Hacettepe University Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Programme

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES IN VIRGINIA WOOLF'S *MRS DALLOWAY* AND *JACOB'S ROOM*

Hilal KARAARSLAN

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2022

HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES IN VIRGINIA WOOLF'S *MRS DALLOWAY* AND
JACOB'S ROOM

Hilal KARAARSLAN

Hacettepe University Graduate School Of Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

English Language and Literature Programme

Master's Thesis

Ankara, 2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

KARAARSLAN, Hilal. *Hegemonic Masculinities in Virginia Woolf's Mrs Dalloway and Jacob's Room*, Master's Thesis, Ankara, 2022.

Virginia Woolf's novels have been analysed regarding their literary style, aesthetic quality and their contribution to the Modernist works with their originality and various novelties. Since masculinity studies started to be a big part of the studies in the fields such as literature and social studies, it has become possible to offer new perspectives to evaluate Woolf's works. Hegemonic masculinity theory that is created by R. W. Connell is one of the most important and influential theories in the field of masculinity studies. It suggests that in every era, place, culture and space, there is a hegemonic masculinity that is deemed as the normal and glorified as the dominant masculinity type. This masculinity type is not something fixed and it is subject to change based on the changing and evolving nature of the society or context in which it is created. In his thesis, different hegemonic masculinities that are created in different circumstances in Virginia Woolf's two novels, *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room*, are examined with examples of three male characters from these novels. The hegemonic masculinity that is created by World War I is examined through Septimus Smith, the one that is shaped by the imperialistic ideas is analysed through Peter Walsh and the one that is constructed in the gendered space of Cambridge University through education is examined through Jacob Flanders. It is argued that these male characters' lives are harmed due to their endless chase of the hegemonic masculinity ideals. Consequently, this thesis claims that Woolf criticises patriarchy's role in constructing hegemonic masculinity ideals because both patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity ideals victimise men by putting them into an endless cycle of trying to become an accepted and ideal man, and she displays her criticisms through the male characters she creates in *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room*.

Keywords

Virginia Woolf, *Mrs Dalloway* (1925), *Jacob's Room* (1922), patriarchy, masculinity studies, hegemonic masculinity

ÖZET

KARAARSLAN, Hilal. *Virginia Woolf'un Mrs. Dalloway ve Jacob's Room Romanlarında Hegemonik Erkeklikler*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara, 2022

Virginia Woolf'un romanları edebi tarzları, estetik değerleri ve Modernist eserlere özgünlükleri ve çeşitli yenilikleriyle yaptıkları katkıları bakımından incelenmiştir. Erkeklik çalışmalarının, edebiyat ve sosyal bilimler alanlarındaki çalışmaların büyük bir parçası haline gelmesiyle birlikte, Woolf'un eserlerini farklı bakış açılarıyla değerlendirmek mümkün hale geldi. R.W. Connell tarafından ortaya atılan hegemonik erkeklik teorisi, erkeklik çalışmaları alanının en önemli ve etkili teorilerinden biridir. Bu teori, her dönemde, mekânda, kültürde ve alanda, normal olarak kabul edilen ve yüceltilen baskın bir erkeklik tipinin, hegemonik erkeklik olarak ortaya çıktığını iddia eder. Bu erkeklik tipi sabit değildir ve yaratıldığı toplumun ya da ortamın değişen ve evrimleşen doğasına bağlı olarak değişim gösterir. Bu tezde, Virginia Woolf'un iki romanı *Mrs Dalloway* ve *Jacob's Room*'da farklı koşullarda yaratılan farklı hegemonik erkeklikler bu romanlarda bulunan üç erkek karakterden örnekler verilerek incelenmiştir. Birinci Dünya Savaşı tarafından yaratılan hegemonik erkeklik Septimus Smith vasıtasıyla, emperyalist fikirler tarafından şekillenen hegemonik erkeklik Peter Walsh yoluyla, eğitim yoluyla Cambridge Üniversitesi'nin cinsiyetçi alanında oluşturulmuş olan hegemonik erkeklik ise Jacob Flanders aracılığıyla incelenmiştir. Bu erkek karakterlerin hegemonik erkeklik ideallerini sürekli yakalamaya çalışmaları nedeniyle hayatlarının zarar gördüğü iddia edilmiştir. Sonuç olarak, bu tez, Woolf'un ataerkilliğin hegemonik erkeklikler yaratmasındaki rolünü eleştirdiğini çünkü hem ataerkilliğin hem de hegemonik erkeklik ideallerinin erkekleri devamlı olarak kabul gören ve ideal bir erkek olmaya çalıştıkları bir döngünün içine sokarak onları kurbanlaştırdığını, ve Woolf'un bu eleştirilerini *Mrs Dalloway* ve *Jacob's Room*'da yarattığı erkek karakterler yoluyla gösterdiğini iddia eder.

Anahtar sözcükler:

Virginia Woolf, *Mrs Dalloway* (1925), *Jacob's Room* (1922), patriarka, erkeklik çalışmaları, hegemonik erkeklik

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Virginia Woolf (1882–1941) is one of the most acclaimed and significant authors in English Literature and a pioneer of Modernist English literature, whose works immensely influenced the fields of novel writing, gender studies, and literary criticism. Virginia Woolf's significant and powerful works have always been analysed through various aspects and theories; the characters she creates have been a source of research and a way to understand the perceptions, ideas, and emotions of different people with different backgrounds. In this thesis, the purpose is to analyse some of the male characters she creates in her two novels, *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room*, and examine what kind of a stance Virginia Woolf has in terms of the hegemonic masculinity ideals constructed by the society. In this thesis, it is claimed that Virginia Woolf considers the patriarchal system as a powerful and destructive set of mechanisms that is detrimental to the lives of men as well as to those of women. This thesis suggests that Virginia Woolf criticises the masculinity ideals that are created to keep the patriarchal system intact and displays her critical views on the harms the hegemonic masculinity ideals inflicted upon men through the male characters she creates in *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room*. It will be explained how Septimus Warren Smith, Peter Walsh and Jacob Flanders become victims of the patriarchy and the hegemonic masculinity ideals even if they all have different experiences and distinctive relationships with patriarchy. These analyses of the male characters of Woolf will be delved into in the following chapters.

In this introduction, firstly, the concepts of masculinity, patriarchy, hegemonic masculinity and influence of these concepts on men will be discussed. After touching upon the important points of Virginia Woolf's life that contributed to her literary understanding, style and her writing in general, Woolf's aesthetic vision in literature and how she contributes to the modernist literature and how she tries to break away from the literary conventions through her work will be examined. Underlining Woolf's importance as an author who creates novelties in her works in terms of style, her significance as a writer who deals with the social, historical, and political issues of her time will be examined. Then, a detailed information about the political and social atmosphere at the beginning of the twentieth century in England will be introduced, and Woolf's ideas on the conventions of gender

roles, masculinity ideals, the war, and the male gender roles that are constructed by the war atmosphere in England will be discussed in detail.

With the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s, the gender roles and inequality between men and women were discussed a lot as women asked for equal rights. In doing this, this movement created the opportunity to draw attention to the constructions of masculinity, femininity, gender, and gender roles. Douglas Schrock and Michael Schwalbe point out that after the 1960s and 1970s, with the influence of the feminist movement, "gender scholars have created an enormous body of theory and research that goes under the rubric of 'critical studies of men and masculinities'" (278). Through these research and discussions, attempts to define masculinity and femininity were made. In one of these attempts, masculinity is defined as "'configuration of practices' – practices that have the effect of subordinating women" (Schrock, Schwalbe 279). Thus, it is possible to suggest that masculinity is a set of practices that are determined to be fit for men within the social structure. However, from this definition, it should not be understood that masculinity is solely an empirical part of the male members of the society. R. W. Connell suggests that "to define masculinity as what-men-empirically-are is to rule out the usage in which we call some women 'masculine' and some men 'feminine' regardless of who displays them…The terms 'masculine' and 'feminine' point beyond categorical sex difference to the ways men differ among themselves, and women differ among themselves, in matters of gender" (69). Masculinity, as a concept, is not a term that can be explained without considering its relation to the cultural, social and historical mechanisms. Connell explains the relationship between masculinity and culture by claiming that "in speaking of masculinity at all…we are 'doing gender' in a culturally specific way" (68). Since its relation to the cultural conditions is deemed extremely important, masculinity has started to be thought of as something plural rather than singular. This means that there is not one definition or understanding of masculinity but there are masculinities. Schrock and Schwalbe explain the birth of such a mindset with the theory of hegemonic masculinity and claim that the idea of the existence of many masculinities "grew out of the distinction between hegemonic masculinity - the kind of manhood act most revered in a culture - and lower-status ways that manhood is enacted by males with fewer resources" (280). Thus, it is claimed that masculinity is not a notion that has only one definition, but it is something that includes many types of masculinities

within itself; and pondering over the power relations between these different masculinities has a great significance because "[t]o recognize more than one kind of masculinity is only a first step. We have to examine the relations between them" (*Masculinities* 76). These masculinity types have a hierarchy among them, and hegemonic masculinity is the one that is most glorified and has the dominant position in this hierarchical structure.

To be able to fully grasp what hegemonic masculinity means, the term "hegemony" should be looked into in the first place. Mike Donaldson explains the notion of hegemony as follows:

> Hegemony, a pivotal concept in Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* and his most significant contribution to Marxist thinking, is about the winning and holding of power and the formation (and destruction) of social groups in that process. In this sense, it is importantly about the ways in which the ruling class establishes and maintains its domination… Hegemony involves persuasion of the greater part of the population, particularly through the media, and the organization of social institutions in ways that appear "natural," "ordinary," "normal." (645)

So, hegemony is created through the domination of a group of people with a certain behaviour, mindset, ideal or a cultural notion and this group's attributes are regarded as the socially accepted norm. Hegemony is certainly possible to be used in order to discredit, dominate and undermine the other groups that do not align with the standards or attributes of the dominating group. Demetrakis Z. Demetriou explains the starting point of hegemonic masculinity theory of Connell and suggests that Connell came up with this theory to criticise and replace the sex role theory (338). He suggests:

> By identifying the social structure with biological difference, sex role theory reduces gender to two homogeneous and complementary categories and thus underplays social inequality and power. This neglect of power is two-dimensional in that sex role theory fails to acknowledge power relationships both between and within genders. (Demetriou 338)

So, it could be argued that Connell, recognizing the shortcomings of the sex role theory, developed the hegemonic masculinity theory to deeply analyse the significance and creation of the power relations between and within the genders and gender roles. Connell aimed to show the existence of different forms of masculinities and femininities and to explain the power relations between these forms by making use of Gramsci's concept of hegemony.

Connell defines hegemonic masculinity as a kind of masculinity that is favored above other types of masculinity in a culture; it is determined as the "normal" for men in that culture and it is continually imposed upon men in the same cultural structure

(*Masculinities* 76). It holds an authority over other masculinities and the culture it belongs glorifies the groups of men that are in line with the constructed hegemonic masculinity values and characteristics. According to Vahit Yasayan, the main function of hegemonic masculinity "is to authorize not only the dominant position of men, but also the dominance of particular social groups of men, along with their power, values, wealth and beliefs over other groups" (2). So, hegemonic masculinity provides a powerful position to a certain group of men above others, while it also contributes to the patriarchal structure that positions men over women. In addition to this, hegemonic masculinity is not something fixed; in every period, a new variant of hegemonic masculinity is constructed by the culture with modified social roles devised for men. Connell explains this by suggesting that "'[h]egemonic masculinity' is not a fixed character type, always and everywhere the same. It is, rather, the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable" (*Masculinities* 76). Thus, it should be noted that hegemonic masculinity is something different than a male sex role, and every era produces its own version of the hegemonic masculinity according to the needs and the atmosphere of the time period and the society. According to Demetriou, gender "is not a fixed set of social norms that are passively internalized and enacted, but it is constantly produced and reproduced in social practice" (340). Hence, change and production of new forms of hegemonic masculinity are central to the theory of Connell.

Connell draws attention to the relationship between the existence of the hegemonic masculinity and the patriarchy by suggesting that "'[h]egemonic masculinity' is always constructed in relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women. The interplay between different forms of masculinity is an important part of how a patriarchal social order works" (*Gender and Power* 183). Since there is such a significant relation between hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy, it is necessary to explain the structure of patriarchy further.

The concept of patriarchy has been used in order to better examine the causes and principles of the oppression of women and the system that systematically empowers men over women. The term has been used for many years throughout history by the significant feminist women like "Virginia Woolf, the Fabian Women's Group and Vera Brittain" (Beechey 66). The reason why this concept came into use by the feminists is to resolve

some problems according to Veronica Beechey:

> Politically, feminists of a variety of different persuasions have seized upon the concept of patriarchy in the search for an explanation of feelings of oppression and subordination and in the desire to transform feelings of rebellion into a political practice and theory. And theoretically the concept of patriarchy has been used to address the question of the real basis of the subordination of women, and to analyse the particular forms which it assumes. Thus the theory of patriarchy attempts to penetrate beneath the particular experiences and manifestations of women's oppression and to formulate some coherent theory of the basis of subordination which underlies them. (66)

Thus, it could be argued that the feminists wanted to create a framework and theoretical structure to explain and resist the systematic oppression of women. In order to display the principles of the subordination of women and to explain that it is something systematic rather than personal experiences of women, they needed to name it on a theoretical ground. Zillah Eisenstein provides a definition of the patriarchy as follows:

> Patriarchy is defined to mean a sexual system of power in which the male role is superior in possession of power and economic privilege. Patriarchy is the male hierarchical ordering of society…The patriarchal system is preserved, via marriage and the family, through the sexual division of labor and society. Sex roles themselves are understood to be units of power and oppression. (202)

So, patriarchy is fundamentally related to both gender and hierarchy. Also, it is a system continuously kept intact by the social and cultural practices. Patriarchy has a great influence on the social structure and institutions as Robert Bahlieda claims: "patriarchal attitudes, values and beliefs shape our cultural, social, political, and economic decision making, interpersonal relationships, leadership models, religious beliefs, and educational practices" (16). It can be safely argued that patriarchy is something that affects every individual of a society whether they are men or women since it is an all-encompassing cultural mindset that can be found in various countries, institutions, and religions. As Bahlieda explains:

> …patriarchy is the primary and oldest group-think ideology of humankind upon which all other ideologies are premised and from which other ideologies arise. It is interwoven with culture, gender, economics, religion, education, leadership, and power. These elements are the lifeblood of all our global social institutions. Patriarchy simultaneously coexists within these bodies while also creating their complexity. (22)

That is why patriarchy should be considered as an ideology that is deeply ingrained in every part of life and influential on critical aspects and areas of the social structure. This makes the patriarchy a system that affects male members of the society as well as women. It should be noted that patriarchy has two sets of principles according to Kate Millett: "males dominate females and older males dominate younger males" (qtd. In Beechey 68).

So, it can also restrict men's lives as well as women's lives according to the requirements of the society, era, culture, politics or economic conditions. The main aim of the patriarchal system is to construct a society that has a certain order organized through the roles that are imposed upon the members of the society according to their gender. Virginia Woolf was one of the most important feminist figures that brought criticisms to this patriarchal order that put restrictions upon people. Thus, her life and her views about the position of women and men within the society, culture, education, and literature and how those views were shaped should be looked into further.

Virginia Woolf was born in London to Leslie Stephen, who was a philosopher and a biographer, and Julia Prinsep Stephen. Woolf had been under the great influence of her close relatives in terms of literature and intellectual preoccupation. Her father was an eminent literary figure and the first editor (1882–91) of the *Dictionary of National Biography* and her aunt, Julia Margaret Cameron was "one of the greatest portrait photographers of the nineteenth century" (Reid n.p.). These connections led Woolf to grow a significant interest in art, reading and writing. Besides, the environment where Virginia grew up was a place where the literary art was greatly appreciated. Virginia Woolf's nephew and biographer Quentin Bell describes the atmosphere of the house of the Stephens by talking about the household of Woolf's great-grandfather and argues that Sir James Stephen's house had a great admiration for art and literature and appreciated writers such as Wordsworth, Scott, Campbell, Voltaire and Montaigne (6). So, it was inevitable for her not to be taken with the ongoing interest in literature in her household and take up writing. The act of writing and publishing her works became Woolf's main endeavour after she married Leonard Woolf in 1912. One of the most important aspects of her literary life was her becoming a part of the Bloomsbury Group. This was a group consisting of various intellectual writers, artists and philosophers, who aimed to discuss social, aesthetic, literary and historical matters by meeting regularly. Woolf's view on life and literature was greatly influenced by the meetings held by this group and led her shape her ideas on historical and political issues at the time.

After her marriage to Leonard Woolf, amid many mental irregularities, Woolf wrote many renowned novels along with significant essays on artistic and literary theory, literary history, women's literature, and the power politics. After the publication of her first two novels, in 1922, she wrote *Jacob's Room* which can be argued to be the first

novel in which Woolf really accomplished what she wanted in novel writing. This is because she focused on the spiritual aspect of a young person dying without putting the person's life in a regular plot organisation because she believed that the perception of human beings could not be conveyed through the traditional methods of storytelling and characterisation used in the Victorian era. Joan Bennett also points out the difference of *Jacob's Room* from her previous novels by suggesting that "*Jacob's Room* is the first of her novels which wholly rejects the old method; but in it her new technique is not yet used with the ease and assurance she was later to acquire" (24-25). At the beginning of 1924, Virginia and Leonard Woolf moved from the suburbs to Bloomsbury "where they were less isolated from London society" (Reid n.p.). Then, Woolf wrote *Mrs Dalloway* (1925), which wholly incapsulates the personal agonies of the people afflicted by the tragedy of war. It might be argued that she found her true voice in this novel since she called attention to the social problems of the 1920s and the war that shattered so many lives by demonstrating individual experiences with an impressionistic style. The nonfiction works of Virginia Woolf, who wrote powerful novels after *Mrs Dalloway*, are also important. One of these non-fiction works is definitely *A Room of One's Own* (1929) in which Woolf blames women's lack of money and profession for their absence in the history or any other public areas of life. Her pacifist work, *Three Guineas* (1938) was written after Vanessa's son, her nephew Julian Bell, was killed in the Spanish Civil War and the book was "privately a lament over Julian's death and publicly a diatribe against war" (Reid n.p.). In the book, she provides ways to stop the war from happening. Among all the crises and mentally challenging periods, Woolf wrote novels that influenced the novel genre immensely with their non-linear aesthetic along with highly crucial essays about women's rights, history of literature, and literary theory. That is why her impact on literature and especially on modernist movement is immeasurable. Woolf was a writer who desired for change in the traditional writing techniques and literary conventions and that is the reason why she always chased after new ways of expressing herself and depicting human condition under various circumstances. According to Madelyn Detloff, Woolf regarded her readers more able to read and understand what she tried to express to the contrary of her critics. Detloff claims that Woolf criticised "the bourgeoisie ("middlebrows") who (in her view) did not evolve new standards of aesthetic value but clung instead to old standards for the sake of keeping up

appearances" (9). She was not content with the fact that the same novels were written repeatedly; nothing new would be appreciated by the literary critics and the bourgeoisie. What she wanted to do was to find new ways to talk about the inner condition of human beings. This is one of the most important things that made Woolf so impactful in English literature and the novel genre. She was one of the most influential presiders of High modernism in English Literature with James Joyce and T. S. Eliot. All together, these writers tried to break free from the conventional ways of expression and eventually to transform the understanding of literature. Maria Dibattista points out that even if Woolf grew up in an environment full of late Victorian and Edwardian traditions and domestic rituals and she was used to an ordinary, simple life; she "as both writer and publisher, was more at home and more herself in the epicentre of Georgian modernity, in which established institutions, conventional ideas, and traditional artistic methods were under scrutiny and, more often than not, under attack" (363). So, it can be said that one of the most important characteristics of Woolf's art was creating experimental works that would aim the destruction or negation of the old ways.

Her perspective on art and what she tried to achieve through her works can be clearly understood by examining one of her most significant essays, "Modern Fiction." This essay is one of the most important sources that include Woolf's views on the importance of reforming the style of the traditional novel writing. She claims that the new novel writing should be more focused on the literary style and the impressions of the human mind and soul instead of a social realist style. These views lead her to be regarded as an apolitical author. In this essay Woolf talks about the conventions of novel writing in the Victorian era, and says "the tyrant is obeyed," meaning the traditions of the novel writing are followed without questioning (160). From this sentence, it can be understood that Woolf wanted to change the old-fashioned literary conventions. When the modernist literature is taken into consideration, it is seen that the aim of the modernist writers was to create a new and aesthetically original style; in other words, "modernist writing proposes a productive and elusive site of change, rupture, or escape from [traditional and cultural] contexts" (Goldman and Randall xi). As a modernist writer, Woolf's proposition was also to deeply transform the traditional literary ways of novel writing brought by the formal realism of the eighteenth century and the social realism of the nineteenth century. She calls the Victorian novelists "materialists" since "they are concerned not with the

spirit but with the body" ("Modern Fiction" 158). By being concerned with the body, she meant that the Victorian novelists were only dealing with the things that can be seen by the human eye. They included the condition of the society, the disadvantaged people, technological and industrial changes that were happening in the country and how they affected the lifestyles of the people, the migration from rural areas to urban areas. Furthermore, they dealt with these topics by means of carefully organised plots, characters that are designed to represent a particular group of people, and a story that follows a certain chronological order. She gives the example of Arnold Bennett, the Victorian novelist, and says that "he can make a book so well constructed and solid in its craftsmanship that it is difficult for the most exacting of critics to see through what chink or crevice decay can creep in" ("Modern Fiction" 158). In other words, she indicates how calculated the novels of the Victorian era are; she says that they are so thoroughly formulated that nothing divergent could be found in them. However, Woolf emphasised that this kind of literary attitude is inadequate in portraying the life that is "a luminous halo" ("Modern Fiction" 160). She says that there is something the Victorian novelists failed to include in their novels by claiming that "[w]hether we call it life or spirit, truth or reality, this, the essential thing has moved off, or on, and refuses to be contained any longer in such ill-fitting vestments as we provide" ("Modern Fiction" 160). She claims that the Victorian novelists, while dealing with the social problems, the form of the novel, the plot and the representative characters, ignored what makes human, human. She says that the impressions the human mind perceives during daily life cannot be expressed with the fixedmethods set by the Victorian novelists and she points out that "if he [the novelist] could write what he chose, not what he must, if he could base his work upon his own feeling and not uponconvention, there would be no plot, no comedy, no tragedy, no love interest or catastrophe in the accepted style and perhaps not a single button sewn on as the Bond Street tailors would have it" ("Modern Fiction" 160). As can be understood from this, Woolf deemed the rules of novel writing detrimental to the development of the genre and thought that the fundamental thing that should be focused on is the human mind and what it goes through on a daily basis. For Woolf, it was impossible to grasp life's various effects on the minds of the individuals through the strict methods of Victorian fiction writing. For Woolf, literature was providing a way to present life with all its ups and downs, and since life was not something fixed or estimated; it could not be

circumscribed with rules or regulations in the novels. The fact that she advocated for a literary style that is mainly preoccupied with the spirit and the mind of the people led to Woolf's being regarded as an apolitical writer and her works were predominantly examined regarding their modernist style and literary value.

The overwhelming part of the studies on Virginia Woolf focused either on her feminism or her modernist literary form that deals with the inner realm of human beings. Even if she had many essays on gender issues that could be considered as political writings, her social concerns and political ideas have been overlooked when her art was discussed. On this matter, Berenice Carroll asserts: "Virginia Woolf is seldom seen as a political writer, least of all as a successful or influential political writer, and almost never as a theorist with a comprehensive and penetrating grasp of the social and political fabric of the society we inhabit. For the most part, the political content of her writings goes completely unnoticed" (99). While she was generally seen as an author of sensibilities, emotions and reflection, Woolf as a social critic was ignored and many people saw her as uninterested in politics and social issues. Her biographer and nephew Quentin Bell wrote that "Virginia was not really worried about politics" (179). This idea of her being uninterested in or bored by the politics was due to her style of revealing the social issues in her art: "In Virginia Woolf's writings, the 'reality' of society is always seen through the observations, words or reflections of individual human beings" (Carroll 103). So, her literary style that focuses on human beings' inner world caused her being considered a writer who is indifferent towards the era she lived in and its troubles.

Another reason for Woolf to be identified as a writer who is not concerned with social or political issues is that she actually put a distance between her and the highly male-dominated political environment of her time. Michael Whitworth suggests that in order to understand Woolf's place in the modernist literary tradition, her differences from and similarities to a generalised modernism should be acknowledged. He, then, mentions her avoidance of politics and says: "Woolf maintained a critical distance from the politics which corresponded to these metaphors [sculptural 'hardness' and 'dryness'], a politics of authoritarianism and exaggerated masculinity" (Whitworth 147). This evasive attitude of hers led to her being understood as a writer who does not deal with social and political issues, merely acting with an aesthetic concern.

Carroll argues that the reason why Woolf's work is mainly analysed in terms of its style

is because Woolf gave an immense importance to the beauty of her language. She suggests:

> [Woolf] tried to submit everything to "beautification of language" in her novels, indeed evenin her political tracts. That she succeeded in this almost beyond measure is undeniable; she succeeded almost too well for her purpose. That there was some political substance to *The Years*, ten years later, was at least dimly recognized by many readers. But that Woolf's purposein *Mrs Dalloway* was "to criticize the social system" was hardly guessed by any. (Carroll 103)

Thus, it can be safely argued that Woolf herself contributed to the fact that the literary circles saw her as an apolitical author who is not interested in social issues by putting her aesthetic concerns before her social concerns or possibly by trying to include both in her art. It should also be considered that Woolf perceived the act of writing fiction as a way to convey the reality of life itself and she thought the only possible way to do so is by including a "myriad of impressions" and by "looking within" ("Modern Fiction" 160). In order to capture life as it is, she said, one should look within the souls of the human beings and reach the truth. In other words, the reason why she was so indulged in the perceptions and sensibilities of the individuals in her novels was that she wished to present a portrayal of a society that had defects in so many areas. Ray Monk phrases Woolf's concern in these words: "in order to represent life as it really is, in order to present people as they really are, we must conjure up phantoms; in order to capture the truth about reality, we must write fiction" (12). The ideological tone in her novels was never a didactic or an obvious one, her "radical critique of 'the fabric of things' is subtly persuasive" and when reading her novels, it is certainly possible to "feel the reach and intensity of [her] socio-political vision, but never the push of her hand" but the reality of the society is always to be found there (Bradshaw "The socio-political" 191). That is why it is possible to find the reality of the society that exists at the beginning of the twentieth century in Woolf's novels through a closer look.

As a matter of fact, a considerable number of Woolf's novels are either about war or have characters that are deeply affected by the war, so "[h]er very involvement in the social effects of the war,and her response to it, made her political" (Salih 30). David Bradshaw claims the fact that Woolf wrote about the social and political issues as well as creating aesthetically satisfying works of art started to be recognised at the beginning of the twenty first century, and suggests that people began to examine her novels like *Jacob's Room*, *The Years* and *To the Lighthouse* from a different perspective and the readers are

"challenged to think just as hard about the wider moral, social and political issues which the novels encompass as they are required to come to terms with the writerly goad of the texts" (Bradshaw "The socio-political" 191). Woolf had many ideological and political ideas she indicated in her novels underlying her lyrical style. She saw many great problems lurking in the English society and she had an agenda either to reflect them in her writing or try to change some things through organisations she attended such as People's Suffrage Federation, Women's Cooperative Guild, and Rodmell Women's Institute. Jessica Berman points out her interest in politics and social issues by suggesting that "[w]hile she did not devote her life to party activity as did Leonard, it has by now become clear that Virginia Woolf committed herself to both investigating and influencing those 'personal, social,' and 'historical' forces" (116).

Woolf deemed social conventions as restrictions upon people's individuality, limiting their lives enormously. In *A Writer's Diary*, for instance, Woolf mentions that she finished reading *Electra* by Sophocles and she points out the conventions that cause Electra to live a "hedged" life. Here she compares the social customs of the Greek and the English and she writes: "It's strange to notice how although the conventions are perfectly false and ridiculous, they never appear petty or undignified as our English conventions are constantly made to do" (*A Writer's Diary* 5). These lines have a great importance in understanding Woolf's view on English society's rules imposed upon people: she either calls them "false," "ridiculous" or "petty" and "undignified."

In *Moments of Being*, she talks about her stepbrother George and how he "believed in society" (153). She talks about his belief in society and then compares herself to him:

> In a thousand ways he made me feel that he believed in society. A belief which is so commonly accepted, as his was by all his friends, had depth, swiftness, inevitability. It impresses even the outsider by the sweep of its current. Sometimes when I hear God Save the King I too feel a current belief but almost directly I consider my own splits asunder and one side of me criticises the other. George never questioned his belief in the old tune that society played. He rose and took his hat off and stood. Not only did he never question his behaviour; he applauded it, enforced it. (*Moments* 153-154)

In these sentences, there is a critical tone about her step brother's attitude towards the conventions and social norms. From the expression "believing in society," supporting the expectations imposed upon the individuals could be understood. Woolf also points out that when she finds herself supporting the society, one part of herself criticises this and she changes her approach immediately. This perspective of hers is seen both in her style

of writing and also in the themes she chose while writing her novels. Even if she is not considered a political writer that is deeply involved in the matters of the society and politics, she often has something to criticise to reform the societal values and systems. So, she ascribes negative connotations to the traditions of the society; she refuses to accept what is seen normal and regular as the unquestionable truth just like she refused the literary traditions of the Victorian society in her essay, "Modern Fiction."

Another instance she was angry with how the English society restricts its individuals can be found in her diary, in the part where she talks about D. H. Lawrence. In her diary, she mentions his books being banned and says: "Government hoofing him out, like a toad: and banning his book: the brutality of civilised society to this panting agonised man: and how futileit was" (*The Diary of* 188). Here, "the brutality of civilised society"has a great significance because it shows the anger and resentment in Woolf against the society that stands in front of the people who try to get free from the requirements to be an accepted individual. The fact that D. H. Lawrence's books get banned by the government due to their controversial content makes Woolf frustrated at the society. So, it can be said that Woolf is never seen as a person who is in line with the society in certain aspects, and it is impossible for her to exclude these ideas of her from her art. To judge her work only with her style and not considering its social and political aspect does not provide a complete understanding of what she wanted to achieve through her writing. Moreover, in her diary, when she talks about the process of her writing *The Years*, she says that she wants to talk about the society and its problems while also including a vision:

> I want to give the whole of the present society -nothing less: facts as well as the vision. It should aim at immense breadth and immense intensity. It should include satire, comedy, poetry, narrative, history, politics, feminism, art, literature -in short, a summing up of all I know, feel, laugh at, despise, like, admire, hate. (*The Diary* 197)

From what she said about the writing process of *The Years*, one may conclude that her aimwas not only to create an aesthetically satisfying literary work, but also to present her views on particular topics including politics, culture, and English society and its values, which can also be understood by examining her characters.

In Virginia Woolf's fiction, there is a myriad of characters who are in a major conflict with the society and its values, and these characters are constantly in a battle against the powerholders, be it the patriarchs, the politicians, or the rulers from different areas of

life. That is why Carroll mentions a primary message that is at the centre of all Woolf's fictional works: "[t]he keynote of Virginia Woolf's political philosophy is struggle" (110). Then, she provides examples of different characters that withstand the dominant ideologies or people:

> Doris Kilman struggles and suffers, Septimus Warren Smith struggles and dies. In *To the Lighthouse*, published two years after *Mrs Dalloway*, Lily Briscoe struggles and triumphs. Doris Kilman, the alien, Septimus Warren Smith, the madman, and Lily Briscoe, the spinster artist, are bound together like sisters and brother in the great compact to resist tyranny. (110)

The common point of all these characters is that they are all regarded as outcasts that are tried to be moulded into some ideal type. All of them have a conflictual relationship with the society and they are obligated to maintain a fight against a general consensus that is accepted as normal. It is clear that Woolf wanted to show the oppression of the English society through the various hardships her characters experience, whether these hardships are about their gender, their behaviour, or their characteristics. She wanted to show that what seems personal is actually political, and in order to reach an opinion in politics, one should look at the individuals' lives and observations. She included personal stories in her novels to portray what a society heavily shaped by the patriarchy does to its individuals for

> Woolf recognized in the society around her a political and social system geared to the destruction and perversion of human life and creativity. The pillars of this system were: patriarchy, property, possessiveness, dominance, and invidious distinction. Like many radical feminists today, she saw patriarchy as the central pillar, where domestic politics, institutional politics, and state politics converge, where the "personal is the political." (Carroll 116)

Thus, Woolf saw that the eradication of the individuals' freedom and passion to create was the outcome of the systematic oppression maintained by the "patriarchy, property, possessiveness, dominance." Since the politics and its consequences created a lethal harm in the lives of the individuals, she realised that it is possible to criticise what is wrong with the system by shedding light on personal lives, feelings, and impressions of people. She wanted to picture the society she lives in with all of its reality, however she chose to do it by focusing on the feelings and perceptions of the characters that are influenced by the social conditions of their society. After the success of *The Years*, for which she gets positive reviews, Woolf gets really excited about this book creating a debate among people about the social issues and writes in her diary: "my intention in *The Years* may be not so entirely muted and obscured as I feared" (*The Diary* 278). She talks about her intention a

few lines later: "And this means that it will be debated; and this means that *Three Guineas* will strike very sharp and clear on a hot iron: so that my immensely careful planning won't be baulked by time of life etc. as I had made certain" (*The Diary* 278). It was not long that *Three Guineas* was published after the publication of *The Years*, and *Three Guineas* was by far the most political work of Virginia Woolf since it was predominantly about war and its effects on society. From what she wrote in her diary about *The Years* and *Three Guineas*, it is possible to conclude that Woolf was happy that her fictional work would create an atmosphere of discussion before she delves into the political issues with a more realistic attitude in her nonfictional work. Carroll suggests that what Woolf mentioned as her "careful planning" in her diary is actually "a conscious political strategy" (103). Thus, although Virginia Woolf has been thought of as an author who dwells on the reflections, visions and observations of the characters she created, it is always possible to find the reality and the circumstances of the society of her time through the perceptions of the characters in her novels.

One of Woolf's most important political texts is surely *A Room of One's Own* (1929), in which she criticised patriarchy severely. She expressed her reflections on "the patriarchs, the professors" as such:

> True, they [the patriarchs, the professors] had money and power, but only at the cost of harbouring in their breasts an eagle, a vulture, forever tearing the liver out and plucking at the lungs-the instinct for possession, the rage for acquisition which drives them to desire other people's fields and goods perpetually; to make frontiers and flags; battleships and poison gas; to offer up their own lives and their children's lives. Walk through the Admiralty Arch ... or any other avenue given up to trophies and cannon and reflect upon the kind of glory celebrated there. Or watch in the spring sunshine the stockbroker and the great barrister going indoors to make money and more money and more money when it is a fact that five hundred pounds a year will keep one alive in the sunshine. (68)

So, it is utterly inaccurate to claim that Woolf had nothing to do with politics or social problems that existed in the society she lived in. In the lines quoted above, she talks about the men in power who have money and power, but she says that in order to have these, they have to sacrifice their lives and also their children's lives, and they have an unlimited desire and hunger for possession and power which eats them from within. While it is possible for them to survive with "five hundred pounds a year" they always strive for more and more money. Thus, Woolf does not hesitate to write about the political figures and powerful men in politics in a critical way; when she sees a significant problem, she points out the problem in her own literary style. So, it can be said that when her husband

argued that Woolf was "the least political animal that has lived since Aristotle invented the definition," he was not aware of the fact that politics was not only about the political parties or the developments in the parliament (*Downhill All the Way* 27).

The social system with all its parts and tools is at fault according to Woolf for it creates an environment that kills the productivity and creativity, and it tries to destroy all of its nonconformist individuals with its machinations. Thus, it can be said that this social system which is highly patriarchal puts various limitations on its individuals without distinguishing genders. The type of oppression or requirements may differ depending on the gender; however, it is enough for a person to be outside of the boundaries that were placed by the society to be punished and outcasted regardless of their gender.

Because Virginia Woolf was heavily involved in matters about gender and gender inequality in many spheres of life, her opinions on the social system can be applied to her ideas on gender. It can be argued that since Woolf saw the whole patriarchal social system as a problematic oppressive agent to mould people into some ideal types, she was also aware of the pressure that was put upon the male individuals of the society. From a very young age, people from both sexes are confronted with various rules that they need to follow to be a decent member of the society. Woolf makes a very important point in one of her essays by claiming that the oppression created by the dominant ideology creates a delusion of freedom for men when in fact it also limits them in various ways:

> No more than men, however, could they [women novelists] free themselves from a more fundamental tyranny- the tyranny of sex itself. The effort to free themselves, or rather to enjoy what appears, perhaps erroneously, to be the comparative freedom of the male sex from that tyranny, is another influence which has told disastrously upon the writing of women. (*Selected Essays* 149)

The tyranny of sex that is created by the society has such a tremendous power that even men cannot free themselves from that tyranny and cannot achieve writing outside of tradition in terms of gender roles. In literature, it may appear that men are writing freely, however they are also bound by the gender roles idealised by the dominant ideology. Thus, even if the patriarchal system subjects women to unfair customs and practices, and positions women in a disadvantaged status, it does not set men free to do whatever they want because the system should be kept intact. Furthermore, in the introduction she wrote for *A Room of One's Own*, Snaith mentions Woolf's argument that "the exclusion of women from social, political, and creative spheres has detrimental effects on society as a whole" (10). In *A Room of One's Own*, Woolf talks about the unequal opportunities in

creating a work of art among people from different groups of society. She refers to Arthur Quiller-Couch, who is a Professor of Literature at the time, and his words about how the poor children do not have a single chance to become a renowned poet compared to the children who could afford the best education Britain could offer. Then, she compares this situation with the condition of women in the British society and she writes:

> Intellectual freedom depends upon material things. Poetry depends upon intellectual freedom. And women have always been poor, not for two hundred years merely, but from the beginning of time. Women have had less intellectual freedom than the sons of Athenian slaves. Women, then, have not had a dog's chance of writing poetry. That is why I have laid so much stress on money and a room of one's own. (*A Room* 115)

This comparison Woolf provides makes it possible to claim that the reason why women could not overcome certain restrictions in creating a work of art is related to economic issues as much as it is related to the gender roles. And these economic problems are valid for working class men, as well. Thus, it can be argued that Woolf considers the economic limitations that could hinder people of both sexes from intellectually growing as significant as the restrictions based solely on gender. This point of view shows that Woolf thinks that the unequal circumstances created by the system can exist for both sexes.

Woolf, while criticizing the societal gender roles imposed on women, was also criticising the patriarchy as the whole system that restricts all individuals. She was scrutinising the society and putting the patriarchy on trial by laying bare the minds of the individuals trapped in a web of expectations. It is an undeniable fact that she was advocating for social change mostly for the betterment of the social condition of women, nevertheless she was also aware of the fact that without changing the social expectations imposed upon both genders, any effort for a social reform would be in vain. In her diary, she wrote that her aim in writing *Mrs Dalloway* was "to criticise the social system and to show it at work, at its most intense" (*The Diary* 57). It is certainly true that Woolf wanted to present the workings of the minds of the characters she created, and she wrote about the pains the modern era inflicted upon the souls of the human beings. She wanted to convey real life by dwelling on people's feelings and mental strains because she "arguedthat 'real' life can only be communicated through the representation of the flow of consciousness, the record of random atoms' impact on perception" (Hussey 15). However, it can be said that along with this attitude that focused on perceptions and emotions of the individuals, she also had bigger concerns about the society and life after war. One can suggest that Virginia Woolf considered the social inequality as one of the problems of both the society and the

era she lived in, that is why she made it possible for people to regard gender roles from a different perspective. It is not possible to fully grasp her conception of gender without examining her male characters according to Peter Capalbo: "Examining the relationship between British manliness and Woolf's male characters is crucial to understanding Woolf's belief that these expectations are one of the foremost causes of social inequality in Britain" (2). In other words, for Woolf, what was expected from people whether they are male or female, created an unequal atmosphere in which individuals got suffocated.

Woolf recognised the social system as something that is maintained as long as the people cooperate, that is why when someone chooses not to be aligned with its values they are pushed outside and marginalised as Carroll puts it:

> Beneath the institutional level, Woolf perceived that the social system and its particular institutions were maintained on the personal level, in part by the acquiescence and collaboration of those who accepted the system's values and chose to seek its rewards, and in part by the ruthless punishment, exclusion and even destruction of those who might seek to change it. (117)

So, it does not matter whether the person posing a threat to the system is male or female; whoever does not follow the societal requirements will get marginalised according to Woolf. That is why throughout her life, one of the most significant issues Woolf dealt with was the particular expectations that were enforced on individuals depending on their sexes. She suggests that men are expected to behave a certain way in order to be considered successful by the society, which she expresses as follows: "Most of our male relations were adept at [the] game. They knew the rules and attached extraordinary importance to those who won the game. Father for example laid immense stress upon school reports; upon scholarships; triposes and fellowships" (*Moments of Being* 153). As is understood, the system that confines women in their homes in order for them to fulfil their domestic duties, at the same time puts psychological pressure to become a breadwinner on men.

Woolf's novels, therefore, often have male figures that are patriarchal tyrants and strong supporters of the idea that women should not be involved in certain areas of life and stay within the circle that is devised for them. However, evaluating all of Woolf's male characters as allies of the patriarchy would, too, be wrong since it "ignores the tremendous complexities inherent in these characterizations" (Capalbo 2). Woolf's concern was not just to create female characters that fight against the prohibitive nature of the society or women characters who are stuck in one sphere in life, but to create individuals that are

all trapped in a restrictive, judgmental system. Capalbo explains Woolf's attitude regarding this by referring to her memoir:

> The concern for men demonstrated in her memoir strongly suggests that her thinking was far more complex and more inclusive than a strict focus on equality for women. In novels like *Mrs. Dalloway*, *To the Lighthouse* and *The Waves*, Woolf's subtle though stinging cultural criticism demonstrates compassion for the difficulty facing men and women trapped in the confines of a suffocating system of social expectations, a sentiment her memoir implies did not waver with time. (3)

It is clear that Woolf wishes for a rooted change in the values and understandings about gender not just for women but also for men since the traditional concepts on how a woman or man should live their lives create a problematic society that hinders individuality, originality and creativity. Alex Zwerdling points out the damaging nature of the British society Woolf observed by arguing: "Woolf was interested in the process through which an independent, responsive, emotionally supple young man or woman is gradually transformed into a conventional member of his class" (qtd. in Capalbo 3). Thus, this systematic operation of shaping every individual according to a certain ideal, leaves no room for creativity. Woolf creates characters that maintain this set of conventions; nevertheless, she also creates many characters that are truly not in compliance with the idealisations that are put forward by the powerholders.

Virginia Woolf, in her diary, talks about her individual tastes in life and says that the reason why she could have this distinctive personality is because she was able to let herself free from the conventions of the society over the years. She writes: "[T]he idea came to me that why I dislike, and like, so many things idiosyncratically now, is because of my growing detachment from the hierarchy, the patriarchy. When Desmond praises East Coker, and I am jealous, I walk over the marsh saying, I am I: and must follow that furrow, not copy another" (*A Writer's Diary* 361). So, Woolf, by giving the example of herself, claims that in a society where restrictions and norms try to create sameness among people, the blame is on the patriarchy and hierarchy. In order to establish an original self, one should isolate himself/herself from these and follow his/her own path. These lines she wrote on her diary could also be understood as a suggestion to question and then resist the templates constructed by the society. She does not specifically refer to gender expectations here, but it is highly probable for an author like her to criticise the gender roles while criticising the whole social system. The importance she attributes to creativity and individuality totally creates a dichotomy with the gender conventions that are deemed

as ideal paths for people to follow. It is also clear that she does not only speak of the conventions built for women but the entirety of the social, economic, historical codes that are ingrained in every sphere of life. These codes surely include the masculinity constructed by the society.

Virginia Woolf's opinions on masculinity, the social expectations imposed upon the male members of the society and their effects on men can be found mostly in one of her most political texts, *Three Guineas*. Snaith points out the importance of this work as follows:

> Woolf's continued concern with gender and society took on a new urgency in the context of the rise of fascism at home and abroad in the 1930s... *Three Guineas* […] emerges out of a context of increased militarization and is her most explicit expression of a deeply held pacifism. While this position became increasingly rare as the implications of Nazism became clearer, even more surprising was Woolf's insistence that war and tyranny had their roots in the power dynamics of the home and the gender inequalities of the public sphere. (10)

So, it can be said that Woolf regarded war and militarism as tools to explain the inequality between the sexes; her pacifism can be understood as an indicator of her opinions on the dynamics of gender conventions. Her ideas about the masculinity ideals can be understood better through examining her views on war because "it was ultimately the war, resulting from rampant patriarchy, which [caused] Woolf to seek to challenge contemporary English notionsof masculinity in her fiction" (Salih 4). The reason why *Three Guineas* is so important in grasping Woolf's views on masculinity is that the book is mainly about World War I and its devastating effects on people. In order to understand Woolf's stand on the issue of gender based norms, her thoughts on war should be looked into. In *Three Guineas*, Woolf's main concern is prevention of war. This purpose alone shows that Woolf has a pacifist attitude towards war, which is an indicator of the idea that Woolf did not approve of World War I that killed millions of people and the idealisations of manhood that aimed to send so many young men off to war. She starts her book by pointing out the fact that war "has always been the man's habit, not the woman's. Law and practice have developed that difference, whether innate or accidental," which makes it clear that she perceives war and fighting as a gendered sphere (n.p.). That is why she constructs her views on male gender conceptions taking the war into account as well. She is aware of the fact that the obligation to fight for one's country is upon men and not women. Then, she continues to talk about how the perception of war can differ from person to person and she emphasises that not every man goes to war with enthusiasm to

kill and with a passion for glory. First, she gives an example of a biographical extract from the life of a soldier who feels like he "got into the biggest in the prime of life for a soldier" (n.p.). After that she immediately shatters the perception created by this example and gives an extract from Wilfred Owen, who was one of the most important anti-war poets of World War I. Wilfred Owen in a letter writes:

> Already I have comprehended a light which never will filter into the dogma of any national church: namely, that one of Christ's essential commands was: Passivity at any price! Suffer dishonour and disgrace, but never resort to arms. Be bullied, be outraged, be killed; but do notkill . . . Thus, you see how pure Christianity will not fit in with pure patriotism. (qtd. In *ThreeGuineas* n.p.)

By including this extract from Owen's letter, Woolf aims to show that war has nothing to do with religion as patriots and the government aim to create passionate and enthusiastic crowds to go to war and die for their nation or send off their sons for the same purpose. It seems clear that Woolf sees the young men as victims of the state, and fully supporting the idea of passivism she looks for ways to stop young people from dying for the sake of the interests of the governments. She wants people to recognise that as much as there could be men who were willing to sacrifice their lives for the salvation of their nation, there could also be some men that were not fit for this kind of a task, and it is possible that "the same sex holds very different opinions about the same thing" (*Three Guineas* n.p.). This is why her views on war can be linked with her ideas on masculinity ideals and the "manly qualities" that are accepted by the society of that era. She tries to create the awareness that just because people have the same sex, it does not mean that they all have the same characteristics, wishes, opinions, passions or strengths and weaknesses. Thus, creating an obligation to fight for a group of people merely due to their sex is not something acceptable for Woolf.

It could be argued that war had always been something Woolf had to think about since throughout her life, she witnessed several wars including World War I, World War II and the Spanish Civil War. It should also not be forgotten that she lost her nephew Julian Bell during the Spanish Civil War. Moreover, she also lost one of her dearest friends and a war poet, Rupert Brooke to World War I, which was another incident that shaped her views on war and the masculinity ideals created by it. So, it could be argued that "war became an ever-closer threat and intrusion in Woolf's life" as a result of which it was inevitable for her not to adopt a pacifist attitude towards the war (Salih 1). She was aware that what led to the calamity of the World War I and also the other terrifying wars was the

patriarchy itself; the system that was created by the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant men was crushing the souls and bodies of the people from all ages and sexes through wars and the conventions they put forward for people to follow. This very system was at the core of what the Bloomsbury Group was revolting against as well. As a group of intellectuals, writers and artists, they "revolted against the power—political, social, moral—that deprives individual human being of practising his/her own liberty, since the Victorian age, in which [they] had been brought up, was an age controlled by patriarchal power" (Salih 14). Being a member of Bloomsbury Group, Woolf was also against this whole system that mongers wars and forces young men to throw away their lives for political causes. She was neither at peace with the war nor with the masculinity idealisations it created. When the war was declared, she wrote that she did not like the emotions that are brought about by the war and added that she also was not really in favour of the patriotism that caused this war (Marcus 179). Woolf's ideas and thoughts on war are surely the result of her personal experiences and also her understanding of the harm of the requirements of the patriarchal system on people. She had been aware of the consequences of the patriarchy on women, she was already fighting for women's rights both through her writing and through the organisations she was involved. However, she also saw the dire effects created on men by the patriarchal system and its constructed gender norms to maintain its power. The maintenance of the patriarchy heavily depends on the acceptance and the re-establishment of the gender norms which are immensely affected by the social and political circumstances of a certain period.

In every period of time, the ideals and norms for each sex are shaped and transformed according to the circumstances and the needs of the era. This is also valid for the hegemonic masculinity idealisations of the time as it was previously mentioned at the beginning of this thesis. Every individual is born into a society which has a lot of requirements according to one's sex so that the person can be accepted as "normal" and not to become marginalised. Bronwyn Davies points out this process of gender construction by claiming that"[t]he male-female binary is held in place because we come to see it as the way the world is and therefore ought to be -what is constructed as truth becomes an (apparently) absolute unconstructed truth" (9). Thus, every person is born into these norms and accepts them as the way things should be because the other options are unacceptable, wrong or immoral. For instance, during the nineteenth century,

"'modern' masculinity entered new territory," the masculinity ideal "was more firmly locked than ever into a notion of paid, productive work" and the ideal masculine man was the "bread-winner" of the family (Tosh 332). The needs of the industrial era were for men to feel satisfied when they are honest workers that contribute to the advancement of the Empire. The Empire, on the other hand, needed men to work as much as possible so that the production continues without any interruption. However, as the requirements of the ages change, the ideals and expectations put upon men and women due to their sex also go through a transition.

To illustrate, when the beginning of the twentieth century is taken into consideration, the most critical impact upon the changing of the understanding of the notions of gender belonged to World War I. Horne emphasises the importance of wars and politics in grasping the development of the masculinity throughout history and suggests that "[b]ecause politics and war have been the activities of men more than women they are especially suited to exploring the historical nature of masculinity" (22). War is an atmosphere, where it is possible to observe the occurrence of masculinity at its peak and to witness the norms of the society regarding "manliness" immensely. So, it is important to realise that in Britain, in the 1920s, World War I definitely transformed the notion of gender and especially the notion of masculinity. Moreover, the norms of the hegemonic masculinity ideal of the time are constructed so that young men could feel the urge to go to war to save their nation heroically without hesitation. Whenever the states find themselves in need of creating the discourse of a powerful nation-state ready to take on every threat they might encounter, they construct an ideal of heroic man. In the late eighteenth century, for instance, where the need to create nation-states emerged, "given the traditional prominence of warfare for masculine prestige, an updated and idealised version of the soldier provided one form of masculine claim on the nation...The volunteer ready to die in defence of the fatherland was the most obvious expression of this idea" (Horne 27-28). This idealisation of the heroic masculine type was definitely propagated again during World War I, since the countries once again needed young men to give their lives for national interests: It "resurfaced as [Germany] faced catastrophe in the total wars of the twentieth century with calls in both 1918-19 and 1944-45 for male volunteers to sacrifice themselves" (Horne 28). Every country, under certain conditions, construct the norm for people to follow regarding their gender and marginalises those who do not fit the

idealised type. Jessica Meyer explains the relation between war and the construction of the ideal masculinity type in Britain accordingly: "Even before hostilities had broken out, the First World War was constructed by British social and cultural discourses as both gendered and gendering through the role it would play in 'making men'" (3). Young people had to be encouraged and motivated to enlist; thus, the ideas of the courageous, altruistic, strong, aggressive young man were being spread by the government through the advertisements, posters and the statements of government officials.

George Mosse emphasises the significance of willpower for men throughout the centuries and he suggests that "willpower was usually equated with courage, knowing how to face danger and pain" (*The Image of Man* 100). Then, he continues by conjoining courage and pain, and says that showing the bravery to bear pain was considered a great virtue of manliness and "service in war provided a glorious opportunity to put theory into practice. To bear pain without complaining was proof of manhood and showed strength of character" (*The Image of Man* 101). Thus, the appearance of the fearless man ideal did not originate in the war, it has its roots long before the war; however, with World War I, the empowerment of this image was required for the war effort. This propagation created such a powerful image for manliness in the 1920s that the young people coming back from the war with psychological and emotional problems were seen as inadequate and were marginalised.

Accordingly, in the first chapter of this thesis, Septimus Warren Smith and Peter Walsh will be examined in detail regarding their relationship with the patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity ideals. Septimus is a young man who joins World War I voluntarily with patriotic feelings. He considers becoming a soldier as a way to serve his country in a heroic way and takes on this duty seriously to save his country. The hegemonic masculinity ideal at the beginning of the twentieth century is formed around the idea that the country needs young men to become a part of the army and fight courageously for the good of the country. At first, Septimus is seen as a man who complies with this ideal because he is brave to join the war. The fact that he volunteers to become a soldier makes him a hero in the eyes of his wife and the rest of the people around them. However, after he comes back from the war with mental problems that are caused by the horrors he has witnessed in the war, his position completely changes, and he starts to be perceived as a rather inadequate, cowardly man. Septimus suffers from depression, post-traumatic stress

disorder and shellshock, which results in his becoming a marginalised character. The patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity ideals that oblige him to go to war blames him for being weak and cowardly after he is damaged by the war both physically and mentally. Since shellshock and men's health after the war are not considered a significant social problem, the doctors' attitude towards Septimus makes his condition even worse. The doctors do not give much importance to the condition of Septimus, the do not know how to treat him, and when they offer solutions, these are not in line with the scientific methods to cure a person's mental illness. Thus, Septimus is doubly victimised; first, before the war, by volunteering to join the war to accommodate to the hegemonic masculinity ideals of the time, and then, secondly, after the war, when he doesn't get the medical care he needs, again due to the constructed masculinity ideals regarding war heroes in the post-war era. In the end, Septimus commits suicide because he cannot bear the mental problems that are caused by the war. The hegemonic masculinity ideal that is propagated during the years of the war, the marginalisation process after he starts to have mental challenges, the attitude of the doctors in the process of his treatment and patriarchy as a whole instigate the death of Septimus and turn him into a victim. Similarly, Peter Walsh, the second character the first chapter focuses on, becomes a victim because of the hegemonic masculinity ideals of the time, this time due to the expectations that are put upon men regarding their imperial duties. The masculinity ideal that is shaped around the imperialistic aims of the country requires men to serve their country by enacting the role of a powerful imperial commander. Since Peter Walsh gives great importance to being seen as a socially acceptable man, and because he cannot be together with the woman he loves and start a family with her, he tries to comply with another masculinity ideal that is glorified by his family and his social class. He does what is expected from him by the society and the state and ends up being a lonely man who is seen as a failure regardless of his efforts to fit in the normative ideals that are constructed for him based on his gender. He is not a patriotic person who wants to sacrifice his life for the sake of the Empire, however he wishes to be seen as a successful, complete and established man, and this desire leads him to do whatever is needed to achieve this status in the eyes of the people. Like Septimus Smith, Peter Walsh sacrifices his personal life for the sake of the Empire and is still seen as a failure by the people around him. Similar to Septimus Smith, he also attends his national duties by his own choice, however, his victimisation is different than the

victimisation of Septimus since Peter continues to be a part of the imperial cause even if he does not have nationalistic or patriotic feelings. Thus, his never-ending wish to become an adequate man in the eyes of the society merely brings him misery.

In a similar attempt, in chapter two, the characterisation of Jacob will be examined regarding his relationship with the hegemonic masculinity that is created by the ancient universities of England at the time, especially Cambridge University since he is a student of this institution. The hegemonic masculinity that is valid in the Oxbridge Universities' gendered space requires men to be an intellectual, elite, bright, white, male student and Jacob complies with this ideal and makes use of the privileges that are brought by this position. Cambridge and Oxford Universities construct another hegemonic masculinity that is different from the hegemonic masculinity of the country during the pre-war era and this hegemonic masculinity is aimed to create another type of man. This masculinity is created so that young students at these prestigious universities can consider themselves superior to other groups of the society in terms of their gender, race, intellectual capability, and social status. These universities aim to educate young men to become instructors, managers, governors, scholars, and statemen. That is why the education given in these institutions exclude and undermine women and fill men with misogynistic ideas, it gives them pretentious superiority ideas and moulds them to become disciplined men with the same characteristics, clothes, mindsets, and perceptions. Jacob fits into these descriptions of an ideal man that is constructed by these universities. He is in a privileged position, and he deems himself and his friends above other social groups such as women and lower-class men. Thus, in the second chapter, this idealised notion of masculinity that is created by the ancient universities which encourages men to feel superior in terms of gender, race, class, and intellect will be discussed and Woolf's opinions and criticisms of this idealised masculinity will be pointed out. While the focus of this chapter is on the educational mindset of the ancient universities at the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth century in England, Woolf's criticisms about the masculinity ideal is directed towards the outcome of this educational mindset. Woolf's criticism about this ideal is mostly about the fact that it excludes women, erases young men's individuality and turns them into victims in the end. She aims to break the illusion that Cambridge and Oxford universities create intellectual, bright young men, who deserve to take important roles in the administerial bodies of the government. She expresses her

criticisms through the characters of Jacob and his friends at Cambridge University. It is mainly argued in this chapter that Jacob's victimisation by the patriarchy has two reasons. One of them is that he cannot achieve self-actualisation as his character is mostly shaped by the education he gets from Cambridge University. The education given in this ancient institution is so influential in his life that he is turned into a stereotypical Cambridge man that does not have unique characteristics or a personality. He merely becomes a symbol for his government, rather than freely creating his own self. The other one is that even if Jacob is provided with the privileges of the patriarchy, he is victimised by the same system by being sent off to the war and getting killed. The masculinity ideal that requires men to serve their country through sacrifice, makes him a victim in the end.

Accordingly, in this thesis, three male characters created by Virginia Woolf in her two novels *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room* will be evaluated in terms of their relationship with the different hegemonic masculinities to argue that Woolf thinks that patriarchy is detrimental not only to women but also to men. Woolf, a writer who is concerned about the social issues, displays the harms of the gender roles that are put upon the male members of the society and the limitations these roles cause in the lives of men. In this regard, Woolf's criticisms about the patriarchal system and the hegemonic masculinities created by it will be examined in each chapter under a new light.

CHAPTER 1: HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY CONSTRUCTED BY WORLD WAR I AND IMPERIALISM IN *MRS DALLOWAY*

Mrs Dalloway (1925) is one of the best-known and most significant works of Virginia Woolf that deals with life in the post-war era in England. Arranged in a rather plotless structure, it is set in one day in London in June of 1923 and essentially follows a day in Clarissa Dalloway's and Septimus Warren Smith's lives in a parallel vein. It depicts both the pre-war era of England through the memories of the characters by using the stream of consciousness technique and also the traumatic ramifications brought about by World War I and captures the tumultuous emotional state the Londoners are in after the devastating effects of the war.

The novel starts with Clarissa's buying flowers as a preparation for the party she throws on the same evening. The novel changes perspectives among characters many times. Then, Woolf creates a change of perspective and continues with the war veteran Septimus Smith who sits at Regent's Park with his Italian wife Rezia. They wait for Septimus to see Sir William Bradshaw, a psychiatrist, as Septimus experiences severe mental problems and talks of killing himself. Later in the book, Septimus jumps out of the window and commits suicide because of these problems. Peter, an old friend and love interest of Clarissa's, arriving in London from India pays a visit to her, which makes both of them to think about their past. The book's perspective then moves to Richard and his lunch with Lady Bruton and Hugh Whitbread, who are from the high society. The novel ends predominantly with Clarissa's perspective while she is having her party. She has all her guests in her house; and in the middle of the party, the news of Septimus killing himself arrives. At the end of the novel, Clarissa ruminates about Septimus's death and her own life.

When *Mrs Dalloway* is treated as a novel that discusses the condition of the English society that has gone through a traumatic experience, it is possible to identify what Woolf wanted to achieve by this novel. She writes in her diary about *Mrs Dalloway* that she "want[ed] to criticize the social system and to show it at work at its most intense" (*A Writer's Diary* 57). Surely, the society she criticises is shaped by patriarchy and the

influence of the Victorian values still continues in the society. Woolf also reveals that this society which always yearns for a war or a conflict of some type causes severe losses on people of both sexes. Christine Froula claims that what makes *Mrs Dalloway* so special is the fact that it finds a new way to "dramatize and mediate violence both psychic and social" (126). The violence created by the social system with wars and the psychological violence that is inflicted upon the people of both sexes in order for them to be more in line with the societal expectations are heavily ingrained in the novel. Woolf, known as an important feminist writer, puts this violence at the centre of the novel and shows that the social system, the war-making society does not only victimise women but also men with its expectations, requirements, and norms. Aside from the angst and the sorrow of the individuals at the time, Woolf mostly makes the collective social tragedies her subject matter in *Mrs Dalloway* as suggested by Rory Ryan:

> Woolf's focus in *Mrs Dalloway* is not on individual pathology, individual action and individual responsibility, but on Georgian society as a single living whole, within which different roles are enacted by agents of conformity or disruption. The drama that unfolds is a representation of health and disease in the social corpus, of a body fighting infection. (69-70)

These tragedies by nature include the male members of the society, as well. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to examine *Mrs Dalloway* and its male characters Septimus Warren Smith and Peter Walsh who are injured physically and/or psychologically by the patriarchy's demands, referring to different theories of masculinity to illustrate how these hegemonic masculinity ideals and their preservation in the society are depicted in the novel. In addition to that, the harm inflicted upon male characters through the constructed hegemonic masculinity ideals in the novel will be examined to demonstrate how these ideals victimise Septimus Smith in terms of war and health, and Peter Walsh regarding imperialism respectively.

Masculinity, as a concept, cannot be understood as a fixed model that conforms with all biological males naturally. According to John Beynon, "'masculinity' is composed of many masculinities" and it is "interpolated by cultural, historical and geographical location" (1). It is not possible to evaluate masculinities independent of their context. The crises a society goes through, the changes people experience, historical events, culture and its traditions all have a great effect on what kind of masculinity is shaped. Masculinity cannot be thought of merely as interrelated with biological aspects of a male because

"masculinity can never float free of culture: on the contrary, it is the child of culture, shaped and expressed differently at different times in different circumstances in different places by individuals and groups" (Berger qtd. in Beynon 2). Different periods in a country's historical advancement form different kinds of cultural environment hence leads up to diverse masculinities.

In every era, the cultural and social elements put forward a hegemonic masculinity that is deemed ideal and respected the most. Hegemonic masculinity, Connell argues, is established when an "ascendancy of one group of men over another" is created not by force but by "organization of private life and cultural processes" (*Gender and Power* 184). So, hegemonic masculinity is the idealised or acclaimed type of masculinity at a certain time and a certain place. It is established through various means such as media, government institutions, family and it is "culturally honoured, glorified, and extolled situationally" (Messerschmidt 198). Hegemonic masculinity, then, is shaped according to the requirements of the society and the cultural background of the period.

When *Mrs Dalloway* is examined through this perspective, it can be suggested that World War I and its idealisation of the heroic, self-sacrificial man, and the lingering values of Victorian era create a cultural structure that values and maintains a particular type of masculinity. The cultural background of the beginning of the twentieth century is based on the perception of the great British Empire and its male founders who are deemed superior to the others in terms of gender, race, religion, and nationalistic ideals. Then, World War I starts to shape the culture of the society to a great extent. During the time of the conscription to the war, "the government launched a propaganda campaign imploring men to join up voluntarily – a project reinforced by the press and the patriotic efforts of private citizens, often acting entirely on their own" (Gullace 7). The fact that it was "voluntary" to join the army was not true in a practical sense. Nicoletta Gullace points out the dichotomy between the men who joined the war and the ones who did not as follows: "Not only did recruiting propaganda celebrate the common soldier as a national saviour, but it castigated those men who chose not to volunteer, claiming that their reluctance to serve was a national disgrace" (7-8). So, it could be argued that this kind of an atmosphere did not leave the young men with a choice at all. Either one would go to war and give himself up for the sake of the national interest, or he would be shamed and marginalised by his own people. Through this dichotomy, hegemonic masculinity of the

era is maintained as one that extolled the heroic man ideal.

Likewise, in *Mrs Dalloway,* Septimus enlists for the war willingly but suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder after the war. Septimus's victimisation has actually two parts, the one in the pre-war and the one after the war. The first step of his victimisation is due to the fact that he believes the propagated war-mongering idealisation of the heroic man which is the hegemonic masculinity ideal. The second step of his victimisation, whic is more focused in the novel, is that he still suffers from the PTSD, even five years later after the end of World War I, that he cannot get the right treatment for his condition and commits suicide as a result of this. After Septimus says that he is thinking of killing himself, his wife Rezia thinks that "it was cowardly for a man to say he would kill himself, but Septimus had fought; he was brave; he was not Septimus now" (17). This idea of Rezia illustrates the common notion that being in a war and fighting for one's country is thought of as bravery. According to her, Septimus once was "manly enough" to go to war under the risk of getting killed, but after the war he lost this bravery and became a coward. Septimus decides to enlist to fight in the war as follows: "Septimus was one of the first to volunteer. He went to France to save an England which consisted almost entirely of Shakespeare's plays and Miss Isabel Pole in a green dress…" (64). Thus, it is clear that the image that is engraved in young people's minds about the war is that there is a national treasure to be protected from the enemy and the people who would take upon this challenge are the honourable young men of the Empire. Miss Isabel Pole is the woman Septimus was in love with and also his teacher who taught Shakespeare's poetry to Septimus before going to the war, and his thinking of this woman while enlisting to the war shows that he joins the war with a romantic image in his mind. He thinks that the woman he loves and the literary treasure of his country need him to protect them. Not knowing the real conditions of the war, Septimus wants to commit this duty for his country and soon develops "manliness" and gets "promoted" (64). Again, here it seems that "manliness" is seen as something related to war and the ability to fight without fear for a great cause. Once Septimus shows this courage, he is considered much more valuable both in the eyes of Rezia and also in the eyes of the government and gets the promotion due to his "manliness." However, since Rezia sees the change in Septimus, she says that he is not the Septimus she knew, she thinks that he lost his bravery. Subsequently, even if Septimus once was seen as compliant with the hegemonic masculinity of the time, after

he starts to show vulnerability due to the traumatic experience he had gone through, the perception about him changes completely in the eyes of Rezia and the other characters that get into contact with Septimus throughout the novel.

Rezia cannot even stand sitting next to him because of his strange behaviours: "…she could not stand it no longer…Far rather would she that he were dead! She could not sit besidehim when he stared so and did not see her and made everything terrible" (17). She feels overwhelmed with her husband's behaviours and she just wants everything to go back to normal. She feels embarrassed when she is with Septimus in public because Septimus stares at a tree tediously for hours, or he says he thinks of killing himself, or he does not realise anything around him for a long time and sits without even saying a word. The unrest Rezia feels towards Septimus is definitely related to the society's standards of an ideal man. This can be understood from Rezia's first thoughts, when she witnesses a weakness or a sign of being overemotional in Septimus. For instance, after Septimus says he will kill himself, Rezia thinks about the crowd around them and hopes that somebody hears Septimus's sentence and helps them. When that does not happen, she thinks that "she must take him away into some park" since she thinks "failure" is something "one conceals" (12). Since Septimus shows some "unmanly" behaviour by saying he will kill himself, she considers him a failure and wants to hide him away from the crowd because one should "conceal" the things one considers a failure.

According to Connell's theory of hegemonic masculinity, the ascendancy of one type of masculinity "does not mean total cultural dominance, the obliteration of alternatives…Other patterns and groups are subordinated rather than eliminated" (*Gender and Power* 184). This is also one of the reasons why every period has a different kind of masculinity as the hegemonic one. Since the hegemonic masculinity is the courageous man who sacrifices himself for the Empire, in *Mrs Dalloway*, the masculinity Septimus represents is subordinated; that is why he is often seen as a strange, bizarre, and peculiar young man by the people. Even a stranger, Maisie Johnson, who asks for directions to Rezia and Septimus, thinks that "the man – he seemed awfully odd" and Septimus was "looking queer" (19-20). The idea of Septimus being a strange man is emphasised in the novel several times. Because he is no longer the fearless man who fought for his country, his masculinity is regarded as having lesser value while the hegemonic masculinity ideal achieves more value.

Hegemonic masculinity theory puts forward the idea that in the process of the establishment of the hegemonic masculinity "other masculine styles are rendered inadequate and inferior" and they are called "subordinate variants" (Beynon 16). It can be argued that the masculinity that is shown in Septimus is also a "subordinate variant." That is why he is considered unimportant, marginal, different. Rezia thinks that not all men who had lost their friends in the war are like Septimus. She says "[S]uch things happen to everyone. Everyone has friends who were killed in the War" (50). For her, if the problem is with the war, or the troubles men have encountered in the war, every man who had been in the war should be like Septimus. That is why she sees Septimus as a man who is not tough enough to handle the harsh reality of the war and its consequences. This is what makes Rezia so disappointed at her husband, too. She thinks he is too emotional and vulnerable which are not characteristics that areappreciated in a man. Hegemonic masculinity is actually in a very significant relationship withthe subordinate variants because hegemonic masculinity ideals "are constructed in relation to weaker and subordinated forms and thereby become legitimized as being 'normal' or 'natural'" (Beynon 17). So, what makes the hegemonic masculinity so dominating is the power it attains by marginalising the masculinities that are considered inferior. The more the subordinated types are marginalised, the more authoritative the hegemonic masculinity type gets. Moreover,the norms and idealistic standards of hegemonic masculinity are notably unrealistic, Connell explains:

> Hegemonic masculinity is very different from the notion of a general 'male sex role,'…First,the cultural ideal (or ideals) of masculinity need not to correspond at all closely to the actual personalities of the majority of men…[T]he winning of hegemony often involves the creation of models of masculinity which are quite specifically fantasy figures. (*Gender and Power* 184)

So, the propagated ideal male model or models that are created for men to comply with are nearly impossible for men to follow in their lives without any setbacks. The fact that an ideal for the perfect man is encouraged by the society, institutions, media, and the government does not mean that this ideal will be implemented by most of the men. They will always fall short and try to reach those standards.

Establishing an idealised hegemonic masculinity for men to follow, exposing men from a very young age to these unrealistic standards and making them feel insecure when they cannot attain these standards ultimately lead to individuals having psychological and/or

physical problems. When the hegemonic masculinity created by a society in war is considered, it is clear that these ideals, together with the war will create serious traumatic experiences and damages. Don Sabo says that since war is usually a male activity, it causes an increased morbidity and mortality in men and then explains the war's effects on men by pointing out the characteristics that are expected from a male warrior:

> Warriors were taught to conform to a type of hegemonic masculinity that embodies violenceproneness, toughness and obedience to male authority…Many boys and men, who aredisproportionately enlisted to fight in wars, are killed or physically and psychologically maimed, whereas elite male groups may profit or solidify political power through warfare. (335).

So, it can be suggested that the socially constructed masculine warrior idealisations are merely used for maintaining the interests of the governments and their institutions. Thus, these norms do not serve the benefits of the individuals in the society, but rather, leave them injured and/or psychologically damaged.

In *Mrs Dalloway*, this can be observed most clearly in the case of Septimus. He is emotionally unstable throughout the novel as he believes that he lost his ability to feel after the war. Due to the trauma he experienced, Septimus "becomes numbed, unable to grieve, feel or love" (Lilienfeld 124). Septimus's inability to feel starts during the war when his friend Evans is killed and Septimus even takes pride in the fact that he does not show a single sign of grief: "[F]ar from showing any emotion or recognizing that here was the end of a friendship, [he] congratulated himself upon feeling very little and very reasonably. The War had taught him" (64). Nevertheless, the fact that he praises himself for feeling nothing over his friend's death changes later, since he thinks that he committed a great crime by fighting in the war and as a result by losing his naive, romantic, and emotional nature. When he is taken to the renowned psychiatrist Sir William by Rezia with the hope of a treatment, and Sir William asks what the matter is with him, Septimus thinks to himself: "He had committed an appalling crime and been condemned to death by human nature" (71). Clearly, he believes that causing people's death in the war is something abominable and not being able to feel anything is his penalty. Because of his emotional numbness, he gets overwhelmed several times throughout the novel. For instance, he goes to a teashop with his wife Rezia and seeing the indifference of the people having a good time, drinking their tea, roaming the streets, he feels suffocated: "He looked at people outside; happy they seemed, collecting in the middle of the street, shouting,

laughing, squabbling over nothing. But he could not taste, he could not feel…the appalling fear came over him – he could not feel" (65). At this point, Septimus does not see his inability to have any kind of emotion as something to congratulate, but rather he feels like he lost a part of his humanity because he participated in a war that killed millions of people. Yet, he is so emotionally unstable that he cries when he beholds nature while sitting with Rezia in Regent's Park. He clearly suffers from shellshock, "one of the most widespread battlefield injuries during the first world war…an injury without any bodily signs, a mass outbreak of mental disorder" (Mosse "Shell-Shock" 101). He suffers from hallucinations, suicidal thoughts, and sleep depravity. Even if he shows these serious symptoms of a mental illness, it is seen that neither the general practitioner Dr. Holmes nor the psychiatrist Sir William can find a useful treatment for him.

The reason for this can be the fact that during the 1920s, shellshock (or PTSD as it is known now) or men's health in general was not much of a public concern or it was not correlated with the social and cultural structure of the particular period. Sabo mentions that the recognition of the seriousness of men's health specifically regarding their gender on a public level starts with focus on men's studies in 1970s and 1980s (326). So, it could be argued that men's health problems related to their gender were not taken seriously as a social problem; furthermore, the relationship between cultural norms and men's illnesses was not acknowledged. It is certain that sex-based health problems are sometimes biological; since women and men have different biological features, they can develop different kinds of illnesses related to their biological sex. However, "close examination of deaths due to both natural causes and external causes exposes the limits of a simple biological reductionist explanation for male/female health differences…the overall differential health status of males relative to females is heavily influenced by socio-cultural factors" (White 271). These factors may vary from the social gender roles created for men, work-related activity, or government related duties. Since the stereotypical image about men that are tough, strong, resilient is glorified for a long time, expectations from men push them towards specific social positions, which eventually leads to serious health conditions. Rob White gives some examples of these health problems related to the stereotypical manhood ideals and claims: "Concern to be tough and self-reliant translates into failure to utilize preventive health measures and a reluctance to use health services. Male bravado and being 'macho' is linked to various risk-taking behaviour, as evidenced

in both industrial injury rates and the high proportions of men involved in motor vehicle fatalities and injuries" (271-272). White's examples sum up how the effort to conform to the society's expectations related to manhood pose various threats to men's health directly or indirectly. It should be noted that the effort that is put forth by men to live up to the standards of the society regarding gender expectations is a huge source of anxiety according to White. He says that the constructed and ideal man stereotype is not realistic and is not something most men can achieve with the limitations of their economic and cultural resources. Then, he adds: "The disjuncture between ideal masculine status, and actual lived experiences, may in itself constitute a major source of stress, anxiety, confusion and emotional angst for some men"(275). The knowledge that these men cannot become the person they are expected to be due to the reasons they cannot control makes them more and more anxious over time.

When this issue is approached from the perspective of the shellshock disease which was very common among the soldiers who came back from the war in the 1920s, it is understood that shellshock was not considered as a public concern at the time, either. Far from it, according to Mosse, "shell-shock provides an excellent example of the fusion of medical diagnosis and social prejudice which had taken place during the previous century and a half" ("Shell-Shock" 101). The social prejudice that Mosse mentions here is created due to the socially constructed masculinity stereotype which upheld till that time. The men who suffer from shellshock are seen as weak, inadequate men because of the symptoms they show such as hallucinations, emotional breakdowns, and unstable mental condition. The people dealing with this illness are stigmatised because "it is difficult to reconcile with normative ideas of masculinity" (Thien 1151). It is seen as something that is fundamentally in conflict with the ideals of the masculinity since it created a "sense of failure" in terms of their manhood (Karner 90). Since these men are not able to fulfil the duties that are deemed necessary to be an adequate male member of the society, (breadwinner, stable, having a family), they are regarded as outcast, redundant or defective.

To explain the root of this prejudice against shellshock disease or the war trauma in menin general, Mark Humphries talks about how the background of nervous illness was feminised under the name of hysteria: "In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries patients who exhibited these conversion disorders were classified as hysterical. *Hysteria*

is an ancient term that has had many meanings. At its most basic, it implies that the womb is the cause of the patient's symptoms and thus the condition is inherently feminized" (506). Hysteria was regarded as an illness of which the symptoms include anxiety, nervousness, insomnia and emotional instability; and shellshock also resembles this disorder. The idea that hysteria was an illness that is based on women's biological differences from men was to support the belief that "men were inherently superior to their female counterparts – physically as well as psychologically" (Humphries 506). Since doctors are unanimous in the idea that hysteria was predominantly diagnosed in women due to "biological reasons," shellshock's symptoms were also seen as "unmanly" because it reduced man to a shadow of his former self. The relationship between hysterical actions and womanhood is explained by Humphries in this way: "Hysterical reactions were understood to result from the female patient's loss of control over her emotions, which allowed baser instincts to take control of the body and mind" (508-509). Thus, a man who is not able to keep his emotions under control is against the image of the socially constructed idealised man who is self-assured, psychologically strong and in control of his own feelings. Mosse suggests that men who are diagnosed with shellshock were "nervous, ill-proportioned, and, above all, constantly in motion" ("Shell-Shock" 102). These kinds of characteristics are certainly not in line with glorified manhood ideals. In fact, they are also perceived as a threat to these constructed ideals since they show that men can also be mentally unstable, insecure and powerless due to trauma.

In *Mrs Dalloway*, Septimus's emotional and psychological condition is mostly presented through Rezia's perspective: She thinks that she is no longer able to stand the state Septimus is in because he "[says] hard, cruel, wicked things, he [talks] to himself, [talks] to a dead man" (49). It is quite clear that neither can Septimus think clearly as a reasonable person, nor is he able to handle the trauma he had due to the war and the loss of a dear friend, Evans. The most obvious indicator of his emotional imbalance can be seen in how he always complains about not feeling anything and then bursts into tears in sight of nature. Kristin Czarnecki explains this instability by giving example from the scene where Septimus gets highly emotional by the sight of an airplane writing words in the sky with smoke:

> So, thought Septimus, looking up, they are signalling to me. Not indeed in actual words; that is, he could not read the language yet; but it was plain enough, this beauty, this exquisite beauty, and tears filled his eyes as he looked at the smoke words

languishing and melting in the sky and bestowing upon him, in their inexhaustible charity and laughing goodness, one shape after another of unimaginable beauty and signalling their intention to provide him, for nothing, for ever, for looking merely, with beauty, more beauty! Tears ran down his cheeks. (16)

About this scene Czarnecki says that "Back in England, he [Septimus] is unable to summon what his doctors consider normal feelings, such as sexual desire towards his wife, yet his eyes well with tears" when he sees this airplane in the sky (54). So, it can be suggested that he cannot feel what he is supposed to feel according to the norms of the society such as procreation or intimacy towards his wife, but he gets sentimental over things that are considered trivial in the eyes of most of the people. He is so irritated that when he hears a car backfiring and he finds himself among a big crowd, he feels "as if some horror had come almost to the surface and was about to burst into flames, [it] terrified him. The world waveredand quivered and threatened to burst into flames" (12). In this scene, it is understood that Septimus is completely in a different mental state compared to the other Londoners because while the others are curious about who is in the car, why it is here and they watch the car with inquisitive eyes, Septimus is driven to a "paroxysm of paranoia and fear" (Czarnecki 61). He is not able to check or balance his emotions, he is either a robotic person who is not capable of feeling anything, or he feels overjoyed, overanxious or paranoid; always living on the edge. Since these emotional imbalances are related to shellshock and indirectly to hysteria, he is outcasted and depreciated by the society.

Humphries claims that even doctors at the time have the same mentality of marginalizing men that do not fit into the socially accepted criteria of an ideal man stereotype, and these doctors "constructed trauma as an individual failure to meet masculine ideals in order to parry a larger challenge to idealized masculinities" (508). Since the idea of being traumatised by the war and suffering from shellshock is a new concept during and in the aftermath of World War I, "[t]his was a new challenge for medical officers both at the front line and in British-based hospitals" (Scragg176). Medical experts were trying to come up with some solutions and explanations for a disorder that they encountered for the first time, so the ways of treatment were not very effective or sufficient. Especially during the time when the war went on, since the army needed the men in the battlefield, the medical officials tried to come up with temporary solutions without fully grasping the gravity of the illness and "Regular army Regimental Medical Officers (RMOs) at the front

tended to respond to their lowly position within the military hierarchy by keeping their heads down and simply patching soldiers up and returning them to active service. The duration and extent of the Great War meant that the regular RAMC was unable to cope" (Scragg 176). Thus, it is clear that both because of the government policies that prioritised the short-term solutions to the problems such as physical health of the soldiers so that they could fight in the war, and the medical officials who had almost no experience with the new disorder prevented a decent treatment for the soldiers.

A person suffering from shellshock could show physiological symptoms as well as psychological symptoms, "soldiers exhibited a range of anxiety disorders—tics, convulsions, nightmares, confusion, fatigue, obsessive thoughts, and inexplicable aches—as well as functional disorders such as mutism, paralysis, and hysterical deafness or blindness" (Scragg 175-176). The effects of this illness are varied, Tracey Loughran claims and gives examples of different cases with varying symptoms and treatments and explains what kind of cases would be called "shell-shock:"

> It was one name for the sufferings of a "nervous" soldier who developed depression and a tremor after an intense four-hour bombardment was followed by a shell-burst right behind his dug-out. Over the following days, his symptoms escalated from crying and "an inability to walk or do anything" to acute mania…The private who found himself mute and deaf when he regained consciousness five days after a shell explosion and was cured six months later by the apparition of a praying woman near his bedside, might also have been described as shell shocked. The label could also be attached to the sergeant in the Twentieth Hussars whose legs were temporarily paralyzed by a shell explosion, and only gradually regained power and sensation over the following fortnight. (101-102)

Thus, it can be suggested that this disorder can develop due to physical harm or something witnessed during the battle or something emotionally devastating experienced in the war, like losing a friend. The experiences that lead to the illness and the symptoms of the soldiers have shown some differences, that is why the doctors come up with different explanations and treatment tactics as Loughran argues: "The experiences and symptoms of these men were bewilderingly diverse, and so were the explanations put forward for the disorder; in these case studies alone a range of physical, physiological, and psychological factors were invoked by the doctors charged with their treatment" (102). So, it is inevitable that this diversity in the experiences and conditions of the soldiers also leads to a confusion among the doctors that deal with the patients. Both because shellshock was a newly researched illness, and because the individuals who were dealing

with this disorder were seen as odd, in conflict with the standards of ideal manhood and nonconformist, doctors could not do what needed to be done. Humphries hence claims that doctors were greatly at fault in treating the men with shell-shock due to social reasons: "doctors were reluctant to address the issue of male trauma precisely because it was so problematic, but when forced to do so as crises arose on the battlefield or in pensioning, they relied on a medical epistemology that delegitimized the symptoms of traumatized males" (508). So, it can be said that the doctors chose to ignore the symptoms of shellshock on purpose because it would create a problem for the survival of the nationalistic war-mongering ideas, and ultimately the perpetuation of the social structure. The idea that young, strong men who had the will and power to fight against the enemy were showing signs of weakness and were unable to fight due to psychological problems that were created by the war prevented the doctors from coming up with adequate solutions.

In *Mrs Dalloway*, these attitudes of the doctors are seen multiple times and these attitudes and approaches are what creates Septimus's victimisation's second step which happens in the post-war era. When Rezia asks the psychiatrist Sir William if Septimus is mad, Sir William says that "he never spoke of 'madness'; he called it not having a sense of proportion" (71). This proportion Sir William too often talks about is actually the mental state of a person who is compatible with the society's conventions and expectations. Sir William believes that a person who shares his idea of proportion could be saved, and his idea of proportion contributes to the society: "Worshipping proportion, Sir William not only prospered himself but made England prosper, secluded her lunatics, forbade childbirth, penalized despair, made it impossible for the unfit to propagate their views until they, too, shared his sense of proportion" (73). From these lines, it could be understood that Sir William regards himself as a saviour who is in the service of the English society. The word "unfit" that is used for the ill people also supports the idea that the treatment does not aim to make people feel better or create a self-sufficient individual but rather it aims to transform people into acceptable individuals according to the ideals of the English society. In the novel, therefore, Sir William "represents social agency at its most cruel, efficient and sinister" and he serves for the protection of the social "hierarchy and privilege" (Ryan 61). Furthermore, Sir William works with his wife to treat the patients because if the patients are men, they are expected to share Sir William's "sense of

proportion" but if they are women, they are supposed to follow Lady Bradshaw's ideals and "she embroidered, knitted, spent four nights out of seven at home with her son" (73). Since the preoccupations of Lady Bradshaw are all considered as feminine pursuits, it is for sure that the proportion ideas Lady Bradshaw and Sir William have are linked to the gender conventions that have been maintained for years. Thus, having a sense of proportion in Sir William's mind is directly related to act "like a man" or "like a woman" according to one's gender and being ideal male or female members of the society without disrupting the consensus.

The patriarchal system and the social order put great emphasis on the existence and acceptance of the gender norms because their power heavily depends on the protection of these ideals. The social consensus needed masculinity ideals to maintain its power as Mosse asserts: "it is of major importance that a firm image of manliness not only existed but had become a symbol through which society confirmed its strength, cohesion and dynamic" ("Shell Shock 102). In *Mrs Dalloway*, then, Septimus is regarded as a problem that should be solved since he is not in line with the norms of the society and is a threat to the maintenance of the social dynamics. In order for the hegemonic masculinity to maintain its dominant position, Septimus's mental health is ignored, and he is considered as a threat to society even by the doctor who is supposed to help him. When Septimus has a vision of Evans and starts shouting his name over and over, the general practitioner Dr. Holmes says that Septimus is "talking nonsense to frighten [his] wife" and he offers to give him something to make him sleep (69). Putting him to sleep so that he would stop behaving abnormally shows that the purpose is not to listen to a war veteran to solve his physical or psychological problems, but rather to keep him away from the society so that the norms can be kept intact. Septimus is seen as an individual who needs to be out of the public gaze since he was a "harbinger of social disintegration" due to his illness that is not in line with the hegemonic masculinity of the era (Mosse "Shell-Shock" 102). Kennard argues that "Dr. Holmes and Sir William Bradshaw, who treat Septimus, are representative of the society that destroyed their patient's mental health. Sir William's values are linked to the idea of Empire" (158). The treatment these doctors try to implement is merely to put Septimus under control, away from the eyes of the other people. Sir William, himself, accepts this by admitting that when his patients show "unsocial impulses" they were "held in control" (75). He thinks that when a person is a

threat to the society's interests, with their "unsocial" behaviours, they need to be either taken under control or sent away. His priority is not the person but the society and the standards that people are supposed to conform to. In order to turn the people with shellshock into acceptable ideal men, Sir William offers solutions that are far from treating serious mental health problems: "It was merely a question of rest, rest, rest; a long rest in bed. There was a delightful home down in the country where her husband would be perfectly looked after" (71). Considering the fact that Sir William is the last resort Septimus and Rezia consult, it is for sure that Septimus is in a condition where his life is threatened due to his mental health problems. At this point, the emotional burden becomes so unbearable to him that he often mentions that he wants to kill himself. However, the solution Sir William suggests is no more than a rest in bed in the countryside away from the society.

Another example about the attitudes of the doctors towards patients like Septimus can be found in Dr. Holmes. Before seeing Sir William Bradshaw, Rezia and Septimus try to find a solution with Dr. Holmes for Septimus's mental problems. Dr. Holmes suggests Rezia to make her husband "notice real things, go to a music hall, play cricket – that was the very game…for her husband" because Dr. Holmes thinks that Septimus "had nothing whatever seriously the matter with him but was a little out of sorts" (16-19). Dr. Holmes, too, completely ignores the seriousness of the situation Septimus is in. It is clear that he has not dealt with patients of shellshock before, and he does not have any information about the disorder. His ignorance about the illness is made even more obvious when he pays a visit to Septimus and Rezia: "he brushed it all aside – headaches, sleeplessness, fears, dreams – nerve symptoms and nothing more, he said" (68). On the one hand, Dr. Holmes seems not to give necessary importance to Septimus's condition by ignoring all his symptoms and on the other hand he does not understand how a brave soldier could be in such a weak position since when Septimus commits suicide Dr. Holmes cries "[t]he coward" (108). Even after his death, Dr. Holmes blames Septimus for not being courageous enough to deal with his situation and for escaping the reality through death. Moreover, he tells Mrs Filmer that it was "a sudden impulse, no one was in the least to blame. And why the devil he did it, [he] could not conceive" (109). As his doctor who was once responsible to treat him, his lack of skills and incompetence leads Septimus to death, for sure. It is clear that even if Septimus had a very serious condition with his

delusions, stammering, crying and hallucinations, he was not in a state that was irrecoverable. This is pointed out by David Bradshaw in his introduction to *Mrs Dalloway*'s Oxford edition. He claims that

> Although he is clearly mentally ill, Septimus is far from wholly deranged. He displays a taste for low-level linguistic playfulness when he makes his pun about 'Holmes's homes' and he is sufficiently well attuned to the real world to remark to his wife on leaving Bradshaw's premises that the 'upkeep of that motor car alone must cost him quite a lot. (n.p)

Thus, it can be suggested that the doctors who had the responsibility to treat Septimus are deeply at fault, since they do not care about the seriousness of the issue and do not take the necessary precautions before Septimus kills himself. They choose to ignore his cries for help even if he mentions his wish to commit suicide several times. If Septimus had been "treated more sympathetically and less harassingly, [he] may have begun to recover his mind" (Bradshaw "Introduction" n.p). The responsibility of the death of Septimus in a way rests both on Dr. Holmes and Sir William. Throughout the novel they do not do much more than trying to seclude Septimus in a place far away from "normal" people, underestimating his symptoms, or making him feel as if he were not tough enough to deal with his emotions and mental struggles. Bradshaw also points out Sir William's inadequacy in treating Septimus by claiming that "[though] Bradshaw [Sir William] knows exactly what is wrong with Septimus, he shows little compassion for his patient and merely addresses him on the dangers of succumbing to unmanly 'moments of depression'" (Bradshaw "Introduction" n.p). The idea of regarding Septimus's condition as a mere moment of depression, which can happen to anyone shows that Sir William does not show the necessary effort to understand the specific mental anguish Septimus is in. That is why his suggestion for Septimus is to send him to a place where "[they] will teach [him] to rest" (72). However, a simple resting period is far from solving Septimus's disorder, his disorder is much more serious than that. The reason why Sir William tries to do this is because he does not want anyone who cannot function properly in the society to be among the society. He takes pride in "secluding [Britain's] lunatics" and that is what he tries to do with Septimus, as well. Sir William is supposed to be an expert in the field of psychiatry, but he does not seem very knowledgeable or solution-oriented when it comes to Septimus. When Sir William is first introduced in the novel as a character, he is said to have the reputation "not merely of lightning skill and almost infallible accuracy in diagnosis, but of sympathy; tact; understanding of the human soul" (70). Yet, with his

attitude towards Septimus and his misjudgement of Septimus's condition, it can be suggested that he does not know anything about the human soul, or he chooses the easy way, to send people with mental problems off. In the novel it is seen that Sir William and Richard Dalloway (as a member of the parliament) try to pass a Bill through the Commons in the parliament and in the list of the things the Bill is intended to deal with, there is also "the deferred effects of shell-shock" (133). Bradshaw claims that Sir William wants this Bill to pass so that he can more easily seclude the people with these symptoms:

> From what we know of their politics and their intolerance, it seems likely that Bradshaw [SirWilliam] is lobbying to have the proposed powers of the legislation extended in order that theState and its doctors would have the authority to deal with the most severely shell-shocked byforcibly interning them in asylums in Surrey and elsewhere. (Bradshaw "Introduction" n.p)

It can be argued that Sir William tries to indulge in some kind of social engineering by sortingout the problematic individuals to create a homogeneous society with people who can keep up with the standards. The bill he wishes to pass with the help of Richard Dalloway is yet another proof of him trying to create a Britain where the people, who do not conform to the "proportion" as he describes it, would be sent away to one of his homes. Thus, even in health issues, the conventions of the society are arranged based on gender norms to ensure the continuation of the society. In the novel, Septimus is portrayed as a victim of the war who cannot live his life as he did in the past and the responsibility is of the society that glorifies war and also the doctors and government institutions who value the good of the state more than its individual's psychological and/or physical health. It was expected of Septimus to fight for his country and as a romantic, patriotic man, he volunteered for war, and he lost his health and life in return. Septimus is a man who willingly joins the war with a romantic image and ideal in his mind, he becomes a war hero who has medals for his great achievements in the war. The hegemonic masculinity plants this ideal and romantic image in his mind by glorifying a certain ideal manhood. Furthermore, the reason why doctors do not give the necessary importance to his mental and physical symptoms is also due to the hegemonic masculinity at the time. The doctors think that Septimus's condition is unacceptable for a war hero to be in. Septimus represents the ideal of a war hero and it is not possible for him to be emotionally harmed due to the war as a heroic man. So, the doctors who could not and did not make more effort to cure Septimus are also responsible for him to commit suicide along with the traumas brought about by the war itself. Because their inactivity or ignorance while

treating Septimus are the products of their biases, ideologies and ideas about how an ideal man is supposed to behave. They do not accept that a war hero can feel an emotional stress or can become weak due to their mental condition. They believe that an established, normal man should be perfectly healthy and emotionally stable even if they are traumatised by the war. These ideas about the ideal man led them to handle Septimus's condition in a prejudiced way rather than a scientific, research-based approach. Thus, it can be argued that the hegemonic masculinity ideals as well as the systems and institutions that had the purpose of maintaining these ideals are all together responsible for many young men's miseries at the time. Hegemonic masculinity and its expectations both send Septimus to the war and also prevent him from getting the appropriate needed treatment when he comes back from the war. The glorified hegemonic masculinity ideal of the patriotic/heroic soldier is an undeniable factor among the reasons why Septimus commits suicide at the end of the novel.

Clarissa Dalloway, the eponymous main character of the novel, however, does not think of Septimus as a coward due to his suicide. On the contrary, she starts to ponder on life, death, and people after she hears about the news of Septimus's suicide and thinks that Septimus could even be considered as a brave man because he embraced death. She thinks that "Death was defiance. Death was an attempt to communicate" (134). Clarissa thinks that killing oneself is brave because "there was the terror; the overwhelming incapacity, one's parents giving it into one's hands, this life, to be lived to the end…there was in the depths of her heart an awful fear…But that young man had killed himself" (134). In these sentences, it is understood that Clarissa thinks about how life and existence is such a fearful thing for her. When living is so scary, to think of somebody killing himself and rejecting to exist is not something to be done easily and it has an underlying challenging attitude according to Clarissa. Clarissa's thoughts about Septimus continues to be described as follows: "The young man had killed himself; but she did not pity him…She felt glad that he had done it; thrown it away while they went on living" (135). While Septimus is seen as a coward, weak, inadequate, weird man by most of the people he encountered due to his mental state and his suicide, he is considered as a brave man by Clarissa Dalloway at the end. Clarissa feels a sympathy for the young man she had never met because he commits suicide. While Septimus's act of committing suicide is regarded as cowardly and weak by his doctor, Clarissa thinks of his death as something meaningful

and passionate and even feels herself close to this young man she does not personally know: "She felt somehow very like him – the young man who had killed himself" (135). The fact that she does not blame Septimus for what he had done shows that Clarissa does not judge him for not acting like the socially accepted stereotypical man.

Septimus is not the only male character who is harmed due to the social gender expectations as Peter Walsh also finds himself in a difficult position after he does what is expected of him as a man for the Empire. Even if his sacrifice is not as big as Septimus's, he is also portrayed as a character who cannot achieve self-fulfilment for the sake of chasing after the hegemonic masculinity ideals at the time. Imperialism is one of the biggest and most important parts of the history of Britain and the world as "the systems of direct colonial rule and indirect economic domination that spread across globe from the early 16th to the mid-twentieth centuries" (Connell "Globalization" 72). Surely it has a powerful effect on people's views and lifestyles because "[l]ocally situated lives are (and were) powerfully influenced by geopolitical struggles" (Connell "Globalization" 72). Since the Western imperial expansion was also a geopolitical struggle, it definitely shaped and influenced the perception of gender, manhood, and the accepted masculinity ideal. Men were supposed to support the Empire by participating in colonial duties; as this was the role that was assigned for them. Connell argues that there are accepted gender roles that are created throughout the years and their existence can only be understood if we recognise that "very large-scale institutions, such as the state and corporations are gendered" and that "international relations, international trade, and global markets are inherently an arena of gender politics" (Connell "Globalization" 72). Since institutions are gendered places, it is impossible for a government institution not to place a considerable importance on gender roles. The Empire needed men who could show the resilience to rule over the countries under the administration of the British Empire. According to Joseph Sramek, the idea of the imperial man can be found in these lines by Walter Campbell who is a famous British Army officer who served during the Victorian era and World War I: "Never attack a tiger on foot—if you can help it. There are cases in which you *must* do so. Then face him like a Briton and kill him if you can; for if you fail to kill him, he will certainly kill you" (Campbell 162). Sramek mentions that tigers "were historically associated with Indian and other Southeast Asian rulers" and he explains the importance of tiger hunting in terms of the formulation of masculine ideals:

> More generally, tiger hunting was an important symbol in the construction of British imperialand masculine identities during the nineteenth century. Precisely because tigers were dangerous and powerful beasts, tiger hunting represented a struggle with fearsome nature thatneeded to be resolutely faced 'like a Briton,' as Campbell put it. Only by successfully vanquishing tigers would Britons prove their manliness and their fitness to rule over Indians.(659)

So, the imperial duties were definitely regarded as a significant part of the accepted masculinity ideals at the time, a man was expected to find in himself the strength to struggle through the challenges of creating and maintaining an empire and conquering distant lands. The tiger as a symbol of powerful Indian rulers that were to be overthrown and dominated by the British through colonising the place reveals that the image of the imperial man was strong, resilient, altruistic, patriotic, and self-confident. John Tosh suggests that during theVictorian period, expressing emotional vulnerability was regarded as something weak for men and he says that this mindset is correlated to the imperial ideas at the time: "The dominant code of manliness in the 1890s, so hostile to emotional expression and so intolerant of both androgyny and homosexuality, can be interpreted as a by-product of a raised imperial consciousness - especially with regard to the imperial frontier and the manly qualities required there" (196). Since the imperial frontier necessitated strength and resilience as valuable characteristics and this mindset was prevalent during the time, showing emotions were not really appreciated in a man. The formation of the British masculinity at the time was directly related to the values of the Victorian imperialism for "the parameters of a 'British masculinity' were defined concomitantly with the consolidation of the Victorian Empire" (Park 5). What imperialism required for men to have as valuable qualities were of course based on strength and durability according to Park, as is seen in his example of Indian mutiny:

> …[E]ach British representative in India had to live up to his ambassadorial role, to perform an appropriate part within the increasingly prescriptive categories of gender, race and class. Imperial necessity, in effect, drove the construction of a 'British masculinity' by requiring the projection of an image of strength, rationality, even invulnerability. Nationality itself came to be seen as performative a category as gender. (6)

Thus, the relationship between imperialism and gender norms cannot be ignored. The men who fulfilled the imperial duty were supposed to fit to a specific type of manliness, where they were expected to act patriotic, heroic, strong and self-sacrificial.

Literary works and artists of the Victorian age were also shaping the ideal masculinity according to the needs of the era. Rudyard Kipling, for instance, as one of the most

influentialpoets of those years, was showing a tremendous effort to propagate the idea of the perfect English man. He thought that the boys should be encouraged to contribute to the Empire; Tozer argues that in his book *Stalky & Co* (1899) Kipling "projected contemporary educational thinking that the aggressive and boisterous instincts of boys should not be tamed, civilised or eliminated but rather harnessed for imperial purposes. As boys grow to men, so they must be expected to become better savages" (n.p.). In order to maintain the existence and power of the British Empire, boys' abilities and strengths needed to be used to prepare them to carry on the imperial duties when they grow up. To arrange and distribute the idea of the necessity of young men for the Empire, this idealistic norm was created by the literary artists and the government as well.

Both imperialism and the women's liberation movements in the last years of the nineteenth century led to a sharper division between the ideals of being a man or a woman. The Empire needed tough men and women's liberation movements caused a loss of power in men, hence the need to propagate more strict ideals of manhood ensued. Thus, being a proper man started to be understood as a "synonym for the toughest and most exclusive male attributes. It [manliness] denied men's emotional vulnerability and reinforced their monopoly on courage and stoicism" (Tosh 337). It should also be noted that these ideals were the ones which were going to be used to send the young British men to the Great War, that is why the ideals created for the Imperial man in the last years of the Victorian period can be thought of as the foundation for the construction of the understanding of the ideal man in the years of World War I. Tosh points out the significant role of imperialism in building a war-mongering, patriotic society as follows:

> [T]he colonies provided a sphere in which military aspirations could be safely indulged—in most cases with relatively little danger to those who enlisted, and with no danger at all to those who applauded from the sidelines in Britain. The normalization of war feeling without experience of the reality was of course one reason why the nation was gripped by patriotic militarism in August 1914. (342)

The feeling of invincibility, together with the idea of conquering, dominating and bringing civilisation to faraway lands, was essential to be able to establish and maintain an empire. These were also the primary ideas the government propagated, when it was time to fight in the Great War. The people who were assigned for the duties to actualise the ideals of the government were young men because of their upbringing and education. Young men, in this sense, were the future of the British Empire.

Although *Mrs Dalloway* is a book that mostly captures the period after World War I, it can be observed in the novel that the ideas of the Victorian era about the ideal man still resonate in the aftermath of World War I. The reason for this is that the nineteenth century is a period when patriotic feelings and heroic male figures were glorified to a great extent since these ideals were still valid during the years of World War I because they were based on the previous years' understanding. In *Mrs Dalloway*, it is mentioned several times that the Empire has its hopes on young men to form a great, superior nation. When Peter Walsh comes to London, he comes across a group of young teenager boys carrying guns and marching on the street and he thinks that the future of the British civilisation lies "in the hands of young men like that; of young men such as he was, thirty years ago" (37). So, it can be suggested that there is a cycle that has been continuing for years and it requires that men, once they grow up, are expected to serve their country. The ultimate duty of men, then, is to create a bright future for their nation. It is understood that Peter Walsh felt the necessity to contribute to his country when he was a young man because government institutions, the society and the people around him expected and encouraged it. The description of the young boys marching on the street also points out that young men of the country are filled with enthusiasm to fight for the country, and they are proud to do so. Or else it seems like they do:"Boys in uniform, carrying guns, marched with their eyes ahead of them, marched, their arms stiff, and on their faces an expression like the letters of a legend written round the base of a statue praising duty, fidelity, love of England" (37-38). However, this idea of strong and enthusiastic young boys eager to contribute to the glory of their country is subverted with Peter Walsh's thoughts about them; "But they did not look robust. They were weedy for the most part, boys of sixteen, who might, tomorrow, stand behind bowls of rice, cakes of soap on counters" (38). In these lines, it is emphasised that these young boys are burdened with more than they can bear; they are weak, however they are supposed to be seen as these powerful, resilient young men with a responsibility to make their nation prosper.

In *Mrs Dalloway*, these boys also put on a performance in front of the people to show that they are ready to take on the responsibilities they are assigned due to their gender while in reality they are just sixteen-year-old teenagers, who are taught that this is the path they should follow in order to be accepted. Peter Walsh knows that this is not something more thanan illusion: boys marching on the streets of London to show their courage and

enthusiasm to serve their country is just a performance. They actually do not know what it is like to dedicate one's life to a nation's interests. This can be understood from Peter's train of thought once he sees these boys: "…one had to respect it, he thought. There they go, Peter thought…and all the exalted statues, Nelson, Gordon, Havelock…the spectacular images of great soldiers stood looking ahead of them…" (38). As the boys are walking under these great statues of the past soldiers and commanders, Peter Walsh thinks about how becoming a great commander everybody respects is rendered as an embellished notion. He thinks that it is something respected by the people because these people sacrificed their lives for the Empire. However, this is something Peter Walsh "did not want for himself in the least" (38). He continues to think about how these boys have no idea about being a soldier, dying for one's country and how devastating it is even if it is glorified and considered as something that needs to be respected: "They [the boys] don't know the troubles of the flesh yet, he thought, as the marching boys disappeared in the direction of the Strand – all that I've been through, he thought, crossing the road and standing under Gordon's statue, Gordon whom as a boy he had worshipped;…– poor Gordon, he thought" (38). From this scene and Peter's thoughts, it can be understood that from a young age, men are taught that dying heroically for one's country is the most valuable and important thing a man can ever do, and they are socially programmed to become these tough men who are ready to join in the fight against the threatening powers to their country. But when they actually carry out their duties, they start to realise that it is all an illusion, just like Peter does. He does not admire the great commanders as he used to do when he was a little boy, because he knows the harsh reality once he becomes a part of the system.

The schools, the most important institutions in fitting these young boys into masculinity ideals try to turn them into people who will do what the government needs from them without questioning. The influence of the education system on constructing the masculinity ideals will be explained in much more detail in the second chapter of this thesis. However, this relationship is also important for this part, so it will be touched upon shortly in this chapter, as well. Schools can be described as "a 'masculinity factory' or as 'masculinity making devices,' where boys learn that there are a number of different, and often competing, ways of being a boy and that some of these are more cherished and prestigious, and therefore more powerful, than others" (Swain 214). Hugh, one of Richard

Dalloway's friends from the high class, in *Mrs Dalloway*, is one of the examples of the ideal type that the government needs because "he's read nothing, thought nothing, felt nothing…He was the perfect specimen of the public school type…No country but England could have produced him" (55). The school system is designed to obliterate individuality in young boys early on and push them in the direction of being "normal" and "accepted" as Jon Swain argues: "For many pupils, the safest position to aim for in the formal school is to be 'average,'… although pupils attempt to construct their own individual identity, no one aspires to be, or can afford to be, too different, and they are conscious that they need to be "normal" or "ordinary" within the strict codes set by their own peer group" (217). Therefore, it can be suggested that there is psychological pressure on young boys to become what is considered convenient according to their gender, as the system tries to create people without unique critical thinking abilities and the ability to question so that they can easily abide by the stereotypical notions of being an ideal man without questioning.

Imperialism and a culture that glorifies war are undoubtedly related to the socialisation into masculinity as men learn how to become a man and a soldier. Although they are not born with a natural instinct to fight for their country or die for it, they are taught to become adventurers who will make the Empire prosper. The idea of the heroic male is planted into their minds by institutions, society and especially the schools. Swain argues that the schools' main function was to create members of the society who could be useful for the country at the expense of their individuality: "Until the last 50 years or so, these schools were unconcerned with meritocracy or academic qualifications and saw their main function as the preparation of a high proportion of their pupils for the armed services or the financial world of the city" (213). That is why they needed to put forward masculine ideals for young boys to follow. As a result of the socialisation process that aims to shape the individuals according to certain gender roles, not just women but also men suffered: "While nineteenth century patriarchal masculinity stifled women, neither did it serve the real needs of men. Indeed, in satisfying the demands of Empire, the military, industry and commerce, men's potential for personal growth and fulfilment was also decimated" (Beynon 59). Since men felt that they were the vessels of the Empire and the state in the path of becoming a superior, invincible nation, they dedicated their whole life to this cause.

Peter Walsh, in *Mrs Dalloway*, is the imperial man who carries out this duty to the Empire by going to India; so, he does what is expected of him. Ultimately, he also becomes one of the men whose potential for personal growth was prevented due to his military duties. Peter Walsh is actually far from the ideals of masculinity even though he likes to see himself as "an adventurer, reckless, swift, daring, a romantic buccaneer" (39). The reason why he goes to India is actually not because of his courageous, adventurer, patriotic nature but because Clarissa tells him that she does not intend to marry him. He does not have nationalistic feelings towards the empire or the army; and he even finds it strange that sometimes he feels a belonging towards this country and especially London.

When he wanders around in London after going to Clarissa's house, he thinks to himself that

> [c]oming as he did from a respectable Anglo-Indian family which for at least three generations had administered the affairs of a continent (it's strange, he thought, what a sentiment I have about that, disliking India, and empire, and army as he did), there were moments when civilization, even of this sort, seemed dear to him as a personal possession; moments of pride in England; in butlers; chow dogs… (40)

In these lines, he talks about how he does not like the culture of Britain so it can be understood that he is not a nationalistic person, because he deems it strange to feel a bond between himself and his country. He does not like the civilisation created in Britain, so it is not possible that he went to India to make a contribution to his nation or out of love for the Empire. He does not fit in the category of the British men who dedicate their lives to the good of their country courageously. He just feels the obligation to take upon the role his family and the traditions enforced on him. He simply accepts the familial and traditional position that is cut out for him. Another reason why he left his country might be that he uses escape as a coping mechanism in life. Since he feels like a failure in certain aspects in life (not graduating Oxford, not being able to get married to the woman he loves), he prefers to escape. This is again a result of the pressure he feels to become an adequate and ideal man. He sees himself as a failed man and leaves the people who impose the gender expectations unto him. He also constantly tries to convince himself and others that he is successful, normal and sufficient as a man as if repeating these things will turn them into reality.

He wants to believe that he is a "daring, romantic buccaneer" however he knows inherently that he is not even able to overcome his feelings for Clarissa after all the years

he spent in India. When Peter comes back from India and visits Clarissa for the first time before the party, "he burst[s] into tears" even if there is no apparent reason for him to cry at that moment (34). He just gets very overwhelmed when he sees the life Clarissa built for herself with her husband Richard Dalloway and he cannot control his tears. The fact that he cries in front of Clarissa during his visit after he comes back from India shows that he still has feelingsfor her even if he does not want to accept it. The fact that Clarissa chose Richard Dalloway instead of Peter as her husband makes Peter consider himself as an inadequate man. Clarissa prefers Richard Dalloway "because he represents stability, status, social position and protection" (Ryan 60). Surely, Peter is aware of this, as well. He knows that the reason why Clarissa did not choose him as her husband is because she did not think that he could give her the stable family life she desired. This knowledge is one of the most important things that creates the foundation of Peter's character because it means that he does not have the attributes to be considered an ideal man who is a stable, breadwinner, and a family man.

He seems to be an ideal man who has fulfilled his duty to the Empire by leaving his life in Britain behind and going to India to participate in colonial mission to propagate British values and culture. Thus, he is not marginalised or regarded as an outcast by the people as it happens to Septimus. However, his obsession with Clarissa; his neediness, unpredictability, and lack of confidence make him a seemingly weak man. Mosse claims that traditional masculine ideals portray "such a man of action who controlled his passions, and who in his harmonious and well-proportioned bodily structure expressed his commitment to moderation and self-control" (*The Image* 101). Peter, however, does not fit into the ideal of manhood. When Clarissa started to get close with Richard Dalloway when they were young, Peter thought: "He [Richard] deserved to have [Clarissa]. For himself, he was absurd. His demands upon Clarissa were absurd. He asked impossible things. He made terrible scenes" (47). He looks down on himself and he thinks that Clarissa was right in choosing Richard over himself, but on the other hand he is still angry at Clarissa for rejecting his proposal. His infatuation with Clarissa and his need to be approved by her after all those years in India can be interpreted as a weakness in his character which is again incompatible with the masculine ideal. In the scene where Clarissa explains Peter that she wants to break up, Clarissa and Peter are described as the opposites regarding their reactions: "…she was unyielding. She was like iron, like flint,

rigid up the backbone. And when she said, 'It's no use. This is the end' – after he had spoken for hours, with the tears running down his cheeks" (48). This is one of the most important scenes to understand Peter's personality because he is revealed in his most vulnerable state. He is needy, obsessive, and dependent. It is known that these characteristics of Peter make Clarissa angry and irritated; she thinks that "it was his weakness; his lack of the ghost of a notion what anyone was feeling that annoyed her" (34).

He tries to convince both himself and Clarissa that he does not feel anything romantic towards Clarissa because he has a relationship with another woman whom he intends to marry. However, he becomes so overwhelmed by the feelings he still has for Clarissa that "to his utter surprise, suddenly thrown by those uncontrollable forces, he bursts into tears; wept, wept without the least shame" (34). It is understood that Peter is unable to control his feelings and even if he tries to seem strong, untroubled or reckless, his emotions always show through, and he ends up seeming as a weak man. His going to India for imperial duties and his efforts to look strong in front of Clarissa shows that he tries to reach the standards of the accepted masculinity, however he cannot succeed since the masculinity ideals are tremendously unrealistic. The characterisation of Peter Walsh and his representation in the twentieth century in Britain shows that even the men who put a great effort into being regarded as the ideal cannot get past the unrealistic masculinity standards.

It could be argued that Peter, one way or another, tries to be considered as an ideal man in the public eye. His accepting a position in India could be taken as an example of him to that end. Additionally, when he visits Clarissa for the first time in her house after he comes back from India, he thinks to himself: "Here she is mending her dress; mending her dress as usual…; here she's been sitting all the time I've been in India"(30). He compares his actions in India and Clarissa's actions in England and creates a gendered binary opposition in his mind. Valerie Reed Hickman explains this instance pointing out that "For Peter, indeed, Clarissa represents not just England but the private, the domestic, the feminine, and (implicitly) the frivolous, while he represents, in his own mind at least, the public, the masculine, and the serious, a modern Odysseus to Clarissa's Penelope" (65). Sewing is considered as a female attribute and going to another country to colonise it is regarded as a male attribute; by comparing these two attributes in his mind, Peter

wants to think of himself as the ideal man who fulfils what is traditionally expected of him. His wish to be seen as a reckless adventurer who travels to an exotic part of the world for the sake of his country becomes more solid with this dualism he creates in his own mind.

When he could not be successful in having a relationship with Clarissa and starting a family with her, he directed his energy into becoming an imperial man and established himself as a man who is in line with the society's expectations this way. Forming a family could be the way he anticipated to lead him to the path to be regarded as the ideal masculine type. Starting from the Victorian period onwards, the idea of forming a family and having the ability and means to provide for the family was considered as a masculine trait. Tosh explains this idea accordingly:

> …[S]etting up a new household is the essential qualification for manhood. The man who speaks for familial dependents and who can transmit his name and his assets to future generations is fully masculine. In the nineteenth century this was a governing condition of the transition to adult life. Once established, a household had to be sustained by the man's productive activities. (185)

The mindset that required men to be able to start a family to be recognised as adequate surely has prevailing effects during the beginning of the twentieth century. Having spent his youth with these teachings and ideas, Peter, wants to have a solid relationship with Clarissa and tries to achieve the status of the ideal man through marriage. However, after being rejected by Clarissa, he dedicates himself to the good of his country through the military ideal.

Furthermore, Peter thinks that in the eyes of the Dalloways and their social circle, he is a failure and not an ideal man, and this situation leads him to think of himself as inadequate. He gives the reasons for being considered a failure by the Dalloways: "Oh yes, he had no doubt about that; he was a failure, compared with all this – the inlaid table, the mounted paper-knife, the dolphin and the candlesticks, the chair-covers and the old valuable English tinted prints – he was a failure" (32). He considers himself a failure compared to the Dalloways because he does not have a family, he does not seem to be getting the confirmation from the public he imagined when he decided to go to India, he does not have valuable materials like the Dalloways do, he is not part of the elite circle. The Dalloways represent the dominant, socially accepted and glorified notions of the period. This could be understood from the thoughts of Clarissa about what the name

"Dalloway" represents, she thinks that the name Dalloway has "a great deal of the public-spirited, British Empire, tariff-reform, governing-class spirit" (57). Peter Walsh does not consider himself complying to any of these ideals and that is why he feels like a failure who cannot fit in. It is also clear that his life is not satisfactory at all. He constantly talks about how he found the perfect woman for him to get married; however, his reluctance to act on it tells otherwise.

His desire to be seen adequate in the eyes of the people is never-ending and always directed to what is expected of him; be it forming a family or being a crucial part of the military machinations of his own country. He follows this desire constantly but never seems to attain it. The standards to become an ideal man are so unrealistic and unattainable that even though Peter shows a significant effort to contribute to the English society and the government and spends most of his life to be useful for the Empire, he still cannot be regarded as either ideal or sufficient.

Clarissa Dalloway considers Peter Walsh as a failure as well; when she is alone, mending her dress before the party, she thinks about Peter, the old days they spent together and thinks to herself: "he had never done a thing they talked of; his whole life had been a failure. It made her angry still" (6). So, from Clarissa's perspective, Peter Walsh looks like a man who could not achieve his dreams in any area of his life and became a failure. This also makes Clarissa angry because even if they quarrelled and uttered harsh words to each other when they were young, Peter was one of Clarissa's best friends along with Sally Seton. The reason why Clarissa sees Peter as a failure is also due to the socially constructed acceptable male stereotype. Peter's efforts to be regarded as an acceptable man through various means do not lead him to become an ideal man. Peter also feels a guilt and shame since he could not become the man he is expected to become, that is why when he goes to Clarissa's house, he tries to look like a happy, accomplished man and talks about how happy he is and how he is in love. Clarissa asks Peter what he had been doing for the past five years and he exclaims: "Millions of things!" (33). It is as if he has a huge desire to be seen like a busy adventurer who had gone through many different experiences and accomplished many things. In reality, his anxious state of mind is described in the scene as follows: "Millions of things! He exclaimed, and, urged by the assembly of powers which were now charging this way and that and giving him the feeling at once frightening and

extremely exhilarating of being rushed through the air" (33). These feelings of anxiety, fear, and urgency can be considered as proof of him showing a great effort to be seen as a successful and socially acceptable man in the eyes of Clarissa and thus the social circle she belongs to. Peter has an everlasting desire to be accepted and appreciated as a man, especially in the eyes of this social circle that includes Clarissa, and he is consumed by this desire while chasing the masculinity idealisations that he thought would lead him to be socially accepted.

In conclusion, in writing *Mrs Dalloway*, Woolf displays the troubles the English society went through as a whole in the aftermath of a greatly damaging war. She portrayed the social issues brought by the Victorian society and World War I along with personal tragedies. However, these individual tragedies are not separated from the collective social crises that are brought by the social norms and traditions. These norms and traditions not only hurt women but also men by forcing them to comply with certain constructed ideals of masculinity. The hegemonic masculinity ideals at the time in which *Mrs Dalloway* takes place are related to nationality, war, heroism and patriotism. That is why the two male characters in the novel, Septimus and Peter, are the ones that are mostly affected by these ideals since they are both buried under military weight. Septimus first accepts the patriotic role that is deemed ideal for men at the time with enthusiasm, however; after his experience with the reality of the war and his shellshock, he carries the burden of killing people and seeing his friends killed till the end of his life. The ideals that are constructed to maintain the patriarchal consensus push him to join the war. When he suffers from a mental illness at the end of this experience neither the people around him nor the doctors help him but instead, they marginalise and try to hide him from the public eye. This, in the end, with many other factors, causes him to commit suicide and makes him a victim of the patriarchal conventions that create these hegemonic masculinities in the first place. Peter, as a man who tries to comply with the national along with the familial and traditional necessities, fulfils his manly duties even if he feels that there are fundamental fallacies in the mentality of the people at the time. He always tries to find a way to be regarded as an ideal man in the eyes of the public, whether it be by marrying and forming a traditional family or by joining the imperial cause and maintaining his national duty. However, whatever he does, he cannot achieve the status he wants, he always has self-deprecating thoughts and deems himself as inadequate. It could be said that the fact that he never truly

finds happiness is because of the unrealistic hegemonic masculinity standards put in front of him to follow. He constantly chases these standards to become successful and sufficient, but he never attains them and becomes depressed in the end. Both of these characters are influenced in a negative way from the enforcement of these ideals upon them, but through different experiences. Septimus's state of mind and his life as a whole is destroyed by the war and the ideals it creates for men to comply with. Peter's life, however, is completely altered due to the aims and ideals of imperialism. Both of them try to fit in, however, and waste their youth and life for the sake of the conventional ideas that are shaped around the notion of nationalism and patriotism fuelled by the same patriarchy that also creates hegemonic masculinities.

CHAPTER 2: HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY CONSTRUCTED BY EDUCATION IN *JACOB'S ROOM*: "THE GREAT PATRIARCHAL MACHINE"

This chapter's focus is the education given in the ancient universities during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and how it created a separate hegemonic masculinity that is valid in Cambridge University that does not have the same characteristics with the dominant hegemonic masculinity in England at the time. Jacob, as a young, white, English man who is a part of Cambridge University, is expected to fit into a certain kind of masculinity. This masculinity is different from the hegemonic masculinity that is propagated in order to call men of the country to the war by glorifying the values such as strength, perseverance, and heroism. The masculinity that is constructed by the ancient universities requires men to believe themselves to be superior to the other groups of the society in terms of racial, gender-related, and intellectual attributes. The reason for this type of masculinity construction is to employ these young men in the governmental and managerial roles once they finish their university education. In the gendered space of Cambridge University, the hegemonic masculinity is different than the general hegemonic masculinity that is valid in the country because it has a different end-goal. Jacob, like Septimus (when he first decides to join the war) tries to fit into this type of masculinity that is created by the Cambridge education. While Septimus joins the war because he thinks it is required to be in line with the hegemonic masculinity, Jacob becomes a man who looks down on women, who is pretentious, and who deems himself superior and fits into the masculinity constructed by Cambridge University. Thus, it could be argued that Jacob fits into the hegemonic masculinity of Cambridge University by becoming a stereotypical Cambridge man. Although both Septimus and Jacob are required to conform with different masculinities, they both become victims in the end. Jacob, differently from Septimus, becomes a victim not because he volunteers to fight in the war and suffers from the consequences of it but because he cannot achieve self-actualisation and as a result he loses his individuality for the sake of becoming one of the stereotypical Cambridge men produced by his ancient university. In this chapter, it is claimed that even if Jacob fits into the ideal male type that is created by the prestigious universities of the country and he is in a privileged state as a man, he is still victimised by

the patriarchal system and hegemonic masculinity in the end.

First published in 26 October 1922, *Jacob's Room* is Virginia Woolf's third novel and it has a young, lonely man who lives in pre-war England at its centre. It has an experimental style since the character of Jacob is demonstrated by how he is perceived by the people in his life. His character is mainly seen through the eyes of the people in his life and their impressions of him. In order to do this, Virginia Woolf implements a variety of modernist elements such as stream of consciousness, internal monologues, and the letters written between Jacob and his mother. Dibattista claims that *Jacob's Room* is Woolf's "apprentice novel in which she so carefully prepared for her plunge into modernity" (370). The novels that follow *Jacob'sRoom* all have modernism ingrained in them to a great extent and she continues to experiment more and more with the modernist techniques throughout the years. It is the novel that allowed Virginia Woolf to find a new, unfamiliar way to express herself and present the character she created more in depth. Hence, it is safe to suggest that Woolf found the courage she needed to follow another direction in her fiction writing and entered a new phase in her literary journey with *Jacob's Room*. It is the first novel Woolf feels like she can truly break away from the literary conventions and display her own art because she says in her diary that "[t]here is no doubt in [her] mind that [she has] found out how to begin (at 40) to say something in [her] own voice" (*The Diary of Virginia Woolf: Volume 2* 186). It is clear that with *Jacob's Room*, Woolf gained the confidence in the kind of art she wishes to achieve and found enough encouragement to continue to proceed in the literary path she had chosen to take. This was also because of the positive feedback the novel got from the literary circles when it was first published. Francesca Kazan explains the effect the novel created at first and the importance of the novel for the literary environment at the time by arguing that "When Jacob's Room was published in 1922 it was immediately hailed as a radically innovative text that broke with tradition and established the groundwork for a new kind of fiction" (701). She, then, gives some examples from the critics who created some analogies regarding *Jacob's Room* and suggests that Rebecca West compared the novel to a "portfolio," while W. C. Courtney to "jazz" and also the novel was linked to the art of "photography" in an unsigned review (701). Even though *Jacob's Room* had this much crucial place in Woolf's canon, it certainly has been overlooked to a considerable extent compared to her other novels. It is an experimental work that equipped Woolf with

the modernist techniques she would be using in her later, more influential works. It has a non- linear plotline which revolves around the character of Jacob that is created through the perceptions, impressions, memories, and sensations of others. So, it could be argued that the novel follows the life of a young man not through the events in his life but how he is remembered and imagined by others. How people see Jacob from their own view throughout his life creates the character of Jacob.

The novel starts with Jacob's childhood, then it continues with his years of college education at Cambridge and proceeds into his adulthood. At the beginning of the novel, Jacob is a little kid with his mother and two brothers in a small seaside town of Scarborough. The novel opens with two boys playing on the beach of Cornwall while their mother, Elizabeth- or Betty- Flanders mourns for her husband who had died. This part of the novel is narrated through the perspective of Betty whose experiences of being a widow are illustrated a little bit. The novel, then, makes a big leap to the year of 1906 when Jacob starts his education at Cambridge as a college student. In this part of the novel, Jacob's struggle to find a group that he can belong to and his efforts to build relationships are narrated. His relationships are told in detail and especially, his friendship with Timothy Durrant and Richard Bonamy is explored in this part. After his graduation, Jacob Flanders decides to live in London instead of going back to Scarborough. In London, he works at various jobs while studying independently on the topics he is greatly interested in such as philosophy, history, and classical literature. Additionally, he meets and forms relationships with people from very different backgrounds. At the age of 26, Jacob decides to take a trip around Continental Europe; he visits Paris, Greece, and Italy. In this part of the novel, the relationships between various people and Jacob are depicted and the idea that it is almost impossible to truly know a person since the relationships are very complex among human beings is conveyed. The novel ends with Betty inspecting Jacob's room filled with objects that belonged to Jacob and it is revealed that Jacob had been killed during one of the battles in World War I. The objects he had and the memories, impressions of him on other people are the only things that are left from him at the end of the novel.

Jacob's Room does not have societal issues or political ideas at its centre; it is a novel that is more suitable to analyse regarding its literary value and originality, however, it has a young man who is among the many young men that lost their lives in World War I. That

is why the novel can be seen as an elegy to Jacob's life; step by step, it moves towards the conclusion of a bright young man giving up his life for the sake of his country. In this regard, it could also be considered an elegy to the lost generation of young men who had to sacrifice their lives in the war because it elaborates on the idea that those young men were not just a part of the statistics but individuals who had their own experiences, relationships, ideas, passions. The political critique of the novel comes from this idea. Young bright men are coerced into joining a war and become the victims of their own government and society due to the gender conventions and societal norms. As these norms result in young people's death, they also restrict them when it comes to living their life to the fullest. Just like Septimus, Jacob is also a victim of World War I. However, along with becoming a victim due to the war, he is also victimised by the requirements that are imposed upon him through the education he gets from the ancient university he attends. If Jacob's death in the war is considered as the obvious reason why Jacob is a victim of the patriarchal system, the masculinity conventions that are put forward by Cambridge University are the hidden perpetrators against him. Virginia Blain suggests that along with reading the novel as a portrait of a young man who lost his life in the war, it is possible to view the novel as a critical work about the conventions of masculinity: "While it is possible to read the book as a perfectly sympathetic account of a young man who is in many ways full of promise, whose life is pointlessly thrown away, it is also possible to read it…as a parody of entrenched masculine prejudices" (134). So, it is clear that Blain believes in the possibility that *Jacob's Room* might be written as a parody that subverts the conventions and norms about masculinity. When this comment of Blain is taken into account, it can be suggested that Virginia Woolf criticizes the constructed ideals of masculinity in the novel to a great extent. In addition to what Blain suggests, Judy Little also argues that *Jacob's Room* is a work that mocks the patriarchal ideals constructed around the gender conventions with an essentialist attitude by suggesting: "in *Jacob's Room* the traditional male growth pattern, full of great expectation, falls like a tattered mantle around the shoulders of the indecisive hero, heir of the ages. The musing and amused narrator mocks the structure of her story; she mocks the conventions of the hero's progress; and, by implication, she mocks the values behind those conventions" ("*Jacob's Room* as Comedy" 105). Thus, it could be argued that Virginia Woolf, through the narrator of the novel, criticizes the requirements that are asked of men and displays the

shortcomings and the harms of these social norms. Criticizing the societal norms that have a negative impact on the lives of the men is made possible by Woolf displaying the workings of the differences between the sexes as pointed out by Kate Flint: "Woolf came to organize her text around a more generalized perception of difference between the sexes. Such differences, she demonstrates with regard to attitudes, opportunities, and values, were crucial to the maintenance of the dominant ideology of a society which was capable of sending 'young men in the prime of life' off to their death on battlefields or under the sea" (362). Thus, it can be suggested that Woolf wants to pinpoint the harms of the gender-based societal conventions upon men by drawing attention to the gender inequality that is existent in the society.

The norms that are constructed in the pre-war England create obstacles in an individual's path of self-improvement. Carol Ohmann claims that the social criticism of the novel can be found in this idea that is conveyed by the novel because *Jacob's Room* is "concerned with social conventions and how, accepting them, people live unawakened and circumscribed"(162). In the end, all of the notions that are seen as normal or acceptable according to one's gender, social status, or age always set limitations on the lives of people. This leads them to live their life unsatisfied and incomplete because they refrain from the things they want to achieve due to the fear of being left alone or marginalised by the society. In other words, idealised masculinity constructions that are created by the societal structures victimise men either by causing them to experience life in a limited manner or by making them sacrifice their lives for a cause that is put upon them due to their sex.

The research on the idea of victimisation through masculinity ideals is a dangerous area according to Scott Coltrane because

> If one focuses on the lived reality of most men's lives, however, one also runs the risk of reproducing patriarchal consciousness. Focusing on men's standpoints will typically produce a picture of men's felt powerlessness. One must be careful to acknowledge that these same men exercise considerable power in their lives, particularly over women, but also over other men. (55)

Jacob is a privileged man due to the education he gets and the social environment he is included, hence, claiming that he is also victimised due to these privileges is a dangerous area just like Coltrane suggests. But it is not impossible for men to attain privileges thanks to the patriarchy and at the same time to become a victim to the patriarchy. It cannot be

denied under any circumstances that men have and had social, political, educational, cultural privileges, and power over women throughout history; however, these privileges come with their own costs. Michael Messner talks about this contradictory situation by claiming that: "These costs are linked to the promise of masculine power and privilege…This process results in the construction and naturalization of men's power over women, and in pain(both physical and emotional) for men" (144). Thus, it is possible for men to become powerful, attain privileges because of their sex but also to be victimised and suffer to be able to be seen like an ideal man that is eligible for these privileges. It is possible for men to both have privileges due to their sex and to become a victim of the same system that provided them with these privileges in the first place.

One of the most important parts of constructing the gender-based conventions creating limitations on people's lives is the education given in the state institutions. Accordingly, how education aims to socialise people into certain standards to make use of them should be looked into. It cannot be denied that schools and education systems have a great influence on the creation of constructed masculinity values because "schooling has, historically, been connected with gender" (Swain 214). Jacob is a character whose social status is elevated, who has the privilege of getting an education from one of the most distinguished universities of the country and who is filled with the ideas of superior masculine type, however, in the end these privileges work as a means to put him in a position where he is not free to become the man who he wishes to become hence victimising him. The reason why he gets the privileges and why he dies at the end is the same: his being a man.

This chapter is mainly focused on the education of the ancient universities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the hegemonic masculinity that is created by these universities, and Woolf's criticism of the education system in these universities. Since the masculinity ideals in question are created in relation to the gender inequality and they are maintained through undermining and excluding women systematically, gender inequality and Woolf's views on the matter will be discussed, as well. In *Jacob's Room*, through Jacob and his friends, Woolf exemplifies two types of masculinity constructed by the education given in the ancient universities at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. One of these masculinity ideals is the obedient young man who is filled with the ideas of the superiority of the white, male, elite, English man ready to rule

and invade; and the other one is the type of man who is more willing to go on adventures in exotic, unknown places with his male friends rather than getting involved in romantic relationships with women, getting married, and settling down. Woolf criticises the structure of the ancient universities' education in England, the masculine ideals it creates and patriarchy as a whole because the ideal that is glorified through this system has a nature that undermines women, erases men's individuality by filling them with a pretentious superiority idea, and victimises men in the end.

The masculinity ideal that is constructed by the ancient universities have some differences with the other masculinity conventions that are affected by other cultural factors. It should be noted that in the same period of time it is possible for many idealised masculinity conventions to be constructed and maintained in a society. The existence of one powerful hegemonic masculinity ideal does not require other masculinity conventions to be erased or destructed. Even though the hegemonic masculinity ideal is the most powerful and the most glorified one, which was discussed in the first chapter of this thesis in detail, it is interrelated with other masculinity conventions. According to Jeff Hearn and David Collinson masculinity forms "need to be understood in terms of their own relations with each other, with respect to the construction of hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinities" (112). Thus, it is possible for many hegemonic and nonhegemonic masculinity ideals to be existent at the same period of time in the same society. The socially constructed gender roles pave the way for the creation of different types of masculinity according to Michael Kaufman: "there is no single masculinity although there are hegemonic and subordinate forms of masculinity. These forms are based on men's social power but are embraced in complex ways by individual men who also develop harmonious and nonharmonious relationships with other masculinities" (144). It is true that dominant hegemonic masculinity is an ideal that is always present and dominating over the other masculinities, it is at the top of the hierarchical structure of the masculinity forms; but it is not the single masculinity type there is. Debbie Epstein claims that masculinity is not a fixed notion but rather it is fluid and it is found in many shapes in relation to different conditions:

> …the ways men form their identities as men, or 'do man' is not fixed. Nor is there some one thing which we can label 'masculinity' and leave it at that, believing that we have explained what we need to know about men. There are many different versions of masculinity which are affected by, among other things: the social

positions of particular men or groups of men (differentiated byrace, ethnicity, class, sexuality, bodily abilities); their relationship to the state (for example, employed by a branch of the state as civil servants, soldiers or teachers…); the life histories of individual men; and common sense or oppositional notions of what men should be like. (49)

There are various conditions and situations that have an effect on how masculinity is defined and a man's class, social condition, the country he lives in, the culture or education he has access to all influence formation of his masculinity to a great extent. It is also possible for mento be in relation to different types of masculinity constructions according to what Kaufman argued in the abovementioned quote. These relationships can be built in a way that is in line with the requirements of the masculinity ideal or vice versa. Thus, men can have a conformity relationship with one of the idealised masculinity constructions while clashing with another one. It should not be forgotten that patriarchy does not only create a power relationship between men and women but also amongst men themselves and also amongst masculinities as Kaufman points out: "Patriarchy exists as a system not simply of men's power over women but also of hierarchies of power among different groups of men and between different masculinities" (145). That is why it is highly probable for various classes of society to encourage different types of masculinity ideals and shape their own manhood idealisations. Kaufman explains this by stating that: "Each subgroup, based on race, class, sexual orientation, or whatever, defines manhood in ways that conform to the economic and social possibilities of that group" (145). Thus, the idealised manhood for a working-class man and an upper-class man with assets and privileges particular to him can be built quite differently according to the needs of the society. Kaufman gives an example of the different formations of masculinity according to class:

For example, part of the ideal of working-class manhood among white North-American menstresses physical skill and the ability to physically manipulate one's environment, while part of the ideal of their upper-middle class counterparts stresses verbal skills and the ability to manipulate one's environment through economic, social, and political means. Each dominantimage bears a relationship to the real-life possibilities of these men and the tools at their disposal for the exercise of some form of power. (145)

Thus, according to the social class and its requirements, the glorified masculinity conventions can be altered so that the best and the most practical use of men in different areas of life can be ensured. Although Kaufman's example is from another part of the world, it is valid for Britain, as well.The dynamics of maintaining a patriarchal society

through norms related to gender roles have quite similar tendencies. Additionally, the British society is strictly divided by social classes and there are different characteristics of different classes. It would be inevitable for these social classes to construct their own ideals in terms of gender roles as well as other aspects of life.

David Morgan explains the relationship between class structure and the formation of masculinities and how sometimes conflictual masculinity ideals can be created, as well: "It can also be argued that class contributed to both a unified sense of masculinity and more diffused, perhaps more conflictual, models of masculinities…class experiences and practices pointed to different ways of being men, different ways of being constituted as effective social actors" (169-170). So, it can be said that what kind of roles men play and what kind of responsibilities they have related to their class determine the expected masculinity ideal they should adhere. Of course, these different masculinity constructions do not make the hegemonic masculinity ideal less powerful or less influential; they merely serve a different purpose of making use of every man from every part of the society. Morgan emphasises this fact as well: "The main argument here is that the recognition of a diversity of masculinities should not obscure the fact that in a particular social formation, certain masculinities are more dominant, more valued, or more persuasive than others" (170). In the British society during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there is a diversity of idealized masculinities that have different and sometimes conflictual characteristics, and they are aimed towards different purposes in line with the social class they stem from. One of these constructed masculinity standards is the one that is created by the ancient universities that have a great impact on the male individuals of the society. This specifically constructed ideal of masculinity is one that is intellectual, superior in many ways to the other groups of people, and have the adequacy of leading and having governmental roles.

The hegemonic masculinity ideal that is created by Cambridge University and the other ancient universities is aimed at the men and boys who are at the upper levels of the society. When the fact that hegemonic masculinity is not something fixed and can change its form depending on the context, space, and the culture of a certain place; it is safe to argue that Cambridge University, along with the other ancient universities, construct a different kind of hegemonic masculinity that is valid and accepted in the social microcosm of the university itself. Cambridge University aims for a different type of man that is intellectual, superior,

boastful and cultured since Cambridge men are to become government officials, teachers, managers and politicians. This kind of hegemonic masculinity is constructed based on the belief that there is power in knowledge. The white, privileged, young males who could get the opportunity to get an education from these institutions are trained to become men who could regard themselves at a higher position than the others, self-confident, capable of ruling and managing administerial jobs in the state and the government. It is not important to create individual, different men with various ideas and characteristics, but rather men who will be ready to be of service to their country with their distinguished intellectual qualities. Jacob fits into these ideals that are constructed by the Cambridge education. However, he does not fit into the strong, heroic, warrior type which is constructed to bombard the lower-class men with the ideas of fighting for their country in the same period. The hegemonic masculinity ideals that are constructed for the lower-class males of the society, like Septimus, are not observed in Jacob's characterisation. Although these ideals of manliness were shaped by courage, strength, and resilience, Jacob's masculinity is not defined by these terms. His masculinity that is predominantly shaped by his education at Cambridge is very different from the masculinity that is created to call young men of the country to join the war.

The difference of Jacob's masculinity from the hegemonic masculinity that glorifies warrior type of man can be observed in his childhood, as well. Even when he is a little child, his choices and attitudes are far from being in line with the mainstream idealised masculinity virtues. From the very beginning of the novel, it is clear that Jacob's interests are not compatible with the standard gender roles that are constructed for boys. When the local priest of Scarborough, Mr. Floyd, tells Jacob and his brothers to choose whatever they want from his study room to remember him by when he leaves the town, Jacob "[chooses] the works of Byron in one volume" while Archer chooses a paper knife (25). This detail is important in terms of indicating the interests of Jacob in his childhood. The contrast between Jacob's choice of a present and his brother's shows that Jacob is more interested in an intellectual lifestyle. As the time progresses, it is seen that Jacob moves away from the idealised masculine type that is valid for the boys that have no privileges or an education from an ancient university in the pre-war England. He is characterised as someone who is a romantic, mysterious, intellectual, reserved young man. He adheres to literature and art a great importance and "is welcome at Lady Rosseter's, welcome among

artists and actresses," (Ohmann 164). His ideals lie not in the military, nation, or being triumphant in a war but in the path to find the meaning of life as it is told in the classics by Plato or Sophocles. He is not compatible with the heroic, strong, resilient, patriotic man that is tried to be served as the mainstream stereotype during the years of the beginning of the twentieth century by the government institutions and the society. He enjoys and wishes to engage in conversations about "sensible" topics in his own words, which include the classical literature and he thinks that he and one of his best friends in college, Timmy Durrant are "the only people in the world who know what the Greeks meant"(97). During the years that are drawing near to the World War I, the public's ideas of masculinity were predominantly placed upon the militaristic views. The idea of defending one's country against the enemy alongside one's community that is composed of the closest friends was glorified and disseminated. Manliness was described first and foremost by soldierly qualities for the ordinary young men who have no relation to the upper class or the ancient universities. However, Jacob is not even slightly described by soldierly qualities throughout the novel by anyone. He is a Cambridge man who thinks of himself as a person that is superior to the other groups of people, and he is not interested in the patriotic, war-centred mindset that creates a mainstream manhood ideal for the lower-class men. The reason why his character shows some conflictual elements in terms of his masculinity is that he has the privilege of getting an education from Cambridge University and shapes his ideals under the impact of this education. It is undeniable that ancient universities have a great effect in constructing an understanding of a manhood that is particular to the privileged white men such as Jacob. And, if Cambridge University is taken as an institution that constructs its own space for the young male members of the society, it is possible to argue that it constructs its own hegemonic masculinity that is valid and accepted within the gendered space of the university itself. Jacob, as a student at Cambridge University is seen as somebody who tries to fit in this hegemonic masculinity type. If the hegemonic masculinity at the time for the country is the heroic, strong, patriotic man, the hegemonic masculinity for Cambridge University, which is a microcosm in itself, is the superior, intellectual Cambridge man. It is possible for Cambridge University to construct its own hegemonic masculinity because it has its own male-dominated environment which is greatly influential on the creation of a specific manhood ideal.

Historically, Cambridge, Oxford and all the other universities were male dominated spaces where male privilege was the most important component and male virtues, and characteristics were constantly glorified. Oxford University did not allow women to formally join and graduate until 1920. Cambridge University was the last university to take in female students, not granting them with the right to get a degree until 1948. Woolf clearly does not approve this kind of an education that excludes women as well as the men who are the products of this education. This critical view of Virginia Woolf stemming from the fact that women are shunned from the environment of university education or from the intellectual circle and her opinions about this discrimination towards women can be observed in the long essay she wrote about gender issues called *A Room of One's Own*.

In the first chapter of this essay, Woolf writes from the point of view of a fictional narrator who sits in the garden of Oxbridge which is not a real university but a combination of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. While the narrator is in deep reflection about the issue of women and fiction, she decides to delve into this topic by reading some books about it in the library of this university. However, she is prevented by a man who warns her: "instantly there issued, like a guardian angel barring the way with a flutter of black gown instead of white wings, a deprecating, silvery, kindly gentleman, who regretted in a low voice as he waved me back that ladies are only admitted to the library if accompanied by a Fellow of the College or furnished with a letter of introduction" (*A Room of One's Own* 6). This shows that being a woman and not having a man who would help you get into the library of this university is a huge drawback in the way leading to intellectualism. It is not even possible for women to get into a small part of these universities without a letter from a man who is a member of the circle of these institutions. It is clear that these places are exclusive to some men; women have no place in it. Even for the duration of the time the narrator in the essay sits in the garden of this university, she feels herself like trespassing because a Beadle's existence and looks make her feel like an alien in this male space:

> Instantly a man's figure rose to intercept me. Nor did I at first understand that the gesticulations of a curious looking object, in a cut-away coat and evening shirt, were aimed at me. His face expressed horror and indignation. Instinct rather than reason came to my help; he was a Beadle; I was a woman. This was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me. (*A Room of One's Own* 5)

If this quote is analysed in terms of the word choices of Virginia Woolf, it is possible to argue that Fellows and Scholars are allowed in the "path". This word choice as opposed to the "gravel" that is used to describe the place where women belong according to Woolf tells something quite important in terms of the separate journeys of men and women in becoming successful individuals. The "path" that is designed for men is a place that is fixed and pre-determined. The path also has a nature that is trampled upon over and over again. It could be said that the path creates the same individuals again and again, without any unique achievements or characteristics. Men who are moulded by the Cambridge education goes through the same path that produces stereotypical British men to be used for the interests of the government. However, the gravel that is left for women to follow in order to find a place for themselves in the world is challenging, full of obstacles and difficulties but it is not fixed. This means that the gravel will create unique individuals with various capabilities and achievements since it does not serve a manual about how to follow the path. Women, then, have to pave the way for themselves with many hardships but do not turn into stereotypical people while doing that. Other than what is aimed with the word choice of Woolf, it is clear from this paragraph that the presence of a woman in the university creates expression of "horror and indignation" in the face of a man, this shows that this situation is extremely rare and strange; it may even be unacceptable. According to Zwerdling, "The Cambridge suburb admitted women only on sufferance, and it taught its male products to patronize them" (905), which can easily be seen in *A Room of One's Own* in this scene where the female narrator is rejected by a male figure. A disincentive environment is created for the purpose of not accepting women in this exclusive circle, and even when they are accepted, there is a great repression and male patronisation that undermines women.

Zwerdling connects Woolf's critical and resentful attitude towards these ancient educational institutions to the fact that she and women in general were not given the opportunity to get this education for a considerably long time and he argues that Woolf creates Jacob Flanders as the embodiment of this mindset that privileges white male individuals of the society. He claims that Woolf does not approve and does not like Jacob and his contemporaries by suggesting:

> Jacob Flanders is a paradigmatic young man of his class. Handsome, clever, and well- connected if not rich, his credentials are impeccable and his future course

> apparently secure. Rugby; Trinity College, Cambridge; a London flat; a couple of mistresses; the Grand Tour: everything in his life is a traditional step on the road to establishment success. The class was Woolf's own, but the sex was not; and between the training and expectations of its young men and young women, there was a great gulf. Woolf's satiric detachment is in part attributable to her feeling that Jacob's world was created by men for men, and essentially excluded her. She reacted with a characteristic mixture of condescension and apprehension. (Zwerdling 904)

Jacob was created by Woolf as a stereotypical young white man who had the opportunity to get this privileged education. Catherine Nelson McDermott even claims that the education that is given to Jacob prepares him to become a patriarchal oppressor: "Jacob is…an oppressor in training, an oppressor of women specifically" (84). Jacob is the product of the patriarchal mindset and authority that gave white males privileges; that undermined and rejected women systematically. It can be said that the type of man who Woolf described in her essay "A Sketch of the Past" when she talks about her cousin Herbert Fisher is embodied in this novel as the character of Jacob. When Woolf talks about her cousin Herbert Fisher, she says:

> What, I asked myself, when I read Herbert Fisher's autobiography the other day, would Herbert have been without Winchester, New College and the Cabinet? What would have been his shape had he not been stamped and moulded by that *great patriarchal machine*? Every one of our male relations was shot into that machine at the age of ten and emerged at sixty a HeadMaster, an Admiral, a Cabinet Minister, or the Warden of a college. It is as impossible to think of them as natural human beings as it is to think of a carthorse galloping wild maned and unshod over the pampas. ("A Sketch of the Past" 153, emphasis added)

From these sentences Woolf uttered, it could be understood that she has a considerably critical view about the educational and public institutions because they are the most important bodies that maintain the patriarchal system that excludes women from the public sphere and aims to create men who do not have individuality and who have acceptable manly virtues and values. She thinks that this "great patriarchal machine" shapes young men into traditional, boastful, privileged leaders who have the exact same virtues, beliefs, and behaviours. The fact that she describes the system that produces these men as a machine shows that Woolf considers the patriarchal system as something that kills men's unique characteristics and moulds them into people to serve the state and the empire in important positions such as admirals, headmasters, soldiers, and ministers. Linda Martin claims that Virginia Woolf has "a sincere and unironic grief for the young men tragically caught up in such powerful institutions" such as the ancient universities (184). Thus, she blames the systematic machinations of patriarchy that force or recruit

men to become idealized people with the same ideas, attitudes, and life patterns. It is clear that there is not a place for women in this machine and this makes Woolf criticise these institutions even more. She sees this as a problem on a social level both for creating men devoid of individuality and also for excluding and undermining women.

However, Woolf does not blame Jacob or the other young men that are his age; she merely criticises the system. Kristina Groover suggests that one of the most important themes of the novel is the "assimilation into the authoritative institutions of university, church, and empire" (46). That is why it is clear that Woolf considers the young men as being trapped by the requirements of the state and society while providing them with entitlement due to their sex. Zwerdling explains the point of view of Woolf about this system by claiming that

> Woolf's feelings about her exclusion from this world are quite complex. She envies the men their guaranteed success (assuming they follow the rules) while pitying them their lack of freedom. The whole exploratory stage of life through which Jacob is passing is subtly under-mined by the preordained, mechanical program he is acting out; and the machinery that would have assured him a place in Who's Who sends him off to war instead. (904)

Thus, Woolf both feels angry about women not having the same opportunities with men and also, she criticises the way the system operates to make use of the men for the sake of the empire. She thinks that men have the opportunity to contribute to the society, get a great education, have an important position in the government or the empire; however, they are required to give up their personal ambitions to make use of these opportunities and, like Jacob, they could even have to give their lives for the sake of the interests of their state and become a victim.

Throughout *Jacob's Room*, it is felt that even if the successful, bright, young, male students at Cambridge University show a great deal of effort in becoming individuals who will build a life for themselves, they are, in fact, trained to serve their country rather than achieving self-actualisation. Woolf's novels that are written after the war, including *Jacob's Room*, have male characters that fall victim to the English society's strict gender norms and the gender role socialisation process as Iqbal Mahdi Salih points out:

> Young men, like Jacob Flanders in *Jacob's Room*, Septimus Warren Smith in *Mrs. Dalloway*, Andrew Ramsay in *To the Lighthouse*, and Percival in *The Waves* are all victims of heroism and the enthusiastic sense of duty. Through these novels, Woolf stresses death as a consequence of the irrationality of war and its equally irrational

heroism, a death that engulfed millions of young men. (33)

It could be argued that according to Virginia Woolf, these young men, including Jacob, are all doomed from the beginning due to what will be expected from them once the time for the war arrives; so, Jacob is "dead before he is born into the text" (Bishop 154). Jacob is absent in the text and his absence can be both related to the fact that his individuality is erased systematically by the education and to his physical death in the war. Little claims that this absence is created through the dominant nature of the narrator and she, then, relates his absence to the patriarchy and its values as follows: "[I]n a sense, he is narrated into absence by his own (male) culture's war discourse which results in his death" ("Feminizing the Subject: Dialogic Narration in *Jacob's Room*" 242). Then, Little describes the male world Jacob tries to exist in as a place where his individuality is eliminated gradually through the idealized masculinity roles that are ascribed to him; she describes this male world as a place "where Jacob becomes more and more thoroughly erased, partly by the narrator's insistence on his mystery, and partly by the symbolic order's representations of manhood: the scholar, traveler, lover, soldier" ("Feminizing the Subject: Dialogic Narration in *Jacob's Room*" 242). The idea of erasing the individuality of Jacob can be seen in the scene where Jacob attends a lunch in the house of Mr. and Mrs. Plumer with the other undergraduates. Mr. Plumer is a lecturer at the university in the field of physics and Jacob considers this a terrible experience. The Plumers are traditional and they represent the oppressive and restrictive nature of the university and the state in general. The relationship between the individuality that Jacob wishes to build and The Plumers is described in this sentence in the novel: "'I am what I am, and intend to be it,' for which there will be no form in the world unless Jacob makes one for himself. The Plumers will try to prevent him from making it" (45). Here, The Plumers serve as a symbol for the traditions and conventions that are kept intact by the institutions of the governments. The main idea conveyed by Woolf here is that the schools and other institutions try to restrain young people from becoming their best self, since individuality is not needed for the purposes and the interests of the governments. Bishop points out that there is a relationship between Jacob's becoming a victim to the societal expectations and Althusser's anecdote of interpellation:

> 'Hey, you there!' comes the call in Althusser's famous anecdote of interpellation, and the individual thus hailed turns around and becomes a subject, becomes a subject because he recognizes that the call is for him…Ideology 'recruits' subjects, and what

> I want to suggest here is that Jacob is 'recruited' by ideology, from that first shout by his brother, 'Ja—cob! Ja—cob!', which recruits him for the family, to the point where he answers off-stage the pointing finger and 'I Want You!' of Lord Kitchener's famous recruiting poster and is enlisted in the war that kills him. (147)

The societal expectations and the ideology that "recruits" Jacob through education, family, or war are the reasons why Jacob loses his individuality in Cambridge and becomes a person who has the same qualities with the rest of the Cambridge men and in the end loses his life. The narrator in *Jacob's Room* comments on how it is not possible to grasp a person's individual self because people are always evaluated through some conventions created by the society. In a part of the novel, the narrator gives some examples of what some of the people around Jacob thinks about him and how they build their opinions on him; such as Clara's, Betty Flanders's, Mr. Sopwith's and Captain Barfoot's opinions on Jacob. Then, the narrator mentions that it is impossible to see people for who they are since standards are constantly in the way: "It seems that men and women are equally at fault. It seems that a profound, impartial, and absolutely just opinion of our fellow-creatures is utterly unknown. Either we are men, or we are women. Either we are cold, or we are sentimental. Either we are young, or growing old" (91). So, there is always a constructed social convention that is in the way of people while making their judgements on each other; it could be about their gender, age, or something else. Through socialisation, people are put into moulds that are provided and strengthened by the norms of the society about the gender roles and people's mode of thinking is shaped according to these conventions, as well. Other than criticising the impact of the social conventions and education on men in terms of erasing their individuality, Woolf also criticises the education of Cambridge University because it fills the minds of the young men with the ideas of superiority of the white English man and idealises this masculinity form.

Virginia Woolf also displays her criticisms towards these institutions in *Jacob's Room* by creating pretentious characters in addition to Jacob such as Timmy Durrant that also has Cambridge education of which the examples will be given later on in this chapter. She creates Jacob and Timmy Durrant in *Jacob's Room* to show the pretentious, boastful and egotistical men who are shaped by these institutions. The idea of superiority, self-importance, privilege is definitely taught to men in these universities and Timmy Durrant and Jacob are the products of it. Woolf's description of Cambridge University in *Jacob's Room* clearly shows her perspective: "It is not simple, or pure, or wholly splendid, the

lamp of learning, since if you see them there under its light (whether Rosetti's on the wall, or Van Goghreproduced…) how priestly they look! How like a suburb where you go to see a view and eat a special cake! 'We are the sole purveyors of this cake'" (49). In these sentences, the pretension and the self-claimed superiority is emphasized by Woolf. She thinks that these institutions seem incredibly holy and precious in the eyes of the public, they are the main sources of intellectuality and learning, education. However, Woolf sees this as factitious because in reality they are not a pure, simple, splendid source of light that illuminates the young minds of the society. She considers this belief in superiority of these universities as constructedand somewhat hypocritical. Woolf thinks that the mindset of putting the ancient universities on a pedestal because these institutions create the most superior, the most intellectual and qualified men capable of creating a bright future for their country is just an illusion. She wants to break this illusion by criticising the ancient universities in *Jacob's Room* through the characters of Jacob and his friends, especially Timmy Durrant.

In *Jacob's Room*, Jacob is presented as a person who is provided with a prestigious position, gladly accepts the position, and cherishes it. Groover explains this attitude of Jacob, his acceptance of this privileged position and the criticism towards him in the text as follows:

> The text criticizes him, at times, as a thoughtless and uncritical inheritor of the privileges that his culture affords to young men of a certain social class. He casually occupies rooms in Cambridge that the female narrator cannot enter; he deplores women in the chapel service; his reading habits are those of a dilettante who views education as his due. (48)

So, Jacob can be considered as a person who makes use of the benefits of being a man and does not question or rebel against the inequality that is created just to provide him with the privileges. Zwerdling explains this by claiming that "From Woolf's point of view, Jacob fits all too easily into this world. His rebellious gestures are relatively superficial, and the picture of him at Cambridge stresses his confident appropriation of his position" (905). In a scene where young men of the Cambridge come together to read, talk and, have a fun night, Woolf describes all these students in detail. Jacob stands in front of the window reflecting on the Cambridge, himself, and the other students; and the narrator describes him: "He looked satisfied; indeed masterly; which expression changed slightly as he stood there, the sound of the clock conveying to him (it may be) a sense of old

buildings and time; and himself the inheritor; and then to-morrow; and friends; at the thought of whom, in sheer confidence and pleasure, it seemed, he yawned and stretched himself" (55-56). Here, it is seen that Jacob sees himself and his friends in the common room of the university as people who have the confidence to create a brighter future for their own country. He has a pompous, boastful perspective towards the set of young men who get an education in Cambridge which includes himself. He thinks that he is a member of an elite group that has the power in their hands.

Woolf describes the attitude of Jacob in detail in a part of the novel, and she has a criticising but mocking stance in these sentences: "The flesh and blood of the future depends entirely upon six young men. And as Jacob was one of them, no doubt he looked a little regal and pompous as he turned his page" (138). In these sentences, Woolf suggests that Jacob sees himself as a person who is so important that burden of future is on his and the rest of the young men that are his friends. However, Jacob is never mentioned as a man who has unique, exquisite characteristics. He is just a stereotype of a man who goes to one of the most prestigious universities in the country and an ordinary man in a group of young men. Maxwell Bodenheim claims that:

> *Jacob's Room* revolves jerkily around the figure of Jacob Flanders, from his boyhood to his death in the late World War, while still a young man. His groping for thoughts, emotions, and prejudices, and his occasional affairs with blithely shallow women, reveal him as an average young man, half pathetic and half ludicrous, but he is advanced with such a microscopical effusiveness and with so many irrelevant details that one is tempted to mutter: 'I see and meet at least fifty Jacob Flanders every month of my life, and if the introduction must be repeated it should hold a brevity and suggestiveness which these actual men do not possess.' (111).

Bodenheim's sentences support the idea that Jacob does not have an impeccable superiority as he deems himself to have; he is just an English man who has the same qualities, capabilities with the other English men especially with the Cambridge men. Zwerdling suggests that "[t]he novel records the classic events in the life of a presentable young man. Jacob's thoughts and experiences are treated as typical rather than unique, and his individual identity is made to merge with that of a group" (906). Thus, it could be safely argued that Woolf wishes to break the idealisation of the gifted young men that had the potential of creating a bright future for their country. She wanted to show that this was not the case, and it was mostly nothing more than an illusion created by the ancient patriarchal institutions.

These ancient patriarchal institutions played a significant role in Woolf's personal life as well, since most of the male members of the Bloomsbury Group were educated in Trinity and King's College, and Cambridge. From the Bloomsbury Group, E.M. Forster, Arthur David Walley, Leonard Woolf, Lytton Strachey all attended to Cambridge University. That is why Woolf was highly knowledgeable about the graduates of Cambridge University and the education given in these ancient institutions. It could be argued that she has a difference regarding her ideas about these universities with the men who are in the Bloomsbury society with her. Zwerdling suggests that Leonard Woolf and Lytton Strachey reminisced about their student days in these universities as heavenly and he gives an example from a letter Lytton Strachey wrote to Leonard Woolf about his visit to Cambridge in which Strachey says that: "Good God! The Great Court is the most thrilling place in the world, it's no good trying to get over it; whenever I come in through the great gate my heart thumps, and I fall into a million visions" (qtd. in Zwerdling 905). It is perfectly clear that Cambridge University means much more than merely an educational institution for the young men who had the opportunity to get into it. It is a place that makes Strachey's heart thump and makes him feel ecstatic as soon as he enters the gates of the university. It has an emotional power over Strachey and most probably for the majority of the students as well, it is as if this educational institution is a sanctuary for the young male students that is incredibly special, and being a man has a big part in this, as well. In *Jacob's Room*, it is clear that Woolf aims to portray Jacob's character as a man who has the similar feelings as Strachey towards Cambridge University. He sees the institution so special, holy, and exceptional; so peculiar to young white men that he feels an unbelievable discomfort when he sees women joining a ceremony in King's College Chapel: "No one would think of bringing a dog into church…a dog destroys the service completely. So do these women…they're as ugly as sin" (41). These lines describe what Jacob feels about the educational institutions clearly. When women are included in a special activity for the university students, Jacob feels like a precious space for merely young white males is infiltrated. He thinks that women should not have the opportunity to be a part of such a celebration because it is a special event for the men. Paul Deslandes talks about the sanctity of ceremonies and special events and how important they are in order to create a feeling of unity among young men and ascribing them an identity by suggesting:

> Within these "webs of significance," undergraduates created, perpetuated, and transmitted their values and perspectives through a set of ritualized activities (including examinations, degree ceremonies, and the acquisition of furniture for college rooms) that were traditional inmeaning and profoundly gendered (as rites of passage that signified, for the Oxbridge student, the transition from boyhood to manhood). (10)

He, then refers to Pierre Bourdieu, claiming that these ceremonies created political and moral values along with cultural atmospheres (Deslandes 10). As it was mentioned above about Jacob's feelings towards the idea of women being a part of the ceremony in King's College Chapel, it should be emphasised that these ceremonies have cultural, political, and social connotations as Bourdieu pointed out. The ceremonies like the one that happened in *Jacob's Room* has symbolic significance and the idea of women or any other person that is not from the elite group of Cambridge or Oxford is unacceptable. They are sacred places that are exclusive to men, particularly Cambridge and Oxford men. Thus,

> ceremonial locations such as the Sheldonian Theater at Oxford and the Senate House at Cambridge, college rooms and dining halls, city streets and athletic fields are viewed, as crucial sites: spaces that are not merely inhabited or utilized but, rather, invested with meaning through cultural practices that transformed specific geographical locations into symbolically important places. (Deslandes 10)

King's College Chapel, then, is also a place like these places Deslandes talks about. They have cultural, social, educational meaning rather than being only material places that held important meetings or special events. They carry cultural connotations within them. Since Jacob is the specimen of the man who is the product of the patriarchal mindset that is existent in the university education, it can be said that Woolf's disapproval of this mindset is expressed through the character of Jacob and sometimes Timmy Durrant.

Cambridge and Oxford had a great significance for the government and the state during the last years of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. These schools represented the privileged, white, intellectual, civilised male ideal. Deslandes explains this situation claiming that

> The educated classes and the government alike were obsessed with the status of England's ancient universities in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Driven by a desire to understand the place of higher learning (and what form that learning should take) in a society rife with dramatic economic, social, and cultural changes, many authors ruminated, in the pages of the great periodicals like the Fortnightly Review, on the place of the liberally educated and masculine undergraduate in the modern world. (1)

The importance placed upon these ancient universities could be because of the nature or

the atmosphere that was dominant in the Victorian period. Scientific development, evolution theories, the importance of knowledge and information were at the centre of the society. That is why Oxford and Cambridge were seen as the main institutions that had the potential to raise the men who would serve their country either in governmental or scientific positions. It should also be pointed out that education is greatly significant in constructing and maintaining certain idealised masculinity conventions. Schools are so important in this matter that Christine Heward names schools as "masculinity [factories]" that construct masculinity standards continuously. Swain mentions this by claiming that "school processes and the meanings and practices found within the school setting contribute to, and help form, young boys' masculinities" (213). According to Christian Haywood and Máirtín Mac an Ghaill, "schools act as 'masculinity making devices'" (59). Thus, one of the most significant assets in constructing masculinity ideals and gender role idealisations as a whole is the state education given in relation with the agenda of the government. Since Oxford and Cambridge are the most influential educational institutions of the British Empire and they are solely aimed for young men of the country, their influence in shaping masculinity conventions cannot be overlooked. Deslandes talks about a contributor to Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine who published a review under the broad title of "Oxford in the Victorian Age." (1) In this review the writer emphasises "the role that the universities played in fostering, recasting, and perpetuating the values of a distinctive educational elite and, more importantly, in forming British masculinities" (2). Surely, the elite white male graduates of these universities were to become the clerics, lawyers, leaders, politicians and colonial bureaucrats for the British Empire, and this was the reason why the education in these universities are given the utmost importance. These are the institutions that are highly embedded in managerial and intellectual ideals of the country. Their main aim is to bring up young men with the idealised male attributes so that they grow the confidence to lead:

> the University of Oxford placed little emphasis on overtly gendered paradigms of masculinity, perceiving its role rather to be that of turning boys into men. Thus 'manliness', as an ideal, was defined by the possession of maturity, both moral and intellectual, and constructed primarily in opposition to notions of boyishness, rather than overtly gendered ideas of femininity or effeminacy. (Ellis 270)

Thus, Oxford University and Cambridge University take it upon themselves to educate young boys and to turn them into mature, intellectual, morally well-behaved men. The

manliness they aim is not the warrior type. Reba Soffer, too, points out the ultimate purpose of the education given in Cambridge and Oxford and claims that "[g]overning bodies, professors, tutors, public school teachers, coaches, examiners, Parliamentary Commissioners, graduates, and the public…all agreed that university teachers must prepare young men for the leadership of church, state, and empire" (1). It was thought that government officials were being created through university education, especially Oxford and Cambridge education, this responsibility led these universities to have a highly disciplined, strict education. In *Jacob's Room*, the aim of the education of Cambridge can be found in the thoughts of Mr. Plumer who is a lecturer of Physics; he thinks that these young men are to become "lawyers, doctors, members of Parliament, businessmen" (42). It is clearly the path of the graduates of the University of Cambridge.

The purpose of this strict education was to create elite men who has the capability of leading; "This elite Oxbridge undergraduate was frequently represented as the epitome of the self-assured British man prepared to take on his role as a leader in the world beyond the college gates" (Deslandes 7). Other than the academic education that prepares men to become politically, socially, intellectually adequate to become imperial and government leaders, it was also important to improve them personally so that they could find the confidence in themselves to take on the roles that they are supposed to have. Ellis suggests that universities are distinctively important in shaping the identities of the young men: "By their very nature, universities are structured according to these distinctions and are often defined as places where males on the threshold of adulthood complete the crucial transition from boyhood to manhood" (267). The idea was that they could have the necessary "contacts and social skills necessary to assume such roles with confidence, aplomb, and sophistication" (Deslandes 16).

In *Jacob's Room*, there seems to be a systematic training for young men in Cambridge to become disciplined like a soldier. The description of the young Cambridge University students attending a service in King's College Chapel in the novel is related to how organised and composed they behave: "Look, as they pass into service, how airily the gowns blow out, as though nothing dense and corporeal were within. What sculptured faces, what certainty, authority controlled by piety, although great boots march under the gowns. In what orderly procession they advance" (39). This detailed narration about the Cambridge students constantly emphasises the order, control, and obeying the authority

as the significant virtues of these young men. These are all related to the requirements of being a soldier as well. They march with their boots in an orderly manner which also connotes the attitudes of soldiers. On another note, J.M. O'Neil talks about the relationship between socialisation and control suggesting that "Control implies to regulate, restrain, and have others or situations under one's command…Fear of femininity focuses men's attention on control, power, and competition issues. The uncontrolled or impotent man is considered feminine and less of a man than one who is in charge, powerful, and competitive" (207). Thus, being able to restraint one's own actions and keep them intact are considered as manly qualities and in *Jacob's Room*, it is observed that socialisation is maintained through these behaviours and virtues and schools are one of the most important places in which this process is ensured. The idea of men who wear the same thing and act in the same way is one of the most important parts of the socialisation process of gender roles so that the order is formed and maintained in the society.

In *Jacob's Room*, this can also be seen in the same scene where the Cambridge students are described in the act of joining a service in King's College Chapel: "The white-robed figures crossed from side to side; now mounted steps, now descended, all very orderly" (40). They all act in the same way at the same time as if they are in an army that is being trained for a battle. There is no place for individuality in this ceremony. It seems to be so significant to maintain the order that Jacob thinks that women are not suitable for the service because they stand out in the crowd and distract the people: "Surely…if the mind wanders it is because several hat shops and cupboards upon cupboards of coloured dresses are displayed upon rush-bottomed chairs. Though heads and bodies may be devout enough, one has a sense of individuals – some like blue, others brown; some feathers, others pansies and forget-me-nots"(Woolf 40). Jacob thinks that these women destroy the service, and he likens them to a dog that destroys the service with its inappropriate behaviours in a chapel (40). As it is mentioned above in detail, he dislikes the idea of women attending this ceremony due to his misogynistic tendencies. But other than this, he does not want them to be a part of this also because of their different, colourful looks that destroy the unity and order in the chapel. He thinks that there should be nothing that looks different than young male students who have the same clothes and the same behaviours. Women with their clothes in various colours and with many decorations, in

fact, express their individuality which is not considered appropriate for a religious ceremony that takes place for the university students according to Jacob.

Additionally, wearing these robes carries a significance in itself because the special clothes that only belong to the Cambridge students serves the purpose of differentiating the Cambridge students from the rest of the British public and turned them into distinctive individuals that are not part of the ordinary people so that it would be an addition to the creation of a special masculinity ideal just for the privileged Cambridge students. Deslandes points out the significance of the clothes in forming a unique masculine identity for the undergraduate students and states:

> While undergraduates clearly used the medium of the student press (as well as other writings)to set off their world as unique and special, they also did so in more concrete ways, most notably through the use of physical markers such as dress. In this regard, students were assisted in fashioning Oxford or Cambridge as specifically male spaces by regulations that required them to wear academic caps and gowns, a carryover from the universities' monasticorigins. (33)

Thus, wearing the same gowns and caps both serves the purpose of providing a distinctive identity to the Cambridge students making them feel different from the rest of the people and also creating a male space for them to belong and be a part of. The gowns and caps were given so much importance that in a student guide written by John Robert Seeley, it is mentioned that

> [t]he cap and gown constitute the Academic dress, and are to be used on all occasions;…at Chapel, except on surplice-days, at the public dinner in Hall, at all College lectures, at all University lectures, on all public occasions in the Senate-House and in the University Churchof St Mary, in visiting the Master and Tutors of the College and the officers of the University.Besides, for the sake of discipline, they are required to be worn by all students appearing in the streets in the evening and throughout the whole of Sunday. (9)

As it is understood from this student guide, it is also compulsory for students to wear their gowns and caps even on Sundays and not just on occasions related to school. This is because these clothes represented the elite, male, university student and it is desired that these clothes to become a part of the students' identity. According to Deslandes, "for junior members, this garb not only represented an imposed standard of dress but also functioned as a reminder of university privilege, an important identifier of their insider status, and a badge of masculinity" (34). So, it could be safely argued that the special gowns are very significant indicators of feeling of belonging to a male space that prepares young males

to govern the country and take on the national and imperial duties. They are the visual symbols of the masculine identity that is prevalent in Cambridge University as pointed out by Thomas DeQuincey: "As a mark of distinction the gown represented to freshmen their first taste of university manhood" (qtd. In Deslandes 34).

It is a strong possibility that Cambridge University is seen as a place where young boys transition into manhood and this mentality is also supported by visual symbols as well. If this ceremony, the gowns, and the common behaviours of the young Cambridge students are taken into consideration under the light of Judith Butler's theory of gender performativity, it can be suggested that the gender role the Cambridge students are required to ascribe to is constructed by Cambridge University and the young men abide by the constructed ideal gender role. Judith Butler claims that:

> gender is not a noun, but neither is it a set of free-floating attributes, for we have seen that the substantive effect of gender is performatively produced and compelled by the regulatory practices of gender coherence. Hence… gender proves to be performative— that is, constituting the identity it is purported to be. In this sense, gender is always a doing, though not a doing by a subject who might be said to preexist the deed. (68)

So, it can be argued that in these ceremonies and among the people, Cambridge men know what kind of attributes they are supposed to have as a man and "perform" the role of a man continuously. In this performance, clothes, the professors, the ceremonies and the places that are given a special importance are the assets that help the performance keep going smoothly. Sara Salih explains Butler's theory of gender performativity as follows: "All bodies are gendered from the beginning of their social existence (and there is no existence that is not social), which means that there is no "natural body" that pre-exists its cultural inscription. This seems to point towards the conclusion that gender is not something one is, it is something one does, an act" (55). So, according to Butler, gender is related to and shaped by social and cultural circumstances and beliefs rather than biological features. Butler explains the social aspect of gender formation by suggesting that gender is composed of a certain set of acts:

> Gender is the repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame that congeal over time to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being. A political genealogy of gender ontologies, if it is successful, will deconstruct the substantive appearance of gender into its constitutive acts and locate and account for those acts within the compulsory frames set by the various forces that police the social appearance of gender. (43-44)

Thus, these young students including Jacob, in order to be accepted as ideal Cambridge

men, behave accordingly and fit in the social requirements of being a man. The social appearance of gender is pre-ordained and accepted, and the appearance of being a man requires these young students to be intellectual, disciplined, obedient, ready to take on the responsibilities to serve their empire; so that is what the role they act over and over again so that they can be accepted. Additionally, Salih also says that "Butler is not suggesting that the subject is free to choose which gender she or he is going to enact. "'The script,' if you like, is always already determined within this regulatory frame, and the subject has a limited number of 'costumes' from which to make a constrained choice of gender style" (56). The young men who are educated in Cambridge University know what they are supposed to do to be accepted as ideal man and they merely follow the norms. The constructed ideals of being a man are always already in their minds and they do not choose to behave like a man, they just know how they are supposed to act and do it.

The most important part of the Cambridge education is to create a sense of superiority in the students so that they can have the confidence to lead and get involved with the most prestigious people in the society. Deslandes explains this wish to create a certain superior group in Cambridge by claiming that

> As they reinforced the special position of the ancient universities in British society and delineated their exclusive character, undergraduates maintained rigid distinctions between elite university insiders and marginalized outsiders by erecting cultural barriers that often mirrored those separating different social classes, races, and genders in late Victorian and Edwardian Britain. The presumptive superiority of men, the professional classes, and the British nation and "race" were, within such an environment, premised on corresponding assumptions about the inferiority of a whole range of other groups, including women, the working classes, non-whites, and non-Christians. (18)

So, it could be stated that the education given in the universities for privileged part of the society such as Cambridge and Oxford universities puts an emphasis on the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon white male people over the other groups. The idea that white males are the ones who should have the intellectual and social abilities to govern is systematically engrained in the minds of the young people during those years.

In *Jacob's Room*, Jacob does not come from a higher-class family; he is not a privileged white male who has a rich and powerful family. The opportunity to attend Cambridge University is given to Jacob by Captain Barfoot who is a retired soldier and has powerful connections. Knowing that Jacob is a successful and bright student, Captain Barfoot

talks to one of his friends asking if it is possible for Jacob to get a scholarship. His friend sends a letter to Captain Barfoot approving Jacob's entry to the university and Captain Barfoot lets Betty Flanders know about this. Thus, Jacob gets the chance to attend this privileged college even if his mother has no means to send him to Cambridge with her conditions. However, despite his background, when he attends Cambridge University and gets exposed to the education of this institution, he also starts to see himself as more intellectual and superior than the other groups in the society. This boastful energy and attitude in Jacob can be seen in the scene where he and his friend Timmy Durrant attend a bonfire night in London and because he does not want to dance and hang out with the rest of the crowd, they go for a walk in the early morning. When they walk together, Jacob says that he wants to talk about "something sensible" (97). Then the scene unfolds with their discussion on how the Greeks are the best in terms of literature among other cultures' and countries' literatures:

> The Greeks -yes, that was what they talked about- how when all's said and done, when one's rinsed one's mouth with every literature in the world…it's the flavour of Greek that remains. Durrant quoted Aeschylus -Jacob Sophocles…Durrant never listened to Sophocles, nor Jacob to Aeschylus. They were boastful, triumphant; it seemed to both that they had read every book in the world; known every sin, passion and joy…And surveying all this, looming through the fog, the lamplight, the shades of London, the two young men decided in favour of Greece. (97)

So, even if Durrant and Jacob do not have the necessary intellectual background yet to evaluate and decide on the best literature in the world, and even though they are very young and inexperienced, they act like they know everything to know about all of the books in the world and all of the experiences to be had in life. They feel like they have the authority and adequacy to judge Greek literature with the knowledge they have. Moreover, when they decide that the Greek literature is above all of the countries' literatures, Jacob says: "Probably, we are the only people in the world who know what the Greeks meant" (97). This mindset of Jacob is definitely an indicator of how much superior he feels compared to the other people. He thinks that he and his friend Timmy Durrant are the only people who have the capability of understanding the true intention of the Greeks and of sufficiently criticising the literature of Greeks or other nations. Angeliki Spiropoulou comments on Jacob's arrogant attitude in this part of the novel as follows: "Jacob does not fancy himself Greek but also fancies that he knows Greek. Being, due to his sex, entitled to a share of the 'cake of learning' possessed by his professors back at

Cambridge, Jacob makes judgments about Greek and poses as a 'true' knower of Greek with all the conceit of his youthful masculinity" (9). Timmy Durrant and Jacob both are quite arrogant when it comes to their education and intellectual adequacy; they have some kind of vanity that is peculiar to young people. They believe that they are the embodiment of intellectual young white male ideal and they have seen and experienced everything there is to see and experience. They regard themselves as young men who have an immense grasp of the classical civilisation and culture; however, throughout the book there is nothing to prove that they have a great intellectual background or knowledge. Jacob's essays are constantly rejected from various magazines and Timmy Durrant has nothing that can be regarded as an intellectual achievement. They always feel like they are on the brink of a great achievement; nevertheless, they do not have a definite purpose to make use of this intellectualism that they claim to have. They do not know what to do with their lives, their intellectual capability is not approved by anything, but they are greatly embedded in the belief that they have a superiority over the others. It is also pointed out that Jacob does not have a great intellectual background in Greek but he thinks of himself as the equivalent of Socrates:

> Jacob knew no more Greek than served him to stumble through a play. Of ancient history heknew nothing. However, as he tramped into London it seemed to him that they were making the flagstones ring on the road to the Acropolis, and that if Socrates saw them coming he would bestir himself and say 'my fine fellows,' for the whole sentiment of Athens was entirely after his heart; free, venturesome, high-spirited (98).

So, even if Jacob does not have the intellectual background or knowledge and knows nothing about the history of the Greeks, he feels that a great philosopher like Socrates would regard him and Timmy Durrant as his friends. This mindset is definitely a result of the education he gets from Cambridge University. Cambridge education fills the students with this idea that they are the ones who have the masculine intellectual power to be assigned to the most important roles in the government and the society. Jacob, even if he is not from a privileged class of the society, gets caught up in this illusion easily and attributes himself the self- importance. In the end, he becomes a stereotypical Cambridge man that is thoroughly shaped by the ideology of Cambridge University, without the chance to become who he wants to become or achieve self-actualisation. The fact that he becomes a person who regards himself better than everyone, undermining women, serving the ideology of the government is the result of the education he gets from

Cambridge University. Thus, he starts to fit in to the hegemonic masculinity in Cambridge University.

Jacob not only thinks of himself better than the other people in terms of literature, but also, he considers himself better than women. As mentioned above, Cambridge education prioritises a British masculinity that glorifies being a man and undermines women. Jacob, as a student that had been fed with this kind of education for a long period of time, starts to despise women in terms of intellectualism. This attitude of his can be observed in his opinion of Florinda. Florinda is a woman Jacob meets at the bonfire night in London; her father is dead and her mother "enjoy[s] the confidence of a Royal master" so she does not have an ordinary family relationship; she is deserted in a sense and she has "tragic eyes and lips of a child" (99).She is described as a character who has a childlike innocence throughout the novel and she "talked more about virginity than women mostly do; and had lost it only the night before, or cherished it beyond the heart in her breast, according to the man she talked to" (99). Florinda is obsessed with her virginity and being chaste, does not have an intellectual background, "she was ignorant as an owl, and would never learn to read even her love letters correctly" (101). Since Florinda has these characteristics and she does not have a high level of intellectualism, Jacob feels himself better when he spends time with her. He finds her childlike and innocent and intellectually beneath himself, that is why he gets a kind of pleasure when he talks to her but in fact, talking to her flatters his pride "because Florinda gives him a feeling of his own sexual power and prowess" (Nelson-McDermott 87). Jacob always has in his mind some ideas and thoughts about the capabilities, intellectual level of Florinda and if she is smart enough or not. He thinks about whether she "had a mind," he looks at Florinda during the dinner and he thinks that "In her face there seemed to him something horribly brainless – as she sat stating" (103). When they go back to Jacob's room together, they enter the room and Jacob cannot understand why he feels good in the company of Florinda: "when she looked at him, dumbly, half- guessing, half-understanding, apologizing perhaps…he knew that the cloisters and classics are no use whatsoever" (105). At his point it is seen that Jacob, as a person who gives a great deal of importance to people having intellectual knowledge about the history, culture, literature of Greeks and classics in general, cannot understand why he feels an attraction towards a person like Florinda since she has nothing to do with these matters. It could be argued that being in company of a woman who has

little to no knowledge in the areas where Jacob considers himself above the others makes him boastful and leads him to consider himself on a higher level.

Another important characteristic of the education given in Cambridge and Oxford universities is that it created a homosocial space for men to engage in and feel like they belong to a group of people who have the same ideas, purposes, and perspectives. Homosocial spaces and being included in a homosocial space are greatly important for a man to act a certain way. Michael Kimmel explains the great role the homosocial places play in encouraging men to behave in the way that is expected and idealised:

> Other men: We are under the constant careful scrutiny of other men. Other men watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is demonstrated for other men's approval…Masculinity is a homosocial enactment. We test ourselves, perform heroic feats, take enormous risks, all because we want other men to grant us our manhood. (128-129)

So, a space that is special for men is a space where manhood is put into a test and that is why places that are created by men for men are really important in shaping the masculinity ideals and pushing men forward into proving their masculinity and directing their lives towards a certain point.

Tosh talks about the change that happened in the last part of the nineteenth century and he calls this change "the flight of domesticity" (Tosh 170). He claims that men started to be more interested in homosocial areas where they can have some experiences with only male members of the society; thus, they put off marriage and direct their focus towards the male spaces. He says: "the modification in the mainstream ideology of marriage went a much more negative response. Among the professional and business classes who had lived by the code of domesticity for two generations or more, there was evidence of growing restlessness amounting in some instances to outright rejection of marriage" (172). According to John Tosh, although before the late nineteenth century, marrying a woman and having a family was charming for men in general, this situation changed later and men wanted to spend more time as bachelors with their male friends because marriage's "main drawback was the check it imposed on intimate relations between men" (Tosh 172). Schools and ancient universities provided men with a male space where they can develop relationships with themselves and help them feel like they belong to the group of men like them. Along with this, Tosh emphasises this drifting away from the idea of marriage is because men wanted to experience exotic adventures with their male fellows

before marriage. He talks about the popular genre of the literature and the topics of the books at that time and says that

> Robert Louis Stevenson and Henry Rider Haggard aimed to provide adults with something heroic, exotic and bracingly masculine...Men set off into the unknown, to fulfil their destiny unencumbered by feminine constraint or by emotional ties with home...Support and companionship are provided by the silent bonds of male friendship. (174)

Thus, forming relationships with their male friends and having experiences with them became much more important for men. It is very probable that imperialism has also a great influence on constructing this mindset in men along with the secluded nature of the university education. Men wished to have adventures in distant lands with their friends before they decided to settle down and start a family. About the reasons of this disaffection towards marriage in men, along with the imperialism, Tosh claims that: "[u]nderneath lay a strong strain of sexual antagonism which arose from the perception that the home was a feminine –even a feminized- sphere" (179). Men felt that being at home, having a domestic life, family matters are predominantly feminine concerns, and they did not want to be included in these things. They wanted to go out and have adventures because they believed that this was the manly thing to do. This was seen in *Jacob's Room*, as well. Neither Jacob nor his young male friends have any intentions of marrying a woman or having a relationship. There is a dialogue between Jacob and Timmy Durrant when they visit the Sicily Isles together. Jacob asks Timmy Durrant: "D'you know Masham's aunt? And Timmy says: "Never knew he had one" (63) Then they talk about Masham's sister: "'His sister,' said Timmy, 'is a very pretty girl.' 'That's what'll happen to you, Timmy,' said Jacob. 'It'll happen to you first,' said Timmy" (63-64). From this dialogue it is understood that the thing that will happen to them and what they joke about is to get married to a beautiful woman. Both of them say that it will happen to the other one first because they want to avoid marriage as much as possible. Additionally, Jacob does not show any romantic interest in Clara even if it is obvious that she likes Jacob:

> 'I like Jacob Flanders,' wrote Clara Durrant in her diary. 'He is so unworldly. He gives himself no airs, and one can say what one likes to him'...But then, this is only a young woman's language, one, too, who loves, or refrains from loving...Now, for instance, Jacob was telling a story about some walking tour h'd taken, and the inn was called 'The Foaming Pot,' which, considering the landlady's name...They shouted with laughter. The joke was indecent. (90)

In this paragraph, the contrast between Clara and Jacob is given with what they do and think about at the same time in different places. While Clara thinks about Jacob and why she feels a romantic attachment to him, Jacob is with his friends having fun and not thinking about Clara at all. These two instances are put together in the same paragraph on purpose in order to make a statement about Jacob's character. He does not deal with romantic relationships and is more entertained when he is with his male friends. Also, Jacob's obsession with Greece and travelling, seeing new exotic places is another example of "the flight of domesticity" that Tosh mentions. When he talks to Timmy Durrant on one of the days they spend in Sicily Isles, he thinks about having an ordinary government job and thinks that him travelling the world would be much more suitable for him than having a desk job:

> Now Jacob began plunging about, half to stretch himself, half in a kind of jollity, no doubt...for having grasping the argument...sunburnt, unshaven, capable into the bargain of sailing roundthe world in a ten-ton yacht, which, very likely, he would do one of these days instead of settling down in a lawyer's office, and wearing spats. (63)

For Jacob, discovering new places, travelling around the world is much more attractive than finding a job, marrying a woman or starting a family. Bradley Deane talks about how ancient cities, undiscovered places that belonged to ancient civilisations created an influential narrative for young men to have their own adventures in different parts of the world, especially with the nineteenth century. He says that "[t]ales of forgotten cities, rediscovered races, civilizations and continents submerged beneath the sea or the ground, the hidden vestiges of ancient empires – over two hundred such stories were published in Britain between 1871 and the First World War" (148). The civilisations such as the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, Vikings were very attractive to the young men of the empire because they were the civilisations with the elements of curiosity and wonder. According to Deane, the stories, books and novels written about these undiscovered places were abundant and it affected the point of view of the young men, as well. He claims that

> In nearly every case, the stories dramatize the rediscovery in apparently alien territories of some fundamental unity with modern manhood, thus refiguring the frontier as an uncanny space in which the grand narrative of progress collapses to reveal a timeless model of imperial character. Just as popular depictions of boyhood came to value the savage impulses of youth,stories of lost worlds brought Victorian and Edwardian men face to face with their primitive past and challenged them to measure up. (148)

So, these kinds of stories set an example for the young men of the empire to reach the constructed ideal manhood. Having adventures and discovering these civilisations were significant for men due to their gender. In *Jacob's Room*, Jacob's obsession with travelling and especially travelling to and discovering the exotic atmosphere of Greece can be an example for this. He travels to Greece and Italy and the narrator suggests that Jacob would boast about his travels: "'You ought to have been in Athens' he would say to Bonamy when he got back. 'Standing on the Parthenon,' he would say, or 'The ruins of the Coliseum suggest some fairly sublime reflections,' which he would write out at length in letters. It might turn to an essay upon civilization" (174). He is fascinated by the far places especially if the culture of the place seems different or curious to him. Travelling, seeing different places, especially faraway places seem incredibly attractive to him rather than staying in England, falling in love, marrying and so on. Thus, along with the masculinity ideal that is created by Cambridge University as the intellectual, bright, white, English man, this type of masculinity is another masculinity form that is deemed valuable by the society and is constructed through education and also literary works at the time. Jacob and his friends show the characteristics of both of these idealised masculinity types because they are the products of the education given in Cambridge University as privileged young white English men.

It is undeniable that Jacob becomes a victim of World War I because he joins the relentless war and sacrifices his life for the sake of the interests of his nation. However, in this chapter it is claimed that patriarchy victimises Jacob both by sending him off to war with millions of young men like him, but also by stealing his opportunity to become a unique individual with a free will to live his life to the fullest. It can be argued that Jacob is entrapped in a web of expectations that is designed by the society and the government to become an ideal Cambridge man, he follows the path he is supposed to follow and turns into a stereotypical Cambridge man while chasing after the hegemonic masculinity ideal that is created by Cambridge University. This is both a privilege and a curse for him since he achieves a status in the society by fitting in the idealised Cambridge masculinity values while he gives the control of his life to the hands of the government. The fact that his death is merely hinted at the very end of the novel with only one short paragraph can be evaluated as a sign that his life, actions, education, his days at Cambridge University and his travels are at the core of the factors that victimise him other than his death in the war.

The requirements he felt that he needed to comply with and what he tries to accomplish in his life tell more about him being a victim of the patriarchy than his actual death. Furthermore, the fact that the reason of his joining World War I is not mentioned in the novel shows that his reason is not important because he is merely a representative of the lost generation of the war. He represents many young men who joined the war based on many different reasons. This gap in the novel is an intentional one because Jacob's reason of joining the war could be any one of the reasons that led many young men like him to join. Since Jacob is not a very patriotic man, his joining the war is probably because of the involuntary drafting, but the important thing is not his reason but his symbolic state. This shows that patriarchy and the hegemonic masculinity make these men suffer by sending them off to war or by turning them into stereotypes. All of these things are part of Jacob's suffering and victimisation, and they are caused by the hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy.

In conclusion, being a part of the upper-class in the British society and having privileges of being a man do not hinder a man from being a victim of the societal conventions built upon the gender roles. It is highly probable for a man to be able to benefit from the privileges that are provided to him by the patriarchy and at the same time to pay some costs and become a victim of the same system. Jacob is presented as an example of this situation. In the period where he goes to Cambridge University, there are different kinds of constructed idealisations of masculinity that are shaped according to the social classes among which there is the masculinity ideal that is constructed for the upper-class Cambridge students. This is a masculinity form that requires men to be intellectual, white, elite, able to govern, and in control of their emotions since it prepares men to have administerial duties in the state beyond the university gates. Jacob fits into this idealisation even if he is not compatible with the other masculinity forms that are created for men of the lower classes. However, in the end, he cannot escape what expects many other young English men and becomes a victim of a relentless war. Woolf criticises the ideal manhood that is constructed by Cambridge University because she thinks that it contributes to the idea that women are inferior and creates men who undermine and exclude women, it victimises young men by killing their individuality and turning them into people with the exact same characteristics through a "great patriarchal machine", and it fills the minds of the young people with pretentious superiority idea that is in fact an

illusion. And in the end, according to Woolf, even a person who seems like he benefits from the patriarchy by being put into superior positions in the society cannot be saved from being sent off to the war, getting killed for the sake of the interests of the government and becoming a victim.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has offered a detailed examination of Virginia Woolf's male characters in her novels *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room*. It has explored Woolf's stance on the issue of the construction of the hegemonic masculinity ideals at the beginning of the twentieth century. Virginia Woolf's criticism towards the patriarchy is approached from a different perspective in this study by taking men's experiences and relationships with the patriarchal system and the hegemonic masculinities it created into consideration. It is argued that Virginia Woolf thinks that patriarchy is detrimental to both women and men because it restricts, dominates, and victimises people from all genders, ages, and backgrounds in various ways. Woolf presents her critical opinions about patriarchy and the hegemonic masculinity ideals it creates to keep the system unharmed through the male characters she creates in her novels. In this thesis, the focus has been on three male characters in Woolf's two abovementioned novels; Septimus Warren Smith, Peter Walsh and Jacob Flanders. Septimus has been examined through his relationship with the dominant hegemonic masculinity that is shaped around World War I, Peter through the hegemonic masculinity that is constructed based on imperialism, and Jacob through the hegemonic masculinity that is shaped by the education provided in the ancient universities of England.

While incorporating the personal feelings, impressions and lives of the people in her fiction, Woolf not only includes female characters' struggles but also men's struggles that are caused by the social mechanisms. The requirements for being considered a socially accepted person may alter according to one's gender, but oppression is valid for both men and women in certain aspects. If a person is out of the boundaries that are set for her/him, s/he is marginalised, punished or outcasted. Woolf sees the patriarchy as an oppressive mechanism that aims to mould people into ideal types, including men. She is aware of the fact that there are expectations of men in order for them to be regarded as normative, accepted, ideal, and complete. Through her writing, Virginia Woolf advocates women's rights but she is also aware of the fact that societal gender expectations constructed for both men and women must be abolished for a complete reform. That is why, in order to understand Woolf's social concerns and the underlying social themes in her fiction, one must examine the relationship between the male characters created by Woolf and the

stereotypes based on masculinity of the British society. Woolf was aware of the fact that the preservation of the patriarchy depends upon the cooperation of the individuals in the society, and the ones who are outside of the ideals set for them are marginalised. This is the reason why she includes outcasts in her fiction. She portrays characters that either cannot fit in, try to fit in but fail, or revolt against the conventions. Her concern in portraying such characters is to draw attention to individuals who are stuck in a judgemental, prohibitive and oppressive system, whether they are men or women.

In this thesis, hegemonic masculinities that are shaped by different periods and societal conditions are examined and how these masculinities are demonstrated by Virginia Woolf in her novels *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room* has been the main focus. It has been claimed that hegemonic masculinities are the constructions of the patriarchal system and they aim to create ideal males based on the needs of the government, cultural atmosphere and the place. It has been concluded through this study that hegemonic masculinity exists in different shapes and forms in different periods, places and even gendered spaces.

The characters that are analysed through their masculinities, Septimus, Peter and Jacob, are all from different classes. It is not certain which class Septimus belongs to, but he is clearly not from the upper-class. It is known that he is a successful man who is appreciated by the people around him and his employer in the pre-war era. Jacob is also not a man from the upper class. The reason he is accepted to Cambridge University is due to the efforts of Captain Barfoot who is a good friend of his mother Betty Flanders and he has a friend at Cambridge who paves the way for Jacob's attendance to Cambridge University. Peter Walsh, on the other hand, differs from these two characters when it comes to class and social circle. His family had been part of the colonisation process for generations. It can be safely argued that Peter feels the burden of becoming a successful man in the eyes of the people of his own social class, while Jacob or Septimus does not have such a feeling. Since Peter is from a upper-class family, it can be suggested that his victimisation is not as serious or damaging as the victimisations or sufferings of Jacob or Septimus. Even if he continuously tries to become an accepted man in the eyes of the people around him and turns into an unhappy man in this process, Peter still can make choices because he is in a different position in terms of his social class compared to Septimus and Jacob. He does not get killed in the war like Jacob or commit suicide like Septimus. This can be thought of as a result of the social class he belongs to. He still has

the chance to continue his life with the privileges he has owing to his class. Jacob enters the high society through his education at Cambridge University, however, he does not feel responsible towards the people from this class like Peter does. He does not have an emotional burden which Peter carries, because his family (his mother and brothers) does not expect him to fill in a specific role as Peter's family does.

When the education factor is taken into consideration, it is found that these three characters differ in terms this aspect, as well. Jacob is the one who has the Cambridge education and the ideal male type he deems valuable is the hegemonic masculinity that is constructed by this education. He wants to be a part of this Cambridge community and space where intellectual, superior men are glorified. He becomes a stereotypical Cambridge man, which shows the fact that education is greatly influential in the creatin of one's character, social status and the place s/he finds for themselves in the society. The fact that he starts to see himself as a superior man who has all the knowledge or experience in the world is because of the mindset he is bombarded with at Cambridge University. Septimus, however, cannot even dream of becoming a Cambridge man, because his social status and his social circle has a different understanding of an ideal man. The hegemonic masculinity Septimus is subjected to requires a man to sacrifice his own life heroically for the sake of his country. For him, the warrior male is the romanticised hegemonic masculinity ideal. Because of this romantic ideal, he joins the war voluntarily and even enthusiastically thinking that he will save his loved ones through fighting courageously. Peter, on the other hand, is known to quit his education at Oxford University. His reason for doing so is not mentioned, however, this action of his is used against him by the people around him to humiliate him for being a failure in that area, as well. Peter is seen as an inadequate man by his social circle for not becoming an established, complete man continuously, and education is just another area which causes him to be seen as a failure.

Family is another notion which differentiates these three characters from one another. Peter is again regarded as a failure in this area. Starting a family with the woman he loves is something Peter longs for with all his heart. When Clarissa leaves Peter, and when Peter understands that Clarissa will marry Richard Dalloway, he cannot bear this situation and leaves for India. The fact that Clarissa choses Richard over Peter, continues to be a big source of pain for Peter in the upcoming years and he cannot get over this fact even if he becomes a man in his fifties. Since being happily married and providing for a family

is regarded as a manly ideal, Peter feels like a failed man and tries to find another way for himself to prove his manhood to his social circle and his family. The hegemonic masculinity that is shaped around the imperialistic purposes requires Peter to leave everything behind for the sake of his Empire and he does this. Starting a family, for Jacob, however, is something that should be postponed as long as possible. Because he is filled with the ideas of becoming an adventurous man who chases the mysteries in the faraway lands with his male friends, he does not want to get married or settle down. The hegemonic masculinity he feels like he must abide, does not require him to be a family man but rather a superior, intellectual, adventurous, boastful man who deals with higher matters than marriage. For Septimus, on the other hand, marriage is something to look forward to at the beginning, when he first meets Rezia. However, when he gets married to Rezia, this marriage does not turn out to be a good one. Due to the symptoms of PTSD that Septimus goes through, Septimus's and Rezia's expectations and dreams about their life as a married couple do not become true.

Richard Dalloway, in Mrs Dalloway is portrayed as the ideal man who is shaped and produced by the "patriarchal machine" in Virginia Woolf's own phrase ("A Sketch of the Past" 153). He is married, a patriot, a parliament member who seems like the perfect man and accepted by his social circle. He is the man who Peter desperately wants to become, Septimus cannot become no matter how much he tries and Jacob would probably be turn into if he had lived. He is a complete and established man in the eyes of the public. However, even he cannot get himself rid of the society's expectations of a man and cannot bring himself to tell his wife Clarissa that he loves her no matter how much he wants to. This is another indicator of how the masculinity ideals as a whole restrict men and suffocates them with unrealistic standards.

Thus, in this thesis, it has been found that these three characters, Septimus, Peter, and Jacob, have major differences in terms of their backgrounds and the lives they pursue. The only thing that they have in common is the fact that they are white and they are English. Other than this, they all have different lives, and they are taught different ideals and values. They all have different perspectives regarding their country, nationality, war or being a proper man. Septimus goes to defend his country with patriotic and romantic feelings, filled with enthusiasm and pride. For him, being accepted as a proper man is through showing manliness and joining the war. Peter, however, has a different idea about

being accepted as an ideal man by his social circle. He is chasing another ideal by trying to become a "romantic buccaneer" who is admired by people due to his bravery and heroism by conquering distant lands in the name of the Empire. Jacob, as a man who finds himself inside an elite group of people has a completely different perspective about being an ideal man. His education teaches him to become a superior man in terms of race, gender, class and cultural capital. He chases a hegemonic masculinity ideal that requires to be a part of a community by giving up his own identity and becoming a stereotypical Cambridge man. Unlike Septimus, he is probably one of the young men who were drafted to World War I and joined the war involuntarily. His idea of an acceptable man is completely different than Septimus's manhood ideal.

It is certain that the sufferings of Septimus, Peter and Jacob are not all to the same extent. It can be said that the victimisation process Septimus goes through is the most hurtful one since he joins World War I due to his belief in the war-mongering ideas that shape the dominant hegemonic masculinity ideal which is the male heroic warrior type. After he comes back, even after 5 years later in the aftermath of the war, he still suffers from shell-shock and cannot get the right treatment. Peter's victimisation can be considered as the least hurtful one, since he has a privileged position in society, he has a wealthy and well-known family. His victimisation is similar to Jacob's victimisation in regards to the fact that he also cannot achieve self-actualisation while chasing the hegemonic masculinity ideal that is put forward by his family and social circle. He feels responsible to continue what his family did for generations and he follows the path that is designed for him. Jacob, on the other hand, can be regarded as someone whose suffering due to the hegemonic masculinity has similar points with both Septimus and Peter. Since he joins World War I, like Septimus, and dies in the battle, his victimisation is similar to Septimus's suffering. Accordingly, since he cannot create his own individual self due to his education process at Cambridge University, he is similar to Peter.

Consequently, it has been seen in this thesis that these three characters are completely different in terms of their cultural background, class, education and lifestyles. Their different conditions lead them to chase different ideals of manhood but none of them seem to be happy or content with the people they turn into in the end. Hegemonic masculinities, then, can differ for people from different backgrounds, as well. Even if it seems like there is only one hegemonic masculinity for a certain period of time, it is also possible for the

construction of various hegemonic masculinities for different classes, spaces and places. It has also been concluded in this thesis that hegemonic masculinities are always a part of an unrealistic dream that is not possible to achieve. The only reason why these masculinities are shaped by the society is to put men into a condition where they continuously chase after a dream of becoming an acceptable man, but never attain it and get disappointed. While trying to comply with the new types of masculinities and chasing them continuously, these three characters are already victimised. The hegemonic masculinities always change and they are unrealistic. The characters cannot achieve these gender-based ideals no matter how much they try and, in the end, they suffer due to not feeling adequate. Virginia Woolf, by exemplifying these three men in her abovementioned novels aims to point out the fact that hegemonic masculinities are created not for the men to achieve but only for them to chase after while feeling a constant anxiety of not being seen as an adequate man. Patriarchal conventions are destructive in their own nature. These characters are all victimised because they feel a never-ending fear of not reaching the standards of the masculinity that is accepted as the dominant and normal one. They are fully aware of the fact that if they cannot attain these standards they will be frowned upon, marginalised, and undermined. However, there is not a finish line for none of these male characters to reach. That is why both patriarchy and the hegemonic masculinities harm these characters psychologically and also physically.

In conclusion, this thesis has examined the three male characters, Septimus Smith, Peter Walsh and Jacob Flanders of Virginia Woolf's creation in her two novels *Mrs Dalloway* and *Jacob's Room*. It has been argued in this thesis that these three men suffer and are victimised due to the patriarchy's hegemonic masculinity constructions as a result of different conditions for various reasons and in different forms. It has also been pointed out that Virginia Woolf criticised the patriarchy's role in creating these hegemonic masculinity ideals and showed that patriarchy is detrimental to men, as well.

WORKS CITED

PRIMARY SOURCES:

Woolf, Virginia. *Mrs. Dalloway.* Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1996. Print.

Woolf, Virginia. *Jacob's Room*. Istanbul: Literart, 2014. Print.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

Bahlieda, Robert. "Chapter 1: The Legacy of Patriarchy." *Counterpoints*. 488 (2015): 15-67. *JSTOR.* Web. 12 Jul 2022.

Barnhart, William C. "Evangelicalism, Masculinity, and the making of Imperial Missionaries in Late Georgian Britain, 1795–1820." *The Historian*. 67.4 (2005): 712-732. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Beechey, Veronica. "On Patriarchy." *Feminist Review*. 3 (1979): 66-82. *JSTOR.* Web. 12 Jul 2022.

Bell, Quentin. *Virginia Woolf: A Biography*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.,1972. E-book.

Bennett, Joan. *Virginia Woolf: Her Art as a Novelist*. London: Cambridge UP, 1945. E-book. Berman, Jessica. "Virginia Woolf." *Modernist Fiction, Cosmopolitanism and the Politics of Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. E-book.

Beynon, John. *Masculinities and Culture.* Buckingham: Open UP, 2002. E-book.

Bishop, Edward L. "The Subject in Jacob's Room." *Modern Fiction Studies*. 38.1 (1992): 147-175. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Blain, Virginia. "Narrative Voice and the Female Perspective in Virginia Woolf's Early Novels." *Virginia Woolf: New Critical Essays*. Eds. Clements, Patricia, Isobel Grundy. London: Vision Press, 1983. E-book.

Bodenheim, Maxwell. "Underneath the Paint in *Jacob's Room*." *The Critical Heritage: Virginia Woolf*. Eds. Majumdar, Robin, Allen Mclaurin. London: Routledge, 1975. E-book.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Power in the Field*. Stanford, CA:Stanford University Press, 1996. E-book.

Bradshaw, David. "Introduction." *Mrs. Dalloway*. Woolf, Virginia. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. E-book.

Bradshaw, David. "The socio-political vision of the novels." *The Cambridge Companion to Virginia Woolf*. Eds. Roe, Sue., Susan Sellers. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006. *Cambridge.org*. Web. 21 Jan 2021.

Bradshaw, David. Ed. *Virginia Woolf Selected Essays*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008. E-book.

Braudy, Leo. *From Chivalry to Terrorism: War and The Changing Nature of Masculinity*. New York: Vintage Books, 2005. E-book.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge, 2002. E-book.

Campbell, Walter. *My Indian Journal*. Edinburgh: Edmonston, 1864. *Archive.org*. 25 Nov 2021.

Capalbo, Peter. "Dismantling The Cult of Manliness: Virginia Woolf's Assault on Traditional Male Gender Expectations." Diss. Rhode Island College, 2010. *digitalcommons.ric.edu*.Web. 08 Dec 2020.

Carroll, Berenice A. "'To Crush Him in Our Own Country': The Political Thought of VirginiaWoolf." *Feminist Studies* 4.1 (1978): 99-132. *JSTOR*. Web. 08 Dec 2020.

Coltrane, Scott. "Theorizing Masculinities in Contemporary Social Science." *Theorizing Masculinities.* Eds. Brod, Harry, Michael Kaufman. London: SAGE Publications, 1994.E-book.

Connell, R.W. *Gender and Power: Society, The Person and Sexual Politics.* Cambridge: PolityPress, 1987. E-book.

Connell, R.W. "Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities." *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005. E-book.

Czarnecki, Kristin. "Melted Flesh and Tangled Threads: War Trauma and Modes of Healing in Virginia Woolf's 'Mrs. Dalloway' and Leslie Marmon Silko's 'Ceremony'." *Woolf Studies Annual.* 21 (2015): 50-77. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Davies, Bronwyn. "Constructing and Deconstructing Masculinities through Critical Literacy." *Gender and Education* 9.1 (1997): 9-30. *Tandfonline.com*. Web. 20 Jan 2021.

Deane, Bradley. *Masculinity and the New Imperialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2014. E- book.

Demetriou, Demetrakis Z. "Connell's Concept of Hegemonic Masculinity: A Critique." *Theory and Society.* 30.3 (2001): 337-361. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Deslandes, Paul R. *Oxbridge Men*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005. E-book.

Detloff, Madelyn. *The Value of Virginia Woolf*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2016. *Cambridge.org*. Web. 21 Jan 2021.

Dibattista, Maria. "Virginia Woolf." *The Cambridge Companion to English Novelists* Ed. Poole, Adrian. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2009. E-book.

Donaldson, Mike. "What Is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Theory and Society.* 22.5 (1993): 643-657. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Eisenstein, Zillah. "Constructing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism." *Critical Sociology.* 25.2-3 (1999): 196-217. *Journals.sagepub.com*. Web. 13 Jul 2022.

Ellis, Heather. "'Boys, Semi- Men and Bearded Scholars': Maturity and Manliness in Early Nineteenth- Century Oxford." *What is Masculinity: Historical Dynamics from Antiquityto the Contemporary World*. Eds. Arnold, John H, Sean Brady. London: PalgraveMacmillan, 2011. E-book.

Epstein, Debbie. "Marked Men: Whiteness and Masculinity." *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity.* 37 (1998): 49-59. *JSTOR.* Web. 20 April 2022.

Flint, Kate. "Revising Jacob's Room: Virginia Woolf, Women, and Language." *The Review of English Studies.* 42.167 (1991): 361-379. *JSTOR.* Web. 10 Jul 2022.

Fountain, Christopher Simon. *The Lamb and the Warrior: Manhood, Militarism and the Diocese of London 1890-1914.* Diss. Open University (United Kingdom), 2012. *Proquest.com.* Web. 20 Sep 2021.

Froula, Christine. "*Mrs. Dalloway's* Postwar Elegy: Women, War, and the Art of Mourning." *Modernism/Modernity* 9.1 (2002): 125-163. *Project Muse.* Web. 20 July 2021.

Groover, Kristina K. "'The conditions of our love': Seeking and Desiring in 'Jacob's Room'." South Atlantic Review. 77.3/4 (2012): 45-57. *JSTOR.* Web. 8 Jun 2022.

Gullace, Nicoletta F. *The Blood of Our Sons: Men, Women, and the Renegotiation of British Citizenship During the Great War.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002. E-book.

Haywood, Christian, Máirtín Mac an Ghaill. "Schooling masculinities." *Understanding Masculinities.* Ed. Máirtín Mac an Ghaill. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996. E-book.

Hearn, Jeff, David L. Collinson. "Theorizing Unities and Differences Between Men and Between Masculinities." *Theorizing Masculinities.* Eds. Brod, Harry, Michael Kaufman.London: SAGE Publications, 1994. E-book.

Heward, Christine. "Masculinities and families." *Understanding Masculinities.* Ed. Máirtín Mac an Ghaill. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1996. E-book.

Hickman, Valerie Reed. "Clarissa and the Coolies' Wives." *Modern Fiction Studies.* 60.1 (2014): 52-77. *JSTOR.* Web. 20 July 2021

Higate, Paul., John Hopton. "War, Militarism and Masculinities." *Handbook of Studies on Menand Masculinitie*s Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Holtby, Winifred. *Virginia Woolf, A Critical Memoir.* Bloomsbury: Bloomsbury Academic, 2007. E-book.

Horne, John. "Masculinity in Politics and War in the Age of Nation States and World Wars, 1850-1950." *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History* Eds. Dudink, Stefan, Karen Hagemann, John Tosh. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2004. E-book.

Humphries, Mark. "War's Long Shadow: Masculinity, Medicine, and the Gendered Politics of Trauma, 1914–1939." *The Canadian Historical Review.* 91.3 (2010): 503-531. *Project MUSE.* Web. 20 July 2021.

Hussey, Mark. "Woolf: After Lives." *Virginia Woolf in Context.* Eds. Randall, Bryony, Goldman, Jane. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2012. *Cambridge.org.* Web. 08 Dec 2020.

Jones, Clara. *Virginia Woolf: The Ambivalent Activist.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2016. *Cambridge.org.* Web. 15 Jan 2021.

Jones, David Michael. *The Secret History of Romance Masculinity: The Byronic Hero and the Novel, 1814-1914.* Diss. University of Connecticut, 2012. *Proquest.com.* Web. 20 Sep 2021.

Karner, Tracy. "Fathers, Sons, and Vietnam: Masculinity and Betrayal in the Life Narratives of Vietnam Veterans with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder." *American Studies.* 37.1 (1996): 63-94. *JSTOR.* Web. 20 July 2021.

Kaufman, Michael. "Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power." *Theorizing Masculinities.* Eds. Brod, Harry, Michael Kaufman. London: SAGE Publications, 1994. E-book.

Kazan, Francesca. "Description and the Pictorial in Jacob's Room." *ELH.* 55.3 (1988): 701- 719. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Kennard, Jean E. "Power and Sexual Ambiguity: The "Dreadnought" Hoax, "The Voyage out, Mrs. Dalloway" and "Orlando"." *Journal of Modern Literature.* 20.2 (1996): 149-164. *JSTOR.* Web. 20 July 2021.

Kimmel, Michael S. "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity." *Theorizing Masculinities.* Eds. Brod, Harry, Michael Kaufman. London: SAGE Publications, 1994. E-book.

Levsen, Sonja. "Constructing Elite Identities: University Students, Military Masculinity and the Consequences of the Great War in Britain and Germany." *Past&Present.* 198 (2008):147-183. Web. 20 Sep 2021.

Lilienfeld, Jane. "'Success in Circuit Lies': Editing the War in 'Mrs. Dalloway'." *Woolf Studies Annual.* 15 (2009): 113-133. *JSTOR.* Web. 20 July 2021.

Little, Judy. "Feminizing the Subject: Dialogic Narration in *Jacob's Room*." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory.* 3.4 (1992): 241-251. *Tandfonline.com.* Web. 11 Jul 2022.

Little, Judy. "*Jacob's Room* as Comedy: Woolf's Parodic *Bildungsroman*." *New Feminist Essays on Virginia Woolf.* Ed. Marcus, Jane. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1981. E-book.

Loughran, Tracey. "Shell Shock, Trauma, and the First World War: The Making of a Diagnosis and Its Histories." *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences.* 67.1 (2012): 94-119. *Project MUSE.* Web. 20 July 2021.

Madigan, Edward. "'Sticking to a Hateful Task': Resilience, Humour, and British Understandings of Combatant Courage, 1914–1918." *War in History.* 20.1 (2013): 76-98. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Marcus, Laura. *Virginia Woolf.* Newcastle: Northcote House Publishers, 2004. E-book.
Marcus, Laura. *Virginia Woolf.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. E-book.

Martin, Linda. "Elegy And The Unknowable Mind In *Jacob's Room*." *Studies in the Novel.* 47.2 (2015): 176-192. *JSTOR.* Web. 15 Jul 2022.

Majumdar, Robin, Allen Mclaurin. Eds. *Virginia Woolf: The Critical Heritage*. London: Routledge, 1975. E-book.

Messerschmidt, James W. Messerschmidt, James W. "Men, Masculinities and Crime."

Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Messner, Michael A. "Men Studying Masculinity: Some Epistemological Issues in Sport Sociology." *Sociology of Sport Journal*. 7.2 (1990): 136-153.

Meyer, Jessica. *Men of War: Masculinity and the First World War in Britain*. London: PalgraveMacmillan, 2009. E-book.

Monk, Ray. "This Fictitious Life: Virginia Woolf on Biography, Reality, and Character." *Philosophy and Literature* 31.1 (2007): 1-40. *Project Muse*. Web. 20 Jan 2021.

Morgan, David H.J. "Theater of War :Combat, the Military, and Masculinities." *Theorizing Masculinities*. Eds. Brod, Harry., Michael Kaufman. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications,1994. E-book.

Morgan, David. "Class and Masculinity." *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinitie*s Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Morgenstern, Barry. "The Self-Conscious Narrator in 'Jacob's Room.'" *Modern Fiction Studies*. 18.3 (1972): 351-361. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Mosse, George L. "Shell-Shock as a Social Disease." *Journal of Contemporary History* 35.1(2000): 101-108. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Mosse, George L. *The Image of Man: The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996. E-book.

Nagel, Joane. "Nation." *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Nelson-McDermott, Catherine. "Disorderly Conduct: Parody and Coded Humor in *Jacob's Room* and *The Years*." *Woolf Studies Annual*. 5 (1999): 79-95. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Jul 2021.

Ohmann, Carol. "Culture and Anarchy in 'Jacob's Room'" *Contemporary Literature*. 18.2(1977): 160-172. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Sep 2021.

O'Neil, J.M. "Patterns of Gender Role Conflict and Strain: Sexism and Fear of Femininity in Men's Lives." *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 60.4 (1981): 203-210. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Park, Hyungji. *The Empire Within: Masculinity and Colonial Travel in the Victorian Novel*. Diss. Princeton University, 1996. *ProQuest Dissertations &Theses Global*. Web. 10 Feb2022.

Randall, Bryony, Goldman, Jane. Eds. *Virginia Woolf in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP,2012. *Cambridge.org*. Web. 08 Dec 2020.

Reid, Panthea. "Virginia Woolf" *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. Encyclopaedia Britannica, n.d. Web. 20 Jan. 2021.

Ryan, Rory. "Peculiarly festooned with prepositions: Aspects of liminality in *Mrs Dalloway*." *Journal of Literary Studies* 17.1-2 (2007): 58-71. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 29 Dec 2021.

Salih, Iqbal Mahdi. *War in Virginia Woolf's Fictional and Non-fictional Works*. Diss.

Bangor University, 2015. *Proquest.com*. Web. 20 Sep 2021.

Salih, Sara. "On Judith Butler and Performativity." (2007). *Researchgate.com*. Web. 16 June 2022.

Sabo, Don. "The Study of Masculinities and Men's Health." *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* Eds. Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Schrock, Douglas, Michael Schwalbe. "Men, Masculinity, and Manhood Acts." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 35 (2009). 277-295. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 Jun 2022.

Scragg, Andrew. "Rudyard Kipling and Shell Shock: 'More than a man could bear'." *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*. 59.2 (2016): 175-190. *Project MUSE*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Soffer, Reba N. *Discipline and Power: The University, History, & The Making of an English Elite 1870-1930*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994. E-book.

Spiropoulou, Angeliki. "'On Not Knowing Greek': Virginia Woolf's Spatial Critique of Authority." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies*. 4.1 (2002): 1-19. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Jun 2022.

Sramek, Joseph. "'Face Him Like a Briton': Tiger Hunting, Imperialism, and British Masculinity in Colonial India, 1800–1875." *Victorian Studies*. 48.4 (2006): 659-680. *Project MUSE*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Summers, Anne. "Militarism in Britain before the Great War." *History Workshop*. 2 (1976): 104-123. *JSTOR*. Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Swain, Jon. "Masculinities in Education." *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* Eds.Kimmel, Michael, Jeff R Hearn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005. E-book.

Thien, Deborah., Vincent J. Del Casino Jr. "(Un)Healthy Men, Masculinities, and the Geographies of Health." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 102.5 (2012): 1146-1156. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Thorslev, Peter L. Jr. *The Byronic Hero: Types and Prototypes*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1965. E-book.

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

Tosh, John. "Masculinities in an Industrializing Society: Britain, 1800–1914." *Journal of British Studies*. 44.2 (2005): 330-342. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Tosh, John. "What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain." *History Workshop*. 38 (1994): 179-202. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 Feb 2022.

Tozer, Malcolm. "Masculinity and the new imperialism: rewriting manhood in British popularliterature, 1870–1914." *Journal of the History of Education Society*. 44.4 (2015): 531-534. *Taylor and Francis Online*. Web. 20 July 2021.

White, Rob. "Social and political aspects of men's health." *Health*. 6.3 (2002): 267-285. *JSTOR*. Web. 20 July 2021.

Whitworth, Michael H. "Historicising Woolf: Context Studies." *Virginia Woolf in Context*. Eds. Randall, Bryony., Jane Goldman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP,

2012. *Cambridge.org*. Web. 08 Dec 2020.

Woolf, Leonard, ed. *A Writer's Diary*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1980. Web. *archive.org*. 08 Dec 2020.

Woolf, Leonard. *Downhill All The Way: An Autobiography of The Years 1919 to 1939*. London: The Hogarth Press, 1975. E-book.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2015. E- book.

Woolf, Virginia. "Modern Fiction." *The Essays of Virginia Woolf*. London: The Hogarth Press,1984. E-book.

Woolf, Virginia. *Moments of Being*. Ed. Jeanne Schulkind. London: A Harvest / HBJ Book. E-book.

Woolf, Virginia. *Moments of Being*. London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1985. E-book.

Woolf, Virginia. *The Diary of Virginia Woolf: Volume 2 1920-1924*. Ed. Bell, Anne Olivier. New York : Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1980. *Archive.org*. Web. 15 Sep 2021.

Woolf, Virginia. *Three Guineas. Projectgutenberg.com.* Web. 15 Jan 2021.

Yasayan, Vahit. "Acting Out Black "Mask-ulinity": Male Struggles For Identity in Three Plays by August Wilson." Master's Thesis. Hacettepe University: 2014. *Tez.yok.gov.tr*. Web. 8 Jul 2022

Zwerdling, Alex. "Jacob's Room: Woolf's Satiric Elegy." *ELH*. 48.4 (1981): 894-913. JSTOR. *Web*. 10 April 2022.