

Suny, Ronald G. "Stalin and his Stalinism: Power and Authority in the Soviet Union, 1930–1953". Ed. Hoffmann, David. *Stalinism: The Essential Readings*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 2003, pp. 13-36.

Surkis, Judith. *Sexing the Citizen: Morality and Masculinity in France, 1870–1920*. Cornell University Press, 2006.

Tang, Yili. "The rhetoric of factuality and fictionality in Julian Barnes's *the noise of Time* and *the Man in the Red Coat"*. Neohelicon 49, 2022, pp. 89–101. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11059-022-00622-4

Taruskin, Richard. "Public lies and unspeakable truth interpreting Shostakovich's Fifth Symphony". Ed. Fanning, David. *Shostakovich Studies*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1995, pp. 17-56.

Tate, Andrew. "An Ordinary Piece of Magic." *Julian Barnes: Contemporary Critical Perspectives.* Ed. Groes Sebastian, and Peter Childs. Continuum. 2011, pp. 51-68.

The Observer. "He's Turned Towards Python (But Not the Dead Flaubert's Parrot Sketch…) Interview with Julian Barnes. Ed. Guignery, Vanessa & Roberts, Ryan. *Conversations with Julian Barnes.* Mississippi, the University Press of Mississippi, 2009.

Tolson, Andrew. *The Limits of Masculinity: Male Identity and Women's Liberation.* New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Tory, Ezster, and Janina Vesztergom. *Stunned into Uncertainty: Essays on Julian Barnes's Fiction*. Thesis submitted to Department of English Studies, School of English and American Studies, Faculty of Humanities Eötvös Loránd University, 2014.

Tosh, John. "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800–1914". *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (April 2005), pp. 330-342.

Turner, Milanika. “Hip Hop as Cultural Capital: Remixing Bourdieu’s Theory to Affirm Cultural Wealth. *Language, Literature, and Interdisciplinary Studies (LLIDS).* 2019, pp. 85-100. http://ellids.com/archives/2019/03/2.3-Turner.pdf

Van Dover, J.K. *We Must Have Certainty: Four Essays on the Detective Story.* Susquehanna UP, 2005.

Volkov, Solomon. *TESTIMONY: the Memories of Dimitri Shostakovich*. Trans. Bouis, Antonina W. Limelight Editions, 1984.

Voronina, Olga. “Soviet Patriarchy: Past and Present”. *Hypatia*. Vol. 8, No. 4. Autumn, 1993, pp. 97-112.

Wagner, Jill. Elizabeth. “Engendered Edens: Postmodern Landscapes in Novels by John Fowles and Julian Barnes”. PhD Thesis submitted to Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2009. https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.460.9981&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Warne Monroe, John. *Laboratories of Faith: Mesmerism, Spiritism, and Occultism in Modern France*. Cornell University Press, 2008.

Watson, Buchanan, M. “Detective Fiction And the Critic of Imperial Masculinity in Collins, Doyle, and Forster”. MA thesis, University of South Alabama, 2017.

Watson, Nick J. et al.. “The Development of Muscular Christianity in Victorian Britain and Beyond”. *Journal of Religion & Society.* Vol. 7. 2005, pp. 1-22. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265497563

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. “Doing Gender’, Gender and Society”. *Gender and Society,* vol. 1, no. 2. 1987, pp. 125–51.

Wetherall, Margaret, and Nigel Edley. “Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices”. *Feminism and Psychology,* 9: 1999, pp.335–56.

Whitehead, Stephen. M. *Men and Masculinities: Key Themes and New Directions.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Williams, Elizabeth. “Gastronomy and the Diagnosis of Anorexia in Fin-de-Siècle France”. Ed. Accampo, Elinor, and Christopher E. Forth. *Confronting Modernity*

in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp. 90-111.

Wilson, Michael. "'Capped with Hope, Clad in Youth, Shod in Courage': Masculinity and Marginality in Fin-de-Siècle Paris". Ed. Accampo, Elinor, and Christopher E. Forth. *Confronting Modernity in Fin-de-Siècle France: Bodies, Minds and Gender*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, pp.192-212.

Wilson, Elizabeth. *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered.* Princeton University Press, 1994.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esme. *Before the Lamps Went Out*. Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 1945.

Wolfe, Peter. "Arthur & George by Julian Barnes". *Prairie Schooner*, Vol. 82. University of Nebraska Press: Fall 2008, pp. 187-188. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40639303.

Wood, Alan. *The Origins of the Russian Revolution 1861–1917*. Second Edition. Routledge, 1993.

Wright, Harrison, M. *The "New Imperialism" Analysis of Late Nineteenth - Century Expansion*. Swarthmore College, 1961.

Zdravomyslova, Elena, and Anna Temkina. "The Crisis of Masculinity in Late Soviet Discourse". *Russian Social Science Review*. 54:1, 2013, pp. 40-61. https://doi.org/10.1080/10611428.2013.11065500

Zizek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. Verso, 1989.

APPENDICES

A. CURRICULUM VITAE

EDUCATION

- MA. Education & Society - Gender & Women's Studies **2019-2021**
  McGill University, Canada
- MA. English Language and Literature **2006-2010**
  Tabriz Azad University, Iran
- BA. English Language and Literature **2001-2006**
  Urmia University, Iran

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

- Settlement Counsellor, *OCISO, Ottawa, ON, Canada* **2022– Present**
- Employer Liaison, *The YMCA-YWCA, Ottawa, ON, Canada* **2021– 2022**
- Teaching Assistant, *McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada* **2019– 2021**
- Research Assistant, *McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada* **2019– 2020**
- Interpreter & Translator, *UNHCR, Ankara, Turkey* **2017– 2019**
- ESL Course Lecturer, *Urmia & Azad Universities, Urmia, Iran* **2010– 2014**
- Research Assistant, *Islamic Azad University of Tabriz, Tabriz, Iran* **2008– 2011**

BOOKS:

Javanmard, R. (2010). *Gender or Socio-political Background? War in Savushun and Landlocked: a Comparative Study in the Light of Showalter's Gynocriticism*. Berlin: VDM Publication. ISBN: 978-3-639- 32329-0.

PUBLISHED BOOK CHAPTER:

Javanmard, R. (2016). A Comparative Study of Representation of Sexuality in Vidal's Two Sisters and Russ's The Female Man in the Light of Butler's Queer Theory. *Innovative Representations of Sexualities in Studies in English*. Ed. Prof. Dr. Bozer, Deniz. Ankara: Hacettepe University press. ISBN: 978 – 975 – 491 – 434 – 4

PUBLISHED JOURNAL ARTICLES:

Javanmard, R. (2018). A Comparative Study on the Construction of Masculinity in *Mountain Called Me* and *Flour Babies*. *Red Feather Journal, 9* (1). https://www.redfeatherjournal.org/volume-9-issue-1.html

Javanmard, R. (2018).مقایسه ی تطبیقی نحوه ی اکتساب مردانگی در نوجوانان [Translation in English: Comparative Study on the Acquisition of Masculinity in Young Adults] . *Journal of Children's Literature Studies (JCLS), 11*(4). Shiraz University Press.

Javanmard, R. (2010). A Feminist Comparison on Representation of War in *Landlocked* and *Savushun*". *Journal of Comparative Literature, 11*(3). Jiroft University Press

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS:

Javanmard, R. (2021, March 27). *Practicality in education.* [Paper presentation]. The Robert Macmillan Symposium in Education (RMSE), London, ON, Canada.

Javanmard, R. (2021, March 13). *Moving beyond Developmental Approaches to Sexual harassment at Schools: A Foucauldian Study.* [Paper presentation]. Graduate Symposium in the Department of Education (GSDE), Concordia University, Canada.

Javanmard, R. (2020, March 14). *Resisting rape culture at schools.* [Paper presentation]. Graduate Symposium in the Department of Education (GSDE), Montreal, Canada. *Cancelled due to COVID.*

Javanmard, R. (2020, February 28). *Gendered Bullying at Schools.* [Paper presentation]. The Rosa Bruno-Jofré Symposium in Education for Graduate Students in Education. Queen's University, Canada.

Javanmard, R. (2020, February 14). *Resurfacing of Edwardian England in Barnes' Arthur & George*. [Paper presentation]. McGill English Graduate Conference 2020, Montreal, QC, Canada.

Javanmard, R. (2019, June 11). *Emerging writers writing in an emergent discipline: Understanding literature reviews on identity-formation.* [Paper presentation]. McGill Research Writing Conference: Academic Genres: Here, Now, and Beyond, Montreal, QC, Canada.

Javanmard, R. (2019, April 04). *Wordsworth's The Excursion: A Travel into the Depths of His Masculine Self*. [Paper presentation]. Hacettepe University Conference for Cultural Studies, Ankara, Turkey.

Javanmard, R. (2018, December 13). *A Pro-feminist Study on Masculinity in Arthur & George*. [Paper presentation]. 24th METU British Novelists International Conference, Ankara, Turkey.

Javanmard, R. (2017, April 13). *A Comparative Study on the Construction of Masculinity in Mountain Called Me and Flour Babies*. [Paper presentation]. The 11th International Conference on Literature, Language and Cultural Studies, (ESSE), Ankara, Turkey.

Javanmard, R. (2016, April 15). *A Comparative Study of Representation of Dystopia in The Lathe of Heaven and Mrs. Frisby and The Rats of NIMH in the Light of feminist narratology*. [Paper presentation]. Hacettepe University. Conference for British Literary and Cultural Studies, Ankara.

Javanmard, R. (2016, May 6). *War and Female Pathos: Doris Lessing's Lessing's Landlocked and Simin Daneshvar's Savushun*. [Paper presentation]. International

Conference on Multiculturalism and English Studies, Karabuk University, Karabuk, Turkey.

B. TURKISH SUMMARY / TÜRKÇE ÖZET

Bu tez, Julian Barnes'ın *Arthur ve George*, *Zamanın Gürültüsü* ve *Kırmızı Giysili Adam* adındaki üç biyografik romanındaki, diğer bir deyişle biyokurmacasındaki erkeklik temsilini konu edinir. Seçilen bu romanların üçünde de on dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonlarında ve/veya yirminci yüzyılın başlarında yaşamış, nam salmış erkek figür(ler) (*Arthur ve George*'ta Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930), *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'nde Dmitri Şostakoviç (1906-1975), *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'daysa Dr. Samuel Jean Pozzi (1846-1918) olmak üzere) yer alır. Üstelik bu romanların olay örgüsü, zaman, mekân ve karakterleri bu tarihi kişiliklerin gerçek hayat hikâyesinden uyarlanıp aktarılan kesitler içerir. Bu araştırma, toplumsal değişimlerin Barnes'ın erkek başkarakterleri üzerinde yaratıp bıraktığı etkiyi birbiriyle karşılaştırmanın yanı sıra bu karakterlerin bu anlatılarda erkeklik sorunu ele alınırken geçtiği benzer ve farklı yönleri eleştirel bir açıdan inceler.

Bu tez, Barnes'ın eserlerindeki erkeklik temsilini toplumsal cinsiyetin performatifliğini ele alıp tartışan eleştirel düşünürlerin bakış açısından inceler. Örneğin bu düşünürlerden biri olan Judith Butler'ın *Cinsiyet Belası* (2006) nam eserinde ileri sürdüğü "toplumsal cinsiyet parodisi" fikri toplumsal cinsiyeti "kökeni olmayan bir taklit" (188) olarak açığa vurur. Burada erkeklik, ihtilaf ve ötekileştirmenin bulunduğu akışkan bir süreçtir ki bu süreç de gelişigüzel, çelişkili ve tutarsız cinsiyet politikalarına dayanmaktadır. Ayrıca söz konusu bu çalışma Barnes'ın erkeklik temsilini Kristeva'nın *ecriture feminine*, Bahtin'in çokdillilik, Foucault'nun ise erkeklerde kalıtsal yozlaşma üzerine fikirleri vb. açısından inceleyerek erkekliğin bireyselleştirilmiş, çok yönlü ve çelişkili yapısını gözler önüne serer. Bu romanları ele alıp metni çözümlerken öncelikle Barnes'ın eserlerinde erkekliği nasıl gerçekçi temsil ettiğini, metinlerin geçtiği tarihlerde yaşanan erkeklik sorununu seçtiğim biyokurmaca eserlerindeki olay örgüsü ve karakterlerinde nasıl yansıttığını belirleyecek, sonra da bu eserlerin kendi bağlamlarındaki erkeklik sorununu ele alırken daha kapsayıcı bir bakış açısı geliştirmek üzere gerçekçi hikâyeyle aralarına nasıl eleştirel bir mesafe koyduğunu araştırıp tartışacağım.

Bu tez bu doğrultuda edebiyat metni çözümlemesiyle erkeklik üzerine sosyoloji çalışmalarını (örneğin Whitehead veya Connell ile MEsserschmidt'in eserleri),

toplumsal cinsiyet düzenine dair felsefi yaklaşımları (örneğin Judith Butler'in toplumsal cinsiyet parodisi fikri), cinselliğe dair postmodern varsayımları (örneğin Foucault'nun gönüllü kulluk veya Kristeva'nın göstergebilim üzerine çalışmaları), cinsiyete dayalı güç ilişkilerini yansıtan sanata (örneğin Bourdieu'nün müzikbilim görüşleri) ve gerçekliğe (örneğin Baudrillard'ın hipergerçeklik fikri) dair tartışmaları birleştirip Barnes'ın seçilen biyokurmaca eserlerinin cinsiyet hiyerarşilerine karşı gelip erkeklik mitini yenilikçi bir açıdan sorgulama amacıyla toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerinin normalleştirilmesinin nasıl önüne geçtiğini göstererek literatüre önemli bir katkı sunar.

Bu araştırmada erkeklik, toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmaları, feminist çalışmalar, kültürel çalışmalar, siyaset bilimi, sosyoloji, antropoloji ve tarih alanlarındaki görüşlerden beslenip bunları birleştiren disiplinlerarası bir çalışma alanı olarak ele alınmıştır. Seçilen romanlardaki temsile ötekileştirilmiş erkekler katılarak erkekliğin cinsellik, sınıf ve ırkla kesiştiği gözler önüne serilmiş, ayrıca erkeklerin hiyerarşik nitelikteki egemen sistemce kurban edilseler veya "sınıf, ırk veya cinsellik vb. açısından madun" (Pease, *Undoing,* 102) konumunda olsalar bile erkek olmayanlarda bulunmayan ayrıcalıklara sahip oldukları farz edilmiştir. Pease'in ifadesiyle belirtmek gerekirse, "Erkekler diğer toplumsal ayrımlar açısından ötekileştirilse bile ötekileştirilmiş topluluklarının içindeki kadınlar üzerindeki cinsiyete dayalı üstünlüklerinin arkası yine de kesilmez" (*Undoing,* 102). Allen Johnson'ın *Unraveling* (1997) nam eserinin izinden giden bu çalışma, Barnes'ın biyografik kurmaca metinlerinde farklı sosyokültürel çevrelerden gelen erkek karakterlerin "kurumsallaşmış ayrıcalıklar"ını (4) tespit edip sorgulayarak bu romanların cinsiyet, sınıf ve ırka dayalı hiyerarşileri nasıl tersine çevirdiğini tahlil eder, ayrıca alışıldık/alışılmadık veya ideal/aşağı erkeklik biçimleri arasındaki farklar üzerine toplumsal varsayımları sorgular. Barnes'ın eserlerinde erkekler (cinsellik, sınıf ve ırk açısından konumlarına göre şekillenen) kurumsallaşmış ayrıcalıklardan aynı derecede fayda sağlamasa da farklı farklı açılardan bakıldığında egemen düzenin basmakalıp cinsiyet rollerine göre genellikle ayrıcalıklı konumdadırlar. Barnes erkekliği temsil ederken egemen düzenin cinsiyet normlarıyla arasına eleştirel bir mesafe koyarak kesin gözüyle bakılan erkek ayrıcalıklarını sorgular.

Bu tez giriş ve sonuç kısımları haricinde üç bölümden oluşmaktadır. Bölümler biyokurmaca eserlere göre ayrılmış, her bölümde incelenen metindeki erkeklik sorununun çözümlenmesine ayrı ayrı odaklanılmıştır: 2. Bölüm'de *Arthur ve George*'ta

İngiliz erkekliği temsili, 3. Bölüm'de *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'ndeki Rus erkekliği, 4. Bölüm'de ise *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'daki Fransız erkekliği ele alınmıştır. Metinlerin çözümlendiği bu bölümler eserde geçen zaman ve mekândaki erkeklik inşasına genel bir tarihsel bakış sunarak açılır: 2. Bölüm, Victoria ve Edward (diğer bir ifadeyle I. Dünya Savaşı öncesi) dönem İngiltere'sinde hegemonik erkeklik ve erkeklik sorunu üzerine tartışmalarla, 3. Bölüm Sovyet rejimi öncesi ve sırasında Rus erkekliğinin inşasına dair tarihsel bir değerlendirme ve erkekliği benimseme konusunda çekilen güçlüklerle, 4. Bölüm ise *Belle Époque* dönemindeki Fransız erkekliğinin tarihsel açıdan çözümlenmesiyle başlar. Bölümlerin her birinde edebiyat metinleri, söz konusu eserde geçen kültürdeki toplumsal cinsiyet ve cinselliği ele alan sosyolojik/felsefi çalışmaların getirdiği anlayış ışığında derinlemesine çözümlenmiştir. Bu çalışmada kullanılan anahtar kavramlar hegemonik erkeklik, erkekleşme, karşılıklılık ve ayrılıkçı erkekliktir. "Erkeklik krizi" veya diğer bir ifadeyle "erkeklik sorunu" da bu çalışmada geçen başka bir anahtar kavramdır ki erkek karakterlerin cinsiyet rolleri ve kimlikleri konusunda kuşkuya düşmeleri ve kafalarının karışması anlamında kullanılmıştır.

2. Bölüm Victoria dönemi İngiltere'sindeki erkeklik niteliklerine dair tarihsel bir değerlendirme sunarak başlar ki bu değerlendirme de İngiliz erkekliğinin bu dönemde geçirdiği önemli değişimlere özet sunacak niteliktedir: On dokuzuncu yüzyılın başlarında dönemin köklü emperyalist, ırkçı ve cinsiyetçi egemen sistemiyle bağdaşan militarist erkeklik başat konumdaydı. Militarist erkeklikse vatanperverliği, fedakârlığı, erkekler arası bağı savunmak, kraliyet yandaşlığı etmek anlamı taşıyordu. İngiliz erkeği, Hıristiyan öğretileri doğrultusunda hem manevi önder hem de evin reisi olarak görülüyor, kendine hâkim olması, dindar, dürüst ve cesur olması bekleniyor, hatta şart koşuluyordu. Bilimsel düşünce ve deneyciliğin ilerlemesiyle Hıristiyan erkekliği modelinin değeri yavaş yavaş azalmaya, erkeklerde duygular yadsınırken rasyonellik ve nesnellik teşvik edilmeye başlandı. On dokuzuncu yüzyılın ortalarına gelindiğinde "burjuva" erkeklik modeli harıl harıl çalışma ve kendine yetme olgularıyla geleneksel erkekliğin yerini sağlamlaştırmaya çalışsa da çağın İngiltere'sinde geleneksel erkekliğe uymak artık ihtimal dışına çıkmıştı. On dokuzuncu yüzyılın ikinci yarısında laikliğin yanı sıra ırkçılık karşıtı ve feminist radikal hareketlerin ilerlemesi geleneksel erkeklik modelini sarsmıştı. Bunun sonucunda ise toplumsal cinsiyet dinamikleri değişmiş, cinsellik yeni biçimlerde dışa vurulmaya başlamıştı. Güç sahipleri ve yönetim, erkeklerin zayıflayan özerkliğini geri almasını sağlamak üzere erkek merkezli ve erkeklere özel

eğitim sistemi oluşturmuş, toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerine dikkat çekmek üzere topluluk ve dernekler kurmuştur. Ne var ki gerek yurtiçi gerek yurtdışında emperyalizm ve savaş karşıtı hareketler Britanya hükümetinin bu girişimlerine karşı gelmiştir. Üstelik İngiltere'nin politik ve ekonomik durumunun on dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonlarında geçirdiği jeopolitik değişimler de bu girişimlere engel olmuştur. I. Dünya Savaşı'nın patlak vermesiyle birlikte İngiliz erkeğinin militarist ülküler hakkında gerçeği görüp hayal âleminden sıyrılmasıyla erkeklik krizi daha da alevlenmiş, harlamıştır.

Bu bölümdeki tarihsel değerlendirmenin ardından romanın tahlil edilmesine geçilir. *Arthur ve George* romanı İngiltere'nin I. Dünya Savaşı öncesi döneminde, yani Victoria dönemi sonları ile Edward dönemi arasında geçer ki bu zaman dilimi çoğunlukla İngiliz erkekliğinin huzur dolu dönemi olarak görülür, genelde de "İngiliz üstünlüğü ve sorgulanmamış yüceliğinin Hint yazı gibi" diyerek tasvir edilir (Berberich, "All Letters" 123). Barnes *Arthur ve George* eserinde geleneksel açıdan muhafazakâr eril bir tür olan polisiye roman türü ironik açıdan kullanmıştır. Böylelikle toplumsal cinsiyet hiyerarşilerinin tersine çevrilmesi, ırka dair önyargılara şüpheyle yaklaşılması, zıtlıkların uzlaştırılması ve Arthur ile George başkarakterlerinin yaşadığı iç çatışmaların öne çıkarılmasıyla on dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonlarıyla yirminci yüzyılın başlarındaki kusursuz İngiliz erkekliği illüzyonu sorgulanmış, ayrıca erkeksi/kadınsı ve beyaz/beyaz olmayan unsurların bir araya getirilmesiyle erkeklik incelenmiş olur. Başkarakterler Arthur ile George'un Victoria dönemindeki geleneksel erkeklik rollerine uyma çabasının beyhudeliği bu karakterleri çıkmaza sokar, iktidardayken acı çekmelerine sebep olur, aynı zamanda da romandaki erkeklik krizine yol açar.

Arthur ve George romanındaki İngiltere'yle İngiliz erkekliğinin kurmaca temsiliyle tarih kaynaklarında Victoria dönemi ve beyaz erkek mefhumuyla ilgili resmedilenler arasında benzerlik vardır. Sanki roman Victoria dönemindeki İngiliz erkeği anlayışını kurmaca versiyonuyla baştan kurmak ister gibidir. *Arthur ve George* romanı gerçek hayattan tarihi bir kişiliği, yani Sir Arthur Conan Doyle'ı başkarakterlerinden biri yapıp gerçekten Victoria döneminde yaşamış George Edalji gibi erkeklerin hayat hikâyesini metne uyarlayarak I. Dünya Savaşı öncesi İngiliz erkekliğine dair saf ülküleri bir araya getirmesi açısından büyük umutlar uyanmasına sebep olur. Tarihsel açıdan bakıldığında Sir Doyle, vatanperver ve militarist edebiyat eserleri on dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonlarından beri epey takdir edilen biri olmanın yanı sıra "İngilizliğin simgelerinden biri"dir (Calafat

461). İngiliz erkekliği anlayışını baştan kurma beklentisini çoğaltan şey ise romanın olay örgüsü, zaman ve mekânının yanı sıra karakterleri ve anlatı tarzında da Victoria ve Edward dönemi özelliklerinin başat konumda olmasıdır. Erkek karakterlerin taşıdığı kişilik özellikleri ve beyaz olmayanların yanı sıra kadınlara karşı takındıkları tavırlar I. Dünya Savaşı öncesindeki İngiliz erkeklerininkini andırmanın çok ötesine geçmektedir. Barnes'ın romanında bu döneme ait gerçek belgeleri, mektupları, gazeteleri kullandığını söylemesi (Schiff & Barnes 72-3), ayrıca Sir Arthur Conan Doyle'un notlarını, 1910'lardaki George Ernest Thompson Edalji vakasıyla ilgili hükümet raporlarını kullanması (Berberich, "All Letters" 122) aradaki benzerliği bir hayli katmerlendirir. Kullanılan ifadelerin gerçeğe uygunluğu I. Dünya Savaşı öncesi İngiltere'si ideali duygusunun ve *Arthur ve George*'un geçtiği dönemdeki hegemonik erkekliğin metinde yeniden oluşturulabileceğini okura temin eder.

Arthur ve George nam eseri geleneksel eril tür olan klasik polisiye roman öğelerini kullanmasına rağmen bu erkeklerin başına aslında ne geldiğini tamı tamına, eksiksiz anlatmaması sebebiyle polisiye türüne esasen aykırı düşer. Üstelik bu roman İngilizlik kavramının sahte olduğunu su yüzüne çıkarması, deneycilik mirasına ters düşmesi, tarihyazımcı üstkurmaca öğeleri kullanması, ayrıca dedektif, asistan ve mağdur arasındaki ayrımı bulanıklaştırmasıyla has erkekliğin nasıl olduğuna dair nesnel bir anlayış getirme ihtimalinin de önüne geçer. Anti-polisiye denilebilecek bu romanda erkekleri mağdurlaştırıp sorunsallaştıran şey başkarakterlerin erkekliği ırk ve cinsellik eksenindeki hiyerarşiye dayandırıp kadınlık, irrasyonalite, batıl inanç ve/veya uydurmaca/kurmacadan ayırarak tarif etmeye yana yakıla çalışmasıdır. Hem George hem de Arthur kendi erkekliğinden emin olmaya çalışsa da ikisi de kendini arada kalmış halde bulur, bu da erkeklik krizi yaşamalarına sebep olur. Roman erkeklerin düştüğü bu çıkmaza karşılık olarak simulakralar ekleyip hipergerçekliğe doğru yol alır. Böylelikle de Victoria dönemindeki erkekliğin gelişigüzel ve değişken bir yapı, performatif bir süreç ve karşıtlıklar arasında dalgalanan zıt özelliklerin bir bileşimi olduğunu gösterip eril benlik ile Öteki'nin arasında bağlılık ve karşılıklılığın gelişmesi talebinde bulunur. Bu roman erkekliği baştan tanımlarken zıtlıkları bir araya getirip uzlaştırarak ötekileştirilenlere güç kazandırır gibidir.

3. Bölüm Rusya'da hegemonik erkekliğin gelişimine dair tarihsel bir değerlendirmeyle başlar. Bu değerlendirmeye göre Sovyet Sosyalist Cumhuriyetler Birliği'nin (SSCB) Rusya'daki kadın ve erkeklerin tümü için eşitlikçi bir ütopya yaratma iddiasına rağmen

rejim herkeste genel tek bir toplumsal cinsiyet yaratmaya odaklanmış, hem kadınları hem de erkekleri komünizme hizmet etmeye zorlamış, rejimin askeri ve endüstri bağlamındaki hedeflerini hayata geçirmek için uğraşmaya mecbur bırakmıştır. Bunun sonucunda ise eril değerler ön plana çıkarılmış, tek tek erkekler zerrelerine kadar ayrılmış, susturulmuş, tabi kılınmıştır. Erkekler bu toplumun ağır sosyopolitik ve ekonomik baskısı altındayken, yoldaşlık anlayışına, aile kurmaya, ekonomik bağımsızlık kazanmaya, yozlaşmaya ve ezenlere karşı çıkmaya dayanan geleneksel (devrim öncesi) Rus erkekliğinden sapmıştır. Durgunluk, kayıtsızlık, güçsüzlük, eyleme geçememe, sağlıksız alışkanlıklara düşkünlük, hareketsizlik ve kadercilik Sovyet erkeklerinin çoğunda görülen başat özellikler haline gelmiştir. Ne var ki devrim öncesine dayanan faal erkeklik türünden boyun eğen, pasif Sovyet türüne geçiş zamanla, gönüllü kulluk döneminden sonra olmuştur. Bu dönemde insanlar Sovyet rejiminin özgürlük ve aydınlanma vaatlerine umut bağlamış, rejimin ideolojilerini ilahlaştırmış, kendilerini bu ideolojilere göre baştan eğitip yetiştirmiş, öyle ki otoriter hükümetten kurtulma ihtimallerini bile akıllarından silmiş, bireyselliklerini dışa vurup ifade etme cesaretini yitirmişlerdir.

Bu bölümdeki tarihsel değerlendirmenin ardından derinlemesine bir metin çözümlemesi sunulur ki bu çözümleme de *Zamanın Gürültüsü* romanıyla Sovyet Rusya'ya dair tarihi kayıtlar arasındaki örtüşmeye dikkat çeker. *Arthur ve George* ile *Zamanın Gürültüsü* romanları arasındaki sosyopolitik bağlam farkına rağmen erkeklik temsili açısından benzerlik bulmak mümkündür. *Zamanın Gürültüsü* de yirminci yüzyılın başlarında geçer. İki erkek karakterin geleneksel erkeklik idealine uymaya çalışırken çırpınışını ortaya koyarak erkeklik sorununun kökenini tahlil etmesi açısından da *Arthur ve George*'a benzer. Barnes bu anlatısında da çeşit çeşit tarihi ve biyografik rapor ve belge kullanarak tarihsel değer taşıyan, nam salmış bir adamın sessizliğe gömülmüş, söze dökülmemiş duygusal yaşamını ve iktidardayken acı çekişini adamda alttan alta bulunan suçluluk ve masumiyet hislerini göstermek için gözler önüne sermiştir. Bu roman yüceltilen metanetli erkeklik modellerini sorgulayarak erkeklik fikrini anlama konusuna çokyönlülük kazandırmanın yanı sıra erkekliğin ötekileştirilen modellerine de hoşgörü geliştirir.

Zamanın Gürültüsü de *Arthur ve George*'da olduğu gibi nam salmış tarihi bir şahsın gerçek hayat hikâyesine dayanarak kurgulanmıştır. Bu şahıs Dmitri Dmitriyeviç

Şostakoviç'tir (1906-1975). Rus besteci ve piyanist Şostakoviç, Stalin için bestelediği eserle ün kazanmıştır. Romanda da anlatıldığı üzere genç Şostakoviç müzik eğitimini önce annesinden, sonraysa Sankt-Peterburg Konservatuvarı'ndaki eğitmenlerden alır. Yine romanda da gösterildiği üzere Şostakoviç yaşı ilerledikçe hem yurtiçinde hem yurtdışında nam salar, müzik dehası da iktidardaki Rus erkeklerinin dikkatini çeker. Sanatından politik anlamda nemalanmak ve getirdiği yeniliklerin önünü kesmek isterler. İktidardakiler Şostakoviç'e yanaştığında, Barnes'ın anlatısındakine benzer şekilde, besteci Komünist Parti'ye üye olmayı Sovyet ideolojilerine katılmadığından baştan reddeder. Bunun sonucunda ise Komünist Parti, sanatçının eserlerine sert eleştiriler getirir, hem de başta halk tarafından müthiş karşılanmasına rağmen. Üstelik ünlü besteci tam iki kez halk düşmanı ilan edilir. Dmitri Şostakoviç İkinci Dünya Savaşı'nın ardından, Soğuk Savaş döneminde daha bile katı ideolojik kontrolle karşılaşınca direnmeyi bırakıp istemeden de olsa SSCB Halk Sanatçısı olarak Komünist Parti'ye katılır ki edindiği bu konum vicdan azabı çekmesine sebep olup yaşamının sonuna değin ıstırap çekmesine yol açar.

Zamanın Gürültüsü'nde Joycevari iç monolog tekniği kullanılarak başkarakter Dmitri Şostakoviç'in bir erkek olarak taşıdığı varsayımlar, duygular ve hassasiyetler konusunda ayrıntılar ortaya dökülmüştür. Barnes'ın BBC-Newsnight söyleşisinde anlattığı üzere, romanda kullanılan bu teknik biyografi yazarları ve tarihçilerin Şostakoviç konusunda sessizliğe gömdüğü, dile getirmediği "psikolojik hakikat"i (daha doğrusu, yazarın hakikat saydıklarını) aktarmaya, söze dökmeye çalışmaktadır. Romanın üçüncü şahıs anlatıcısı, *Arthur ve George* eserinde de olduğu gibi, çoğunlukla başkarakterin anlatılan dönemde yaşadıkları ve gördükleriyle sınırlandırılmıştır. Bu anlatım tarzı bestecinin duygularının dipsiz bir kuyu olduğunu su yüzüne çıkarır. Barnes bu romanda, *Arthur ve George*'un tersine, "kesintisiz bir anlatı" sunmaktan kaçınarak hikâyeyi "epifanik bölümler"le, yani karmaşık paragraflarla anlatır; böylelikle de bestecinin değişen fikir ve inançlarını yansıtır, üstelik "Şostakoviç'in yaşamının parçalı yapısına ayna tutar" (Freiburg 136-7). Anlatıdaki karmaşa, zıtlıklar ve çözümlenemezlik Şostakoviç'in ömrü boyunca çektiği psikolojik baskı ve ıstırabı akseder (Nayebpour 7). Romanda başkarakterin en derin duyguları ifade edilmeye çalışılmaktadır. Barnes 2007'deki "Julian Barnes: The Final Interview" söyleşisinde "Bazen anlatıyı müzikal anlatıma benzetirim" demiştir (Guignery & Roberts 177). Bu açıdan bakıldığında *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'nde de başkarakterin başına gelenlerle anlatının ilerleyişi arasında belli bir

harmoni var gibidir. Şostakoviç'in Komünist Parti'ye katılmasından duyduğu pişmanlık arttıkça metin de daha da parçalı bir hale bürünür.

Arthur ve George'a benzer şekilde, *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'nde de erkeklik, bireyle çevresi arasındaki müzakereye tabi, değişken ve performatif bir sürece dönüşür, ayrıca hegemonik erkeklik modelinin dayandığı, iki seçenekten başkasını sunmayan geleneksel anlayışın ötesine geçer. Bu iki romanın diğer bir ortak özelliği toplumsal cinsiyet ikiliklerini bulanıklaştırıp cinsiyetlere yüklenen geleneksel özellikleri sorgulamalarıdır. *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'nde de erkekliğin duygusallık, kadınlık, irrasyonalite ve uydurmaca/kurmacadan ayrı düşünülmesi eleştirilir, ayrıca erkeklerde cinsiyetçi veya ırkçı davranış geliştirilmesi sorgulanır (Segal 7). Ne var ki iki roman arasındaki bağlama dayalı sosyopolitik farklar bu anlatılardaki ayrı ayrı hegemonik erkeklik modellerinin ne şekilde ve ne kadar değiştirilebileceğini de belirler. Örneğin *Arthur ve George*'da erkek başkarakterler etraflarındaki sosyokültürel sisteme karşı serbest iradelerini kullanıp ortaklaşarak geleneksel erkeklik özelliklerini baştan düzenlese de *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'nde bu konuda düzenlemelere mecbur bırakıp erkekler arasında baskıcı güç ilişkilerinin doğmasına yol açan şey despot yönetim sisteminin kendisidir. İlk romanda George, Arthur'un erkeklik modeliyle gitgide ilgilenmeye başlayıp bu modeli bir şekilde benimserken ikinci romandaki başkarakterler olan Stalin ve Şostakoviç arasındaki politik anlaşmazlık gittikçe hararetlenir. Buna bağlı olarak Stalin'in Şostakoviç üzerinde kurduğu sosyopolitik baskı sanatçının sanat aracılığıyla kendini gerçekleştirme ihtimalini ortadan kaldırır. Bu iki roman kıyaslandığında ilk metinde Arthur ve George karakterlerinin arasındaki işbirliği ve ortaklığın İngiliz erkekliğinin oluşumunda katkısı bulunan cinsiyete ve ırka dayalı hiyerarşilerin tersine çevrilmesine olanak tanıdığını, ikinci metinde ise iktidardaki diktatör Stalin'in erkekleri hâkimiyetine alıp sert bir denetime tabi tuttuğunu, bunun neticesinde de erkeklerin yozlaşmasına sebep olduğunu, bu kişilerin eril özellikleri benimseme konusunda kendi bireysellik ve kişiliklerinden yola çıkma ihtimalinin önüne taş koyduğunu, hatta bu ihtimali topyekûn ortadan kaldırdığını, bu erkeklerin cinsiyete dayalı sosyopolitik normları sorgulama gayretini de yokuşa sürdüğünü görürüz.

SSCB'de toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerinin gelişimini gösteren tarihi kayıtlara benzer şekilde, *Zamanın Gürültüsü*'nde Stalin'in sorunlu erkekliğini teskin etme çabası ve insanların hem fikir hem de eylemlerini manipüle etmek için adamlarıyla birlikte

kullandıkları teknikler dönemin Rus erkeklerinin çoğunluğunun kendileriyle, kadınlarla, toplumla ve hâkim ideolojilerle ilişkisini karman çorman eder. Buna bağlı sosyopolitik baskının altında kalan erkeklerin, kahramanca cesaret, erkek dayanışması, hür düşünce, vatanperverlik ve liberalizme dayanan, Devrim öncesi erkeklik modeline uyum sağlama çabası boşa çıkar. Barnes'ın başkarakteri Şostakoviç bu bağlamda tıpkı Devrim öncesinden bir Rus erkeği gibi davranır, başta halkına kahramanca hizmet edip döneminden bağımsız ve saf eserler besteleyerek despot İktidar'a karşı koyduğunu ifade etme mücadelesi verir. Şostakoviç müziğin çok katmanlı ve esrarengiz yapısı sayesinde metanetli Sovyet erkekliği modelini kadınsılığın bastırılmış gücüyle uzlaştırabileceğini, dönemindeki sorunlu Rus erkeklerinin duygularını dışa vurup ifade etmesini sağlayabileceğini düşünür. Ne var ki Stalin, *Mtsenskli Lady Macbeth* eserini yasaklatarak bestecinin bu yenilikçi yaklaşımının yolunu tıkar. Bu durum ise Şostakoviç'in ömrü boyunca cebelleştiği, erkek olma sorununu iyice pekiştirip sanatçıyı kendinden feragat etmeye, pasifliğe, eylemsizliğe iter. Şostakoviç bu sırada erkeklik ve erkeksi cesaret konusunda zıt bir anlayış geliştirir ki bu anlayışa göre erkeklik toplumsal bir inşadır, belli bir erkeklik modeline uyma çabasıysa absürtlüğün ötesine geçmez. Tarih kayıtlarının güvenilmezliği konusuna bir de bu eklenince erkeklik, hegemonik erkeklik modellerinin gelişmesini sağlayan, iki seçenekten başkasını sunmayan geleneksel anlayışın ötesine geçerek, nokta konulamayacak ve çoğullaştırılmış bir kavrama dönüşür.

Önceki bölümlerde olduğu üzere, 4. Bölüm de hegemonik erkeklik üzerine tarihi bir değerlendirmeyle başlar. Bu bölüm *Belle Époque* dönemi Fransa'sındaki erkekleşme örüntüsüne odaklanır, ayrıca modernleşme, endüstrileşme ve kentleşmenin bu toplumdaki hâkim sosyokültürel yapılarda yol açtığı zorlukların bu konuyu nasıl sorunlaştırdığını gösterir. Radikal toplumsal faaliyetlerin etkisiyle erkeklerin madunlaşması/kadınlaşması ve cinsiyete dayalı hiyerarşilerin tepetaklak edilmesine dair korkular bu dönemde artmıştır. Bu hareketlerin kadın-erkek ilişkilerini modernleştirme çabasına nihilizmin yükselişi de eklenince insanlar geleneksel cinsellik normlarından uzaklaşmış; Fransız erkeklerinin adı kötüye çıkmış, bu erkekler dünyevi zevklere düşkün ve aciz olmaları sebebiyle havai kadınlara benzetilmiştir. Erkeklerin arzularını denetlemeye yönelik tedavi merkezlerinin ortaya çıkmasına ve hükümetin cinsiyetçi politikalarına rağmen erkeklerin "yozlaşma"sının sonu gelmemiş, "erkeklikten çıkma"nın arkası kesilmemiştir. Ne var ki avangart hareketler sayesinde cinselliğin

kişiye özgü olması anlayışı ağırlık kazanmış, (karşı cinsle özdeşleştirilen kıyafetleri giyme ve androjenlik gibi) toplumsal cinsiyet sınırlarını bulanıklaştıran tavırlar yaygınlık kazanmıştır. Has erkekliğe erişmenin mümkün olmaması insanların geleneksel erkekliğe dair gerçek dışı ve görsel temsillerine dikkat etmesine yol açmış, (rasyonalite, patriyarka, kahramanlık, muhafazakârlık vb.ye dayanan) erkekliği benimseyen hegemonilerin aldatmacadan ibaret olduğu gözler önüne serilmiştir.

4. Bölüm'deki tarihi değerlendirmenin ardından *Kırmızı Giysili Adam* (KGA) romanının metin çözümlemesi gelir. Bu kısımda *Belle Époque* (1871-1914) dönemindeki erkeklik sorunu incelenir. Bu dönem Fransız erkekliğinin alaya alındığı, Fransız erkeklerinin mizacından gelen sosyalist-liberal eğilimlerinin ve duygulara fazla bel bağlamalarının İngilizlerin çoğu tarafından hoşnutsuzlukla karşılandığı, kültürel açıdan zengin bir dönemdir. Dünyevi zevkler peşinde koşan havai Fransız erkeklerinin saldığı kötü nam, *Belle Époque* sırasında Avrupa ülkelerinde yol açtığı sosyopolitik gerilimler sebebiyle kaygı uyandıran ciddi bir mesele olarak ele alınmıştır. On dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonları ve yirminci yüzyılın başlarında ortalama Fransız erkeği; dürüst, cesur ve sadık olmasıyla genel beğeni kazanan orta sınıf beyaz İngiliz erkeğinin aksine, genelde kibirli, aciz veya kadınsı bulunur; yaşama getirdiği pragmatiklikten uzak yaklaşımında direttiğinden idealist zihin yapısı ve hayalperest coşkuları çoğunlukla İngilizler tarafından eleştiri yağmuruna tutulurdu.

Bu tez Barnes'ın *Kırmızı Giysili Adam* romanının on dokuzuncu yüzyıl sonu ve yirminci yüzyıl başlarındaki Fransız erkeği kavramıyla ilgili olarak kötü nam almış genellemeleri sorgulayarak toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerinin birer inşa olduğuna nasıl dikkat çektiğini tahlil eder. 4. Bölüm'de *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'ın erkekleşme çabalarının normalleştirilmesiyle ilgili olarak bu dönemde yaygın görülen anlayışı eleştirdiği, erkekliğin inşasında görülen sosyokültürel ve ırka dayalı sınırların ötesine geçerek *Belle Époque* dönemindeki Fransız erkekliğine dair tektipleşmiş anlayışı sorguladığı ileri sürülür. Bu çalışmanın işaret ettiği üzere, Barnes'ın anlatısı *fin-de-siècle* dönemindeki erkeklik sorunuyla ilgili tarih kaynaklarına sadık kalmasının yanı sıra, erkekliği anlama konusunda yeniden doğuş, dönüşüm ve yenilik gibi kavramları da öne sürer, üstelik erkekleşme konusunda çeşitliliğin kucaklanabileceği çok sesli bir ortam yaratır. Böylelikle de Fransız erkekliği meselesinde ötekileştirilmiş modellere gösterilen hoşgörüyü arttır. Bu roman Fransız erkekliğine dair geleneksel varsayımları ortaya

koyarak aslında bu varsayımları sorgular, ayrıca yeni yeni tomurcuklanan erkeklik modellerinin kapsayıcı olmasını sağlar.

Kırmızı Giysili Adam, Fransızların bu dönemde sanatta insan arzuları, cinsellik ve bilincinin geleneksel temsillerinden kökten kopuşunu idealleştirir, on dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonlarında "gıpta edilesi bir rahatlık"la gelişen Fransız kültürünün "bastırılmış İngilizler"in aynı dönemde yarattığını iddia ettiği ahenkten "ahlaken üstün" "neşeli" ve daha huzurlu olduğunu öne sürer (*Somethng to declare* 15, 21). "Bu farkların biyoçeşitlilik adına sürmesi gerekir. Hayvan türlerini yitirdiğimiz hızda yitirdiğimiz lisanlar var. Üstelik ölçülmesi o kadar da mümkün olmayan insani farkları da yitiriyoruz" (15). Barnes *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'daki Fransa'yı ele alırken bu farklar üzerine kafa patlatır, bu farkları irdeleyip takdir eder. Barnes Britanya'nın o dönemde Fransızlara gösterdiği antipatiye karşılık olarak iki kültürü de anlamaya çalışır, kendini de şöyle anlatır: "Avrupa'yı sevsem de bürokrasiye şüpheyle yaklaşırım, enternasyonalist olsam da kültürel anlamda korumacı, liberal solcuyum" (16). Barnes'ın farkları inkâr etmeye şüpheyle yaklaştığı, daha kapsayıcı bir bakış sunduğu söylenebilir.

Barnes *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'da on dokuzuncu yüzyılın sonları ile yirminci yüzyılın başlarında Fransa'da yaşayan, çoğu erkek olmak üzere birden fazla tarihi kişiliğin hayat hikâyesini bir araya getirerek *Belle Époque* döneminde Fransız erkeklerinin kötü nam salmasının gerekçelerinin altını çizer ve bu kişilerin "erkeksilikten uzak" kişisel özellikleri ile toplumla uyumsuz sosyopolitik eğilimlerini inceleyerek bu dönemde görülen erkekliğe dair yenilikçi bir anlayış geliştirir. Bu anlatı Fransız erkekliğinde suç bulmaktansa bu adamların modern Fransa'da içine düştükleri toplumsal cinsiyet karmaşasına dair ufku daha geniş bir bakış açısı benimser. Fransız erkekliğinin böyle eleştirel ele alınması cinsiyete dayalı hiyerarşilerin tepe taklak edilmesi, erkekliğe dair hegemonik anlayış aldatmacasının ipliğinin pazara çıkarılması, erkeklik tanımında zıtlıkların bir araya getirilmesi toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerinin benimsenmesi konusunda yenilikçi bir yaklaşıma yer açar. Bu roman sağlam duruşlu, metanetli John Bull imgesinde vücut bulan İngiliz vatanperverliğiyle tezat oluşturan (Bell, *France and Britain* 20) Fransız erkekliğini Marianne imgesinin kadınsı havailiğine benzetmek yerine çeşitlilik ve belirsizlik hissi yaratarak İngilizlerin Fransız erkekliğine dair anlayışını daha derinlemesine olmak üzere baştan değerlendirir.

Barnes'ın *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'da başkarakterin hayat hikâyesini temsil etmesi, belli açılardan bakıldığında *Arthur ve George* ile *Zamanın Gürültüsü* romanlarında kullanılan karakter kurma teknikleriyle benzer özellik taşır. Dr. Pozzi'nin de tıpkı George, Arthur ve Şostakoviç gibi arada kalmasının kökeni erkekliğin esasının cinsiyetçilik, ırkçılık, kahramanlık ve tümdengelimli rasyonaliteyle ilişkilendirilmesinde yatar. Bu da erkekliğe dair hiyerarşik ve yerleşik parametrelerin baştan değerlendirilmesini gerektirir. İlk iki metinde olduğu üzere bu romanda da başkarakter kahraman/düşman konumunda bulunur ki bu da romandaki zıtlıkların farklı sosyokültürel katmanlarda uzlaştırılmasına bir alan sağlar. *Kırmızı Giysili Adam* başkarakterin yaşadığı iç çatışmaları ön plana çıkarıp dönemin ırk ve cinsiyete dayalı ve toplumsal hiyerarşilerini sorgulamasıyla has erkeklik diye bir şey olduğuna dair illüzyonu sorunsallaştırır. Roman bu özelliği sebebiyle de *Arthur ve George* ile *Zamanın Gürültüsü* metinlerine benzer.

Ne var ki *Kırmızı Giysili Adam*'da temsil bulup tarihi nitelik taşıyan erkek karakterlerin genel mülayimliği ve pek önem taşımamaları bu metni diğer iki romandan ayırır. Dr. Pozzi "Fransa'nın en seçkin cerrahı" (*KGA* 257) olmasına ve edindiği bilimsel başarılara rağmen, romanın ilk sayfalarında okura eski bir resme "konu" olmuş "sıradan" biri olarak tanıtılır, günümüzde hatırlanmasının tek sebebi ise Singer Sargent'ın *Dr. Pozzi At Home* adındaki tablosunda giydiği kırmızı giysidir (*KGA* 3-4). Üstelik romandaki erkek karakterler Fransız erkekliğinin geleneksel modellerine uymakla pek ilgileniyormuş gibi değildir. *Arthur ve George* ile *Zamanın* Gürültüsü romanlarında erkeksilikten uzak nitelikler olarak ele alınan kadınsılık, irrasyonalite, batıl inanç, ahlak dışılık ve uydurmaca/kurmacaya bulaşmak Dr. Pozzi'nin yaşadığı toplumdaki erkek karakterlerin hoşuna gider. Bu erkekler Fransa'da (Napolyon gibi) devrim niteliği taşıyan tarihi kişiliklerin soyundan gelse de askerce-kahramanca erkekliğe veya Fransız erkekliğinin heteroseksüel normlarına uymaya gerek duymazlar. Hatta birçoğu toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerini oluştururken dini varsayımlardan hareket etme kafesine girmekten de kaçınır. Ne var ki *Kırmızı Giysili Adam* romanındaki erkekler, erkeklikle ilgili geleneksel varsayımlarla aralarına bir mesafe koymalarına rağmen kadınların baskılanmasına bel bağlayan bir erkekliği benimserler. Bu özellik bu romanda ilk iki metinde görmediğimiz bir derecededir. Hatta bazı kısımlara bakıldığında erkekler anca kadınları susturarak erkek gibi davranmaya çalışıyormuş gibi gelir.

Barnes'ın *Kırmızı Giysili Adam* romanı *Belle Époque* dönemindeki farklı farklı türden erkeklerin "yozlaşmış" benliklerini ortaya koyar, ayrıca Fransa'daki erkeklik sorununa

yeni bir bakış açısı getirir. Bu roman çeşit çeşit erkekliklerden oluşan geniş bir yelpazenin bulunduğu karnaval misali bir alan açar ki bu alan da cinsiyete dayalı hiyerarşilerin tersine çevrilebildiği, toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerine dair tutarlılığın altüst edilebildiği, çeşit çeşit erkekleşme biçimlerine kucak açılan, otorite karşıtı gey bir bağlam yaratır. Emniyet supabı gibi işleyen bu karnaval, erkekliği yanıltıcı görünümlerden ibaret bir hale çevirir ve erkekliğin inşasının normalleştirilme çabasını boşa çıkarır. Ötekileştirilen erkeklik modellerine bu romanda gösterilen hoşgörü, erkekliğe yeni anlamlar kazandırma ihtimalinin önünü açar, ayrıca erkeklik gerçekliğini oluşturan dramatik eylemler bir yana konduğunda ontolojik açıdan aslında erkeklik diye bir şey olmadığını da gösterir. Barnes bu romanıyla *Belle Époque* dönemindeki toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerine dair gerçeğe dayanan açıklamalar arasında devamlılık yaratırken aslında bir yandan da bölünmez ve tek bir erkeklik modeli ortaya koymayı reddeder. Ayrıca erkeklerin toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerini benimsemesini, birbiriyle sözümona zıtlık oluşturan benlik ile Öteki'nin ortaklaşması, uzlaşması ve karşılıklı bağımlılığını içeren köksüz bir gölge oyununa dönüştürür. Barnes'ın Britanyalı bakış açısına göre, *Belle Époque* döneminde Fransız erkekliğinin benimsenmesinde görülen müthiş zenginlik ve alışılmamışlık, Fransızların eşsiz şenlik havası mirası gibi övülüp kutlanması gereken zengin bir aydınlanma kaynağıdır.

Barnes bu biyokurmaca eserlerinde biyografi ile kurmaca arasındaki sınırı bulanıklaştırarak tarihi kişiliklerin hayat hikâyelerinde ya göz ardı edilenlere dikkat çeker ya da hayatlarına farklı bir bakış açısı getirir. Barnes bu eserleri yayınlanmış anılar, biyografiler, mektuplar ve hakiki belgelere dayanarak kaleme almış olsa da bu anlatılar bu kaynaklarda muhtemelen dile getirilmeden, bahsi geçirilmeden bırakılmış meselelerin altını çizer, ayrıca nam salmış bu karakterlerin yaşadıkları dönemlerdeki erkeklik sorunuyla baş ederken ne gibi karşılıklar verdiğinin ayrıntılarına girer ki bu karşılıkların da günümüz dünyasında erkekleşme konusunda görülen davranış modellerine farklı bir seçenek sunması mümkündür. Barnes'ın biyografik romanlarını ele alan bu tezde, bu eserlerin birbirinden farklı, çeşit çeşit sosyokültürel bağlamda erkekliğin performatif olduğuna ısrarla işaret ettiği, farklı kültürlerdeki erkeklik yapılarının sınıf ayrımı, cinsiyetçilik ve ırkçılık gibi sosyokültürel yanlılıklara dayanmasına eleştiri getirdiği görülür.

Bu tez, Barnes'ın biyokurmaca eserlerinde erkekliğin nasıl temsil edildiğine dair metin çözümlemesi yaparak Barnes'ın erkek karakterlerinin toplumsal cinsiyet rollerini

benimserken yaşadığı kafa karışıklığı ve çektiği acıları inceler, ayrıca bu adamların hegemonik (geleneksel) erkeklik modeline uymakta çektiği zorlukları irdeler. Bu çalışma Barnes'ın anlatılarının erkekliğe getirdiği otorite karşıtı yaklaşımı araştırarak söz konusu romanların cinsiyete dayalı hiyerarşilerin ötesine geçmek, toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerine dair tutarlılığı sorgulamak ve ötekileştirilmiş erkeklerin toplumca kabul görmesini sağlamak için hangi yollardan geçtiğini ele alır. Bu araştırma erkekliğe dair özcü varsayımları sorgulayarak erkekliğin anlaşılmasında çeşitliliğin ve kapsayıcılığın yer edindiği bir alan yaratır. Seçilen romanların incelenmesinde postyapısalcı bakış açısı benimsenmiş, böylelikle de homofobi, homososyallik, cinsiyetçilik, ırkçılık vb.nin çığırtkanlığını yapıp yayılmasını sağlayan "İdeal Erkekliğe" dair varsayımlar sorgulanmıştır. Hegemonik erkeklik modeli sorgulandığında, farklı farklı kültürlerde görülmesine rağmen doğuştan geldiğine ve değişmeden kaldığına inanılan erkekliğin özü efsanesi sorunsallaştırılmış olur.

Barnes'ın biyokurmaca eserleri erkekleşme normlarının gelişigüzel yapısını söze döker, ayrıca erkekliği benimsemede belli bir özcü gelenek aramanın veya öyle bir geleneğe uymaya çalışmanın beyhudeliğinin altını çizer. Bu çalışma böylelikle erkeklik çalışmalarının yanı sıra, Barnes eserlerinin toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmaları çerçevesinde incelenmesine de katkıda bulunur. Julian Barnes üzerine edebiyat çalışmalarıyla erkekliğe dair sosyolojik tartışmaları bir araya getirmesi açısından özgün bir araştırmadır. Bu araştırma, Barnes'ın biyokurmaca eserlerinin erkeklik çalışmaları açısından göze çarpacak derecede az ele alınmasına karşılık olarak doğmuştur. Seçtiğim bu romanlarda öne sürdüğüm metin çözümlemeleri, Barnes'ın eserlerinde karşılaştığımız tanınmış tarihi kişiliklerin erkekliğinde rastladığımız zıt nitelikleri gözler önüne sererek şuna dikkat çeker: Hegemonik erkeklik tutarlılık, sahihlik ve iktidar vaadi taşısa da, erkekler farkında olmaksızın onların hayatlarında varlık sürdürmeye ve erkeklerin her hareket ve davranışını bu erkeklik idealine uydurmaya çalışmaya yönlendirmeye devam etse de, hegemonik erkekliğin kendi içindeki çelişkiler ve uyuşmazlıklar sebebiyle gerçek hayatta herhangi birinde vücut bulması ihtimal dahilinde değildir.

Barnes'ın biyokurmaca eserlerinde yer alan erkek karakterler farklı farklı sosyokültürel çevrelerden gelmelerine rağmen yaşadıkları toplumun geleneksel erkeklik anlayışıyla bir noktada ya müzakereye oturur ya da bu anlayışa değişiklik getirir. Böylelikle Barnes'ın biyokurmaca eserlerinde erkekleşme toplumdaki egemen toplumsal cinsiyet normlarını

sorgulayabilecek, bunlara karşı çıkabilecek bir performansa benzer genelde. Diğer bir ifadeyle, bu açıdan bakıldığında, herkes toplumsal cinsiyet özelliklerini oluştururken iktidarın koşul ve söylemlerine körü körüne bağlanmak yerine kendi tavır, davranış ve eylemleriyle egemen toplumsal cinsiyet ideolojilerine karşı çıkmakta ve farklı farklı kültürlerde farklı şekillerde bulunan egemen basmakalıp cinsiyet rollerinin arasına kaynayıp gitmekten kurtulmaya çalışmakta özgürdür. Bu açıdan bakıldığında erkeklik, toplumsal yapıların gerek kendi içinde gerek birbiri arasında değiştirilebilecek toplumsal bir inşa olarak işler; üstelik bireylerin içinde yaşadıkları toplumla sürekli müzakereye oturarak farklı farklı şekillerde ifade edebilecekleri performatif bir şeydir.

C. THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Informatics ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Javanmard
Adı / Name : Raziyeh
Bölümü / Department : İngiliz Edebiyatı / English Literature

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (**İngilizce** / English):

THE REPRESENTATION OF MASCULINITY IN JULIAN BARNES' *ARTHUR & GEORGE, THE NOISE OF TIME* AND *THE MAN IN THE RED COAT*

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: **Yüksek Lisans** / Master ☐ **Doktora** / PhD ☒

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır. /** Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☒
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years. *** ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. ***** ☐

***** *Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası tezle birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. / A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library together with the printed thesis.*

Yazarın imzası / Signature ..... **Tarih** / Date .....
(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.