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This thesis discusses the emergence of a separate and gendered children’s literature in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Victorian era. The existence of different literatures written for boys and girls is discussed through the ways in which the imperial ideology of Britain shapes the construction of gender roles as part of the nation’s future imperial policy: while Victorian militant masculinity shapes the identity formation for boys, the Victorian appropriation of the Romantic construction of child and motherhood as the Victorian female ideal shapes the identity formation for girls. The restructuring of public schools, the role of educational reforms, and the ideological function of reading and its influence on the subjectivity of the reader constitute the other foundational elements of the argument.
Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis originates from a convergence of two complementary personal areas of interest, English literature and Women and Gender Studies. The thesis focuses on the imperial and Victorian constructions of masculinity and femininity in a juvenile literature that focuses on the ideals of an imperial ideology governed by the British Empire. As separate fictions written for boys and girls point to significant differences in the construction of femininity and masculinity, I have been intrigued by the ways in which a consciousness of gender and dominant gendered roles can be inculcated in children through different gendered narrative models in juvenile literature. John Tosh claims in *A Man’s Place* that “Victorian England is not called the first modern society for nothing” (8), and it is interesting to explore the Victorian roots of the most prominent discourses and arguments that modern feminist theory focuses on pertaining to the division of spheres, the cult of home and domesticity, and the power of a bourgeois culture. In this respect, an analysis of the Victorian construction of gender in children’s literature will also provide insights toward understanding past and contemporary representations of masculinity and femininity as well as the ideological justifications for using sexual differences to promote separate literary texts and other reading materials categorized as being for young readers in Victorian popular juvenile fiction.
Today’s children have the opportunity to read juvenile books, mainly fiction, in a wide range of topics and genres, yet literary texts whose messages and ideologies are shaped and constrained by the society in which they are produced by adult writers still have the power “to invite [child reader] to become something like the reader they imply as [children] read them” (Nodelman 18). This change in reader occurs through a reading process that introduces texts by which the child reader understands her/his social place and constructs a sexual identity (Reynolds 38). As many children’s literature scholars have noted in analyses of the relationship between literature and the reader’s subjectivity, the power of a text is grounded in an expected transformation likely to occur in the reader through the reading material which marginalizes the child reader not only within but also outside of the text. The relevant questions for this thesis will focus on how femininity and masculinity are constructed in the Victorian era so as to buttress the power of Empire founded on an imperialist ideology, the ways in which both masculinity and femininity suggest different areas of political and social growth positioned in a public/private division, and the ways that fiction for boys and fiction for girls inculcate diametrically opposite imperial gendered roles and norms through the children’s reading process. The responses show that the imperial demands placed on children’s literature lead Victorian boys to be primarily manly, imperial leaders or soldiers when the same ideology creates romantic girls sanctified for their female passivity, their purity and innocence, and their domestic achievements segregated from the civilized world. Stated thus, this imperialist gender-based ideology is significant for offering separate literary representations, adventures, and gendered subjectivities (motherhood for girls and Empire-
builders/adventurers for boys) in separate fictions motivated by different adult desires and longings.

Children’s literature is historically a wide area of research both in subject and time. Instead of conducting an analysis for an extended chronological period, I am focusing on a historical context, but not on the full history of children’s literature. I am particularly concerned with the period between 1870-1914, which demarcates my analysis at a time when children’s literature was already having a period of the greatest popularity in the publishing industry in addition to its success and power in shaping a colonial formation of gender for children. In order to make this time-delimited period more understandable, it is necessary to explain the changing attitudes toward children in the history of childhood and the subsidiary adult recognition of children as different from adults themselves.

Chapter 2 briefly provides a historical discussion on the ‘absent’ adult vision of childhood and adults’ discovery of the distinctiveness of the childhood experience, which arouses various anxieties and fears about how to address and handle this new concept. The adult’s discovery of childhood, or the growing interest in children as adult’s primary concern, makes children as something to be worked on (Grylls 75). When their childish patterns of manners are interpreted as something “not to be plucked out but rather to be cultivated” (Grylls 75), adventure stories, public school stories, and domestic novels aim to mold children by virtue of gendered imperial roles. Chapter 2, then, answers these following questions: What kind of fears and expectations operate, covertly or overtly, to shape separate literatures for children and determine appropriate gender roles in juvenile
fiction? Which characteristic of the Evangelical child \(^1\) causes those fears and reproduces new social anxieties?

Chapter 3 discusses the types of reading materials that are seen appropriate for boys from different classes. In parallel with the expansion in the publishing industry and inclusion of entertaining elements into children’s book at the beginning of nineteenth-century, the sacrosanct instructional role of reading is ostensibly superseded by ‘reading for pleasure’ (Reynolds 23). However with this aspect, the fear aroused by the fact that children might read books with an inappropriate content increases in intensity. As a matter of fact, the working-class literacy and their reading material (penny dreadfuls) become problematic in terms of its “immoral” and “disrespectful” characters. Chapter 3, then, asserts that when working-class reading is shown as a possible source for cultural decadence, the real intention of the ruling upper-middle class in terms of aggrandizing the upper class’ domination among classes and preventing the creation of a self-sufficient working-class which will be mindful of their own needs will be concealed from this discourse. With regard to the upper classes, the ideal boys are inculcated in public schools with an interest in strengthening the moral, muscular, warrior side of their characters. Chapter 3 discusses three boys’ books: Thomas Hughes’ *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* (1857), Frederic W. Farrar’s *Eric, or, Little by Little* (1858), selected stories from Rudyard Kipling’s *The Complete Stalky & Co* (1899), in terms of the characteristics of boys’ masculinity and Christian self-sacrifice as a virtue which will be later replaced by patriotism as the prime civic virtue, serving one’s own country (MacDonald 526).

\(^1\) By naming the Evangelical child, I refer to an ideal child figure constructed in the 18th and early 19th century as a spiritual, religious, and selfless one who is believed to be born with the original sin like adults.
Kipling’s stories, on the other hand, differ from Hughes’ and Farrar’s novels as a late example of the school-stories, but herald the future ruling masculine image of the First World War through representing imperial manliness with an emphasis on military adventures: soldiers in the army or navy overseas.

Chapter 4 is devoted to analyses of girls’ books: Susan Coolidge’s What Katy Did, Frances Hodgson Burnett’s The Secret Garden, L. T. Meade’s A Sweet Girl Graduate, and E. Nesbit’s The Railway Children, with an exploration of the characteristics of the “Angel in the House” as the Victorian feminine ideal. These books present opposite female representations and limited subject positions to girls in comparison with the images in the boys’ stories. As the early androgynous construction of manners and virtue in the Evangelical child is replaced by a separation in the construction of femininity and masculinity in the second half of the nineteenth century, I will argue for one of the most valuable assertions in Claudia Nelson’s book, Boys Will be Girls, when she points out that Victorian stereotype of romanticized childhood had much in common with the feminine ideal (Nelson 2). Which characteristics of children that romantic poets eulogized are customized for the middle-class domesticity? How is the romantic image of child in nature tailored to the romanticized image of the segregated woman?

Chapter 4 also discusses the lack of the entertaining value in stories written for girls because of the limited number of formulae used as plots. As Kimberley Reynolds notes in Girls Only?, the existence of separate syllabuses and curricula designed for girls and boys in the education system, a system that educates boys as future imperial leaders in (public) schools, does not present the same opportunities for girls. Thus, some (one assumes not
all) girls turned to the more adventurous plots of the boys' books. Similar to the fear felt for the working-class who reads subversive fiction such as the penny dreadful, the likelihood of girls rebelling against the normalized sexual identities and social roles in the society directs the middle-class to turn girls into a needy group whose interest in entertaining stories would be responded to “without the accompanying danger of corruption” by a literary market addressing only to girls (Reynolds 94). Chapter 4 will suggest answers to questions such as, what kind of books is written under the umbrella of girls’ literature? What kind of precautions against the danger of corruption is taken on the level of literature? What are the several images and roles disseminated among girls to subdue? How is the imperial ideology played out in these books?

The last section (Chapter 5: Conclusion) argues a cultural ideology which appropriates a bifurcation in imperial roles depending on different sexual identities in/through children’s gendered models. In the Victorian age, when juvenile literature becomes an adult tool for social, political, and sexual control over children, “the unconscious desire of the adult authors was to present the kind of adult world they wished children to grow up into and to rule themselves one day” (Kutzer 11). In the late nineteenth century, the colonial aggrandizement of the empire demands that children be influenced by imperial roles and images that will provoke their contribution to the future building of the nation. I find Donald E. Hall’s words in the article, “‘We and the World’: Juliana Horatia Ewing and Victorian Colonialism for Children”, complementary to my argument when he rephrases the relationship between children and children’s literature as a complex process by which “a group of potentially noncolonial infants becomes a nation of active
colonizers, one in which adult ideologies slowly filter down and progressively become the ideals and assumptions of a new generation” (Hall 51). Thus, children who have never been exposed to any colonial experience participate in the proliferation of the colonial ideology through the stories and books written for them. The national superiority of England and its fiction that presents Britishness as a privileged identity in the world influence the distribution of roles. When these children learn to participate in British colonial activities fictionalized in the books they read, s/he, without doubt, acquires the imperial knowledge as a colonizer. Nevertheless, the class and gender-based narrative models for children as a continuation of a broader national politics in the Victorian age distinguishes the active colonizer as a male child and colonizes the female child twice within its imperial narratives of the male dominated society.

Chapter 2 will discuss the adult recognition of childhood before Victorian children were realized as potential imperial colonizers and will explain the romantic foundation of femininity that repositions female in private domains whose formations are colonized by a class and an imperial-based ideology.
Chapter 2: Imperial and Victorian construction of masculinity and femininity in boys’ and girls’ literature between 1870-1914

Juvenile literature, which suggests an independent body of texts as a separate genre with a child addressee, does not occur as a distinct category of literature until the eighteenth-century (Gillian 104). In the history of children’s literature, the nineteenth century is thereafter defined as the golden age of juvenile literature with an increasing number of publications for children and with a special focus on shaping children with different gender roles in a fictive world where children will be their own rulers. In Empire’s Children, when Daphne Kutzer affirms that “the rise of imperialism is roughly contemporaneous with the golden age of children’s literature and the two grew up together” (10), propagandizing a culture of imperialism reflects a gender and class-oriented focus at its intersection with children’s literature. For the matter of that, the overlapping ideologies of imperialism and the middle-class values which determine the subject matter of children’s literature in the mid-nineteenth century as a genre (Reynolds 30) require a further analysis of this gendered juvenile literature at the point at which empire, gender, and class intersect.

Many historians of children’s literature suggest that there are various significant components which affect and play role in the formation of a separate children’s literature:
the changing image of children from a sinful to an innocent child figure in the Romantic period, the increasing adult attention to children as a result of understanding childhood difference from adulthood, the growth in the publishing industry, and the rise of imperialism by the turn of nineteenth-century. When there emerges a subsequent division in the boundaries of children’s literature in the shape of different literary representations and genres for boys and girls, understanding the existence of a gendered split highlights the noteworthy differences in the construction of femininity and masculinity in an Empire-focused juvenile literature.

Although attitudes toward children vary over centuries, teaching children morality and manners was always an underlying motive. While the necessity of discipline is a very popular discourse for parents with children even in the twenty-first century, it was a recurrent notion in the history of children when adults’ interpretation of children and childhood changed from one century to another. When scholars study different motivations and reasons for why children need to be disciplined, those reasons vary from “the emergence of an education system” to “changes in the family structure”, “the rise of capitalism”, and “the increasing maturity of parents” (Pollock 28). According to Philippe Ariès, who was the first person who discussed the absence of a separate childhood before the early modern period and underlined a lack of a distinct concept of childhood in the Middle Ages\(^2\) (Thomas 45), children were disciplined harshly in the past and this did not change even when childhood as a concept developed after the seventeenth century.

\(^2\) It is important to note that his theory has been contested and refined for several times in the scholarship of children’s literature.
Towards the end of the sixteenth century and during the seventeenth century, the adult desire impelled to “break the will of the child” (Pollock 14) tallied with a Puritan ideological spirit. Among Puritans, when the children’s soul became the sole objective to be rectified and saved, the weak body of the child epitomized the lack of virtue. Like adults, children were fallen and needed to have redemption (Avery 104).

In the eighteenth-century, Evangelical literature for children does not go beyond a literature of “school books and books of courtesy” and religious writings which are supposed to equip them with relevant religious education (Avery 95). In this context, obedience to parents as the representatives of God on earth reveals the interpretation of the family and adult rules as sacrosanct. Thus, when children submit to the adult’s world in terms of humility and obedience, purification of the soul instead of perfecting manners predominantly forms the content and goal of the religious children’s books (Nelson 9).

The spirituality of the Angel-like child, which will later refer to female roles and female embodiment within the domestic sphere, form the basis of the ideal early-Victorian child for both sexes. What was being distinguished in the later Victorian child became the replacement of the Puritan inheritance of the original sin with an innate Romantic innocence (Nelson 11). This was an important restructuring and re-contextualizing the role of the child. The new emphasis on the child’s innocent nature repositions him/her not according to her/his weakness but due to an empowerment of the child as a source of spiritual and moral source. As part of this development, the Romantic era creates an innocent child figure by situating the child in nature and isolation. Nevertheless, in mid-nineteenth century formerly androgynous attitudes will be further appropriated to girls,
distinguishing the female image as the Angel in the House who was a spiritual, self-sacrificial, religious, and selfless female figure located in the household.

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the Victorian construction of gender was already based on the romanticization and idealization of the child (Nelson 11). In Boys Will Be Girls, Nelson argues that the romanticization of the child is appropriated to the romanticization of womanhood both physically and morally. The elevation of the child’s innate innocence over the adult’s corrupted material world is melted into a similar romantic discourse that is used to justify the female segregation: “distance like the ideal woman from worldly contamination, children had only to accept their marginalization to find themselves to moral culture” (Nelson 11). And, it was important to protect their innocence from any social contamination. On the other hand, this adult/male approach toward children becomes a wish-fulfillment for the adult needs. As both children and woman are cut off from the material world, the stress of their spirituality is suggested as an escape for the civilized men. The romantic female imagery of the family (private domain) that is segregated from the public world and presented as a safe zone for men who seek for harmony and peace is also applied for romanticizing both children and women.

The idea of a progress of the middle-class boy from infancy to a manhood of work and public service forms the Victorian masculinity. Whereas, the condition of woman confined largely to the private sphere (in the family) determines the woman’s social circle where her role as a self-sacrificing mother/woman and her self-fulfillment are restricted with(in) the home life. John Tosh asserts in Manliness and Masculinities that
“since most middle-class women were [seen as] wives and mothers before anything else, the greater prestige now attached to these roles tended to raise the status of women, and to endow them with greater morality” (5). The spiritual and moral aspect attached to the notion of family will be better understood as a realization of the cult of the home in the bourgeoning industrial society. In his earlier work, *A Man’s Place: Masculinity and the Middle-Class Home in Victorian England*, Tosh emphasizes the increasing gap between the cult of the home and the bourgeois society which rested on trade, entrepreneurship, and the pursuit of individual profit (6). The spirituality of woman is elevated against the material public life in a similar fashion with the Romantic discourse which suggests nature versus civilization dichotomy. Referring to the alienating effect of the new industrial society, Nelson suggests that the romanticization of womanhood and the role of woman within the home are used as an “instrument of Victorian society’s subversive quest to heal itself by undermining the precepts of aggression, selfishness, and competition upon which the male world depended” (4). On the one hand, Nelson’s claim that there is something “subversive” about the Victorian romanticization of domestic womanhood makes it necessary to question the rule and attitudes of the male world, but on the other hand the romanticization of domestic life as women’s concern does not necessarily lead to a female freedom. While the corruption in the adult world was ever present, the savior role required an identity formation for the female child whose purifying role would only be suitable when she was segregated from the material world. When androgyny is seen as useless and inappropriate for boys’ identity formation, the romantic construction of girls is not questioned at all. The idealization of family and women as moral and spiritual entities, then, supports the radical division of the public and
private worlds, and the material world jeopardizes the unity and harmony of this romanticized image of family and gender roles. In *Girls Only?*, Kimberley Reynolds’ imagery of citadels reveals that tension between the Victorian ideals of the bourgeois home/family and the public sphere: “the last bastions of civilization holding out against the menace and corruption of the market place and a fallen world” (31). That the household should provide refreshment and rest and that it should not fill the father/husband mind with more problems are the most common references, still used today to explain the function of the house.

With this polarization that occurs in the construction of femininity and masculinity in the second half of the nineteenth-century, the androgynous ideal fails to be more appropriate for the boys rather than girls in Empire-focused children’s literature. In *Dreams of Adventure and Deeds of Empire*, Martin Green asserts that Britain started to expand its geographical borders prominently through overseas possessions at the end of seventeenth century and could have been defined as having an imperial identity earlier since “England had conquered Wales in the Middle Ages, and Ireland in Elizabeth and Cromwellian times” (Green 6). However, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Britain as the dominant power, lionizing adventures was equal to lionizing imperialism (Green 10). By the same token, “as early as the 1880s the ideal child had become the normal child, enterprising, adventurous, and even innocently destructive due to a natural lack of comprehension of the workings and subterfuges of the civilized adult world” (Nelson 29). Nevertheless, this image of the ideal child does not consist of the
female child, since adventure which embodies movement, mobility, new experiences in essence becomes a gendered activity to be explored.

The imperialist ideology condemns the early Victorian ideal of an androgynous, egoless child as threatening to render effeminate the male child who will be the future ruling class of the British Empire. Thus, particularly at the beginning of the twentieth century the feminized boy automatically causes a fear of emasculation in the imperial identity of the Empire which is based on military and mercenary deeds. As both man and woman take roles in British establishment of an imperial identity, Kutzer’s description of the imperial relationship between Britain and its colonies portrayed in terms of a mother-child relation is an intriguing approach to reveal how both femininity and masculinity are shaped for the powerful image of the Empire, yet also discloses women’s role as domesticated:

Women are important in the imagery of empire insofar as empire was often presented in metaphoric guise as a family, with Queen Victoria the head of the “mother country,” and colonial subjects as immature children in need of discipline and order given by the “mother” imperial power. But beyond metaphor, women had a real and important role in the building of the British Empire. They went to colonies as missionaries and educators as wives; and occasionally as servants. Even women who stayed at home in England were involved in domestic imperial endeavors. (48)

After the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth century, masculinity and femininity become polarized when nobility, heroism, and renunciation of feelings (in other words,
banishment of the emotional world) would refurbish manliness and reaffirm the boy’s masculinity. The imperial context also continues to consolidate boys’ aggressiveness, their mastery, and their rational and exploitive characteristics as the masculine ideal. However, when this ideal is constructed on the invisibleness of women, the ideological mechanism causes women to be absent from the imperial stories written for boys. Being grounded in a gender binary roles and spaces segregated within the British imperial context, the agency of the Victorian women is only empowered within the domestic sphere along with a middle class morality which shaped the writings of the children’s classics. The ideology that was supported by “women as mothers of the race and men as the active, assertive element” (Manliness and Masculinities 195) presents the romanticized motherhood/womanhood and the Angelic attributes appropriate only for girls.

The Evangelical literary model where a sanctifying dying child brings a spiritual salvation to the child itself is transformed into a literary model of adventure stories where the androgynous child can hardly survive and his self-sacrificing death cannot cause any redemption to the protagonist. Although Russell in Eric and Arthur in Tom Brown’s Schooldays can easily be recognized as embodiments of Evangelical attributes, their existence neither have legacy nor authority in a world where physical exploration, bodily strength, and individualism require a novel identity formation for former boys who had feminine and religious fragile characteristics. Until his death, Russell’s good influence on Eric is repeatedly mentioned throughout the text. Having no mother, no father, and no relatives, Russell was a real selfless, spiritual child whose class orientations were already
blurred by the lack of his familiar bonds. His death is very symbolic when he cannot jump between the rocks which were divided from the shore and his fall into the water and the following conversations between Eric and Russell are very Evangelical in tone. Russell was “very happy” in the face of death because he was going to find comfort in God (123). After he dies, Eric gives up smoking and drinking while concentrating more on his lessons, but his good attitudes do not last for long. Arthur in *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* also fights for survival towards the end of the book. While he does not die, his illness also transforms some of Tom’s bad habits, such as cribbing. The feminized, Evangelical Arthur manages to survive at the end of the book, yet with a more athletic body ready to go out to explore nature with another schoolboy adventurer Martin. In Kipling’s stories, it is obvious that there is no space and tolerance for selfless, self-sacrificing, Evangelical children. The following chapter looks at the replacement of the Evangelical child with a new identity formation for boys, discussing its relation with the national politics and the development of the new manly image.
Chapter 3: Boys’ Books for Empire-Builders

A passage from an Evangelical child to individual manly heroes

Although the privileged existence of a male agent in fiction for boys does not alter in the history of boys’ literature, the characteristics of the Victorian boy depicted in the mid-nineteenth-century books can easily be differentiated from the ones written in early nineteenth-century in terms of the “change in attitudes to and representations of masculinity” (Reynolds 50). The androgynous Evangelical child figure in the early examples of children’s fiction loses its power as the controlling model for the late boys’ books where the emerging discrepancy is exemplified by different male images and the increasing emphasis on the representation of imperial manliness. In this chapter, I will discuss different embodiments of masculinities, the processing of the boy through public school stories, and the impact of class on shaping an imperial masculine identity, respectively in Thomas Hughes’ *Tom Brown’s Schooldays*, William Farrar’s *Eric, Little by Little*, and Rudyard Kipling’s *Stalky & Co*.

The transition from childhood to adulthood, or from youth to maturity, consists of the child’s active participation and construction of self. Reading the right type of book becomes important for children from different sexes since, as Kimberley Reynolds suggests, “reading is one way in which the child learns about social organization; [and]
what is read can affect how s/he understands herself or himself socially” (38). Hence, understanding sexual identities with their vulnerability to social and moral pressures causes adults, publishing houses, and the ruling class to instruct children in the appropriate Victorian social and sexual roles as part of the correct socialization (Reynolds 35). The ideological attitude toward masculinity as well as its presentation as central to the patriarchal system of the British imperial rule appropriates strong male models for boys and implants *manliness* as a male image in boys’ books. While it is evident that boys’ fiction as a genre contributes to the construction of gender-specific duties and learning of gendered subjectivities among children, boys’ stories are framed by the ways in which the issue of class plays a determining role in the distribution of imperial, gendered roles. Depending on their class status, some boys join the army as soldiers and some as administrators. In “Of England, Home and Duty” J. S. Bratton draws attention to a reciprocal relationship between the reproduction of a dominant culture and the educational system of a society and its literature. Noting that many educators and writers chose to write fiction to transfer the current ideology more easily, Bratton asserts that “anyone educated to the level of basic literacy was accessible through a story [and] it was also private, enabling the direct messages inculcating imperial ambitions, and national, familial and racial pride” (Bratton 76). Bratton’s diagnosing the use of children’s fiction for political reasons is significant in the burgeoning criticism of a gendered juvenile literature where concerns for gender and imperial ideology overlap and where they are fictionalized in a subtle way.
In *Boys Will be Girls*, Claudia Nelson distinguishes *manliness* and *womanliness* as an ideological split rather than a division of sexes in the early Victorian age (2). When the gender of the children was not prominently determined on shaping the child character in early Victorian children’s literature, the “androgyney of [Christian] virtue” (Nelson 44) formed the emotional and behavioral values for boys and girls (2). Discussing this emphasis on soul by the early Victorians, Nelson emphasizes the insignificant aspect of the issue of gender in comparison to the development of the child’s spiritual dimension: “both boys and girls should be obedient, courteous, self-disciplined, honest, sensible, and neither foolishly timid nor recklessly brave” (9). As long as androgyney appears as a set of traits both boys and girls adopt and practice in different settings, “self-sacrifice, self-control, selflessness” become the chief characteristics of both manliness and womanliness (Nelson 2). Nevertheless, being egoless versus individualism is one of the oppositional affirmations fiction for boys fosters by the turn of the nineteenth century. While self-sacrifice and purity were recognized as the feminine ideals and “girls in books aspired to ethereal benignity”, aggressiveness and physical strength imbued with the male models inaugurated the fictional boys “to explore, challenge and master” (Reynolds 51).

An emphasis on the degree of femininity incorporated into the male image interestingly shows the changes in and new interpretations of the characteristics of masculinity. As a development of the Evangelical literature, “the feminine knowledge of one’s own powerlessness” (Nelson 9) continued to be considered as a positive aspect of androgyney in the early and mid-Victorian juvenile literature. The susceptibility of the Evangelical child to a worldly corruption was often identified with the female passivity,
spirituality, and Virgin Mary-like purity. Whenever a child was disobedient or rebellious under the influence of external, ‘corrupting’ rules, oftentimes s/he was allowed to sacrifice and repent in order to purify the spirit. However later, as boys participate actively in the imperial ideology, their bodily strength becomes equally important as their spiritual development. Nelson emphasizes this change as such, “if the typical mid-Victorian children’s book brings its hero and heroine to spiritual perfection through feminizing processes of illness, humiliation, or powerlessness, its Edwardian counterpart scorns both process and product as ‘muffish’” (29). What is actually being scorned evolves to be femininity and feminine impotence. While the initial emphasis on Arthur’s fragility, feminine characteristics, and his latter illness in *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* serve as an example for the spiritual perfection presented to Tom, the deaths of Russell and Eric’s brother in *Eric, Little by Little* are also used to redeem Eric’s corrupted character tempted by his school experiences. Although neither of them succeeds fully, Eric’s own death secures the protagonist’s spiritual redemption. On the other hand, the stress on “being Stalky”, which means “clever, well-considered and wily, as applied to plans of action” (Kipling 13) replaces “Ericking” in Kipling’s *Stalky & Co.*

When mastery over body and morality required a fixed masculine identity established by rejecting any attribute that is feminine (Reynolds 43), the absence of the women from boys’ stories and the lack of any physical interaction with women in a predominantly male-driven and male-associated spaces strengthens the new masculine image. In this discourse, the repression of emotions and the abandonment of attitudes which might be interpreted as feminine supersede the lionization of masculine attributes.
Thus, when one cannot have a portrayal of an androgynous child as it was in the former evangelical tracts, one can easily trace the transition from androgyny to a new form of masculinity which will be polarized in its relation to femininity in latter children’s fiction: “The heroes of boys’ fiction became manlier than manly: braver, stronger, more loyal, more patriotic, more cunning, more masterful and more reticent than ever before” (Reynolds 59).

Boys’ fiction suggests a practical reestablishment of a relationship between literature and identity and reinforces images while creating particular subject perspectives for boys to adopt. As Reynolds asserts, boys’ literature does not only “define manliness, but also produce a reader who accepts the definition” (53). The reader’s acceptance of the definition, once again, refers to the powerful nature of fiction in transmitting various ideas and values. When children’s literature and masculinity are positioned in an imperial context, mesmerizing the reader with the idea of power incarnated by the masculine boy, his body and his pugnacious attitudes strongly “appeal to and employ the readers’ imagination” (Bratton 76). It is obvious that while this fiction in a sense engenders an escapist and entertaining world for its reader, these representations still remain powerful. As Bratton suggests in his article, “the elaborated idea of the school itself, or of the battle, or the expedition, when set in the ideal and shapely world of art, may be far more potent than the messy and unsatisfactory reality” (76).

In a Victorian children’s literature where girls’ and boys’ fiction serve as separate literary forms, juvenile books written for boys suggest a boyhood whose foundation is both “Christian” and “muscular” in nature. The division between two representations
likewise projected upon the nineteenth-century educational policies forms a class-based, sexist, and imperial form of social and political identity formation which becomes the driving force behind structuring the imperial identity of Britain. Public schools and public schoolboy stories are of particular importance in the development and proliferation of this ideology in Victorian society. As Reynolds asserts, the difference in the representation of masculinity between the mid and the end of the nineteenth-century stems from the imperial necessity of “encouraging the next generation of men to adhere to new, more rigid and aggressive notions of masculinity” (52).

Discovering the role of education and literacy as a social control in an imperial, class-based system

Education (literacy) and literature are used by the ruling class as a tool to control and maintain the social and political borders/inequalities between classes in the Victorian age, as both Kimberley Reynolds and Joseph Bristow mention this point in their books. When the middle and upper classes became aware of the existence of a literate working-class that read cheap papers, penny dreadfuls, the middle class felt anxious by a possible rebellious working-class as a nonfunctioning industrial workforce. Edward G. Salmon (1865-1955), who published three important review articles on the reading habits of boys, girls, and the working-class in *Fortnightly Review* and *Nineteenth Century* magazines, wrote in “What The Working Classes Read”, that there was a great variety and number of publications for the working-class in the mid-nineteenth century. However, the number of the periodicals and serials written for the working-class man was misleading in presenting the working-class as “the most omnivorous devourers of mental food ever
known” (Salmon 108). Even though there were “self-educated working-class poets, critics, and novelists” (Bristow 11) who produced high-quality writings and critical local arguments, Salmon reveals that a significant portion of the working-class reading material was formed by penny novelettes whose heroes varied from killers to robbers (Salmon 112). These were the readings that were regarded as having the potential to make the child reader immoral and rebellious based on their narrative structure, use of language, and the criminal characteristics of the heroes used in many of the penny dreadfuls (Bristow 12). From a middle-class perspective, the working-class and its literature were perceived as the source of the cultural decadence and all the vices existent in the society and were also forming a threat against the status-quo, if reading habits were not controlled. According to Salmon, while the intention behind these working-class writings was not to secure a moral elevation on behalf of the working-class, it would be deceptive to suggest that they were intentionally motivated to corrupt its readers. While “the worst that can be urged against them is that they do help to keep the moral tone of their reader low” (Salmon 114), Salmon asserts that working-classes were reading very little in reality and even for the cases they read they were deprived of taking action: “The English labourer either reads the political articles and fails to act up to them, or does not read them at all” (115).

Wishing to transform the identity and role of the working-class based on their own fears, the middle-class used education to overcome the corrupting influence of the cheap, self-identified working-class publications while maintaining the class differences. It was necessary for the ruling middle class to diminish the working-class interest for the
‘immoral’, low status penny dreadfuls “until reading of a particular kind came to be seen as a desirable leisure activity for ‘lower orders’” (Reynolds 7). The desirable texts for working-class were limited to religious texts such as Bible and Sunday paper, whose narratives would obviously be beneficial to their religious education, otherwise “literacy had been perceived by many members of the middle classes as a special philanthropic gift to working class” (Bristow 14).

Although the imperial ideology determines the roles and identities for each class, it repositions the working-class child in a political discourse which sets proper credentials for a citizenship when the ruling middle-class in power controls the economic, political, and literary distribution of roles. The suitability of the books for the working-class child, then, is decided in reference to a new political and sexual image of the male child positioned in the midst of British imperial power:

Given the extension of the franchise in 1867 and the marked rise in the working-class population, the boy was now identified as a political danger to the nation. He had to be trained not only to read the right things, to turn his mind away from the debasing effects of penny fiction, but he had also to meet the demands of becoming a responsible citizen. Imperialism made the boy into an aggrandized subject- British born and bred- with the future of the world lying upon his shoulders. (Bristow 19)

The shift toward a more obviously ‘responsible citizen’ and ‘British born and bred’ signifies the emerging imperial consciousness which positions boys and boyhood in relation to the strong image of the Empire (MacDonald 520). Nevertheless, as Bristow
already asserted in *Empire’s Boys*, his national identity was not enough to empower the working-class boy as a ruler in the imperial aggrandizement which was class-driven in nature. Even though Robert H. MacDonald emphasizes the necessity of a young boy who “had to be given ‘character’ to make them fit and willing to serve in the imperial cause” (520), there were different approaches in serving for a nation depending on the class of the male boy.

Education reforms after the mid-nineteenth-century were aimed to eliminate the ignorance in the society, yet it could not save itself from nourishing a class and gender-based discriminating educational system. Many of Thomas Arnold’s followers believed in “English literature, when carefully selected and presented to the people, that may act as the central civilizing agent to lead the masses” (Bristow 6). However, with the introduction of the compulsory education in 1880, schools become places where majority of children start to be socialized and improved according to certain class and gender norms. Thus, the fear of a working class that can read and write as do its betters is minimized and overcome by different educations that become characteristic of each class (Reynolds 36). Reynolds underlines the ways in which how curriculums were designed differently according to class and gender since different levels of English teaching and comprehensive skills were given to students from different classes (Reynolds 34). In the Board of Education schools, while upper-class children were instructed largely in literary classics, the middle-class was receiving educational skills for entrepreneurial works, and working-class children were engaged in a curriculum “which attempted to instill habits of
obedience and frugality but insufficient knowledge of political economy to enable them to interfere in the decision-making of their masters” (Reynolds 13).

Until the 1860s, public schools were places where children from aristocratic communities come together and educated while other children from opposing classes were attending to local, daily, or home schooling (Bristow 55). The demarcations among classes shifted in Queen Victoria’s reign and the middle-class families, who increased their political rights and property through entrepreneurship, send their pupils to public schools where they interact with upper-class children (Bristow 33). Bristow asserts that this combination of two classes as a result of the political and economic fluctuations in the society forced the public schools to “reorganize itself in the mid-Victorian period so that it was able to accommodate a dynamic exchange of values between both classes: to cultivate, on the one hand, the virtues of the proper gentleman (fair play, team spirit, decorum), and to embrace, on the other, the values of competition, independence, and a willful strength of mind” (Bristow 58). In addition to a class-based educational system Reynolds, as well as the other historians of children’s literature, asserts that “the decade between the 1870 Education Act and the introduction of compulsory education in 1880 saw the rapid expansion of the branch of the publishing industry directed at young readers” (5). Thus, the educational policies of the second half of the nineteenth century and a gendered juvenile literature work together to transform the child’s identity into a Victorian and imperial figure whose class and moral values are determined by a middle-class ruling ideology.
The construction of a public school boy and the presentation of manliness cannot be examined apart from the British imperial propaganda which increases its influence by major changes taking place in school curriculums and educational system in 1880s. In *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century*, John Tosh suggests that the imperial characteristic of the school curriculum with the inclusion of classes such as history and geography shows the imperial role of the public schools which aim to educate boys for colonial positions where they will actively contribute to the empire’s future (197). Graduating as the imperial ideologues offered in the Victorian public schools, boys learn *manliness* and the culture of imperialism as a result of their engagement in school fagging, prefect system, and team sports. What is more important is the fact that each boy starts from the bottom and become part of this school/imperial culture by experiencing the benefits of this hierarchy bodily and mentally (Nelson 58). Toward the end of the century, the emphasis on the boys themselves instead of the school authorities will be more obvious as in Kipling’s stories.

When public schools accommodate upper and middle-class boys, these boys are appropriated to administrative positions depending on their class orientations. John Tosh emphasizes that “the main target for empire propaganda was not the working-class but the ‘service class’” and manliness “was about learning to stand up for oneself in the company of men, both in the physical sense of showing courage, and in the social sense of finding one’s place in a deeply hierarchical society” (197). In this respect, Rugby in *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* (1857) and Roslyn in *Eric, Little by Little* (1858) were
associated with the upper levels of the society from whom colonial administrators and officers in the army and navy were traditionally drawn, whereas, the United Services College was a military school that prepared Kipling boys to the army as soldiers or clergies.

Public schools used to have a negative reputation due to a lack of discipline and deficiencies in the regulation of the institutionalized educational system in the early nineteenth century, but this image changed in time. In “The Public Schools in Victorian Literature”, John Reed underlines the birth of manly and athletic heroes in pursuit of adventure in new public schools, which resumed classical learning and a more ‘secular’ school curriculum (Reed 29). Reed distinguishes Hughes in his successful attempt to transfer “the setting of his adventures to the public school and [to] present his lively and virtuous heroes as schoolboys” (68). It was an important transformation of the public school and schoolboy images since during the early nineteenth-century when parents abstained from sending their children to public schools whose environment and conditions were interpreted as dangerous and destructive for children’s innocence and naivety, boys’ innocence was believed to be preserved.

In Tom Brown’s Universe, John Raymond de Symons Honey, who is an educational historian, warns Arnold readers to be mindful of the fact that Dr. Thomas Arnold, whose ideas on education exercised a unique influence on the educational system of the country and whose first rule appointed in 1828 at Rugby became a model for a revision in the educational movement, “did not regard himself as primarily, or even essentially, an educationalist at all: his major concerns were ecclesiastical, political, and social
problems” (Honey 2). Based on Arnold’s educational theory, the revival of the public schools in nineteenth century is mainly focused on the relevancy of classical learning, the role of chapel, and the importance of the games in playing field at schools.

Honey asserts that Arnold interprets the society as being ruled by sin and he believes the necessity of a social reform rooted in a “stable government and an aristocracy which was not so flagrantly corrupt that it did not know how to come to terms in some degree with the people” (3). However, mainly suggesting an “analogy between the ideals of the Christian school and these of the Christian state” (5), Arnold’s plan to correct the political and social conditions of the society appears to be more as a process of Christianizing the school and the state according to the Gospel pattern (Honey 4). In addition to the sole muscular strength, “Muscular Christianity”, a term associated with Arnoldian theory, appears as one of the distinguishing features of the public-school fiction. In “Of Muscles and Manliness: Some Reflections on Thomas Hughes”, George J. Worth explains how this phrase was coined:

The phrase “muscular Christianity” appears to have been coined by the author of a February 1857 review of Charles Kingsley’s novel Two Years Ago: “(…) His ideal is a man who fears God and can walk a thousand miles in a thousand hours-who, in the language which Mr. Kingsley has made popular, breathes God’s free air on God’s rich earth, and at the same time can hit a woodcock, doctor a horse, and twist a poker round his fingers” (Worth 303).

As the term itself is criticized by some scholars because of its “anti-intellectual tone” (Worth 303), Hughes strengthens the same point in Tom Brown’s Schooldays when he
writes that “the object of all schools is not to ram Latin and Greek into boys, but to make them, good English boys, good future citizens” [my italics] (59). In addition to the importance of literacy and quality of education at schools, their future ability to fit into the societal roles, then, seems equally crucial. Similarly, about Tom’s entering Rugby, the author voices Tom’s father, Mr. Brown’s opinions as follows:

“If he’ll only turn out a brave, helpful, truth-telling Englishman and a gentleman and a Christian, that’s all I want” thought the Squire (Hughes 74)

In addition to the Christian self, when the “presentation of Englishness, as a moral and ethical baseline” justifies the deeds of Empire, J. S. Bratton emphasizes that “it seems necessary to many writers to present and to praise English or British national characteristics, and the land itself, in order to establish a sense of what is good and to be valued [so that] for the imperialist writer, the extension of this Englishness overseas is a cogent reason for colonial expansion” (78). In Tom Brown’s Schooldays, Thomas Hughes introduces the Brown family as a prototype of the idealized structure of the British society. The Browns were a mighty family whose members were “broad in the shoulder, deep in the chest, and thin in the flank” (3), excelled at warrior skills and always knew how to stand against unfairness and things “they think going wrong” (4). In other words, they were not only fighters but also the guardians of truth and justice. Although the class hierarchy was an undeniable form of the British society, class discrimination was, in many cases, veiled by patriotism which was metaphorically practiced through sports and tournaments. Hughes writes that “feast-time was the day of reconciliation for the parish” (28-9), presenting the harmonious existence of different classes in “veast day” when
traditional sports and amusements such as back-sorting and wrestling took place in the Vale of the White Horse. Although the demonstration of physical strength might reach to an extent where the fight between the adversaries becomes bloody for the most time, these gatherings fulfill the objective of the athletic sports which was to strengthen the men’s bodies.

Tom’s life in Rugby points to his development in manly characteristics as a combination of morality and physical strength. While Tom continues to engage in bullying, cheating and developing personal strength, he also learns to function in the hierarchical world of Rugby. During a feast organized to celebrate the school defeat in one of the football matches, Tom experiences hierarchy as they serve and sit at the back of the older students at the very early days of the school. The system of fagging has a significant role in establishing a school system based on hierarchy and birth of a public school boy who is conscious of the use, sometimes abuse, of power. In *Forever England*, Jonathan Rutherford touches on the major importance of suppressing the individual ego in order to gain a new character in the shape of a public school boy, which emerges as a national identity.

In a system of rigid hierarchies and ritualistic codes of status and duty, survival demanded conformity to those with power, not a display of individuality. What mattered was a boy’s willingness to submit himself to the structures of the public school order and prove his good character (...) the almost religious espousal of loyalty to house and school formed the micro-language of loyalty to race and nation (Rutherford 16).
As Bristow comments on the school playing fields as the “battlegrounds where heroic deeds are done” (57), the captain’s speech sounds significant in several points. First, it refers to the necessity and importance of anti-egoistic attitudes that shape masculinity as well as to the productivity of exercising a self-sacrificing feminine manner.

It’s because we’ve more reliance on one another, more of a house feeling, more fellowship than the School can have. Each of us knows and can depend on his next-hand man better— that’s why we beat ’em today. We’ve union, they’ve division (114).

Secondly, the idea that unity, creating a community, and sharing responsibilities will bring success is a very suitable theme for the British Empire. Tom should leave his “spoilt, egocentric boyishness” (Nelson 58) behind to adopt the spirit of community and the imperial nation. Besides controlling the individual ego, Tosh interprets the role of team sports dominating the public schools as to train boys “to obey (and later to give) orders; they subordinated the individual to the team effort; and they instilled stoicism in the face of pain and discomfort” (198).

The captain’s sermon on the vices of bullying at the end of his talk refers to another component of establishing hierarchies in public schools since bullies themselves have the potential to undermine the foundations of a possible hierarchy. That is why, as Nelson suggests, bullies as few in number and used in this literature “not only by plot-driven necessity but by didactic design” (Nelson 63). Even in Kipling’s stories, although Stalky
and his friends can be interpreted as bullies, they challenge the existence of bad boys who “augment the hegemony of the strongest” as opposed to the weakest (Nelson 65).

Tom’s real development towards true manliness evolves through his friendship with East and Arthur. While Hughes’s Tom Brown typifies the mid-Victorian masculine boy, as Nelson highlights, he is not the ideal manly boy at the beginning of the novel as well as the other male characters (East and Arthur) are not (41). Right after Tom moves in Rugby, he meets East whose primary role in the story was to mentor Tom in how to fit into the world of Rugby. East’s experience and mastery over the rules of the schools appeals to Tom and that East is “frank, hearty, and good-natured, well satisfied with himself and his position, and chock full of life and spirits, and all the Rugby prejudices and traditions which he had been able to get together” (91) fascinates Tom at the beginning of the story. However, in order to be the hero of the book Tom should overcome East’s influence and mastery.

Although East is the first boy Tom meets in Rugby and stays as his best friend for a long time, Arthur’s female-directed upbringing and Christian spirit are important characteristics that Tom needs to be a real manly boy in the mid-Victorian imperial Britain. Arthur’s first appearance in the story creates a sharp contrast with other boys; he was an example of the “manly code of early Victorian evangelicism [which] was in many respects anti-masculine, androgynous and asexual” (Rutherford 14). Tom “in the far corner of the sofa was aware of a slight pale boy, with large blue eyes and light fair hair, who seemed ready to shrink through the floor” (205). Arthur lacks solidity and materiality, which will foreshadow his illness towards the end of the book. Doctor
interprets his arrival as an important step in Arthur’s life since he needs to take “some Rugby air and cricket” (208) in order to be normal.

Once again, we see that manliness requires a disowning of the domestic life when Tom warns Arthur not to feel homesick and to be afraid of the other’s boy questions. Tom never encourages Arthur to talk about his family in case Arthur “would be softened and less manly thinking home” (225). However, through Tom’s mothering Arthur at Rugby and specifically during his illness Nelson suggests that “Tom’s original naïve assumption that manliness is the opposite of womanliness has been corrected to reflect the truth: in their emotionalism and feeling for community rather than self, manliness and womanliness are effectively synonymous” (44). Nevertheless, this relationship benefits both sides. When Arthur was described very feminine and weak, his Christian piety and morality teaches Tom to be a good Christian and makes him give up cribbing in Latin classes. On the other hand, as Hughes shows his appreciations, “thanks to his intimacy with them [reference to Tom mainly] and Martin, [Arthur] has learned to swim, and run, and play cricket, and has never hurt himself by too much reading” (289).

Frederic W. Farrar’s *Eric*, written one year later than Hughes’ school novel can be differentiated from *Tom Brown’s Schooldays* in terms of following the moral tradition of the Evangelical fiction overtly. Unlike Tom Brown who develops to being a responsible, sturdy and manly hero as graduating from Rugby, “nothing at Roslyn . . . cannot reform him [Eric]” (Bristow 71). Farrar’s critical depiction of the public school environment, the education and the male interactions lead to the ruination of Eric when Hughes’ interpretation of the public school prioritizes a more secular school system which creates
a hero from Tom Brown. The notion of evil and guilt haunts Eric throughout the book. No matter what Eric does, his deeds cannot bring salvation. Although he starts school with a group of friends such as Owen, Duncan, Montagu, and Russell who “was the noblest of all noble spectacles” (Farrar 32), he makes wrong choices and the popularity he gains corrupts him in the end.

Eric starts with the twelve year-old Eric’s great enthusiasm as he counts down the days for the school start. Tom Brown and Eric differ from each other in terms of their character developments. Eric appears more likely to be an Arthur-like figure in Tom Brown’s Schooldays. When his parents were in India, Eric was brought up by a widowed aunt and a girl cousin. Although Mrs. Trevor and her daughter did not cultivate his mind with religious doctrines that would frighten and restrict his childhood by demanding religious rules, he learnt “to be truthful, to be honest, to be kind, to be brave, and he never quite forgot the lesson; nor amid the sorrows of after life did he ever quite lose the sense of a present loving God, of a tender and long-suffering Father” (14-5). Having these Christian virtues, Eric forms a similar attitude with Arthur.

When Arthur is identified with the female virtue, Bristow points to Arthur’s dead father and the absence of brothers. As Arthur’s only association was with his mother, Bristow asserts that “closeness to women has nurtured his love of God” (63). For Eric, Fairholm Cottage provides similar ties to him along with an emphasis on “Nature – wisest, gentlest, holiest of teachers- [which] was with him in his childhood” (13). The Romantic image of the child in nature is revived in Fairholm Cottage as Eric roams by the side of the stream that runs through the valley at the bottom of Mrs. Trevor’s orchard, and here he “was allowed to go about a good deal by himself, and it did him good [:] he
grew up fearless and self-dependent, and never felt the want of amusement" (13). Although later Eric and his friends will be able to enjoy the countryside around Roslyn, women are excluded from the world of school. Instead, Eric is constantly surrounded by male friends and schoolmasters. Although his inclusion of the Roslyn makes him lose his romantic image and innocence, bad bullies, such as Baker and Bull, highlights Eric’s good nature restored in his childhood. In Roslyn, as Eric will experience every single temptation and vice, the same opposition serves to highlight the dangers of the public school as opposed to the protected world of the domesticity. We will see that like Arthur, Eric is not strong enough to see his way to the end of the story.

Farrar does not hide the Evangelical tone of his tale whose moral message is explicitly originated in Eric’s failure to repent for his bad habits he gains at Roslyn. Farrar delineates Eric’s downfall as a result of his being powerless to resist the temptations of a schoolboy atmosphere. He indulges in cheating, drinking, and fighting. As in *Tom Brown’s Schooldays*, Eric’s best friend, Edwin Russell gets ill, yet his illness, unlike Arthur’s, was not enough to save Eric from his bad deeds. Even the deaths of Russell and Eric’s little brother Vernon’s death cannot make him repent. Nevertheless, at the very end of the book, he returns home and his death results in redemption, though quite late.

Hughes and Farrar approach public school experience with different views. Thomas Hughes affected by the famous master of Rugby, Thomas Arnold’s educational theories believes in a school system that can promise spiritual and physical development for boys. Like Arnold, William Farrar, who was also an educationalist, a “schoolteacher from 1854 to 1871 and then headmaster of Marlborough College from 1871 to 1876” (Rapple 58),
publishes loads of articles on education. While Hughes incorporates Arnold’s educational theory into Tom Brown’s Schooldays, Farrar does not include his educational theories to Eric, instead prefers to preserve Eric’s narrative as a moral tale. In “Dean Frederic William Farrar (1831-1903): Educationist”, Brendan A. Rapple claims that “though neither Thomas Arnold nor Rugby are mentioned, Roslyn is in a pre-Arnoldian stage” (61). Since the emphasis on “the children’s natural inclination to wrongdoing” (Rapple 59) identifies Eric with the Evangelical, moralistic children’s literature rather than new trend with Arnold’s educational theories.

While entrance to a public school allowed boys to leave their families and feminine virtues gained in domesticity, Nelson suggests that “the Victorian school story for boys developed into the male analogue of Victorian domestic novels for girls” (57). Concepts such as the development of soul, corrupting influence of power, and “virtue rather than glory” rule the world of the boys’ school stories in Tom Brown’s Schooldays and Eric, whereas by the end of the century the physical segregation of the female from the male world was considered so insufficient that the male embodiment of self-sacrifice and selflessness posed a threat for the nation’s future goals and aggressive identity of the imperial Britain (58). The Victorian boy is transformed from an image of adventurous, virile public school boy in Tom Brown’s Schooldays and Eric to ‘manly’ imperialist boys represented in the works of Kipling.

Kipling gives glimpses of a new type of story in Stalky & Co (1899) that is distinguished from the existing examples written in the mid-nineteenth century. In his stories, Kipling's heroes appear as Britain's empire-builders, which, arguably, are drawn from an archetype, in Rutherford's words, as he writes, "The imaginary Englishman with
his stiff upper lip and masterly control over world affairs (…) in the years between 1870 and the outbreak of the First World War" (12). Being actively involved in the construction of an imperial identity, these imperialist stories were written for boys to subversively reject the ideals of the traditional, accessible school-stories as can be read in Hughes' *Tom Brown's Schooldays* and Farrar's *Eric*. These new imperialist stories reify 'manliness,' which Rutherford suggests is "no longer dependent upon soul-searching, but upon subordination to the national ideal" (14).

As Bratton suggests, the public school story reader was not accustomed to read boys who were cunning and subversive to the school rules in boys’ books, “which normally seek to reassure the reader that he can do his bit perfectly well by being a decent average sort of chap, as long as he internalizes the values offered him completely” (84). By the end of the century, Stalky and his friends appear antithetical to the obedient, class-conscious, and virtuous mid-Victorian heroes. Although it is difficult to suggest that Stalky, M’Turk, and Beetle are not virtuous at all, the origin of their virtue is based on the qualities of bravery, and of national more than a Christian foundation. When Robert H. MacDonald also asserts that “there is a noticeable shift during the period 1892-1914, from moral issues to social issues, from the need to keep young boys ‘pure’ and manly to a concern for patriotism and good citizenship” (519), love for Christianity is replaced by nurturing love for one’s own country.

Rudyard Kipling’s *Stalky & Co* published in 1899 with a collection of short stories which are set at an English boarding school in a seaside town on the North Devon coast makes a sharp contrast with the coarseness and virility of the boys as well as their cleverness at the United Services College (USC). As in *Eric*, while the school is
presented as bad, boys in Kipling’s novel surpass their educators with their being clever (Bristow 75). At the end of the first story, “Stalky”, Stalky and his two friends, “shock-headed and spectacled” Beetle and M’ Turk, “the son of an Irish baronet”, stay out all day long and return to school late. However, they fool the school Sergeant and their House-master with their own story of the “cows waiting to be milked” (25). Similarly, when they intend to become members of the Natural History Society, none of them really respects the interest of the group in “first-flowerings, early butterflies, and new arrivals” (29) nor become proud of their membership. However, their enrollment to the club was important to gain more freedom to wander practically where they choose in the interests of science. Ironically, when Hartopp, the President of the club, who is acquainted with their bad fame, believes that his acceptance of their membership will help those “sinners” to repent, his thinking sounds very naïve and Evangelical.

The disrespectful attitudes of Staky, M’ Turk, and Beetle toward any authority in school remind one of Eric’s rebellious and disobedient manners in Farrar’s novel. Nevertheless, while Eric repents for his bad development in the interests of Roslyn and the inadequacy of the masters’ power of a good influence over the students, “Kipling celebrates the assertive individualism of his boys” (Bristow 75). As opposed to Dr. Arnold’s effect on Tom Brown, the teachers’ interaction with the boys in Kipling’s school is based on fear, violence, punishment, and lack of trust. For instance, the school Sergeant’s business was “to wear tennis-shoes, carry binoculars, and swoop hawk-like upon evil boys” (29) as if he is hunting his quarry. In the light of Farrar and Arnold’s educational theories Kipling heroes can easily be categorized as immoral and spiritually
low boys who are unsuitable to be heroes. “In Ambush”, when all of the boys build huts in the furze-hill behind the College Stalky, Beetle, and M’ Turk likened to beavers build up a summer place, “a place of retreat and meditation” for their own likes: smoking. Moreover, they were not only smoking but also cursing and acting violently among themselves. Different from Tom and Eric’s friendship, Stalky kicks Beetle “by etiquette of their friendship, [and] this was no more than a formal notice of dissent from a proposition” (13).

Participating in the establishment of order out of school, these boys stand on their own resisting any authority they find doing wrong. In one of their adventures, when these three boys trespass an Irish estate owner’s land, the interesting conversation between Colonel G. M. Dabney, J. P. and M’ Turk refers to a power of speech and resistance originating from an upper-class privileges. Referring to the housekeeper for shooting the foxes, M’ Turk criticizes Colonel Dabney for allowing such a thing “worse than murder” and questions his rule while emphasizing the fact that “a ma-an ought to say once and for all how he stands about preservin’ (…) because there’s no legal remedy” (35). The rest of the conversation is carried between “one gentleman [and] another”, or “one man [and] another” (36). The stress on that M’ Turk was a gentleman, a landed man before he recognized himself as a student at college draws attention to the mixture of class and patriotism. Bristow construes M’ Turk interference as “a point emphasized in many places in the novel- Stalky & Co are by rights members of a class that is, with or without a public-school education, naturally suited to managing the employment of others” (77).
In the lives of these boys a service for the empire takes precedence over the rules of a school.

There is a discrepancy between the classes Kipling’s boy and Hughes’ Tom Brown belong to. Although M’ Turk is a land owner, his Irish identity undermines his position in the British society as well as repositions him as a stranger to Britain. As opposed to the upper levels of the society from whom colonial administrators and officers in the army and navy are chosen by the graduates of Rugby and Roslyn, Kipling’s boys directly serve in the army as soldiers or leaders in command of military units. In *Victorian Writers and the Image of Empire*, Laurence Kitzan asserts that *Stalky & Co* “does set forward Kipling’s adventurers’ canon, and bit by bit it weaves a picture of the place of the adventurer in the larger scheme of the British Empire” (153). Hence, as adventure story as a genre supersedes school stories, the school-boy gains a new identity as adventurer who will constitute “the raw material of empire” (Kitzan 153). In the last story of the book, “Slaves of the Lamp II”, while the reader confronts the active participation of these boys who serve for the future of the empire as officers in different colonies, another undercurrent reality that the reader is made aware becomes the inevitability of death. Although these adventurers are destined to die young in the service of the British Empire, the last story, in particular, replete with violent war scenes and references to the death of soldiers during military sieges can still shock the reader. Nevertheless, death is faced and dealt with quite calmly by these adventurers in the story. Kitzan explains the familiarity of death as it becomes a “frequent visitor in the imperial adventure stories because, of necessity, they occupied violent settings in violent times, and war and skirmishes of war,
and criminal activities and the vagaries of nature so often carried death as the inevitable passenger that the presence of death seldom needed comment” (136). Stalky’s cleverness in using the dead body of Everett who was shot through the temple in a watch-tower as a way to the passage he opened into an underground granary cellar-room below the watch-tower (286) during a war exemplifies such a coldness and estrangement these boys can have against the reality of death.

What kind of characteristics defines an imperial adventurer? Stalky marks the book with his heroism, courage, and military successes on the frontiers of British India. His physical fitness is visible when he is “about seven feet high and four feet thick” (281). In addition to the glorification of his physical force, his cleverness signaled throughout the book presents him as an ideal and “useful type of adventurer for the empire to have” (Kitzan 153). In “Slaves of Lamp II”, Stalky emerges “in a greasy, bloody old poshteen, squatting on the ground, eating with his men” as a commander of Sikh troops in one of the colonies (284). His troops and two other officers from the old school find themselves surrounded by Khye-Kheens and Malots, two tribes that were “ancestral enemies” back home and that do not trust each other at all (285). Taking advantage of the strife between each other, Stalky takes his Sikhs out of the fort and into the hills into a position from which they can lob shots at one tribe in such a way that the shots appear to be coming from the other tribe (Kitzan 154). Thus, when two tribes end up attaching one another and ignore the British forces, which save Stalky and his Sikhs from besiege. As the image of new adventurers is eulogized, Kitzan discusses the ideology which is a useful, yet ultimately pernicious one: “the defense of the homeland ultimately depended on those
boys who carried their well-developed sense of fun and adventure into the adult world and used it to punish all those who were foolish enough to provoke England, or in some way threaten parts of her empire” (155).

In addition to the threat originated in the colonies, domesticity and female influence emerge as other sources that are likely to enfeeble the power of manly boys and the imperial empire. The following chapter looks at the precautions, such as the representative power of domestic models in literature, which try to mitigate the male fear of losing the demarcation between gender formations and women’s possible feminizing effect on the public domain.
Chapter 4: Girls’ Books for Domestic Endeavourers and Future Mothers

The characteristics of girls’ literature and the Victorian appropriation of the Romantic construction of the child for formation of women

Girls’ literature provides a narrative model different from its masculine counterpart in boys’ literature as a response to the construction of a female subjectivity approved by the Victorian “parents, guardians, educationists, critics and even publishers” (Reynolds 93) who controlled the reading materials for girls. Once separate literary forms of existence in children’s literature are recognized, one should examine the reasons why the creation of a special literature for girls was seen necessary and one should also explore the ways in which a separate gender-based literature was considered to be ideologically relevant and accurate.

In Girls’ Only, Kimberley Reynolds notes that when “there were no more than handbooks for good behavior loosely held together by an unexciting story” for girls (93), girls preferred to read their brother’s books, whose stories saturate the boy reader with a culture of imperialism and imperialist heroism based on physical strength and adventure. What might happen if a girl desired to occupy a male subject position depicted in boys’ fiction? In other words, what might happen if she emulated masculine manners and in turn started to resist the pre-established female roles and approved images of femininity?
The model for femininity associated with the Victorian cult of domesticity was focused on girl/woman into the family life as “the Angel in the House”. For continued female identification with the Victorian image of the ideal woman, a body of literature written for girls and governed by social, political, and sexual anxieties was necessary and practical after literature itself was seen as an ideological tool by the governing class and publishing forces. Wolfgang Iser’s article, “Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach”, has been considered and used by various scholars as a primary source for understanding and explaining the ways in which language inculcate a certain ideology into the child reader through a gendered juvenile literature. Iser’s theory describes the reading process as an interaction between a text and a reader, where the convergence of both as complimentary components brings the literary text into existence for the reader during the reading activity (Iser 274). In his influential book Language and Ideology in Children’s Fiction, John Stephens, whose major focuses are on the ideology of text and discourse analysis in children’s literature, also refers to Iser’s argument when reader actively involves in reading and is transformed by means of different subject positions and gaps s/he fills within the text: the reader “leaves her own subjectivity to identify the subjectivity of the [fictive] character” with “the ideological position of the implied reader” that each text offers to its reader (Stephens 55).

The possibility of girls’ resistance to conventional literary models and a perceived autonomy of girls were threatening to the ruling middle class and publishers of Evangelical ideology because of presenting a danger to the domestic roles and prevalent notions of femininity girls need to be inculcated. Girls, on the one hand, needed to be
provided with entertainment and exciting books as their brothers did. Their entertainment, on the other hand, needed to be distinguished from boys’ entertainment and also needed to be regulated so that girls would be reading appropriate female models and roles. When a desire for entertainment forms the source of girls’ resistance, the term *entertainment* makes a contrast with the passive female roles in girls’ conduct books that do not appeal to the girl readers.

In the mid-nineteenth century, stories and books written for girls ranged from courtesy books, manuals, and girls’ school stories to domestic novels (Mitchell 4). In *What Katy Read* in which Shirley Foster and Judith Simons examine the roots of children’s classics and how these classics function in shaping the role models for boys and girls, they define the characteristics of fictional narratives for girls through “two important literary influences, the Evangelical tract and the sentimental/domestic novel” (Foster 5). In the late eighteenth century, Evangelical fiction, whose well-known examples were written by Mary Martha Sherwood, was a type of religious fiction with a focus on one’s own sin, spiritual weakness and, in return, the recognition of God’s benevolence and salvation (Nelson 11).

As discussed in Chapter 2, the identity formation for girls becomes the Romantic re-interpretation and re-adaptation of the Evangelical approach to children as spiritual identities. The Evangelical stress on soul, moral superiority, and altruism and the Romantic innocence and segregation serve to shape the domestic Victorian ideal. The contributing ideology that also reinforces the class status quo overlaps with a contributing force that justifies the female subordination. When religious tracts that intend to
indoctrinate children with the necessity of higher morality formed the majority of children’s books in English, the primary, yet the solitary, concern in these texts was, as Reynolds emphasizes, to “provide sufficient reading skills to allow the mass of the population to spell out the Bible” and to improve the work-force of the working-class through basic literacy skills (3). Apart from the moral objective of teaching literacy to the working-class, the fervor for Christian doctrine converged with a ruling middle-class desire for a control in the face of social, economic, and political inequality. It was expected that the working-class children who “learn to read the Bible [will] embrace its tenets of humility, submissiveness, and patience” (Vallone 73), which in overall veiled the ideological program which aims to “reinforce the status quo while reforming the morals of the poor” (79).

Evangelical Movement, its leaders in the Clapham Sect, the Religious Tract Society, as well as the mass of upper-class believers form a Child as an “audience created not for its reflection of vigor or health, but for its perceived weakness and efficiency” (Vallone 74). Domestic novels of the late-nineteenth century seem to reject the hegemony of the religious didacticism dominant in earlier evangelical books due to the weakening political influence of Evangelicalism. As being said in Guardians of the Children, David Grylls, for instance, notes the relative loss of an adult authority, adult wisdom, and adult power on children along with an entertaining focus in children’s literature. Nevertheless, he also draws attention that in reality “didacticism survived, but it did not maintain its pre-eminence, [instead] it was subverted by notions of democracy, by the deliquescence of Christian dogma, and by a boom in publishing that extended the range of
commercially attractive alternative modes” (93). Gryll’s emphasis on the instructive tone of didacticism “held on more tenaciously in the domestic story for girls” (97) in the nineteenth century is important to reveal the focus of this study.

In a genre where boys’ adventure and girls’ domestic stories were written to be read by children according to their sex, a more covert didacticism, then, operates in terms of constructing masculinity and femininity which will enforce the imperial characteristic of the British Empire separately. While the male child was associated with a future established in culture, the civilized adult world, and adventures out of borders, female child was singled out by her innocence and her ultimate segregation from civilization. What was expected to be attained by the female child was an association with the Romantic child innocence. While this image was no longer valid for boys’ identity formation, the Romantic construction of child was appropriated only for the formation of women. A concise argument is provided in Judith Plotz’ article, titled “’One Shape, One Feature, and One Size’: Romanticism and the Quintessential Child”. Plotz indicates that romantics discovered childhood in a very colonialist attitude when “throughout the great nineteenth-century age of geographic colonization, this new continent of childhood is also named, mapped, explored, and colonized” (Plotz 2). Essentializing the child appears as a distinguishing characteristic of the Romantic discourse which is “intelligible, self-consistent, and effective at producing a Quintessential Child who figures powerfully in Golden Age children’s literature” (4). Romantic ideology creates a child independent from time, gender, and class associations. Plotz indicates that “this essential timeless figure is principally produced by two initiatives: the identification of childhood with
Nature and the attribution to children of an autonomous, unitary consciousness” (5). When the new image of childhood is defined both physically (bodily) and mentally, the entire interpretation of the child is based on the establishment of child’s autonomy that grows out of their being different from adults. Bodily, the child is repositioned in the midst of nature, having no material link with culture and society. While child was imaginative and natural, having intuitive mental faculties, adulthood meant to grow into rationality (21). Moreover, the essentialized Child, who is elevated over culture, “is set up as a sanctuary or bank vault of valuable but socially-endangered psychological powers: idealism, holism, vision, animism, faith, and isolated self-sufficiency” (13). The Romantic identification of the child had characteristics common to the Evangelical child who was spiritual, selfless, and segregated from the material life. However, the main difference was the Romantic interpretation of the child who was good, innocent, and creative by birth. The child’s mental powers were also unitary and not deformed by any physical conditions (14). Looking for a childhood which was organic, abstracted from culture, and isolated (5), Romantics believed that “children [were] unifiers”, thinking synthetically rather than analytically like adults do in culture (15). Moreover, comparative analytic thinking is believed to be violating “the natural development of a young mind and is both psychologically and morally damaging” while disrupting the “the temporary loss of the self, or the absorption of the self” (17).

Different from the Evangelical child whose selflessness is an indication of self-sacrifice and spirituality, Romantics empower the child’s individuality and solitary existence. During the Victorian age, the categorization of the Child supplants the
categorization of the ideal woman who is expected to be devoted and submissive to male-governed domesticity. Affected by the values of middle-class, the prize mental qualities and intellectual skills of the Romantic child that are maintained in “self-sufficient isolation” (Plotz 22) are appropriated to female moral attitudes. Angelhood and/or childhood are romanticized for the female child whose segregation from the adult/male world keeps her pure. In this respect, a passage to adulthood, normally, appears as an unwanted situation for a child from the romantic’s perspective. However, keeping children in their places, or depicting them in nature, overlaps with the ideology of separate sphere where woman’s passage from private to publish sphere is undesirable.

The gendered division of spaces is open to criticism by means of today’s theoretical lenses in the sense that the hierarchy between two spheres is considered today to be constructed when roles, appreciation of values, and tools for self-expression are shared unequally based on sex. When Nelson asserts that “the development of children’s fiction is best viewed in tandem with the development of adult ideas of childhood, which in turn has much in common in the nineteenth century with the development of ideas of true womanhood” (6), she draws attention to the common characteristics used to describe both childhood and womanhood in terms of moral superiority, innocence, and separation from the adult world. Although the Romantic image of the child is a phenomenon primarily of the early 19th century, we see that it was already in place and ready to be exploited silently as part of the dominant ideology of childhood by the Victorian era, in particular the female childhood (Nelson 21).
The Romantic image of childhood and the idea of childhood innocence which vitalize the bond between child and nature, and their separation from the industrial society are interpreted in a way that the “notions of original sin” is challenged and replaced by “suggesting spiritual origins” in the nineteenth-century (Thacker 19). Moreover, this is appropriated for female integration into the separate sphere as part of which girls’ literature serves to secure the emotional or psychological development of the heroine and depicts “the heroine’s growth to ideal womanhood” in the domestic sphere (Foster and Simons 5). In Take Up Thy Bed and Walk, Lois Keith’s emphasis on the fact that “faith, specifically Christian faith, was still central to the novels of this period, and the belief that God is good and had the power to heal went mostly unchallenged” (Keith 70) points to the ethos of Christian belief preserved in the body of woman with reference to purity, innocence, and spirituality.

The rest of the chapter includes analyses of the girls’ books, What Katy Did, The Secret Garden, A Sweet Girl Graduate, and The Railway Children. These books refer to a variety of content and genre within girls’ literature. While What Katy Did can be interpreted as an example of the sentimental/domestic type, A Sweet Girl Graduate typifies the narrative structure of the girls’ school stories. On the other hand, both The Secret Garden and The Railway Children can be considered as examples of girls’ adventure stories; the only difference is that the former is an early and the latter is a late example of this genre. Considering the publishers’ and writers’ primary intention behind creating a literature for girls only who need to be kept away from entertaining boys’ books, one should not be deceived by the space allocated for girls’ adventures in these stories. These stories, in reality, intend to guarantee the proper female socialization at
home as mothers or wives. Throughout the analyses, I will indicate that even though the plot seems to vary in girls’ stories, the end does not vary: starting from the middle or toward the end of the book, the nature of the girl “hero” starts to be corrected, if she is too boyish, or she is allowed to have adventures which are domesticated. Although girls seem to be given some freedom in the stories written for them, the gardens, houses, or even the boarding schools for girls present an illusionary independence and create (the feeling of) enclosure that evokes the romantic interpretation of childhood appropriated to the construction of femininity.

*What Katy Did*

*What Katy Did*, published originally in 1872, was written by Sarah Chauncey Woolsey under the penname Susan Coolidge. Coolidge’s story serves as a good example for the domestic genre in terms of depicting emotional and psychological development of Katy, the main character, at a domestic setting. It is a story of the Carr family where Katy is the eldest of the six Carr children, at the age of 12. Throughout the book, the succession of events and conversations prepare Katy for a mother role that she will be socially and psychologically transformed in the last chapter. Although it is written after the mid-nineteenth century, the story carries some of the Christian attributes associated with evangelical tract and a didactic narrative voice which keeps “establishing the work’s ethical orientation” through the narrator’s comments on the moral accuracy of the children’s manners (Foster and Simons 112).
At the beginning of the story Katy appears as an active, plucky girl, spending her time by running, playing, and getting dirty out in the garden or at school. Katy’s initial portrayal as a naughty, talkative, and recalcitrant child who has no interest in either physical beauty or her clean clothes undermines her femininity as a girl child. The life she lives with her aunt, her sisters and brothers, and her far-away father was quite ego-centric, pleasure-driven, and adventure oriented. When the reader does not expect her to conform to the traditional gender roles, the accident that leaves her crippled for four years changes the thematic emphasis of the book, indicating the necessity of her social, physiological, and physical development towards a Victorian ideal woman, or a romantic girl figure.

Her maturation towards motherhood contradicts her real motivations mentioned early in the story, such as writing/telling stories, traveling abroad, doing heroic deeds, and indulging in adventures. However, this move is functional in the sense that her development will be conceived by its girl readers in such a way that Katy’s progress will engage the reader’s imagination when the girl reader try to understand her social roles in the society. Katy was interested in heroism achieved by courage, strength, and outdoor adventures. However, her real intentions were ironically misinterpreted by the narrator who criticizes Katy for being a failure as “a comfort to [Elsie, Katy’s sister]” (Coolidge 6). Nevertheless, in conformity with the gender roles and feminine conduct Katy becomes the source of comfort for the whole family as a transformed mother figure, the narrator’s wish-fulfillment, at the end of the book. The didacticism of the text, then, can be
summarized in reference to Claudia Nelson’s words: “the superiority of selfless feminine heroism over flamboyant male courage” (23).

Katy’s heroism and her interpretation of adventures remind us the masculine and national ideals of the boys’ world. When Katy and Clover go to Mrs. Knight’s school, the author heralds the constant feud raged between two schools, Mrs. Knight's school and Miss Miller's school, whose girls emerge quite destructive for the Romantic child image. Contrary to the innocence a child is believed to own, the contention between the girls of two schools is so bloody that “it was hardly hard safe for a Knight to meet a Millerite [the Miller girls] in the street” (18). When her sun-bonnet flies away to the Miller’s garden, Katy visualizes the whole scene where Miller girls start “dancing war-dances round the unfortunate bonnet, pinning it on a pole, using it as a football, waving it over the fence, and otherwise treating it as Indians treat a captive taken in war” (20). Motivated to partake in a war against “the Other”, which is incarnated by violent, uncivilized, and vulgar Miller girls, Katy climbs over the board, saves the bonnet which also symbolizes her class status in the society, and manages to return “alive from the camp of the enemy” (21). As part of a national discourse, when her return from an adventure in an exotic and dangerous garden was welcomed by a group of vociferous Knight girls, “it was a great day for the school, as day to be remembered” in the history (21).

Katy’s fall from the swing and her physical punishment in terms of being paralyzed for four years project both the diminishing, yet still valid, influence of the earlier Evangelical tract. When Aunt Izzie forbids children to swing, she does not explain why they must not. Even when the narrator acknowledges that "this was unwise of Aunt Izzie
[and] it would have been better had she explained further" (78) it is obvious that the Aunt Izzie did not even think of the possibility that any of the children will disobey her authority. Nelson singles out the most important characteristic of the early nineteenth-century fiction in terms of children’s ‘obedience’ to the adult world which represents the unquestioned ideal: “children who insist on having their own way, or on taking their own way behind their parents’ backs, invariably live- or often, do not live- to regret it” (7). As an appropriate Evangelical move, Katy regrets her disobedience to Aunt Izzie for four years as lying motionless on bed or sitting on her chair at the end of her sickness.

In the absence of Mrs. Carr, one of the female models offered to Katy was Aunt Izzie, the first surrogate mother for the Carr children. Mrs. Carr dies long before the story begins. Although Mrs. Carr is a dead mother figure, "Katy could remember her pretty well; [yet] to the rest she was but a sad, sweet name, spoken on Sunday, and at prayer-times, or when Papa was specially gentle and solemn" (2). It is interesting that motherly love needs to be in control of patriarchal discourse, whether it is a male-headed conversation or an institution such as church. At the end of the book, Katy will fill in the absence of Mrs. Carr’s absence as a substitute mother. On the other hand, although Aunt Izzie is not the favorite of the narrator, it is evident that the narrator feels sympathy towards her for fulfilling the traditional female roles. For the aunt figures in the Victorian novels, Kimberley Reynolds asserts that “unable to find husbands for themselves, these ‘odd women’ become dependent on relations and have to justify their presence by energetic demonstrations of domestic utility” (96). Similar to Reynolds’ portrayal, Aunt Izzie cleans the house all day long, washes children’s dirty clothes, and keeps the house tidy, working like a domestic worker who lives within the employer’s (Dr. Carr)
household. Besides, she also symbolizes the traditional Evangelical values: “The good boys and girls in Sunday-school memoirs” were “the young person she liked best, and understood the most about” (3). Her real satisfaction was based on the establishment of her authority on children when they all "sit in their chairs and learn the Bible verse for the day" right before the breakfast (3). However, neither the Carr children nor almost anyone else expresses Aunt Izzie's value until she dies.

The construction of the female identity as a mother in Katy not only gives salvation from her irrational and disobedient childish manners but also restores the Carr family whose attributes violates the traditional family image and gender constructions. Dr. Carr, the father and the patriarch of the family, typifies a far-away father figure who is away from home all day and sometime all night. Although he is a doctor, the narrator describes his profession as "taking care of sick people" (2). Since it is a book written for children, a simplification in language will be understandable but it may also refer to the feminine side of Dr. Carr who embodies a more agreeable, friendly, and less authoritative and punitive patriarchal order at home. When “he wished to have the children hardy and bold, and encouraged [their] climbing and rough plays, in spite of the bumps and ragged clothes which resulted" (3), he appears more like a modern father figure. Nevertheless, even if he has adherence to feminine roles, his male identity as the breadwinner of the family makes him work out and do the male work.

The book can also be dealt with in terms of child-adult relationship and the amount of freedom given to the child. The Carr children have unrestricted childhood while occupying different physical spaces such as home, garden, and school. With reference to
this attribute of the Coolidge’s story, Foster and Simons distinguish American juvenile texts from British children stories in terms of allowing “their heroines a considerable degree of freedom, certainly in a social and physical sense” (109). In addition to time spent at home and in the garden, the school that Katy attends also reinforces the idea of freedom and escape from the adult gaze when it "stood quite at the other end of the town from Dr. Carr's" (17). While Foster and Simons emphasize “the originality and appeal of Coolidge’s work [from other contemporary writers’ works] in its exploration of juvenile behaviour isolated from direct contact with adults” it is also important to indicate the temporary “illusion of a free world of youthful experience” (Foster and Simons 107).

This retirement of Katy from the adventurous school and outer life that she used to share with the other Carr children can be considered as a relinquishment of the material world for the sake of her “moral pilgrimage” in Foster and Simons’ term. Her moral pilgrimage begins by her disobedience to the adult authority, and is reinforced by her ‘fall’, Cousin Helen’s visit, the resurrection of her feminine self. When Foster and Simons underline that “the story literally reproduces the traditional Christian patterning of fall after sin, succeeded by a gradual painful rise to a transformed selfhood” (111), motherhood becomes the ultimate transformation Katy needs to go through as a female.

By the Victorian era, this transition from childhood to adulthood was seen to be an inevitable stage in a child’s life. Cousin Helen’s visit to Dr. Carr’s house during Katy’s school vacation alters Katy’s approach to life and her understanding of her selfhood. Cousin Helen, who is presented as the favorite of the narrator, symbolizes the characteristics of the Angel in the house figure in terms of self-control, self-sacrifice, and
selflessness of a woman. For Dr. Carr, Cousin Helen was “half an angel already, and love[d] other people better than herself”. This was a perfect example for Katy as a woman. As Cousin Helen’s “preminent Angelic quality, the power to influence others for good,” (Nelson 6) starts to rule Katy, she loses her individuality, creativity, and egocentrism. Her servitude to Cousin Helen on her bed, as she shakes her pillow or embellishes her breakfast tray with flowers, replaces her creativity used earlier for literary works. During her illness, we see that her stories written for her own interest are superseded by her poems written according to the recipients’ taste as a Christmas gift to the children. Her outside adventures are channeled back home where her only concerns become cooking, preparing the list for dinner, and sewing. When her "brownish pig-tails were pinned up into a round knot, and the childish face has gained almost a womanly look" (127)", her walk down the stairs on the birthday of her mother completes her development in conformity with the ideal womanhood and she becomes “The Heart of the [Victorian] house” at the end of the book (148).

The Secret Garden

Frances Hodgson Burnett’s The Secret Garden (1911) is the story of Mary Lennox who was born in colonial India and describes her as “the most disagreeable-looking child ever seen” (Burnett 7). The story, as well as Mary’s “contrariness”, develops as this ten-year-old girl who becomes an orphan in India, starts to live in her uncle’s house on the Yorkshire moors, and discovers her hysterical male cousin at Misselthwaite Manor and a garden, locked for ten years. In “Gardens, Houses, and Nurturant Power in The Secret Garden”, when Phyllis Bixler underlines Burnett’s "use of pastoral imagery to symbolize
the children's physical and psychological healing” (Bixler 208), the secret garden as the main setting of the novel is presented with its healing effect on Mary Lennox and Colin Craven, Mary’s cousin. It is true that the reawakening of the secret garden after a ten year sleep heralds the reinvigoration of Mary and Colin’s physical health, energy and robustness. However, while the psychological healing signifies the reestablishment of motherhood in Mary it also restores patriarchal authority in Colin. Moreover, the revitalization of the traditional gender roles is once again shaped at an intersection of imperialism, gender, class, and race.

As a disagreeable child, Mary shows contrary attributes that will undermine her place as a female in the Victorian society. Mary’s development from a disagreeable child image to an agreeable one who can receive and, in return, give love, and who can talk to and establish friendship with other people is achieved by her relocation to England and finalized by her constructing an identity based on the “female nurturant power” of motherhood at the end of the book (Bixler 209). The influence of the colonies on the female, or the identification of women with colonies, is significant in the text. When the narrator approves other people’s statements on how unamiable looking Mary has, she reveals Mary’s “little thin body, thin light hair and a sour expression” as well as her yellowness (7). The early reference to her yellow face and her sick body because of the fact that she was born in India indicates Burnett’s implication of the colonial effect on Mary. However apart from this colonial corruption, her disagreeableness was not only restricted with her appearance but she also demonstrates unpleasant manners and a spoilt nature. Actually, from being a baby to a toddler, Mary is depicted as a sickly, fretful, ugly
child who is implanted with an inner anger, which does not fit in the Romantic child image.

Both India and her parent’s ignorance of Mary work antithetical to the isolation romantics believe to be necessary for a child. In contrary, Mary’s disagreeableness in *The Secret Garden* stems from her abandonment as a child in India. Similar to the neglect of colonized inhabitants she is completely ignored by her parents. We are informed that Mrs. Lennox neither wanted to have a little girl nor desired to see Mary in her view and nearly no one in her own social circle ever knew that she had a little girl. Thus, the primary task of the Indian servants was to “keep the child out of sight as much as possible” (7). Even when she moves into her uncle’s house, keeping her out of the adult’s way becomes a routine. As a result of this isolation, Mary develops a disagreeable character as a lonely, violent, selfish, and self-centered child having no commitment to anyone, even to her own parents. Her wild approach to her servants and her nanny who she kicks, beats, and utters curses contradicts the Romantic innocent child image with an innate goodness.

As Daphne Kutzer asserts, Mary's initial “yellowness [which] is associated with physical illness and perhaps also moral illness . . . links Mary to the exotic East, to India, and marks her as an outsider not only to Misselthwaite, but to England as a whole" (58). While Burnett does not also present her Indian image as a reliable and fixed identity, the desire to emphasize her Englishness remains as an undercurrent theme from the outset. While Mary’s “yellow face” represents her colonial self; her “yellow hair” always reveals her western origin and her Englishness. The restoration of the English self was important
for Mary to adopt the Victorian domestic womanhood. The distribution of the imperial roles requires different gender formations. On the one hand, Mary learns the hierarchical relationship with the servants dominant at home. On the other hand, she was too aggressive, egocentric, and disagreeable to be a female who could fit in the Victorian domesticity. Within the imperial context, the issues of class and race are structured intertwiningly. When there is an emphasis on the British hegemony in India grounded on the natives’ being racially *The Other*, a similar hierarchical dominance is established through class differences in England (Kutzer 60). The relationship between Martha and Mary instructs Mary in how to be a colonial mistress.

Mary’s journey from India to England starts with a new identity: having no family left, she becomes an orphan. Then, why does she need such a transformation? What is functional about being an orphan? In *Victorian Heroines*, Kimberley Reynolds and Nicola Humble emphasize the role of incorporating girls as orphans into Victorian novel such as, “The independence the orphan-convention lends to its heroines is allowable precisely because it is controlled by the narrative processes of the texts in which it occurs- almost invariably the narrative moves to remedy the orphan’s lack: to find lost parents or to supply surrogates or spouses to provide the missing family structure” ((K. a. N. H. Reynolds 27). Then, before a family structure is constructed, orphanhood indicates a time period when an orphan stands against the conventional image of women with her radical and uncompromising attitudes. However, Reynolds and Humble also note that the manners of orphan-heroines do not become threatening in terms of the established Victorian gender roles since “ultimately the orphan conforms to traditional expectations
and so never directly seems to incite those who are not orphans to radical behaviour” (30). In Mary’s case, this points to restoring the traditional gender roles as well as the Victorian family structure in her uncle’s house.

In order to stay under the surveillance of her guardian, Uncle Archibald Craven, Mary returns back to England. England does not seem very different from India in terms of its decadency in the Craven family. Mrs. Craven is dead and Mr. Craven cannot fulfill his father roles, instead he appears as a distant patriarch. Mr. Craven’s crushing depression ever since the death of his wife, aggrandized by his suffers from a crooked spine victimizes his own son, Colin as well as imprisons Colin in his own hunchback image. For the fear of seeing his own son growing in a distorted body, similar to his, and of a possible emotional and mental breakdown he can have at an encounter of his son due to his resemblance to her mother, Archibald spends most of his time abroad. Even during the times he is home, he prefers to see his son when he is at sleep. His confession to Mary that he does not “know anything about children” (112) foreshadows his own situation with his son. However, Mr. Craven driven by his own fears does not do anything to better his communication and overcome these obstacles. A female existence (Mary) will be instrumental to heal the father-son relationship. There appears precisely a series of superimposed oppositions that Mary must mediate. When she becomes the stabilizing figure in the family triad, Mary, Colin, and Mr. Craven, she helps Colin gain his male identity and masculine power in the garden.

Mary’s curiosity and exploration of the garden becomes the keystone for the restoration of the traditional family structure and Kutzer finds this process relevant for
Mary who “must play at colonizing and domesticating the wild garden in order that she may recolonize herself in English ways. (...) In attempting to resurrect the garden, she resurrects her English self”. Her approach towards the (secret) garden symbolizes her romantic isolation from the material world as a female. That garden was “her new kingdom” (79) whose “beautiful old walls shut her in no one knew where she was” (86). Although the inspiration of her imagination based on fairy tale images may grow passivity and helplessness of a fairy tale queen in Mary, she gives the signals for subversion of this passivity by suggesting that she has “no intention of going to sleep” (86). Instead, she becomes wider awake with the slightest idea of the garden. Nevertheless, how long can she manage to keep the garden safe for herself?

The vulnerability of Mary’s new kingdom is framed by the issue of keeping and disclosing secrets. Her acknowledgement that she has “stolen a garden” (96) during her conversation with Dickon foreshadows the absent Mrs. Craven whose soul and body is identified with the garden throughout the novel and Master Colin who will be announcing his rule over the garden once he learns the garden. The idea that she would be all alone, inventing her own games and playing them in the garden without giving any notice to anyone was the compelling motivation for finding out the garden. She owns the garden so much that she finds something that belongs to her in this lonely place where everything is shut up and deserted. From a contrary situation when she did not feel owned by any one, the tone of a possessive language she uses for the garden gives glimpses of the changes in her disagreeable character.
Among several feminist critiques on *The Secret Garden*, Elizabeth Lennox Keyser puts forward in “‘Quite Contrary’: Frances Hodgson Burnett’s The Secret Garden”, that "as Mary ostensibly "improves," her role in the book diminishes, and she loses for the reader her main appeal; instead, the other "thoroughly unattractive" child, Master Colin, increasingly gains the center of the stage" (Keyser 2). Being attractive according to adults’ and social norms indicates Mary’s loss in one of the central positions in the book, and a sacrifice in her power and independent character. Even though there are two male children in the book and Dickon is the first person with whom Mary shares the knowledge of the garden, Mary serves Colin to overcome Dickon as a character and become the center, or next patriarch, of the garden at the end of the book.

Mary’s influence on Colin’s development throughout the book is evocative of a mother-son relationship which equips Colin with male roles while preparing him for the patriarchal responsibilities. Contrary to Dickon resembled to an Indian native who has power to charm animals, Colin is mainly likened to a young Indian Rajah who “had rubies and emeralds and diamonds stuck all over him” at the beginning (135). His rude and tyrannical approach to the servants and people around him aligns him with a Rajah whose commandments should be obeyed either voluntarily or involuntarily through violence. In this respect, his rule as a British imperialist who is supposed to govern the empire and colonies in ‘peace’ can be criticized. On the other hand, Colin is a spoilt, mentally sick, capricious child located in one of the rooms at Misselthwaite Manor. As the son of Dr. Craven, he will be inheriting the Manor and it was his right to be the next patriarch as an upper-class white British male while Dickon cannot be the next patriarch
since he is a working-class child while all his animals and manners identify him with nature. Dickon’s feminine attributes such as being “nurturant” (Bixler’s term) also outshines his physically strong, muscular body. When Mary follows one of the laurel-paths into the woods in search of rabbits, she hears an odd whistling sound and, following it, comes upon a boy playing a wooden pipe beneath one of the trees. For Colin, she hears cries as of a child weeping for several nights from her room and, in the end, follows the noise, discovers Colin. When Mary calls Colin “hysteric”, which is considered as a common feminine psychological disease in the Victorian period, he is also associated with a feminized character, but this feminizing effect on Colin appears quite artificial and is overcome by Mary’s visits to Colin in his room, which results in her being resembled to a nurse for Colin: Mary leans “against the bed and began to stroke and pat his hand and sing a very low little chanting song in Hindustani” (129). After Mary introduces the garden to Colin, he becomes significant in the distribution of work and giving orders. In the garden, Colin starts to do his daily activities to gain physical strength before he welcomes his father. In a sense, Mary transforms the secret garden into a space for Colin where he can restore his health, physical strength, robustness while getting rid of the sick, self-absorbed, and unmanly attitudes.

Although there are also several parallelisms between Mary and Colin’s lives, their future gender roles differ within the family and in the Empire. He was born in the same year in which Mary was born and the secret garden locked shut. They are both neglected children by their parents and spoilt by the authority given over the servants. They are both disagreeable through which Mary confronts Colin’s hysterical traumas and makes
him realize his own rudeness and believe that he does not have lump on his back. Another parallelism I would like to refer occurs between Colin and Katy (in *What Katy Did*) in terms of the imprisonment both have in a room due to their illnesses. Under the guidance of Cousin Helen, Katy's long year of schooling teaches her self-control and instructs her to deal with her discomforts patiently. As Helen recommend Katy to “be nice and sweet and patient, and a comfort to people” (96), Katy becomes “the center and sun” to all the other children in the family as “they all revolved about her, and trusted her for everything” (147). On the contrary, Colin frightens everyone with his disagreeableness and bad temper and his recovery to an active, robust, and masculine body differs from Katy’s which drags her more into passive wife/mother role.

At the last chapter of the book, when Mr. Craven returns to the moor, he gets surprised by the vision of children shouting, playing, and running in the garden. Finding Colin healthy and strong, Master Craven embraces her son. The last description of the book is very significant: when “his head up in the air and his eyes full of laughter walked as strongly and steadily as any boy in Yorkshire- Master Colin!” (276) as the heir of the Misselthwaite moor, England, Mary was depicted as a bystander embedded in invisibility and female passivity. As they, Mr. Craven, Dickon, Mary, and Colin, all go back home, we come to understand that the garden promising for her adventures at the beginning becomes a place where she fulfills her role as a female as a helper and a mother to the future Empire-ruler.
A Sweet Girl Graduate

While the list of books written for girls by the first decade of the twentieth century includes career books, holiday adventures, and advice manuals (Mitchell 1), school girl stories are another type of girls’ reading in addition to the sentimental/domestic and adventure novels in the mid-nineteenth century. What might be the reasons for the variety of content in girls’ books? As opposed to the obedient and Angel-like girls in the domestic novels, there emerges a countering trend in literature for girls, stories that permit a brief period of “freedom” before the girl must return, with regret, to the role of “dutiful daughter” (Mitchell 5) While making this point, Sally Mitchell argues that “between 1880 and 1915 both working-class and middle-class girls increasingly occupied a separate [girl] culture” whose values, rules, and desires are conditioned as a result of the changing social and political conditions in the lives of girls (3). Mitchell’s classification of the new girlhood refers to “a period of transition between ‘child at home’ and the assumption of wholly adult responsibilities” (3).

The introduction of compulsory education, the working age and hour regulations in child labor along with incorporating girls into higher education, and welcoming girls’ contribution to the family budget through their work exemplified noteworthy changes starting from the late nineteenth-century (Mitchell 3, Ruwe 212, Reynolds 55). For these reasons, a girl can neither properly fit the domestic child figure educated at home nor the female adult category as a wife in the domestic sphere: “the new girl-no longer a child, not yet a (sexual) adult” gains transitory freedom in-between these two identities (Mitchell 3).
The New Woman was a notion that feminist and women writers were debating in the early twentieth century. The New Women novel was a product of feminist novelists who wished to have and discuss the possibilities of “the same education and the same employment opportunities, the same rights of citizenship, and even the same access to sexual expression” in a patriarchal society (Richardson 13). The New Woman debate suggests reclamation of woman as a new category of identity, and The New Woman writer interprets different opportunities based on gender differences as “political differences and not merely natural” (Richardson 12). And, the wish to raise woman status and empower women is followed by writing new representation for woman. Girls’ stories presenting girls in colleges and boarding schools spring from a desire to regulate a new representation for girls. In the article “Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire”, Judith Butler makes the argument about how power produces subjects that are politically and socially represented in culture. The recognition, even the thought, of patriarchal power, reveals the production of a certain representation rooted in a binary thinking. Butler claims that although “some existing identity” has been the initiator of the interests in feminist theories for “a political representation [of women to be] pursued” (341), she emphasizes the controversial status of politics and representation:

On the one hand, representation serves as the operate term within a political process that seeks to extend visibility and legitimacy to women and political subjects; on the other hand, representation is the normative function of a language which is said either to reveal or to distort what is assumed to be true about the category of women (Butler 341).
Different representations of women and children in a power structure grounded in the operation of binary thinking should make us question the veracity of these representations. For instance, as in Romantic thought, where praising childhood and, in return, devaluing adulthood in a dualist western thinking raises the status of child to an extent where adults get inspired by a pure, imaginative, and isolated child image, women are equated with nature and are situated in a romantic segregation of the innocent. In *Black Feminist Thought*, Patricia Hill Collins explicates how binary thinking operates in terms of race and gender. Although she is mainly focused on the oppression of white patriarchy over black women, I want to use her description of the binary mechanism in understanding oppositional representations of child/adult, man/woman, and nature/culture. According to her, first, categorization of people and ideas occur in terms of their difference from one another (70). Secondly, “difference is defined in oppositional terms”, as nature and culture, child and adult become opposites to one another (Collins 70). At last, this oppositional difference is followed by domination and objectification through which “one element is objectified as *The Other*, and is viewed as an object to be manipulated and controlled” (70). In terms of *othering* in the context of British Empire, LeeAnne M. Richardson asserts that New Woman novels and the fiction of imperial adventure, which forms the body of boys’ stories, have much in common to contain the oppression of colonized people and subordination of women (14-5). However, although the colonial adventure makes the subjugation of the colonized seem necessary by presenting the natives uncivilized, and weak, the New Woman novel defies the same rationalization which is rooted in a vision of women as “fundamentally different from
men: purer, simpler, weaker, and requiring men’s tutelage, supervision, and protection” (13).

“The young counterpart [of the New Woman], ‘the girl of the period,’” (Reynolds 96) is shaped through the girls’ school stories, which are consumed widely by girls from different classes. What is so attractive in these stories? Although the 1880 compulsory elementary education for every child sets boundaries for “girlhood,” and enforces the working-class girl to work out of the home while channeling the middle-class girl back home, girls enjoy discovering an identifiable fictional world and reading a new construction of girlhood with non-traditional life choices before marriage (Mitchell 7). Many scholars of children literature discuss L. T. Meade, who “wrote voluminously, publishing close to 300 books during a forty-year writing career” (Reimer 199), in terms of her popularity for girls’ school stories and her managing Atalanta, a girls’ literary magazine. Although Atalanta aims to reach, as Mitchell suggest, an audience of upper-middle-class girl, it was also accessible in the public libraries to working and lower-middle-class girls (Mitchell 11).

Along with The New Woman reformers, her works and the content of her magazine portray girls with intellect and girls who are successful in using that knowledge in girls’ new place in higher education and employments. However, Reynolds approaches Meade’s writings more critically than Mitchell and suggests that the changing content of Atalanta shows the constraints put by the “publishers and a fix notion of what suited the girls’ market” (114). The number of romantic stories was increased (113) and jobs such as “teaching, lacework, embroidery, painting, and nursing” as the “traditionally ladylike
ways of earning money” were started to be promoted (114). On the other hand, with the introduction of compulsory education in 1880, schools became places where majority of children were not only discriminated according to their class status but also based on their gender. As an extension of the governmental adjustment, “stratification of books within the field of juvenile publishing follows, or perhaps responds to, divisions within the education system” (Reynolds 27) which presents separate syllabuses for girls and boys. Reynolds defines the Board School curriculum after 1870 as “increasingly organized along with sexist lines, with girls being taught domestic subjects such as home economics, sewing, cookery and child care, while boys were offered new options such as animal physiology, algebra, chemistry, and physics” (24). That is to say, girls’ education, differing from boys’ education both in subject and status, promotes a psychological and ideological division in terms of gender interest and manners. In Meade’s schools stories, as in *A Sweet Girl Graduate*, girls challenge those kinds of curriculums while studying a variety of classes as well as Greek and Latin, which we used to encounter in boys’ school stories.

The novel presents the same orphan image, as in *What Katy Did* and *The Secret Garden*, in L. T. Meade’s *A Sweet Girl’s Graduate*, where the heroine, Priscilla Penywern Peel, loses her parents when she is 12 and 14 respectively. As in *What Katy Did*, an aunt figure is once again replaced after the death of the mother and takes care of the rest of the family, Priscilla and the three little sisters. The Peel family was “a north-country folk” (Meade 34), who stood for the Christian ideals such as purity of soul, goodness, and avoidance of the material luxuries. When Mr. Peel lost all his savings of a
life due to a break in the bank where he kept his money, he could not survive with the shock of the loss. His death, or his loss, can be considered a defeat within the changing economic system of the century centered on money and exchange of goods. Mrs. Peel, on the other hand, died two years after her husband. Although we are not given any detail pertaining to her death, it is likely to be interpreted as an unavoidable fact of the new circumstances where a traditional, dependent mother who has neither income nor a husband is doomed to fail in survival.

As typical of aunt figures, she is another spinster in a Victorian novel. She differs from Aunt Izzie in *What Katy Did*, through new ways of representing a more powerful and ‘modern’ woman who works out of home, earning her own financial income. However, her so-called economic autonomy cannot liberate her from the embodiment of traditional female roles among which her “feminine ideal of service” (Mitchell 25) is emphasized. When the children go to Devonshire, Aunt Raby toils, “as perhaps no woman had ever toiled before, to put bread into their mouths” (35). Apparently, the narrator prizes Aunt Raby’s nurturing attitudes toward children, yet the emphasis on Priscilla’s “gift of acquiring knowledge” and sharing this knowledge with her sisters shows the writer’s interest on the importance of education for girls when “nobody [including Aunt Raby] thought about the children’s education” (35). Throughout the story, there are several incidents that remind Priscilla the important and practical aspect of education. The vulnerability of Aunt Raby’s earnings and the early implications for a prospective death makes Priscilla revise her situation as a female with the responsibility of taking care of her sisters. The susceptibility of shifts among classes and different life
opportunities based on class differences are evident in Priscilla’s situation. When Aunt Raby unexpectedly faints in the hayfield, her explanation for the reason why she wants to abandon her studies is very self-explanatory: Priscilla reveals her anxieties to Mr. Hayes as she “must learn money as soon as it is possible for a girl to do so [in order to be able to support Hattie, Rose, and Katie]” (37).

After Priscilla starts St. Benet’s far-famed college for women, her interest in Greek and Latin helps her become closer with the most popular girl of the college, Maggie Oliphant, whom she is influenced by her beauty and charisma. On the other hand, Maggie gets annoyed by Priscilla’s Puritanical character and her emphasized morality of the poor. Priscilla’s development from a valuation of morality of the poor to an appreciation of beauty, pleasure and aesthetics is completed by the college education Meade delineates. Just after she moves into her room, she responds to the pressure of the other girl graduates on embellishing her room with new and nice furniture by opening her empty trunk and showing that she has “nothing to make her room pretty, and cozy, and home-like” (44). Although in her purse she has about thirty shillings, she bravely utters that “she is poor, and she has got to work hard, and she has no time for pleasure” (45). Afterwards, she always keeps wearing her brown-dress Aunt Raby sewed, yet her feelings reflect the change in her, maybe not physically but in taste.

Aunt Raby was dressed in a rough homespun garment, wearing list slippers which are very coarse and common in texture. Her whole appearance was the essence of the homely, the old-fashioned, even the ungainly. Priscilla had seen elegance and beauty since she went away; she had entered into the life of the cultivated, the
intellectually great. In spite of her deep affection for Aunt Raby, she came back to
the ugliness and the sordid surroundings of home with a pang which she hated
herself for feeling. She forgot Aunt Raby’s sufferings for a moment in her
uncouthness. She longed to shower riches, refinement, beauty upon her” (141)

Focusing on the significance of L. T. Meade’s literary works for girls, Mitchell
asserts that “friendship and feelings” (Mitchell 17) form the relationships between girls at
St. Benet, such as in the case of Miss. Oliphant, Nancy, and Priscilla or Miss. Day, Miss.
Marsh, and Miss. Merton. The rooms of the girls should be pretty with ornaments and
furnished with easy chairs as well as comfortable lounges. Girls should be ready to
welcome other girls in their rooms. Turning boarding rooms into warm places was always
followed by this expression: “a feeling of home” (L. T. Meade 16, 44). Mitchell suggests
that “this is a way of assimilating the female world of family and relationships to the
male world of school and [while] the boys’ public school was seen as both model of and
preparation for the adult male world of politics, the army, and the empire”, girls’ schools
becomes places where girls involved in adventures and relationships domesticated at “the
old-fashioned family-style boarding school” (17). In “World of Girls: Educational
Reform and Fictional Form in L.T. Meade’s School Stories”, Mavis Reimer also
emphasizes the creation of “idyllic school settings” (208) and “well-proportioned
[school] buildings in graciously landscaped grounds” in Meade’s stories “unlike the
boarding schools described in the autobiographies of Victorian women” (207). This
unspoiled and pastoral image of girls’ schools reinforces the romantic image of child and
romanticizing female space.
Different from the bad boy images in boys’ school books, “the only bad girls [in girls’ school stories] are those who sow dissension and deliberately make others unhappy” (Mitchell 17). Honesty and honor emerge as important component of girls’ culture. As in the case of Rose who commits a crime by stealing Maggie’s purse, “a tearful public confession by the wrongdoer” happens and “the only girls who are banished from the community are the ones who refuse to tell all they know” (Reives 210). As opposed to the homes where girls are disciplined to be in service, self-control, and selfless, “girls' education at school suggests an alternative to the education at home (Reynolds 136). St. Benet appears as a school with these unwritten rules. The writer informs the reader about the college life at St. Benet, where “there was no one especially to be obeyed, and neither rewards nor punishments entered into the lives of the girls” (79). While girls were free to go out for parties, there were still some “invisible bounds [that] were prescribed” (41) and the current rules were “neither many nor arbitrary” (79).

Having these new attitudes, revolutionary representations, ‘liberating’ ideological constructions, what is the function and challenging role of girls’ school stories in terms of understanding the traditional feminine roles? It is obvious that girls’ school life with its adventures and its fictional images for girls in groups deviate from the reality of its audience for the most part, especially from the working-class reality but these stories, as Mitchell notes, are important due to exercising “an imaginative and emotional power with fertile potential for nurturing girls’ inner selves” (3). However, Reynolds underlines the uncritical and submissive nature of L.T. Meade’s stories in terms of learning “to
construct a critique of the society in which they lived and were controlled" (115). Instead, traditional female roles and images are restored through self-sacrifice and marriage.

No matter how much Maggie, who has money more money than she can imagine, encourages Priscilla’s studying classical education, suggesting to support her education financially, Priscilla chooses to concentrate on modern languages. It is emphasized in the text that Priscilla finds borrowing somebody’s money very restricting and prefers to be independent while earning her own money. Nevertheless, her renunciation of interest and her love for Classics emerges quite self-sacrificing. In contrast, Maggie’s following classical education and taking her first class in her tripos examination not only underlines the role of class on life-long decisions but also the traditional end of the novel. While in New Woman and Colonial Adventure Fiction in Victorian Britain, Richardson suggests the New Woman’s fear as “losing her autonomy in a traditional Victorian marriage” (17), Maggie marries Mr. Hammond who was a man of large property, and waiting to take over the possession of his estates after graduation. On the other hand, upon Priscilla’s decision and feminine self-sacrifice to care for her sisters’ well-being Miss Heath sounds very striking:

I encouraged her to give up her classics for the present and to devote herself to modern languages and to those accomplishments which are considered more essentially feminine. As I did so I had a picture before me, in which I saw Priscilla crowned with love, the support and blessing of her three little sisters (192).
As Reimer asserts, “the end of girlhood in this model is not a movement into independent adulthood, but into the ultimately relative position of wifehood” (204) and these schools cannot go beyond presenting a formal closure in its own artificial girl culture, or its romantic analogy with an enclosed garden.

*The Railway Children*

*The Railway Children* by E. Nesbit as the last book of the girls’ book series discussed here can be distinguished from its previous examples in terms of both its publication time and a different representation of femininity it offers to its girl reader. When E. Nesbit wrote the story of *The Railway Children* in 1906, she was known as an active cofounder of the Fabian Society. In addition to the emphasis U.C. Knoepflmacher makes in “Of Babylands and Babylons” on her life choices, being seven months pregnant, which strikingly differ from her Victorian female contemporaries, “on the surface, E. Nesbit appears to be a *New Woman*” (Knoepflmacher 301). In her fiction for children like in *The Railway Children*, there is, on the one hand, a subversion of the traditional gender stereotypes girls were used to read in her stories. On the other hand, she “neither challenges a patriarchal order nor sharply departs from the more pronounced moralism of earlier nineteenth-century women writers” (Knoepflmacher 302) and the romantic idea of enclosure is also put in play with *The Railway Children*.

The story opens with an idyllic description of the family which positions mother at home, writing stories for the children’s birthday, helping them in their homework and amusing them in their leisure times. The father was likewise keen on playing with the children, “never cross, never unjust” (Nesbit 2). The absence of the parents’ names...
contrary to the singularity of the children initially strikes the reader. When the parents, called as “the mother” and “the father” throughout the text, refer to a categorical formation, the very early emphasis on the children’s names reveals the focus of the book. The absence of parents in the traditional sense, in the Victorian novel tradition, is also carried out in Nesbit’s The Railway Children. However, as opposed to the orphanhood motif used by the Victorian novelists to be able to shape and correct the lives of the children with invalid mothers, psychologically abusing fathers, or colonial parents, Nesbit’s displacement of the mother and the father is used to give more freedom to children in their adventures.

In What Katy Did the mother is dead and Dr. Carr appears as an absent father who is for the most part busy due to his long working hours, whereas both of Mary’s parents die in the first chapter of The Secret Garden. In A Sweet Girl Graduate, after Priscilla loses her parents she is also taken care of her aunt. In contrast to The Railway Children, Nesbit does not use a real death for the parents. Instead, children go through a temporary loss of their parents whose disappearance takes different shapes. While the father was imprisoned after being accused of selling state secrets to the Russians, children move to a poor cottage in the country near a railway line with their mother who is metaphorically locked in a room where she writes stories to support her family in the absence of the father.

When a particular guardian or an aunt figure does not appear along with the parents’ displacement, we see that Nesbit distorts the traditional structure of the Victorian novel in a very subtle way. The mysterious passenger who only waves from the train window and
does not introduce himself until the end of the story remains as a fairy-tale character more than a guardian, an uncle or an aunt. In his article, Knoepflmacher asserts that after the oral tradition “children’s fairy tales resulted from the male usurpation of a female country” which used to be a literary medium for women story-tellers (299). When the most influential female writers of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, who were concerned about the ideas and immoral feelings a fantasy can inspire choose to follow realism in literature rather than fairy tales and fantasy, Knoepflmacher claims that “E. Nesbit is occasionally regarded as the first woman writer of children’s book able to free herself from the realistic conventions that had still bound [many other] fantasists” (301). However, it is important to note that her inclusion of fantasy in her stories is motivated by her desire to solve her “personal fears about abandonment and dissolution” which she experiences through the death of her real father (Knoepflmacher 302). Hence, when children wish that the railway train will one day bring their father, a wish fulfillment for both Roberta and Nesbit occurs through the old gentleman who travels in the train every morning and who helps Roberta’s father to prove his innocence to be able to get out of the prison.

Instead of transforming children into little mothers and fathers, the invisibility of the parents serves to liberate children in Nesbit’s story. In Happy Endings, Alison Lurie distinguishes Burnett’s The Secret Garden such as: “one of the most innovative things about The Secret Garden, as Ann Thwaite [the biographer of Frances Hodgson Burnett] remarks, is that children are not reformed through the intervention of some wise and kind other person, but mainly through their own efforts” (Lurie 30). I find this assertion more
applicable to the ways that Nesbit children are shaped and find their ways both for themselves and for their parents. Contrary to Kate, Mary, Colin, or Priscilla, Nesbit children appear as a team of heroes and heroines, which is one of the hallmarks of Nesbit’s fiction. They prevent a foreigner from arrest and take him home (Chapter 5), stop a train when a landslide covers the tracks (Chapter 6), save an infant and dog from a barge canal on fire (Chapter 11), and find an injured older boy in the train tunnel while getting help (Chapter 12). Moreover, they establish various friendships as watching the passing trains and waving the passengers. They become friends with Perks, the station porter and also an Old Gentleman who waves them back from the 9:45 train.

Another feature of Nesbit’s writing is that she uses family groups and distributes the reader’s attention to both sexes instead of focusing on one isolated child figure. When a group of children explores the world, the railway station, the idea of establishing an identity in groups makes a contrast with the individual girls such as Katy, Mary, or Priscilla in the other family and school girl stories. Presenting boys and girls together is noteworthy in the sense that Nesbit defies the separate understanding and traditional gender construction of femininity and masculinity and her stories differs from the preceding stories where a girl’s development relied mainly on their separation from boy’s manners and speech. In What Katy Did, there is not a single boy character that Katy becomes friend with and Colin’s appearance in The Secret Garden repositions Mary’s power entirely. In A Sweet Girl Graduate, after Mr. Hammond, as the main male character of the book, marries Maggie she is shown to complete her self-fulfillment as a female. However, when Foster and Simmons suggest that “Nesbit more often examines
the cultural implication of femininity from the perspective of the norm of the nuclear family [and] girls are thus seen, not apart from, but alongside their brothers and boy cousin” (134) Roberta appears as a strong girl who is engaged in adventures with the male boys. What makes her smart and special is that she is also aware of her brother’s male desires and sensitive to the adult problems.

Although the story is based on a meta-text structured around Peter’s broken toy-engine and a real railway train, the role and power of Roberta as a girl undermines the focus of the book. Peter wishes to fulfill the absence of the father as the only male child in the family, which makes the reestablishment of his masculinity obvious. For instance, when three children play a bandit game, Peter becomes the bandit and distributes the other captive and captive’s family roles to his sisters. Or, when children realize the financial problems their mother is trying to solve out, he comes up with an idea. But he abstains from sharing his idea with his sisters since according to him “girls are always so hasty tempered” (25). Although he was not sure whether his deed would be something right or wrong to do, he romanticizes himself as a hero who will do “a lone adventure” (26). In *What Katy Read*, Foster and Simmons interpret Peter’s effort to “evade the ethical issues implicit in his crime” as an upshot of “finding analogies for his role in classic adventure narratives” (136). After he tells his sisters that “some people might think it wrong- I don’t. And if mother asks where I am, say I am playing at mines” (26), it becomes ironic when his “play” turns out to be stealing coals. The coal scene itself is also significant with regard to an interpretation of children according to their class; the Station Master
decides against taking him to the police station because the children were “nicely dressed” (29).

When the Station Master catches the thief, Peter denies the fact that he was a thief. During this lonely confrontation with the Master, his sisters appear from the shadow of a truck and try to defend Peter. Roberta suggests that they also deserve to be punished because “they helped [Peter] to carry the coal away and [they] knew that where he got it” (28). Peter’s initial reaction is a big disappointment for him when he singles out his theft as a heroic adventure suitable for a male. However, he feels more disappointed when the sisters confess that they “knew it all the time [and] they only pretended [they] didn’t just to humour [him]” (29). While this confession of Roberta undermines Peter’s power that he boasts overtly, it repositions girls as cunning and observant. About girls’ being ignorant, Foster and Simons examine that “the girls’ level of awareness and understanding continually exceeds their brother’s, but in a parody of adult feminine strategies, they pretend to ignorance in order to feed the male ego” (136). On enacting a patriarchal identity, Peter is inclined to suggest inequality between woman and man and devalue woman’s intelligence and capacity. In the first chapter, when Peter shows his lack of trust on girls and doubtfully asks “Can girls help to mend engines?” the father corrects him immediately by saying, “girls are just as clever as boys, and don’t you forget it!” (5), which is proved through Roberta and other female characters in the story.

Roberta, who shows her desire to be an engine-driver or a fire-woman in a conversation with her father, presents a strong character throughout the novel. Being aware of the hard conditions in the new house, she wakes up her sister and brother and
reminds them their own responsibilities while being useful in the house since there is “no servant or anything” (18). She also becomes a nurse to her mother and as her bed is moved into the mother’s room, she gets up in the middle of the night to check the fire and give her mother milk and water (41). However, these new responsibilities never cut her off from her adventures and she always shows interaction with people outside. For instance, when she wants to repair Peter’s engine secretly, she stumbles and falls in a real engine. Her ‘fall’ into the real engine which was just about to leave the station can be interpreted as a fall into more knowledge, knowing more people and information about the engines since she starts to learn more about how train works and “as the three children went home up the hill, Peter hugging the engine, now quite its own man again” she tells “the story of how she had been an Engine-burglar” with joy (60). The idea of taking off their red petticoats in order to prevent a train accident also belongs to Roberta. When they see a paper chase go into the tunnel and when they realize that the last boy did not appear out the other end they prefer to go and investigate for him. It becomes Roberta once again who nurses him in the dark tunnel until help arrives whilst the boy struggles to remain conscious. This scene is interesting in the sense that Nesbit first seems to use a conventional model which might turn Roberta into a Mary-like mother figure as in *The Secret Garden*, then inverts the model and makes another twist for Roberta who continues going out for adventures after he is brought home. Nesbit’s story appears promising and revolutionary in terms of female roles when Roberta does not end up being a self-sacrificing Angel-in-the-house figure. Instead, the mother is rewarded for the nursing role of Jim and this shift in responsibility is also followed by other changes in the
household. The old gentleman who used to wave from the train window turns out to be Jim’s grandfather and offers to run a business which will be managed by the mother.

The beginning of the story positioned the female as writing at home with a children audience. Although the mother was shown as a productive woman supporting her own family, the isolated professional woman plays as an undercurrent theme. When her domesticated creative action is turned into a professional writing with a wider group of unknown reader, she starts to spend her time in her room shut off from her children. The estrangement of the mother from the household responsibilities created fears of masculinization by late in the century. When the mother voices her fears for the possibility that children are starting to forget their father to Roberta, she also risks her mother roles by isolating herself in a room. One the one hand, her sickness points to the female vulnerability when attempting to work in a male-regulated profession and on the other hand it belies the real strength of the mother. After Roberta moves in her mother’s room to be able to take care of her, she not only takes place of her mother but also recognizes some of the female roles such as silence and secrecy as a response to her husband’s displacement. Foster and Simmons interprets Roberta/Bobbie’s development as a “freedom (albeit temporarily) to explore divergent subjectivities, as both androgynous child and burgeoning adult woman” (140). Although Foster and Simmons emphasize the positioning of Roberta between the “attraction of carefree childhood and the appeal of womanliness, between the desire to run wild and the need for an ordered, secure environment” (142), I would suggest that the text itself is not didactic or prescriptive enough for such a gendered role-oriented determination as in *What Katy Did.*
Towards the end of the story, the restoration of the patriarchal identity is emphasized in the doctor’s conversation with Peter. Although none of the characters really reflect polarized feminine and masculine representations, the doctor’s words evoke the construction of the proper roles based on gender: “men have to do the work of the world and not be afraid of anything- so they have to be hardy and brave. But women have to take care of their babies and cuddle them and nurse them and be very patient and gentle” (168). The appearance, or the return, of the father also serves to be strategically useful and heralds the new structure of the house. When a cook and a housemaid were hired, children “no longer got the tea and cleared it away and washed up the tea-things and dusted the rooms” (177). The mother who no longer has any writings and housework to do goes back to teach their lessons, play with them, and makes up little rhymes for the children who begin to attend the school. The last paragraph of the book begins with Roberta’s voice, calling her daddy in the house where they were all settled and ready to welcome. As the father “goes in and the door is shut” (188), the writer chooses to stop narrating the story. Although that “they seemed to be hardly Railway children at all” (181) is made as an obvious point, the ending is still ambiguous. We are not sure if the mother and the children will continue exploring their life through writing and adventure or the affirmation of the patriarchy (the restoration of the traditional nuclear family) will shut them in their home. That is to say, even though the railway station is introduced as a romantic enclosure for children where they can freely and innocently indulge in a world ruled by their own humour and heroism the book is not used as an instrument to enclose its reader dominantly as in the early girls’ books.
A common feature among the girl characters in these books is the self-sacrificing emphasis on their femininity and female roles. Girls’ stories were, then, important to provide girls with experiences that would lead them to be mothers forever.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

Children’s association with reading has always raised concerns among parents, librarians, publishing houses, and educators at about what their children read. When Anthony Storr asserts in his article, “The Child and the book”, that “at the back of the adult’s anxiety is usually the belief that children are innocent little creatures who must not have unpleasant ideas put into their heads” (96) a child’s embodiment of ‘inappropriate’ gender roles is, time and again, seen as unpleasant to the “guardians” of children and destructive of the child’s innocence. That the child is born innocent is one of the adult’s latest and most productive interpretations of childhood. It is practical and productive in the sense that this repositioning of child gives space for more adult manipulation and domination on the lives of children.

In “The Other: Orientalism, Colonialism, and Children’s Literature”, Perry Nodelman draws a parallel structural and theoretical mechanism that works for both the child and the Orient, which is a term Edward Said appropriated in his famous book Orientalism. Although the genre itself is called children’s literature, Nodelman’s parallels reveal that adults occupy, invade, and dominate the literary representations of children in the books they write for the recipients of the girls’ and boys’ literatures. As adults start to speak for the silent (child) in children’s literature, the imperialist adult attitude, unconscious or the
opposite, positions children as the other, the uncivilized, the innocent, the feminine, the weak, and the egocentric similar to the colonizing attitude of Europeans to the Orient, the East. Nodelman claims that “child psychology and children’s literature are primarily for the benefit of adults” since they nourish children “with values and with images of themselves [adults] approve of or feel comfortable with” so that children become easy to control and deal with (P. Nodelman 30). That a child will learn to use a ‘bad’ language or to act inappropriately through the books they read not only highlights the common belief on the power of a written text but also evokes both personal and cultural anxieties about a child’s future. However, by and large, there is much to be said for this fear felt for children. The paradox is that on the one hand, adult’s recognition of childhood different from adulthood ends in a separate children’s literature, but, on the other hand, it is obvious that adults find it difficult to see children independent from their own desires and fears which are closely woven into a politics for the whole nation. When Kutzer asserts that “children’s fiction provides a mirror of adult desires”, she discloses the adult motivation behind writing books for children and emphasizes the adult goal to alter children by acculturation of cultural and imperial roles: “The desires of the adult creators of classic children’s books include a desire that children grow up not only to be honorable and respectable, but that they grow up into the kind of adult who can maintain Britain’s [imperial] strength” (138).

The focus of this study has been the issue of gender roles merged with a British imperialist ideology embedded in juvenile books of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. What kind of Victorian and imperial parameters determine appropriate
models and norms for male and female behavior? How are those roles adopted into a literature which will be predominantly consumed by children? What kind of different representations are boys and girls exposed to in a gendered children’s literature? How are the issues of class and imperialism incorporated into these stories? These are some of the questions that I find fruitful to ask more about the division behind distinct literary genres in the canon of Empire-focused juvenile literature during the Victorian age.

While the recurring romantic view of childhood has been appropriated for female child in the Victorian era, especially after the mid-nineteenth century, the romantic model was no longer taken as useful for the construction of masculinity. When romanticizing womanhood remains relevant for girls and romanticizing heroism and war for boys, the empire-building adventurer constitutes the new image of a middle-class boyhood. MacDonald distinguishes this imperial consciousness supported by burgeoning of a patriotic program as a desire to strengthen the Empire and as a response to “the dangers of a decadent society” (520). In *Masculinity and Manliness*, John Tosh details this fear of degeneration as “social Darwinism as an important strand of degeneration thought [produced] a heightened sensitivity to any indication that the British race might be losing its place at the top of the hierarchy” (195). Not surprisingly, the male-dominated culture furnished boys with the social privilege of the imperial rule, expecting ‘manly’ boys to empower the British race as the ruler of the world. For the matter of that, early Victorian androgynous features, already considered feminine, are interpreted to be enfeebling for Britain whose identity is established on imperialist expansions and adventures by mid-Victorian period (Nelson 53).
Separate imperial and gender-specific roles are adopted into children’s literature by differently-gendered narrative models. While boys were saturated by imperial representations and roles as future soldiers or administrators in boys’ stories, the fact that girls could also find the chance to read those stories whose adventurous aspect made them fans of their brothers’ books engendered the necessity of a market publishing entertaining stories for its girl readers. However, when the gendered body of children’s literature suggests mainly domestic novels to girls and public school stories and adventure stories to boys in the mid/late Victorian and early Edwardian period, self-realization for girls was limited to domesticated adventures conditioning girls within domestic spheres such as gardens or houses. On the contrary, a literary boyhood excelled in imperial adventures was written by the authors of boys’ books. When adult authors of the Victorian age wrote books for children to read, children were expected to adopt the subjectivity that the ideology of these books imposed. Perry Nodelman asserts in *The Pleasures of Children’s Literature*, “children’s literature is a body of texts by its intended audience [and] what is and how adults think about it are intertwined with society’s ideas about children- about who they are and how and what you need to read” (79). Thus, within the children’s literature culminating in separate genres, children/childhood becomes likely to be colonized based on gender since children who are objectified in the adults’ narratives learn to fit into the society at the expense of embodying masculinity and femininity separately.

For example, in *What Katy Did* it was necessary, rather than being a coincidence, for Katy to develop a patient and self-denying female character while learning to act
indifferently to her own desires. That Katy is seen at the end of the book as a mother figure both to her sisters and brothers, and to her father at the age of fourteen affirms the appropriate gender construction for a girl. Similarly, when Mary’s disagreeableness emphasized at the beginning of *The Secret Garden* as a reference to her life in India and the repercussions of a colonial experience is corrected through her friendship with her cousin Colin, she is also transformed to be a mother figure and a helper for his adventures. By the time he discovers his male identity, his strength, and his ‘future’ at the end of the book, Mary loses her secret garden that used to symbolize her power, her adventurous nature, and her resourcefulness. Even though L. T. Meade’s *A Sweet Girl Graduate* offers a different setting, not a house, for a girl to grow into, Priscilla’s departure for a boarding school only for girls, is doomed to fail to let the girl readers have similar adventures boys normally have in public school stories.

Boys’ adventures and the male heroes in the public school stories can be easily differentiated from the adventures written for girls. Even though both boys and girls appear as naturally plucky and eager to explore the world at the beginning of their stories, the power to pursue more physical adventure out of their home is only bestowed to boys. What is more, no matter how corrupting these adventures can become, they constitute the ideals of masculinity which extol the cult of athleticism, patriotism, and national efficiency. Early in the book, some of Tom’s adventures consist of his escape from his nanny, Charity Lamb’s orders to be able to run into a neighboring farm-house to eat more curds and fighting with the other boys in the village. Before long, Tom fearlessly throws himself into the playing-field even at the expense of getting hurt among the stronger and
bigger other players in Rugby. Although Eric’s initial image at Fairholm Cottage where he lives with his cousin and aunt exemplifies a romantic child figure with a feminine sensitivity, Eric becomes one of the bullies at Roslyn short after his admission. He not only violates the school rules while spending time in bars, getting drunk with some of his friends, but also he smokes and cheats in the exams as Tom used to provide cribs for his Greek translations. Stalky and his friends committed to militarism have also adventures that vary from bullying, smoking to drinking. While Stalky develops a rebellious character as disobeying and being disrespectful to the authorities at school, except Reverend John, nothing, including the vulgarity of their language full of curses or their disobedience can demolish their significances as heroes of these stories. For they were always ready to serve for “the concepts of duty, honour, and patriotism [that] were redefined” as the new authorial power of the ideology of the New Imperialism in the twenty years before the first world war (McDonald 526).

Although these boys do not avoid using a bad language, drinking, and smoking, none of these attributes were included into any of the girls’ stories. Katy, whose school is in a fight with the neighboring school, acts against the rules as she jumps over the wall and enters into the ‘dangerous’, enemy garden. Actually, Katy who used to come home in a school-uniform dirty and torn reminds of the early traditional public school boys who are brave and free in their actions. Nevertheless, when Tom, Stalky, and his friends develop their strength and gain power as rulers in the army at the end of their stories, Katy’s regression to home through her temporary, yet severe, paralysis underlines that being plucky was a boyish thing and was appropriate when boys combine it with military
motives. Boys’ adventures that converge with an emphasis on being physically and morally strong reveal a different discourse that causes a gendered set of moral codes appropriated based on sex. While purity as a passive virtue rules the physical, sexual, and spiritual state of the girls only, the incorporation of the same virtue into the concept of manliness is realized when “the essence of moral courage [which] was to know what was right” and wrong (MacDonald 522) requires action, invasion, and instruction as part of imperialism.

When the Victorian definition of domesticity and the relationship between masculinity and femininity is “a state of mind as well as a physical orientation” (Tosh 4), different types of books regarding the sex of children cause children to construct different forms of masculinity and femininity, which become polarized in terms of recognizing and rejecting each other’s attributes. Therefore, cutting off the emotional and physical male bond with home/mother and with the sexual female becomes an important step for establishing the male child’s masculine identity. In a parallel development, the exclusion of women from the public school stories written for boys and the lack of direct reference to women in conjunction with imperial masculinity appear as important issues a separation in juvenile literature cultivates.

The focus of this thesis was to understand and explore the separation of gender roles with the imperial ideology embedded in the empire policy while leading shifts in the content of children's readings, the impact of gender binaries, and the impact of the imperial project on children's reading. Children’s literature is, as Kutzer suggests, qualified in two ways: both as a national allegory/medium for the projection of adults’
and the nation’s fear and as a tool for the cultural heritage “to be transmitted over centuries” (11). Actually, both forms of literature, the Victorian school-stories for boys and the domestic novels for girls, emphasize self-sacrifice and selflessness, yet for different reasons and motivations. By the time children are interpreted as agents of the nation who carry the burden of the imperial responsibilities of the past and future deeds, boys are repositioned to sacrifice themselves for the nation and to submit their ego to the imperialist ideals, whereas self-renunciation for the sake of the family order and segregated domestic roles as mothers and/or wives are appropriated for girls. At this point, I would prefer to move forward by questioning the validity and contemporariness of these representations and images. Today, it is assumed that no nation invade a country with a sole intention of aggrandizing its borders, but with political incorrectness. Civilizing or improving the life of “The Other” is used to redress what is wrong and inappropriate from a powerful perspective that determines the dominant discourse on gender roles and imperial projects. Women have already been in the public domain with different interests and have found ways to express their needs in the twenty-first century, but the power of the Victorian romantic female images are actually still valid. The female representations for the ideal womanhood still continue to control the perception of the modern woman who is an intellectual and a work force as the invention of “the fetishistic cult of the domestic angel [which] ended with the "angels' in bloomers, in offices, in higher education, and driving motorcars" (Humble and Reynolds 4-5).
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