

THE SON, THE WOMAN & THE HOBBIT:
A GENDER-BASED READING OF SECONDARY CHARACTERS IN
J.R.R TOLKIEN'S *THE LORD OF THE RINGS*

İREM FİLİZ

JULY 2021

THE SON, THE WOMAN & THE HOBBIT:
A GENDER-BASED READING OF SECONDARY CHARACTERS IN
J.R.R TOLKIEN'S *THE LORD OF THE RINGS*

İREM FİLİZ

DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MA
IN
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

JULY 2021

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

Date : 12.07.2021

Name, Last Name: İrem, FİLİZ

Signature:

ÖZET

Bu çalışma cinsiyet temelli bir okumayla Tolkien'in Yüzüklerin Efendisi romanının ikinci karakterleri olan Sam, Éowyn ve Faramir'in incelenmesini önermektedir. Aslen bu tür cinsiyet temelli okumalar sıkça görülseler de bu çalışmalar anakronistik ve esere karşı önyargılı yaklaşımlar sergileyebilmektedir. Bu yaklaşımların aksini ispatlamak için bu çalışma ikincil karakterlerin okunmasını önermektedir. Frodo ve Sam genellikle homoerotik bir bağlamda okunmaktadır, bu yaklaşım yerine homososyalleşme konseptinin kullanımı ile incelenmesi sayesinde Frodo-Sam ilişkisi daha iyi anlaşılacaktır. Tarihi bir bakış açısı ile Frodo-Sam ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı Subay-Emir Eri ilişkisinin birleşimi aralarındaki bu özel bağı daha iyi anlamamızı sağlamaktadır. Eşitlikçi Feminizm ve Erillik Çalışmaları ışığında Éowyn ve Faramir'in kendilerini içinde buldukları ve çatıştıkları sosyal durumlar tartışılmaktadır. Tolkien genellikle seksizm ile suçlansa bile Eşitlikçi Feminizmin felsefelerinden habersiz olamaz ve eserine çok az kadın karakter koymuş olsa da her birine çok önemli roller vermiştir. Éowyn kendisine sunulan sosyal normlara karşı savaşı, iradesi ve cesareti ile bunları aşarak dönüşümünü tamamlar ve yeni dünyada yerini bulur. Eşitliği savunan benzer duruş Faramir ve hipermaskülen aile baskıları ile olan çatışmasında görülebilir. Éowyn ve Faramir'in birliktelikleri okuyuculara barış ve uyum içinde yaşayacak ideal ve modern bir çift sunmaktadır. Bu çift Tolkien'in gün geçtikçe artan endüstriyelleşme, tekilcilik ve dehşet dolu dünyaya cevabı olabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Homososyallik, Erillik, Baskın Erillik, Yakın Erkek Dostluğu, Eşitlikçi Feminizm, Dişil, Eril, Cinsiyet Çalışmaları, Birinci Dünya Savaşı, İkincil Karakterler, J.R.R. Tolkien, Yüzüklerin Efendisi, Sam, Frodo, Éowyn, Faramir, Boromir, Denethor

ABSTRACT

This study offers a gender-based reading of Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* through three of its secondary characters: Sam, Éowyn and Faramir. Although such gender-based readings are common, some of these tend to be anachronistic and biased ways of looking to the novel. As a response to these claims, this study tries to prove otherwise through a reading of secondary characters. While Frodo and Sam are occasionally read through a homoerotic lens, in response homosociality as a concept is utilized to understand Frodo-Sam relationship. A historical perspective that connects Frodo-Sam to the Officer-Batman during the World War I helps understanding the very special bonds between them. Equality feminism and masculinity studies are used to discuss the similar social positions Éowyn and Faramir finds themselves and struggles with. Tolkien is also commonly accused of sexism, yet probably not being ignorant to the philosophies of equality feminism, although putting a relatively few women in his novel, he gave all of them important roles. Éowyn fights against the social norms presented to her, and through sheer will and courage she overcomes them, completing her transformation and finds her place in the new world. The same pose for equality can also be seen with Faramir and his struggle with hypermasculine impositions of his family. Éowyn and Faramir's union presents the reader with an ideal, modern couple which may live in an age of peace and harmony, which can be Tolkien's answer to an ever increasingly industrial, individualistic, and horror-filled world.

Key Words: Homosociality, Masculinity, Hegemonic Masculinity, Male Bonding, Equality Feminism, Feminine, Masculine, Gender Studies, World War I, Secondary Characters, J.R.R. Tolkien, The Lord of the Rings, Sam, Frodo, Éowyn, Faramir, Boromir, Denethor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my warmest gratitude to my Supervisor Ass. Prof. Dr. Osman Emir Benli for giving me the opportunity to do this research and providing me guidance and feedback throughout this research.

I would also like express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Adriana Raducanu, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Catherine MacMillan and Ass. Prof. Dr. Hatice Karaman for helping my studies and expanding my literary understanding throughout my master's degree. I would also to thank Ass. Prof. Dr. Pelin Kümbet, Dr. Zümrüt Altındağ and Prof. Dr. Metin Toprak for their endless moral support, their genuine goodness and being exemplar instructors throughout my bachelor's degree.

Finally, I must express my deepest gratitude to my lovely mother, Şener and father, Sedat and my sister, Selen and brothers, Alper and Batuhan, also my aunts and uncles who are always there for me. I further would like to thank to my dearest friends; Burcu Akad, Kerem Kır, Cansu Bahçetepe, Öyküm Savaş, Büşra Aslan and Cansu Ergin for providing me with unyielding support and continuous encouragement. Also, I must express my absolute gratitude to my love, Mehmet Korman, who is always there for me, for his continuous support and understanding and the most needed push towards finishing the process of writing this thesis. This achievement could not be possible without them.

Thank you all, for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
1. HOMOSOCIALITY, BROMANCE & THE BATMEN.....	6
1.1 Homosocaility as Concept	6
1.1.1 Homosociality and Hegemonic Masculinity.....	8
1.1.2 Homosociality and Homoeroticism	11
1.1.3 Female Homosociality	13
1.2 Theory of Homosociality, Male Bonding & Bromance.....	14
1.3 Male Bonding, World War I and Lord of the Rings	17
2. WOMAN, FEMININTY & THE SHIELDMAIDEN	30
2.1 Femininity and the Female.....	31
2.2 What is a woman?	34
2.3 Femininity: “On ne naît pas femme: on le devient.”	37
Table 1 - Aspects of Feminine and Masculine Traits	40
2.4 Triskelion: Women of Tolkien.....	41

3.	MASCULINE, NON-FEMININE & THE SECOND SON	59
3.1	Masculinity	59
3.2	Denethor and Faramir: A Hegemonic Father?.....	66
3.3	Day & Night, Masculine & Feminine, Boromir & Faramir	72
4.	SECONDARITY: TO WHOM THE WORLD IS LEFT FOR	85
4.1	Samwise the Brave.....	85
4.2	Representation of the Modern Man & Woman.....	90
	CONCLUSION.....	93
	REFERENCES	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Aspects of Feminine and Masculine Traits
----------------	--

INTRODUCTION

The main argument of this thesis is to discuss that J.R.R. Tolkien's timeless epic *The Lord of the Rings* and its three important secondary characters, Samwise Gamgee, Faramir and Éowyn, through the lens of gender politics, looking for details of how they are represented, what purpose they held in the narrative, what subtexts they point out to, how their unique positionality as to their specific gender politics were handled by critics and scholars and what can be said of their secondary position in narrative.

All three characters have similarities, connections with gender roles, and most importantly for the purposes of this thesis, positions of secondarity, a social role that puts them into a secondary place either in society or family, bringing about manifestations of latent heroism, capability of deeper empathy as well as connection to healing and nature. Although they are secondary characters, they have immensely important roles to play in the novel. While the final victory could not have been won without the aid of Sam, similarly the fall of Witch-king and Frodo finding his path into Mordor through Ithilien are all due to these characters. What is more, when the War of the Ring ends, the new world is up to these characters to define and make a future in it, thrusting their secondariness within a unique dialectic that allows the above-mentioned qualities to provide the constitutive qualities of the world-to-come. Although Faramir and Éowyn are not part of the Fellowship, they have close ties with at least a few of the Fellowship. Sam, on the other hand, is one of the first members of the Fellowship and the one who followed Frodo to Mount Doom. Apart from their importance, these characters are, although ordinary folk, do not follow the normative aspects of their respective societies.

Looking at their secondarity in their societies, this study also focuses on the relationship between Frodo and Sam through the lens of homosociality, Éowyn from the scope of equality feminism, and Faramir through the concept of masculinity in order to articulate novel ways of looking at some accusations made towards Tolkien's lack of women in his novel and his assumed sexism, and the sexist nature of *The Lord of the Rings*. This study will try to show that Tolkien not only approved of strong female characters in society, but he also gave a great importance to feminine aspects and saw them as an essential for a healthier society. It can be even argued that Tolkien is against the power-hungry masculinity and narrow-mindedness of society, which paved the path to two world wars which devastated Europe. His position against over-industrialization, lack of empathy, social repression, and evil are quite clear, especially through such secondary characters. While many similar points can be found throughout the novel, for example through the cross-racial friendship of Gimli and Legolas, a gender-based reading of the novel brings these three characters to the fore.

Homosociality, the study of male friendship without sexual connotations is a great perspective for understanding the relationship of Frodo and Sam. Many critics prefer to see a homosexual and homoerotic relationship between the two characters, and even the novels show an extremely greater level of intimacy between them, critics who only argue about the movie representations make such assumptions. However, homosociality, and its connections with the close relationship soldiers make during the trench warfare of World War I, as witnessed by Tolkien, bring about a relationship built on love, friendship, trust, and respect. While intimacy and love are easily mixed with homoeroticism, a defence of friendship is in order to really understand what Tolkien wishes to give to the audience with Frodo and Sam. This close relationship is

formed by their master-servant relationship, the concept of “the batman” and simple male friendship gives a better perspective to understanding Sam.

Equality feminism, especially through the contribution of Simone de Beauvoir has many reflections in Tolkien’s novel. Tolkien was inspired to write *The Lord of the Rings* following one of de Beauvoir’s writings on “death” and it is quite difficult to assume that he neglected her other ideas completely. It is true that only a few women highlight the pages of the novel, and many prominent characters dominate the narrative. The story takes place in an age dominated by male figures, a very mediaeval world, yet the few women who were portrayed are immensely important in their roles. Galadriel is one of the most ancient beings on Middle-earth with great potency in magic and wisdom, while Arwen although fulfilling a minor role, relinquishes immortal life for her love and can be seen as a great sacrifice. Éowyn can be Tolkien’s most interesting female character, as she is neither an Elf nor a character with immense strength. She has nothing but passion and courage, a wish to change who she is and to have a voice of her own without the perceived shackles of her sex weighing her down. Eventually, she reaches all her goals and cures herself from the passions of glory and by herself decides to live a peaceful life. She physically, mentally, and emotionally has to battle to achieve her goals. De Beauvoir’s and other equality feminists’ arguments on how women were socially ignored, assumed to be inferior, pushed into inferiority by male dominance, and through assumption of social roles they were restricted from their rights to live as they please find their plea in Éowyn’s distress and her narrative trajectory. On the other hand, certain unwanted masculine aspects of Éowyn force her to cross-dress as a warrior and hide her identity to find her calling on the battlefield. It can be interpreted as Tolkien showing how being restricted to assumed “feminine” traits women were

denied their destiny. This line of thought is similar with equality feminists, and a similar approach by Tolkien can be seen with Faramir, and his denial of hypermasculinity. Therefore, as will be argued, it is difficult to see Tolkien as a complete sexist, and a contemporary mistake is to take Tolkien's position with a contemporary understanding of sexism as well. For his age, he can even be considered as someone who promotes gender equality and someone who is against social acceptance to all gender-based personality traits.

As women were restricted by social norms, so were men. Masculinity, as femininity is expected of women, had its expected features to be apparent in every man. A man cannot show tears, must be courageous against fear, must face his enemies head on. These restricting characteristics were becoming more and more dated, and in the age of modern warfare they became all the more dangerous paths to follow. Tolkien's novel is sometimes interpreted as a message against the industry's consuming character, ever continuing strive for power, politics of superiority, cruelty and want of destruction. Although Tolkien declined any direct connection between the novel and the events of World War II, his own memories of World War I and first implications of modern warfare most probably shaped his writing. Mordor and Saruman's Isengard both utilize highly industrialized and pragmatic approaches to war, while the old mediaeval-esque approach is doomed to failure in the hands of fellowship.

It could be argued that Tolkien's narrative seems to eventually vanquish those that follow a hypermasculine power-hungry model; Denethor, Boromir, Saruman and even Sauron himself. Instead, male characters with assumedly feminine aspects had greater success and possibility of a future. Faramir, being the second son of Denethor, had little say in the governance of his people and held little power. However, he is the

one who for a small amount of time held the power of controlling where the Ring would go, and he followed the path of wisdom and let it go. A hypermasculine character would not do so, as it can be seen in the example of Boromir and his betrayal to the Fellowship's ideal and goal.

All these gender-based differences and their importance give a glint of Tolkien's intentions or his innate worldview and cannot be simply accused of sexism. The level of emotions shown in Tolkien move beyond simplistic reading of eroticism, homoerotic or otherwise, as it is likely to be read and can be found between many characters other than Sam and Frodo. Such criticism of characters, narrative, and Tolkien himself are shaped by contemporary perspectives. Examples of a much more accommodating approach to Tolkien's gender politics can be seen throughout the novel by how he takes gender norms, masculine and feminine features and provides us with a multi-layered outlook, giving importance to women of power and men of non-masculine or sometimes genderless characteristics, and finally how they manage so much more than those who are their opposites or foils. Tolkien calls for goodness of heart, simple courage, acceptance of people disregarding their set masculine and even feminine features to create subjectivities beyond the boundaries of these conceptions.

1. HOMOSOCIALITY, BROMANCE & THE BATMEN

1.1 Homosociality as Concept

The concept of homosociality, as a part of gender studies, strive to explain the diverse social bonds that are created between male-to-male or female-to-female, in other words, people of the same-sex which are not obligatorily romantic in nature. It is one of the more commonly used outlooks that are made in studies on men and masculinity. As Lipman-Blumen (1976) and Bird (1996) argue on the subject:

A popular use of this concept can be frequently found in studies on male friendship, male bonding, and fraternity orders. It is also often appertained to explain how men preserve and defend the gender order and patriarchy through their friendship and intimate companions with other men. (Bird, 1996; Lipman-Blumen, 1976, as cited in Hammarén & Johansson, 2014, p.1)

Despite its common use, the concept of "man-to-man bonding" tends to be oversimplified even by some scholars and academics and homosociality is reduced to almost an implicative term which is used to describe how men form closed teams, protect their privileges, and keep others from challenging their authority. According to Eve Kosofsky Sedwick (1985), the definition of homosociality is more complicated, evolved, and dynamic than its commonly assumed and defined. In her book *Between Men*, rather than just using the concept to analyse "social bonds" and "power relations" between them, she focuses on different kinds of desire and intimate relationships between men. As she argues:

To draw the “homosocial” back into the orbit of “desire,” of the potentially erotic, then, is to hypothesize the potential unbrokenness of a continuum between homosocial and homosexual – a continuum whose visibility, for men, in our society, is radically disrupted. (Sedgwick, 1985, p. 1-2)

Here Sedgwick develops an intriguing and beneficial theory for the studies of gender and masculinity through her analysis of the complex relationship between homosociality, homosexuality, and homophobia. The book examines the oppressive effects of a cultural system on both women and men, where the male desire can only become comprehensible by the non-existent desire of a woman. She continues her argument through:

For instance, the diacritical opposition between the “homosocial and the “homosexual” seems to be much less thorough and dichotomous for women, in our society, than for men. [. . .] The apparent simplicity – the unity – of the continuum between “women loving women” and “women promoting the interests of women”, extending over the erotic, social, familial, economic, and political realms, would not be so striking if it were not in strong contrast to the arrangement among males. (Sedgwick, 1985, p. 2-3)

This division created between homosociality, and homosexuality allows the concept of "male bonding" to find itself a place. Male bonding is a concept which can be characterized by a homosocial desire as well as a physical and emotional intimacy between men, alongside a consequential homosexual panic which is due to the felt need for intimacy and desire. While such a relationship may turn to homosexuality, there is absolutely no certainty or need for such a relationship to go beyond

friendship. To be more exact, homosocial desire indicates to men showing their attention to other men, and homosexual panic is the fear of this attention creating a homosexual desire. Eventually, Sedgwick shifted her studies towards the concept of homosociality. As a leading figure on the subject, this concept has been interpreted and presented in various ways by her and her fellow colleagues. Primarily, as discussed above, with the example on how to analyse men through their relationships and social bonds with other men, which will be discussed under *Homosociality and Hegemonic Masculinity*, secondly, there is a full range of literature on queer homosocial readings and on the subsequent continuum of desires and relationships, that will be discussed in “Homosociality and Homo-eroticism,” and finally, there are lots of studies on the female side that present a somewhat different picture under “Female Homosociality.”

1.1.1 Homosociality and Hegemonic Masculinity

We must recognize, then, a continuum of homoerotic experience among working-class men in a number of social settings. At the same time, we must acknowledge that this experience is silenced, that the public language of the peer group and the workplace is heterosexual. Moreover, it is often seriously homophobic. “Poofers” are an object of derision, sometimes hatred. (Connell, 2000, p. 109)

Research has shown an extensive number of studies about the hierarchies created by men's male-to-male relations, as well as the various methods used by men to preserve male dominance and maintain male privilege. Paul Willis gives an example to this phenomenon in his study titled *Learning to Labour: How Working-*

Class Kids Gets Working-Class Jobs (1977) and describes a group of working-class boys who hold an informal social group and do not behave well according to middle-class ideology. These boys fight all the middle-class authorities, whereas they accept and respect all the working-class authorities. The school, as an ideological system of socialization and a place of creating productive citizens, is dominated by middle-class values, and the boys resist strongly towards anyone who respects this middle-class ideology of compliance and theoretical knowledge: the teachers, and other students. This conflict eventually leads to building of a close male order that excludes young women and immigrants and other men who are part of the oppressive middle-class.

Adding to the discussion, Michael Flood's research titled *Men, Sex and Homosociality (2008)*. on young men and how their bonds affect their perspective and relationships with women and their own sexuality is enlightening. In his article he recounts the interviews with young men at a military school, in which many examples of how friendship and close bonds between men allow the building and shaping of sexual behaviour towards women. In this specific case, these young men use the image of women to improve their ranking among the male group. According to Flood, homosociality refers primarily to non-sexual and same-sex bonds and also involves some degree of homophobia. On the other hand, Flood (2008) also argues on a possibility of the use of homosociality as a cover for actual and disregarded/unwanted homoerotic desires within the group through recounting of sexual activities with women:

Male-male relations organize and give meaning to the social and sexual involvements of young heterosexual men in powerful ways. Homosocial bonds are policed against the feminizing and homosexualizing influences of

excessive heterosociality, achieving sex with women is a means to status among men, sex with women is a direct medium of male bonding, and men's narratives of their sexual and gender relations are offered to male audiences in storytelling cultures generated in part by homosociality. (Flood,2008, p. 355)

Thomas Thurnell-Read (2012) deals with this close relations between young men in his study titled *What Happens on Tour: The Premarital Stag Tour, Homosocial Bonding, and Male Friendship* and argues that competition and exclusion are often the basis and formation of homosociality, and recent research has shown a more complex picture of masculinity and friendship. In social gatherings such as “stag night” or “bachelor party” there are certain changes in men's relationships. In his research on young men, he separates his participants into eight groups and his following observations showed that men actively maintain and develop their bonds. These men's groups showed great effort for group cohesion, unity, and intimacy rather than for male hierarchy, and personal – social competition. While this can be considered a part of hegemonic masculinity, there are also traces of changes in masculinity and its subsequent redefinitions. The difference between Willis' study and that of Thurnell-Read is the focus; in the latter the focus is on the creation of sensitive and intimate masculinity.

According to Connell's (2005) study titled *Masculinities*, hegemonic masculinity means “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy” (p.77). This concept is often employed to analyse the mobility in historical power structure, together with the hierarchical relationship between men and women. Hegemonic masculinity is built in relation to both subordinate and marginalized masculinities and femininities.

While historical and social patterns have changed in society, and continues to do so, the hegemony may also be put under question; however, it is never completely removed from society. Connell includes the term “complicity” in his writings to theorize and express how men prefer to apply power and hegemonic structures of masculinity in their lives. When it comes to power, according to Connell, most men have a dependent and ambivalent relation to it.

1.1.2 Homosociality and Homoeroticism

In 1994, a “metrosexual” man was defined as a “white, middle-class man who is quite concerned with appearance, style, and image.” These men brought into the light an issue of masculinity, an enhanced relationship between homosexuals and hetero-men and an overall movement towards a new masculinity. Coad (2008) in his *The Metrosexual: Gender, Sexuality and Sport* argues on connotations of metrosexuality on masculinity articulates this point as:

Metrosexual males may look prettier and more beautiful than their nonmetrosexual brothers, but metrosexuality is the motor behind more decisive changes in the realm of sexual politics; it influences how heterosexual males interact with homosexual males and it is in the process of replacing traditional categories of sexual orientation. (Coad, 2008, p. 197)

However, Shugart (2008) in *Managing Masculinities: The Metrosexual Moments* claims that metrosexual masculinity is defined as a type of universal male solidarity. Instead of emphasizing a new masculinity and a more sensitive and inclusive manliness, metrosexuality restructured homosociality in order to distinguish homosexual men from both women and heterosexual men. This movement, according

to Shugart (2008), resulted in a highly commercialized masculinity, which is in effect the hegemonic masculinity, as well as a strengthening of a normative masculinity, which is the new “metrosexual” masculinity.

To understand the whole idea of a new masculinity and the boundaries between heterosexuality and homosexuality, we should return to Sedgwick’s (1985) arguments as discussed above. Her definition of homosociality is defined by a triangular structure, which is between “man – man – woman,” that acts as a channel through which men create bonds with other men through their relationship with women. In this triangle men have non-sexual bonds with other men and women. Nevertheless, in this triangle of bonds there is a point of attraction between men, which can be found in the notion of rivalry among men in their relationships with women. The idea that there is an essential continuum between different kinds of male homosocial desires opens a new area for research into the feeble boundaries between masculinities and heterosexuality/ homosexuality. In *Inclusive Masculinity*, Eric Anderson (2009) mentions that today people are witnessing a significant change in masculinity. The significant decrease in homophobia gradually leads to an increase in the range of masculine identity and positions that can be embodied and fulfilled. Anderson encourages an optimistic view of gender and gender structural changes. In many masculine contexts around the world, masculinity is still defined as the opposite of femininity and homosexuality. He does, however, describe and present a scenario in which masculinity becomes more inclusive and acceptable over time:

In a culture of diminished homophobia, boys and men will be free to express emotional intimacy and physical expressions of that relationship with one another. Accordingly, this culture permits an ever-greater expansion of acceptable heteromale behaviours, which results in a further blurring of

masculine and feminine behaviours and terrains. The differences between masculinity and femininity, men, and women, gay and straight, will be harder to distinguish, and masculinity will no longer serve as the primary method of stratifying men. (Anderson, 2009, p. 97)

1.1.3 Female Homosociality

Recent academic studies support the recently approved continuum of female friendship, feminist solidarity and same-sex desire. Nevertheless, this approach to female homosociality is also being criticized. Sedgwick suggests a point on the asymmetry between male and female homosociality. She claims that by exchanging women and consolidating men's strength, male homosociality is first and foremost shaped in society, whereas for women, the huge gap between homosociality and homosexuality is not as clear and stable. According to Katherine Binhammer (2006), this is a rather idyllic image of women's relationships, perhaps even a naive one. She argues that women circle through the same capitalistic economy and system as men and are permeated by them in many ways. Women's bonds are not formed outside but as part of the predominant sexual economy. Thus, feminine relations are not automatically defined as a hegemonic masculinity challenge.

In the article of Henriette Gunkel (2009), she mentions and analyses the "mummy-baby" relationship in the South African schools. In short, "mummy-baby" is a specific form of same-sex intimacy, female intimacy and South African schools are not the only example, there are other examples as well, such as the British boarding schools. Older girls in the school assist and advise newcomers, as well as provide emotional support, and these relationships can sometimes develop into sexual desires and emotions. As Hammarén and Johansson (2007) argue, even though such

relationships take place in the highly politicised and homo-phobic environment, this specific form of relationship seems to exist alongside the sexuality apparatus in order to be accepted. Concept of love and intimacy have always been seen as feminine aspects. In many places, particularly among young men, intimate female relationships are regarded as friendship; for example, when young women kiss, hold hands, or hug each other, they are not regarded as lesbians and their actions are regarded as normal female behaviour. Therefore, when we investigate the whole idea, there is a sharp contrast between how homosociality and homosexuality work in a male and female perspectives.

1.2 Theory of Homosociality, Male Bonding & Bromance

The concept of homosociality is mainly used as a tool to understand and to analyse male friendships and their mutual attempts to gain and to hold onto power and hegemony. In this chapter, the distinction between “vertical/hierarchical” and “horizontal” homosociality will be clarified. Hierarchical homosociality, as its name suggests, is connected to amplifying personal power in a social manner and creating close homosocial bonds to both gain and preserve hegemony. Even though this definition of homosociality is primarily used to describe male friendships and their attitudes in their social environments, it is also possible to use it to analyse female friendships and relationships. Horizontal homosociality, on the other hand, is remarkably similar to female homosociality, but it does not mean that it must be between women. This concept mainly points to relations between same-sex friendships that are based especially on emotional closeness and intimacy. There are, surely, no definite boundaries between these two ways of homosociality.

According to Sharon R. Bird (1996), homosociality preserves hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy, acting to separate men and women institutionally and interpersonally, and to suppress masculinities which are nonhegemonic. However, the common use of this concept, which is about how men maintain the patriarchy through their relationships with other men in terms of emotional neutrality, competitiveness, and homophobia, tends to reduce homosociality to a heteronormative, androcentric, and hierarchical term that describes how heterosexual men bond and defend their privileges and position. Hence, it seems that is not possible to discuss male homosocial relationships in terms of intimacy, gender equality, and non-homophobia without ignoring masculinity's potential advances.

In order to answer the previously asked question which looms over all forms of male or female friendship disregarding hierarchical means and ends, the concept of “bromance,” for male applications, and “womance,” for female applications of the term, has been introduced and it is discussed both in academic circles, rarely, and much more frequently in popular culture. “Bromance” or “womance” are close and intimate nonsexual and homosocial relationships between two or more men or women. “Womance” is quite similar to the concept of female homosociality, as female homosociality has no connotations of hegemony; however, bromance is different from traditional understanding of male homosocial relationships, and it does not always fit into the construct of masculinity found in some theories regarding masculinity that emphasize competition and hierarchies. Bromance emphasizes love, exclusive friendship, and intimacy that is not based on competition or the commonly described “shoulder-to-shoulder” masculine and sometimes even “macho” friendship, such as watching football together, golfing, or training for a marathon together. Bromances create a space for intimate friendship (Chen, 2012), even though studies

show that male friendships may include utilitarian aspects such as desire, rivalry, and self-interest, they are less idealized than bromance (Bray, 2003).

Although the concept of bromance is rarely discussed in academic circles, it is frequently depicted in media following popular culture, such as movies, TV series, comics, or websites. Sherlock Holmes and Dr. John Watson in *Sherlock Holmes* movies and TV series, Superman and Batman in DC Comics' *The Justice League* series, Dean and Castiel in *Supernatural* or Joey and Chandler in *Friends* can be given as some of the most popular examples of bromance in popular media. Many bromances are about how men form strong bonds and focus on each other. According to E.J. Chen (2012) bromances have three main characteristics: they are only for men, they are asexual, and they are places where men can share intimacy, love, and affection. Bromances are also described as phenomenon in which a complex love and affection is shared by two straight males. Bromances, or homosocial relationships between gay men, or a straight man and a gay man are uncommon, but they do exist. Chen argues that bromance gives a space for male intimacy to men, which is an opposition to the general thoughts of society about male friendship:

Bromances notably provide a space for male intimacy, in sharp contrast to the general types of friendship that society permits men to have. They recognize intimacy without sex, in contrast with general conceptions of intimacy. (Chen, 2012, p. 248-249)

The concept of bromance or male intimacy can be considered as a kind of love relation among men who hang out all the time, talk about everything and who may like to show asexual intimacy like hugging each other. It may be described as a nonsexual love affair between men. Homosocial relationships or bromances, also

known as male intimacy, are frequently associated with shared activities such as games, sports, drinking, or even going on a journey together. In the following parts of this study, homosociality will be discussed as male intimacy and bonding.

1.3 Male Bonding, World War I and *Lord of the Rings*

In social sciences, male bonding is defined as a form of close relationship and cooperation, and even as intimacy between males. Generally, it is used to describe the friendship between men in sports fields, journeys, social drinking, battlefields, and military activities; such examples, of course, can be increased and male bonding may appear in different or less male environments. Male bonding is discussed in this study through the characters of Sam and Frodo from J.R.R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* (2005) and its connections to Tolkien's knowledge and experience in World War I. There are a variety of views regarding the famous friendship between Frodo and Sam. Author Marion Zimmer Bradley, for example, describes their friendship as the book's deepest love relationship, having a close similarity to the classical ideas regarding friendship (Smol, 2008, p.320). However, David Craig (2001), in his article *Queer Lodgings: Gender and Sex in The Lord of the Rings*, sees a more modern type of friendship between Frodo and Sam regarding a comparison of their friendship to other homoerotic partnerships represented by other post-war authors who were similarly affected by World War I. According to Craig's conclusion, the relationship between Frodo and Sam is clearly a homosexual one (Craig, 2001). C.S. Lewis, a friend of Tolkien, was fiercely opposed to the idea that ancient and medieval warrior bonds were entirely homosexual, which could be seen in a similar fashion to the position of the soldiers in the trenches of World War I. In his book *The Four Loves* (1960), Lewis argues that:

Kisses, tears and embraces are not in themselves evidence of homosexuality. The implications would be, if nothing else, too comic. Hrothgar embracing Beowulf, Johnson embracing Boswell (a pretty flagrantly heterosexual couple) and all those hairy old toughs of centurions in Tacitus, clinging to one another and begging for last kisses when the legion was broken up ... all pansies? If you can believe that you can believe anything. (Lewis, 1960, p. 93).

On the other hand, Lewis (1960) does not dismiss the possibility that homosexuality, or "abnormal Eros," may creep into war-like societies as a "contamination" in cultures where women were largely absent. However, even with contesting arguments on the topic, this study takes the relationship between Sam and Frodo not as a homosexual or homoerotic relationship but one that represents male bonding as discussed above. Many critics like Tom Shippey (1995) and John Garth (2003) have argued that Tolkien's war experiences had a huge influence on his writings, which can be seen in reflections from Frodo and Sam's journey and relationship. Like most post-war writers, Tolkien deals with male bonding, issues of disillusionment, problems of recognition, and the return to domesticity. Additionally, we may assume that he reflects parts of the close emotional bonds created among the soldiers through Sam and Frodo.

In his descriptions of combat and certain fighting groups in the novel, Tolkien does use representations similar to a medieval style of heroism, but he also hints some twentieth-century aspects of the modern soldier in war. For example, the language describing the Rohirrim has an epic and medieval tone, but the Orcs or the Uruk-hai are described in a modern language. This is understandable as both Sauron's and Saruman's forces use industry and mass production of weapons and armour, as well

as Orcs themselves. Hence, it can be assumed that these dark forces are representations of the modern industry culture and modern war that comes with it. “That’s my orders. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 445) or “I may have to report that” (p. 446) are examples of how the Uruk-hai and Orcs argue among themselves and are examples of very typical modern communication, especially in modern armies. These scenes highlight the worst aspects of corporate military life; with no representation of a medieval bond of loyalty between lord and retainer, all what is represented is a gathering of soldiers forced into action against their will in order to obey orders from anonymous superiors. This easily parallels the situation and emotions felt by the conscripted soldiers of World War I. Rather than relying on a forced group solidarity, soldiers like Tolkien relied on personal bonds, such as the one shared by Frodo and Sam. Post-war writers idealized the sacrificed/killed friend, according to Paul Fussell's (1975) classic study of war literature (p. 119-20), a role that Frodo certainly fits. In the movies, we witness his physical sacrifice as he is stabbed by a Ringwraith, skewered by an orc chieftain, struck by a cave troll, stung by Shelob, whipped by orcs, and brutalized by Gollum. Tolkien's conception of Frodo's ennoblement, of his "sanctification" (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 181, p.342), involves sacrifice, a quality that Sam recognizes. Frodo tells Sam he had no sensations left:

No taste of food, no feel of water, no sound of wind, no memory of tree or grass or flower, no image of moon or star are left to me. I am naked in the dark, Sam, and there is no veil between me and the wheel of fire. I begin to see it even with my waking eyes, and all else fade. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 937-38)

Frodo’s reflections on his feelings, or his lack of feelings, resemble the emotional position of the troops staying alive but trapped in the wasteland created by bombs and

guns with a general lack in sanitation, good food, water, along with the ever-looming danger of sudden death and the deaths of those around them. Tolkien, on the other hand, does not allow Frodo to become a simple stereotype of the mythical slaughtered soldier of World War I. Frodo can be seen as a war-weary veteran who is unable to adapt successfully to civilian life by the end of the novel. Sam can also be seen as a veteran, but he has crossed the threshold between peace and war and returned happily. Sam has wishes to be with the woman he loves, Rosy, while Frodo does not have much to return to. His stab wound given by the Ringwraiths also bind him to the ghost of the past war, he is never at peace and cannot pass to the life beyond the terror of war. The remaining effects of the War in the post-war years was a common problem, soldiers still suffering from shell shock or worse. Some managed to integrate back into society, and some failed to do so.

Considering these examples given above, it may be assumed that Tolkien was really influenced by War, and he reflected his experiences in his works. Indeed, Tolkien had mentioned that he wrote Sam as “a reflection of the English soldier, of the privates and batmen I knew in the 1914 war and recognized as so far superior to myself” (Carpenter, 2000, p.95). In our contemporary understanding, the word "batman" may conjure up images of Batman and Robin from the DC Comics, but Tolkien's use of the term comes from a military term. British officers having a soldier-servant was the accepted order of the day since officers were indeed gentlemen in the British sense of the word, aristocratic or from well-endowed families. The word batman is derived from the French word "bât," which means "pack saddle," rather than cricket bats, as some have suggested. Before the motorized transportation, a batman was the attendant who took care of the baggage on the packhorse, but in time, a batman became an officer's valet, his companion. Several examples of batmen's

loyalty and devotion to the officers they cared for can be found in memoirs and books on World War I. These stories and memoirs were taken to pen by British line officers who like Tolkien had seen combat on the front and provide an insight into the types of batmen and their relationship with their officers. Lieutenant Tolkien quite possibly encountered such people during his time on the front, although there is no evidence that Tolkien actually read such stories, but the batmen described in these texts have a lot of similarities that Tolkien attributed to Sam. He wrote in a letter: “He [Sam] did not think of himself as heroic or even brave, or in any way admirable—except in his service and loyalty to his master,” (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 246, p. 476)

William Noel Hodgson (1917), who also wrote stories and poems under the pseudonym “Edward Melbourne,” died on the first day of the Battle of the Somme as a lieutenant with the Devonshire Regiment. He was a Rupert Brooke-style Georgian poet who also wrote stories and essays about the war. He wrote a story about his resourceful batman called Pearson. Lieutenant Colonel Graham Seton Hutchison also wrote about his batman, Peter McLintock (1929, p.211-22). Hodgson mentions his batman Pearson as:

He is my servant, and if he were Commander-in-Chief, the war would be over in a week. But I should get no baths, so I am glad he isn't. And I doubt whether he would care to be, himself; at present he is supreme in his own sphere and knows it and knows that the other servants know it. The only thing that he does not know is his own limitations—nobody else does either—they have never been reached.... A good soldier servant is one of the greatest marvels of our modern civilization. To possess one is better and cheaper than living next door to Harrods. Do you want a chair for the [Officers'] Mess? You have only to mention it to Pearson. Are you starving in a deserted

village? Pearson will find you wine, bread, and eggs. Are you sick of a fever? Pearson will heal you. From saving your life to sewing on your buttons, he is infallible. (Hodgson, 1917, p.77)

This type of relationship appears to be close to what we may describe as hegemonic homosociality, since there is a hierarchical order. Even though Hodgson and his batman had a male bonding, Pearson was still a “servant.” The same thing can be seen between Sam and Frodo. The relationship between them expresses the hierarchy of an officer and his batman, as Sam’s real occupation is that of a gardener to Frodo, and he always call him Mr. Frodo out of respect, as a batman would call his officer with his rank before his name. Frodo, although Hobbits have no “real” sense of nobility, belongs to one of the higher standing families, the Bagginses. His possession of Bag End, being one of the more prestigious locations in Hobbiton at least make him a landlord of an important holding. His wealth, also owing to Bilbo’s adventures, adds up to his position as a gentleman among Hobbits. Similarly, the British officers during the War were university educated and came from a middle-class family. They had the right and possibility to acquire the best servant or "batman" and Sam is the best batman for Frodo. Although he was Frodo’s gardener before, as batmen usually had professions and occupations before the War, he now had new responsibilities like waking Frodo up, cooking and packing:

Sam gathered a pile of the driest fern, and then scrambled up the bank collecting a bundle of twigs and broken wood; the fallen branch of a cedar at the top gave him a good supply. He cut out some turves at the foot of the bank just outside the fern-brake and made a shallow hole and laid his fuel in it.

Being handy with flint and tinder he soon had a small blaze going. It made little or no smoke but gave off an aromatic scent. (Tolkien,2005 p. 653).

As Tolkien (2000) also wrote in one of his letters regarding Sam's utmost loyalty and modesty, as he took head on come what may in the service of his master. He had his daily duties as discussed above, yet he also fought Goblins in Moria, Orcs in Mordor, put up with Gollum and walked the marshlands filled with the dead, and even then, it differed a little for Sam as all meant doing his job:

Sam was cocksure, and deep down a little conceited; but his conceit had been transformed by his devotion to Frodo. He did not think of himself as heroic or even brave, or in any way admirable – except in his service and loyalty to his master. (Tolkien,2000, Letter 246, p. 476)

Hodgson (1917) mentions another story about Pearson. The place where they used as the Officers Mess, a place where military personnel socialized, had a stone floor, and that made that place quite cold. When the President of the Mess ordered a carpet, Hodgson inconsiderately volunteered Pearson to get them a carpet. However, it did not seem at all possible because although Pearson was many things, he was not a "conjurer," and there was even a bet whether Pearson could get a carpet in the middle of the Western Front. In the end Pearson somehow found the carpet and brought it the next day, saying that since he could not let his officer lose a bet and lose face, he had done what he had to do. In his memoirs Hodgson (1917) mentions Pearson, after all the selfless work he has done, as supreme, as Frodo does Sam. When Sam gave the Ring that Frodo thought he had lost, he says to Sam "you are a marvel" in the Tower of Cirith Ungol (Tolkien, 2005, p. 911).

Another example of a batman is Peter McLintock who was the servant of Hutchison (1929). Hutchison mentions him as “the best, most intimate friend man ever had” (Hutchison, 1929, p.211), also he adds: “he was a faithful servant, a friend and counsellor, an ever-present companion to me, confidence in the darkness of a dangerous night, and good cheer, when fortune favoured a visit to battalion headquarters” (Hutchison, 1929, p. 215). He continues “[Peter’s] friendliness took complete possession of the necessary, though often inconvenient, affairs of life. In such things Peter’s service was priceless.... He would ... prepare a varied menu from interminable bread, plum-and-apple jam, and the sickly meat and vegetable ration... Multum in parvo to his charge, omnipresent, yet ubiquitous. . . . And he would run when his officer went over the top, and fight by his side. When the officer dropped, the batman was beside him” (Hutchison, 1929, 219-20). Both stories about batman’s traits and friendships, and Sam has almost all these traits. By the ending of the first book, for instance, Frodo warns Sam on how their journey is far too dangerous, and yet for Sam being left behind is worse than a dangerous journey. For Sam, just like the “batman” of the War, the same rule is applied: where your officer goes, you go as well.

It would be the death of you to come with me, Sam," said Frodo, "and I could not have borne that." "Not as certain as being left behind," said Sam. "But I am going to Mordor." "I know that well enough, Mr. Frodo. Of course you are. And I'm coming with you. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 406)

Certainly, the batman relationship supported the creation of physical and emotional bonds between men, in a similar fashion with the regular soldiers in the trenches during the War. Bourke (1996) describes men cooking and cleaning for each other, dancing together, reading to each other, nursing their friends, and sleeping curled up against each other in close range as examples of these bonds (p. 124-32). Although Craig (2011) believes that Sam's physical expressions of devotion to Frodo are difficult to explain solely as a result of their master-servant relationship, they are not extraordinary when considered in the context of wartime behaviour. Sam demonstrates extreme loyalty and devotion from the moment he discovers that Frodo is leaving the Shire. This devotion can be seen in the part that Sam runs to Frodo the moment he awakens in Rivendell:

Then as he had kept watch Sam had noticed that at times a light seemed to be shining faintly within; but now the light was even clearer and stronger. Frodo's face was peaceful, the marks of fear and care had left it; but it looked old, old and beautiful, as if the chiselling of the shaping years was now revealed in many fine lines that had before been hidden, though the identity of the face was not changed. Not that Sam Gamgee put it that way to himself. He shook his head, as if finding words useless, and murmured: "I love him. He's like that, and sometimes it shines through, somehow. But I love him, whether or no. (Tolkien, 2005, p.652)

There are many other examples of this devotion: When they meet the elves in the woods, Sam refuses to leave Frodo's side; when Frodo is stabbed at Weathertop, he chokes up with tears. Also like a good batman, Sam decides what to bring for Frodo and himself, cooks, and supplies food and water. Only Sam, out of the entire

company, knows Frodo well enough to know what he will do if they cannot find him at Amon Hen. Their relationship is marked by physical tenderness and protective gestures, known as "tactile tenderness," which is described as typical gesture of male intimacy during World War I. As they stop to catch their breaths on their way to the Bridge of Khazad-dûm, Frodo leans on Sam, who wraps his arms around him. Sam tells Frodo to take a turn sleeping after rescuing him from the Tower of Cirith Ungol, and as he struggles to stay awake, he takes Frodo's hand while sitting and thinking. Following this scene, in the next morning "they woke together, hand in hand" (Tolkien, 2005, p.922). When Frodo confides to Sam, whom he calls "my dearest hobbit, friend of friends (Tolkien, 2005, p. 624)" that all he expects for them is a one-way trip to Mount-Doom, Sam's reaction is as: "He took his master's hand and bent over it. He did not kiss it, though his tears fell on it" (Tolkien, 2005, p. 624). Of course, the bond between them is mutual, which can be seen when they creep their way through Shelob's lair: "Sam left the tunnel-side and shrank towards Frodo, and their hands met and clasped, and so together they still went on" (Tolkien, 2005, p.718). After Sam tells Frodo about Gollum's betrayal, there is only one response Frodo can give: "When he had finished, Frodo said nothing but took Sam's hand and pressed it" (Tolkien, 2005, p. 926) Although these are small, private gestures, Tolkien creates both a physical affection and protection which more openly represents the love between the two friends. When they are on the stairs of Cirith Ungol, Sam says Frodo to sleep and rest a while he keeps guard. When it is observed this scene from Gollum's perspective:

Sam sat propped against the stone, his head dropping side ways and his breathing heavy. In his lap lay Frodo's head, drowned deep in sleep; upon his white forehead lay one of Sam's brown hands, and the other lay softly upon his master's breast. Peace was in both their faces. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 714).

Gollum murdered his friend Deagol, whom he called “my love” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 53), and from his point of view, this situation is the opposite of what he had done. Sam protects Frodo and his devotion to his friend Frodo is immense. Although Sam is committed to Frodo from the start of the journey, their relationship becomes even more important once they separate from the rest of the fellowship. A turning point is, of course, the moment when Sam catches Frodo leaving for Mordor without him. They express that each is equally important to the other. Sam “All alone and without me to help you? I couldn't have borne it, it'd have been the death of me.” And Frodo replies to that “it would be the death of you to come with me, Sam . . . and I could not have borne that (Tolkien, 2005, p. 406). When Frodo rescues Sam from drowning, he says “Up you come, Sam my lad!”(Tolkien, 2005, p. 404). He also uses the affectionate term "lad" a second time, describing it as "very warm" in its representation of male intimacy. Even though Frodo still leads, as an officer, Sam gradually gains control as the journey progresses. The part of their final moments in their journey, in Mount Doom, where they crawl up towards the summit shows how a reversal of roles take place, with Sam leading and Frodo following. In that moment, Frodo trusts Sam whole heartedly because Sam knows him best, knows his intentions and maybe Sam considers himself as an extension of Frodo. This unity comes from extreme trust and love, which is a perfect example of homosociality, where social hierarchy loses its meaning. However, even though Sam takes the role of leadership

from Frodo, he still sees him as his "master." Therefore, he can be considered as a typical, if not archetypal, batman. The deep reliance of Frodo for Sam's assistance and power can be seen in the scene where Frodo falls after glancing of the Eye, which causes Frodo to uncontrollably reach for the Ring, all the while asking Sam for assistance:

'Help me, Sam! Help me, Sam! Hold my hand! I can't stop it.' Sam took his master's hands and laid them together, palm to palm, and kissed them; and then he held them gently between his own (Tolkien, 2005, p. 943).

While master-servant or officer-batman relationships, as well as friendship, continue to exist between them, on the other hand Sam shows some heroic aspects as well, although heroism is mostly expected from leading characters. As George Clark points out, Sam is similar to traditional heroic warriors: at the Council of Elrond, he takes a vow to die with Frodo if necessary on the quest, although it is not formally stated, and he dreams of having his acts recorded in songs. Sam takes on heroic qualities in other ways as well. After Frodo has been injured at Weathertop "Sam drew his sword and stood over Frodo" (Tolkien, 2005, p.197) just like a warrior who is defending his lord, or a loyal batman would for his officer. Another example is that Sam jumps to Frodo's help at Moria's gates, slashing at the tentacles of a monstrous creature, dragging him into the pool with his knife, while the others are stunned in horror. Also, he shows his loyalty and courage on Mount Doom. Sam pushes to his physical limits and carries Frodo up the mountain, which he did with a true heroic fashion, though the task seems almost impossible: "Come, Mr. Frodo!" he cried. 'I can't carry it for you, but I can carry you.'" (Tolkien, 2005, p.940) All of Sam's heroic moments, on the other hand, exist purely to help Frodo to complete his quest, not to gain personal glory for himself. His

loyalty and love for Frodo seems to be the stem of his heroism, unexpected courage, and power against any opposition.

As it is stated in the previous pages, Sam and Frodo's relationship is quite similar to what soldiers had in the trenches of World War I: a socially closed area where male bonding and intimacy are found. Even though Sam and Frodo are like the officer and the batman, they have an extremely close bond and, most of the time a deep intimacy. This combination of male bonding and intimacy is often taken as explicit portrayals of homosexuality or homoeroticism by some critics. However, many other critics whose ideas are presented in the pages above, these are actually the social and emotional necessities of the War and the specific conditions it brought forward. With the film, of course, there has been a differing in the image of the relationship between Frodo and Sam. The film replaces the book's loving gestures with a more solid image of a hand assisting a friend. There is a focus on the image of "hand reaching for a friend" as Frodo does when Sam is drowning near the end of *The Fellowship of the Ring*, also, Sam does when Frodo is hanging from the edge in the Crack of Doom in *The Return of the King*. This image is one of the film's most dominant images of friendship, yet it lacks the tenderness which the books put forward. When compared to the books, the films diminish the intimacy, particularly the physical intimacy, between Frodo and Sam. Even so, by modern standards, they successfully convey the depth of feeling between the two friends, as well as a convincing portrait of all hobbits as quite emotional beings. Following the criticism of their relationship in the books, even such a diminished representation of male friendship or intimacy, can create discussions in a similar sense.

Tolkien's portrayal of the Frodo and Sam's story is that friendship styles are historically defined to a large extent. It can be said that *The Lord of the Rings* (2005) portrays a male intimacy that grew out of the extraordinary circumstances of the World War I, trench warfare and continuous existence in a wasteland. Tolkien created the friendship between Frodo and Sam based on his own experiences, a relationship that has sometimes been misunderstood, ridiculed, or sometimes cherished, and elaborated by many readers. Whether people encounter Frodo and Sam's relationship through books or films, it is almost impossible to deny that male bonding and friendship have been depicted in the greatest sense it could possibly be.

2. WOMAN, FEMININTY & THE SHIELDMAIDEN

There is no such thing as a natural death: nothing that happens to a man is ever natural, since his presence calls the world into question. All men must die: but for every man his death is an accident and, even if he knows it and consents to it, an unjustifiable violation. (*Simone de Beauvoir, A Very Easy Death, p.75-76*)

In the 1968 BCC interview, Tolkien mentions this quote from Simone de Beauvoir and the idea of death is the key-spring of his masterpiece *The Lord of the Rings*. As it is known now, De Beauvoir is recognized as a "feminist" and Tolkien is usually derogatively labelled as "sexist" for the way he took women into perspective in his novels by a large number of scholars and academics. However, how could he be inspired by De Beauvoir's thoughts this much and ignore her other opinions? Many scholars have accused Tolkien and his friends, the Inklings, of being "sexist," and

Tolkien, in particular, has continuously been accused of having too few female characters in active roles in *The Lord of the Rings*. Although it is easily forgotten that only a glimpse of his world can be seen in the novel, and many prominent female characters enlighten some of his most inspiring parts that are only faintly reflected. What is more, it should not be forgotten that Tolkien lived in an era where there was a male hegemony in Europe, and quite strongly in Britain. Also, he served with the British Expeditionary Force in World War I, which, according to many critics, had a profound effect on him, and echoes of the war can be seen in *The Lord of the Rings*. In his opinion, the only females in the war were nurses and possibly cooks; women took less place in the military efforts in history and a grander one in politics thus, it seems natural that there are few examples of women characters in an epic set as a last war between good and evil/light and darkness. The very few women are the “most” important exceptions, however, it is also understandable for critics who look from a contemporary point of view to accuse him with sexism. In spite of this common approach, as it is mentioned above, we must remember that his motivation for *The Lord of the Rings* came partly into being from a quote by De Beauvoir and even though there are a few female characters in the novel, these characters are quite prominent in the story. In this chapter, the focus will be on femininity and female characters, to elucidate a novel look upon these themes and especially, the Lady of Rohan, Éowyn.

2.1 Femininity and the Female

In *The Lord of the Rings* (2005), there are very few female characters that are given a voice; however, these female characters are not negligible. Beside their non-negligible importance, they look for equality in their rights, especially Éowyn, like the

women did in the era where the book was written. The suffragette movement was active during his lifetime, and as the movement saw Joan of Arc as a symbol of their movement following the events in 1909, and Éowyn with her resemblance to the historical figure and saint may hold some importance to Tolkien's approach to women in a world torn by war of survival. Suffragette movement, similarly, with Éowyn, asks for the same rights with the men of their society and therefore a study of equality feminism from the perspective of the day may shed light upon how Tolkien handled Éowyn and her connection to women in general.

Equality feminism emphasizes men and women's essential similarities, with the main goal of gender equality in all areas. This includes political and economic equality, workplace equality, being free from all the gender roles. Feminist theory aims to promote women's rights as equal and not to be differentiated from men. According to equality feminists, of course, men and women have fundamental biological differences; however, on a psychological level, the ability of using rationality or reason is genderless. Equality feminists consider men and women to be on an equal basis when it comes to their capacity to reason, achieve goals, and to be successful in life. What equality feminist theory promotes is equality regarding wants, goals, and achievement for both men and women. In this view, humans have an androgynous, neutral, and equal foundation when it is looked outside of the cultural context. According to many equality feminists, the main core of women and men is the capability of reason.

One of the important figures of "equality feminism" is Mary Wollstonecraft who wrote one of the earliest feminist works but while she does not explicitly state that men and women are equal, she does call for equality in various areas of life, which leads the way for future equality for feminists. She wrote one of the earliest

works in feminist philosophy, but while she does not state clearly that men and women are equal, she calls for equality in different areas of life that paves the way for future equality for feminists. In her work *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*, she actually discusses that women should be educated in a way comparable to their social position. She utters her argument by suggesting that since women were the primary care givers, they could teach their own children better and be "companions" to their husbands rather than wives.

Wollstonecraft argues that as women are human beings and that, therefore, they deserve equal fundamental rights as men instead of being considered as "property" exchanged through marriage. (Wollstonecraft, 2021, p.74-88)

Adding to this line of argument, John Stuart Mill published *The Subjection of Women* (2009) in which he argued for equality between the sexes. Mill believes that the moral and intellectual improvement of giving women equal opportunities would lead to greater happiness for everyone. He believed that all humans have the possibility to be educated and civilized, and he argued that women should have the right to vote. (Mill,2009, p.92) Throughout the book, Mill maintains that both men and women should be able to vote in order to defend their rights and to be able to stand morally and intellectually on their own two feet. Mill counters many of the arguments that women are inferior to men in certain activities and should therefore be prohibited from participating in them. His defence stemmed from the fact that women were not given the same opportunities and it has not been possible to know at all what women are actually capable of. (Mill,2009, p. 96-98) He continued his argument through the actions of his contemporaries and that men were making an authoritative statement without providing any evidence, and that their argument was purely

speculative. Mill's opinion was that by allowing women to discover their full potential, it would double the number of mental faculties available to serve humanity and have a significant impact on human development. (Mill,2009, p.167-69)

2.2 What is a woman?

Simone de Beauvoir played an incredibly significant role in equality feminism with her book *The Second Sex*. “Man is defined as a human being and woman as a female—whenever she behaves as a human being, she is said to imitate the male” (DK Publishing, 2019, p.157) as De Beauvoir argues, and she wrote a book about women, and their place in society. De Beauvoir starts with a straightforward question: "What is a woman?" (Beauvoir, 2014, p. 28). She goes on to say that women are the "Other," that is, they are defined only in relation to men, noting that philosophers have generally defined women as imperfect men, starting from Plato and Aristotle and continued in the Western tradition. She explains that a woman is simply what man decrees, and that she is defined and differentiated in terms of man, rather than in terms of her. Woman is “incidental,” the “inessential” and the “other,” whereas man is a “subject,” “absolute” (Beauvoir,2014, p.29). In other words, society establishes the male as the primary sex and the female as the secondary.

De Beauvoir investigates biology, psychology, and historical materialism in the first volume of *The Second Sex* (2014) in search of reasons for women's subordination; however, she finds none. These various disciplines reveal undeniable differences between men and women, but they do not justify women's status as second-class citizens.

When an individual or a group of individuals is kept in a situation of inferiority, the fact is that he or they are inferior. But the scope of the verb to be must be understood; bad faith means giving it a substantive value, when in fact it has the sense of the Hegelian dynamic: to be is to have become, to have been made as one manifests oneself. Yes, women in general are today inferior to men; that is, their situation provides them with fewer possibilities...”

(Beauvoir, 2014, p. 37)

This quote establishes de Beauvoir's viewpoint on women's status in society and how they came to be into the position they held during the period she was making her research. Her argument established an important point: keeping women in an inferior position, eventually made them suffer more, and allowed this male perspective to become true. For example, denying women access to education because they are perceived to be “assumedly” inferior in the first place makes them eventually inferior to men over time, because they would lack the same academic skills as men were gifted with. Therefore, her proposition was that men prevented access to education for women because they were actually afraid of them and the competition they would bring to the field:

Some men feel threatened by women’s competition. In Hebdo-Latin the other day, a student declared: “Every woman student who takes a position as a doctor or lawyer is stealing a place from us. (Beauvoir, 2014, p.37)

Pointing out to this Hegelian dynamic means that women were not always inferior, or at least they are not biologically inferior mentally, but they “generally” did become inferior over time, because of the assumption of their inferiority caused them

to be subjected to inferior conditions. Therefore, with the stand she takes, De Beauvoir denies the established, fixed, and inevitable destiny laid out for women. De Beauvoir also explores history, tracing social changes from nomadic hunters to modern times, as well as mythology and literature. Even when fighting for their rights, such as the suffrage campaign, she finds that women were treated as second-class citizens in all areas. She contends that male values always prevail and that women are subordinated to the point where the female's entire history is man-made.

De Beauvoir provides key concepts about how men have mythologized women. She begins by stating that men created women as “the other” in order to economically oppress her. On top of that, she also claims that this situation fits men’s ambitions as well: “This condition served males’ economic interests; but it also suited their ontological and moral ambitions” (Beauvoir, 2014, p. 210). In short, a man desires to possess a woman in order to establish his existence. Women have learnt how to hide their real feelings since men oppress them. According to De Beauvoir, men label women as how they should be or how they are and they believe that “real women” are those who embrace their roles as “the other,” as defined by men. De Beauvoir’s stand is perfectly defined in the impossible position given to women as:

A woman who teases male desire too blatantly is considered vulgar; but a woman who is seen to repudiate this is disreputable as well: she is seen as wanting to look like a man: she’s a lesbian; or to single herself out: she’s an eccentric; refusing her role as object, she defies society: she’s an anarchist. If she simply does not want to be noticed, she must still conserve her femininity. (Beauvoir, 2014, 706-7)

2.3 Femininity: “On ne naît pas femme: on le devient.”

De Beauvoir (2014) starts the second volume of the book by saying:

Women of today are overthrowing the myth of femininity; they are beginning to affirm their independence concretely; but their success in living their human condition completely does not come easily. (Beauvoir, 2014, 355)

In the first part of the *Second Sex*, de Beauvoir (2014) discusses how girls are usually treated during their childhood. Her primary argument is that girls are not born into womanhood but are raised to identify with certain characteristics associated with "femininity" and “womanhood:”

One is not born, but rather becomes, woman. No biological, psychic, or economic destiny defines the figure that the human female takes on in society; it is civilization as a whole that elaborates this intermediary product between the male and the eunuch that is called feminine. (Beauvoir, 2014, 357)

This claim sets de Beauvoir's theories apart from Freud's. Unlike Freud, who believed that women think in certain ways because of their anatomy, de Beauvoir (2014) claims that they think in certain ways as a result of how they are socially constructed by adults and peers over time. According to de Beauvoir (2014), a young girl is as strong as her brothers and has the same intellectual capacity until she reaches the age of twelve. De Beauvoir (2014) , on the other hand, describes in great detail how a young girl is conditioned to adopt what is presented to her as femininity, claiming that a woman's autonomous existence and her objective self are at odds: she is taught that in order to please others, particularly men, she must make herself the object rather than the subject, and she must abandon her autonomy. Similarly, same

kinds of roles can be seen for the boys as well, when they grow up to a certain age, they must now learn to be the desired “subject:”

It is here that little girls first appear privileged. A second weaning, slower and less brutal than the first one, withdraws the mother’s body from the child’s embraces; but little by little boys are the ones who are denied kisses and caresses; the little girl continues to be doted upon, she is allowed to hide behind her mother’s skirts, her father takes her on his knees and pats her hair; she is dressed in dresses as lovely as kisses, her tears and whims are treated indulgently, her hair is done carefully, her expressions and affectations amuse: physical contact and complaisant looks protect her against the anxiety of solitude. For the little boy, on the other hand, even affectations are forbidden; his attempts at seduction, his games irritate. “A man doesn’t ask for kisses ... A man doesn’t look at himself in the mirror ... A man doesn’t cry,” he is told..... The requirements he is subjected to immediately imply a higher estimation. In his memoirs, Maurras recounts that he was jealous of a cadet his mother and grandmother doted upon; his father took him by the hand and out of the room. “We are men; let’s leave these women,” he told him. (Beauvoir, 2014, 360)

Even if young women are motivated to study and participate in sports, they will not be exposed to the same pressure to succeed as boys will eventually be exposed to. Instead, a girl seeks a different kind of fulfilment; she must maintain her femininity and remain a woman. Women reinforce their own dependency, according to de Beauvoir, through love, narcissism, or mysticism. De Beauvoir attacks and rejects a life with “tedious housework, motherhood, and sexual slavishness” (DK

Publishing,2019, p.159) and she believes that women who are conditioned to be dependent accept a life full of these roles. According to de Beauvoir (2014), a woman sees herself and makes decisions based on how men define her, not on her true nature and this is where her oppression begins.

Femininity, according to Tara Williams (2011), began in the 1300s during the English medieval period. Women in those ages were defined by traditional roles: “maiden, wife, or widow” (p. 4). Then, in 1949, de Beauvoir wrote “no biological, psychological or economic fate determines the figure that the human female presents in society” and “one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman” (Beauvoir,2014, p. 357). It is believed that although biological differences existed between males and females, the concepts of femininity and masculinity were socially constructed, with traits such as passivity and tenderness being assigned to women and aggression and intelligence to men. According to Judith Butler (1999), gender is not a fixed or inherent trait, but rather a socially defined set of behaviours and characteristics that have evolved to be labelled as feminine or masculine over time. Feminine and Masculine characteristics can be listed as (Rawls, 2015, p. 112):

Table 1 - Aspects of Feminine and Masculine Traits

	Feminine (understanding)	Masculine (power)
Positive	love, counsel, intuition (insight and foresight), mercy and compassion	law, action, reason, justice
Forms of Creativity	song, dance, healing, weaving	fine arts, crafts, technology
Negative	impotence, passivity, consuming or devouring	rashness, aggression, self-aggrandizement

The table above explains, in Rawls' view, the separation of feminine and masculine traits; in positive, negative and creativity based the problem is not creating characteristics, but to assume that women must have only feminine aspects. The same thing goes for men as well. It is wrong to expect only masculine characteristics from men. Tolkien wrote deep and most interesting characters who could be great examples of having both feminine and masculine aspects. One of these characters is Éowyn, who is considered as "the second" in the society because of her gender.

2.4 Triskelion: Women of Tolkien

Many contemporary scholars, especially feminist critics, have very harsh feelings about *the Lord of the Rings* and how few women it includes, and they blame Tolkien for being a "sexist." Candice Fredrick and Sam McBride mention the idea in their book *Women Among the Inklings* (2001): "Middle-earth is very Inkling-like, in that while women exist in the world, they need not be given significant attention and can, if one is lucky, simply be avoided altogether" (Fredrick & McBride, 2001, p. 108). Maybe the world of Middle-Earth seems to be "a world of men" and maybe especially female readers feel abandoned by this. However, there are three incredibly significant ladies in the book: Galadriel, Arwen and Éowyn. Also, Hobbit and Dwarf women are mentioned as well. The reader does not have much knowledge about Dwarf women though. It is noted in the novel that the Ents have lost their wives and are still waiting/looking for them. It is highly possible that Ent-wives were destroyed in one of the wars that plagued Middle-Earth. A topic which is well wrought into the fabric of the novel.

Some critics argue that Tolkien should not be judged according to the 21st century moralities and ethics. They claim that Tolkien lived in a different era where women were mostly oppressed. Melissa McCrory Hatcher (2007) mentions this in "Finding Woman's Role in The Lord of the Rings" as:

This idea of presentism, however, fails both to adequately explain Tolkien's own sexism and to take seriously the powerful female characters in *The Lord of the Rings*. Tolkien's contemporaries were Virginia Woolf and the Bloomsbury group and Gertrude Stein and her Paris writers' group. Tolkien himself worked with several strong female scholars at Oxford Moreover, when Tolkien was writing his masterpiece, from 1937 to 1948, women were

even controlling the home front in England— taking over "male" jobs during World War II. He and the Inklings were aware of the women's movement and lived at a time when it was impossible to ignore. Therefore, it is certainly not adequate to make the argument of presentism to defend a man living only fifty years ago. (Hatcher, 2007, p.3)

Although Tolkien's position seems to contribute to the possibility and importance of powerful women, his personal letters to his son give away some of his more "sexist" perspectives towards women. Either due to what de Beauvoir's ideas represented as women inferiority is due to ages long oppression in preventing their education or directly personal prejudices towards women in scholarly life, his ideas show a disregard for women's intellectual capabilities:

How quickly an intelligent woman can be taught, grasp [her professor's] ideas, see his point—and how (with rare exceptions) they can go no further, when they leave his hand, or when they cease to take a personal interest in him (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 43, p.74-5)."

However, *the Lord of the Rings* and characters in it should be considered according to their own merits, not with the possible biases of its author. Because even though, Tolkien could have been a sexist in his personal life, in the book, Éowyn is a complete character who fulfils the themes of "peace, preservation and cultural memory" (Hatcher, 2007, p. 3). Tolkien gives an important role to women as healers or protectors. However, Éowyn, who protects Middle-Earth with her life, has a central role, as Fredrick and McBride mention in *Women Among the Inklings*, "Éowyn has more speaking lines and appears in more scenes than any other woman in *The Lord of*

the Rings” (Fredrick& McBride, 2001, p.112). She is possibly a representative of an ideal woman Tolkien has in mind, who pushes through social norms and expected roles, overcomes obstacles, and faces one of the greatest fears of fighting men in the field of slaughter. If a contrast can be made between the medieval epic of Sir Walter Scott’s *Ivanhoe*’s (1994) Rowena and Éowyn, as Rohan has similarities with the Anglo-Saxon culture, although they seem similar in terms of their physicality with a shared fairness of a princess, they are completely different in terms of the gender roles they fulfil. While Rowena is powerless and fragile, Éowyn is strong and outspoken. While Rowena waits for her champion to finish the work and come back to him, Éowyn rides with men into battle. Finally, when Rowena watches helplessly for *Ivanhoe* to be cured, Éowyn takes over the role of the healer as her part as a warrior is finished. Although both are similarly portrayed in medieval or at least mediaeval milieu, Éowyn takes a completely different approach.

Another character who fulfils the theme of peace and is an extremely powerful woman in *The Lord of the Rings* (2005) is Galadriel. The Lady of Lothlorien is portrayed as an all-seeing Mother Nature figure who can read the Fellowship's thoughts. She is a mighty individual, but it is a different kind of might. She does not fight in the war like Éowyn does; however, she has strong characteristics. First of all, she is one of the oldest beings on the face of Middle-Earth. When Galadriel was born, the stars were not present in the night sky, and when they came to be, their first light is hewn into her eyes for ever more. Her wisdom, deep knowledge of the world, magical power and capability of healing is beyond most beings in Middle-Earth, probably making her the greatest of all the Elves in Middle-Earth during the Third Age. Tolkien writes her scenes according to her gravitas and magnanimity. For

example, the scene where the Fellowship are in the presence of Galadriel and her husband, Celeborn:

‘Alas!’ said Celeborn. ‘We long have feared that under Caradhras a terror slept. But had I known that the Dwarves had stirred up this evil in Moria again, I would have forbidden you to pass the northern borders, you and all that went with you. And if it were possible, one would say that at the last Gandalf fell from wisdom into folly, going needlessly into the net of Moria.’

‘He would be rash indeed that said that thing,’ said Galadriel gravely.

‘Needless were none of the deeds of Gandalf in life. Those that followed him knew not his mind and cannot report his full purpose. But, however it may be with the guide, the followers are blameless. Do not repent of your welcome to the Dwarf. If our folk had been exiled long and far from Lothlorien, who of the Galadhrim, even Celeborn the Wise, would pass nigh and would not wish to look upon their ancient home, though it had become an abode of dragons?’

‘Dark is the water of Kheled-zarâram, and cold are the springs of Kibil-na’la, and fair were the many-pillared halls of Khazad-dûm in Elder Days before the fall of mighty kings beneath the stone.’ She looked upon Gimli, who sat glowering and sad, and she smiled. And the Dwarf, hearing the names given in his own ancient tongue, looked up and met her eyes; and it seemed to him that he looked suddenly into the heart of an enemy and saw there love and understanding. Wonder came into his face, and then he smiled in answer. He rose clumsily and bowed in dwarf-fashion, saying: ‘Yet more fair is the living land of Lórien, and the Lady Galadriel is above all the jewels that lie beneath the earth!’ There was a silence. At length Celeborn spoke again. ‘I did not know that your plight was so evil,’ he said. ‘Let Gimli forget my harsh words:

I spoke in the trouble of my heart. I will do what I can to aid you, each according to his wish and need, but especially that one of the little folk who bears the burden.’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 357)

In this scene, it can be seen how powerful and strong Galadriel actually is. She humbles her husband Celeborn after his demeaning comments regarding Gimli and his dwarven kin on the matter of Moria. Eventually, Celeborn asks for forgiveness from a dwarf which is quite uncommon and possibly even hurtful of for a high-born elf. In addition to that, Galadriel is the actual ruler of Lothlorien, and she is the one who has the “one of the three rings.” While other bearers of Elven rings were changed in time, as one passed to Elrond from his previous king Gil-galad, and the ring of fire was given to Gandalf, Galadriel is the only one who still held onto her ring and created the protected Heart of Elvendom on Middle-Earth. Galadriel and Éowyn are both portrayed in positions of power; however, expression of their power is different. Éowyn chooses to fight in a battle.

Éowyn is both a warrior and, later as she decides, a healer. In *Arwen: The Elf Warrior?* Jessica Yates (2000) describes Éowyn a warrior who meets all criteria for this title: “sense of identity and purpose, military training, armour, good weapons and a horse, magic powers due regard for chastity and modesty.” Also, she maintains that Éowyn, as the embodiment of the classic woman warrior, is more concerned with her sense of identity and purpose than with self-transformation or having a love interest (p. 14). As a scholar of Northern myths, languages, and histories, it is almost impossible to ignore the fact that Tolkien was well versed in the stories of the shield maidens of the Viking warriors or women fighters in other Germanic tribes. Even Éowyn herself is described as a shield maiden in the novel, although her position

appears to be symbolic to the men of Rohan, but not to her. She would prove this in the Battle of Pelennor Fields. Éowyn is also depicted as strong from the point of view of Aragorn:

The woman turned and went slowly into the house. As she passed the doors she turned and looked back. Grave and thoughtful was her glance, as she looked on the king with cool pity in her eyes. Very fair was her face, and her long hair was like a river of gold. Slender and tall she was in her white robe girt with silver; but strong she seemed and stern as steel, a daughter of kings. Thus Aragorn for the first time in the full light of day beheld Éowyn, Lady of Rohan, and thought her fair, fair and cold, like a morning of pale spring that is not yet come to womanhood. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 515)

Before she joins the Riders of Rohan in battle, in one of her first scenes, Éowyn and Aragorn talk in a witty manner. After Aragorn refuses to ride with her brother, Éomer, Éowyn asks Aragorn whether she can ride with him or not. However, Aragorn tells her to defend her land when all men go to battle. And Éowyn's answer to this:

'Shall I always be chosen?' she said bitterly. 'Shall I always be left behind when the Riders depart, to mind the house while they win renown, and find food and beds when they return?' 'A time may come soon,' said he, 'when none will return. Then there will be need of valour without renown, for none shall remember the deeds that are done in the last defence of your homes. Yet the deeds will not be less valiant because they are unpraised.' And she answered: 'All your words are but to say: you are a woman, and your part is in the house. But when the men have died in battle and honour, you have leave to

be burned in the house, for the men will need it no more. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 784)

This excerpt illustrates Éowyn's challenge to the traditional role of a woman in Rohan and possibly in other realms of men, which can be seen as a reflection of the women's struggle throughout the 20th century. As it is mentioned previous pages, De Beauvoir mentions this matter as women's "situation provides them with fewer possibilities." (Beauvoir, 2014, p.37) Éowyn is not given much of a choice, instead she is given a duty. She puts words in Aragorn's mouth as she seems to be fed up with her role to be decided for her by the men of Rohan, her uncle King Théoden, and her brother Éomer, throughout her life. Although they leave to fight to protect the land and leave her in control of Edoras, this kind of power is not enough for Éowyn. Then she adds: "But I am of the House of Eorl and not a serving-woman. I can ride and wield blade, and I do not fear either pain or death" (Tolkien, 2005, p.784). According to her, there are worse things than death. She is not afraid of pain but is afraid of oblivion. Also, she lists her qualifications to Aragorn to prove her value as she wants to ride with him. Since she is trained just like the men of Rohan, she does not understand the reason why she should be left behind and tend to the land. These words belong to a woman who will not be oppressed by any men, even her king. She seeks glory in the battle, not love. Éowyn is not a stagnant character and she is searching for a meaning in her life. That is the reason she wants to ride with Aragorn and ride for battle. When Aragorn asks her what she fears of, she answers:

'What do you fear, lady?' he asked. 'A cage,' she said. 'To stay behind bars, until use and old age accept them, and all chance of doing great deeds is gone beyond recall or desire.' (Tolkien,2005, p. 784)

As it can be understood from the quote, Éowyn does not fear death but not to be free. Such treatment of women of royalty was common in English history, left to govern the kingdom when their king was away. Some of these queens took their nations to battle as well, such as Catherine of Aragon battling the Scottish King while Henry VIII was in France. Others ruled their countries instead of their inept husbands, such as Margaret of Anjou. Amy Licence remembers a passage from Edward Hall, famous medieval historian and lawyer who describes Margaret of Anjou as: "This woman excelled all other, as well in beauty and favour, as in wit and policy, and was of stomach and courage, more like to a man, than a woman" (As mentioned in Licence, 2018, p. 39). Although there are no clear lines that connect the inspiration of Éowyn to the She-Wolves of English history, yet Tolkien must have been aware of their existence, and even in the medieval era, such women with unexpected qualities were found to be exceptional, even more so than men of their age.

As feminist critics point out that much of the Western literature has denied women's desire, subordinating women to men's desires. Éowyn does not fulfil her desire, yet Tolkien accepts that she has a complex, powerful subjectivity, because of her desire to have both masculine and feminine sides. She transforms herself into Dernhelm to provide male aspects, but she keeps her feminine aspects. Her desire is not to be caged; but rather to find her role in society. In the light of these reflections of women, it is hard to assert that Tolkien was indifferent to the feminist movements.

Another argument for Éowyn's situation is that she had to disguise herself in male clothes to go to battle. Fredrick and McBride (2001) mention this idea by saying: "to depict Éowyn as an actual warrior, Tolkien must transform her into a man" (Fredrick & McBride, 2001, p. 113). This attitude agrees with "gender roles." Because, if men and women are equal and can have both a feminine and masculine side, why

does Tolkien have to transform her into a man? It is discussed that Éowyn cross-dresses because she wants to have a "voice" in society. She does not fit into given female roles, because she does not have just a feminine side, she does also have a masculine part. Even from the beginning, Éowyn is portrayed as a "warrior," and within her disguise, she gets what she desires; however, it does not mean hers is a complete "transformation into a man" (Hatcher, p. 8). Even while disguised, Tolkien pictures how much Éowyn loves and cares for others, almost like a maternal figure. This dialectic renders Éowyn as a complex and an integrated character. She has both a feminine "-love, insight, mercy"- and a masculine -"justice, action"- parts.

‘I received you for your safe-keeping,’ answered Théoden; ‘and also to do as I might bid. None of my Riders can bear you as burden. If the battle were before my gates, maybe your deeds would be remembered by the minstrels; but it is a hundred leagues and two to Mundburg where Denethor is lord. I will say no more.’ Merry bowed and went away unhappily, and stared at the lines of horsemen. Already the companies were preparing to start: men were tightening girths, looking to saddles, caressing their horses; some gazed uneasily at the lowering sky. Unnoticed a Rider came up and spoke softly in the hobbit’s ear. ‘Where will wants not, a way opens, so we say,’ he whispered; ‘and so I have found myself.’ Merry looked up and saw that it was the young Rider whom he had noticed in the morning. ‘You wish to go whither the Lord of the Mark goes: I see it in your face.’ ‘I do,’ said Merry. ‘Then you shall go with me,’ said the Rider. ‘I will bear you before me, under my cloak until we are far afield, and this darkness is yet darker. Such good will should not be denied. Say no more to any man, but come!’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 804)

After Théoden tells Merry that he cannot ride with them, and Éowyn, as a Dernhelm, takes Merry with her because she knows no one else will take him into battle. She makes a connection with Merry since she is not allowed to ride to the battle with the rest of her people. Éowyn disguises herself in male warrior clothes to gain a right to have a voice and to achieve what she desires. Her cross-dressing example can be seen in the *Twelfth Night* (2007), when Viola first arrives in a strange foreign land, she dresses as a boy to protect herself and to find a voice in society. Éowyn has grown up to feel committed and devalued in a culture which values physical strength and strength in arms. After Éowyn defeats the Witch King heroically, Gandalf tells her brother Éomer:

‘My friend,’ said Gandalf, ‘you had horses, and deeds of arms, and the free fields; but she, born in the body of a maid, had a spirit and courage at least the match of yours. Yet she was doomed to wait upon an old man, whom she loved as a father, and watch him falling into a mean dishonoured dotage; and her part seemed to her more ignoble than that of the staff he leaned on.

(Tolkien, 2005, p. 867)

Through Gandalf, Tolkien expresses a gender perspective that is certainly sensitive to the pain of a woman like Éowyn living in a male-dominated world although it cannot be called explicitly feminist. As a woman, Éowyn is further characterized by physical activities which she proves to be more than adept in carrying out. The encounter between the Witch King and Éowyn proves her strength and her skill in the battle. In her *Mythology*, Jane Chance mentions that Éowyn “serves Rohan in battle better than any other Rider from the Mark” (p. 72). Even though she would prove to be best of Rohan, she was always left behind by her king

and brother. Before the Battle of Helm's Deep while the people of Edoras were to be transported to Dunharrow, Éowyn is not the first choice to lead the people either, a man is sought for the important task at hand:

'Behold! I go forth, and it seems like to be my last riding,' said Théoden. 'I have no child. Theodred my son is slain. I name Éomer my sister-son to be my heir. If neither of us return, then choose a new lord as you will. But to someone I must now entrust my people that I leave behind, to rule them in my place. Which of you will stay?' No man spoke. 'Is there none whom you would name? In whom do my people trust?' 'In the House of Eorl,' answered Háma. 'But Éomer I cannot spare, nor would he stay,' said the king; 'and he is the last of that House.' 'I said not Éomer,' answered Háma. 'And he is not the last. There is Éowyn, daughter of Eomund, his sister. She is fearless and highhearted. All love her. Let her be as lord to the Eorlingas, while we are gone.' 'It shall be so,' said Théoden. 'Let the heralds announce to the folk that the Lady Éowyn will lead them!' (Tolkien, 2005, p. 523)

The moment Théoden chooses the person who will lead when they have gone to battle, at first, he does not think of Éowyn, but Háma mentions how brave she is and how much everyone in the kingdom admires her. Yet, some feminist critics see this as negative because she is not asked her decision on this matter. As Fredrick and McBride (2001) mentions that as "an unwillingness to accept her lot in life: living as a female who, as such, is disbarred from a life of glory on the battlefield" (Fredrick & McBride, 2001, p. 113). However, when viewed through the lens of the "middle-age" era, it is actually one of the highest societal positions, that could be taken up by a woman. Besides, Háma suggests Éowyn to this position primarily because she is

"fearless," so in the eyes of men, Éowyn is more than a regular lady, partaking in qualities that are deemed masculine. Until the cross-dressing for battle, Éowyn has been silent, and when she disguises as a Dernhelm, her silence is her own choice. Thus, in the moment she encounters with the Witch King her voice becomes hers again, embodying a singular subjectivity that maintains a strong feminine-masculine dialectic. Through Merry's point of view, readers learn the aspect of this new-born voice: "Dernhelm speaking; yet now the voice seemed strange, recalling some other voice that he had known" (Tolkien, p. 841). Thus, we can maintain that she eventually finds her own voice again as Éowyn, and as a female knight:

‘Begone, foul dwimmerlaik, lord of carrion! Leave the dead in peace!’ A cold voice answered: ‘Come not between the Nazgul and his prey! Or he will not slay thee in thy turn. He will bear thee away to the houses of lamentation, beyond all darkness, where thy flesh shall be devoured, and thy shrivelled mind be left naked to the Lidless Eye.’ A sword rang as it was drawn. ‘Do what you will; but I will hinder it, if I may.’ ‘Hinder me? Thou fool. No living man may hinder me!’ Then Merry heard of all sounds in that hour the strangest. It seemed that Dernhelm laughed, and the clear voice was like the ring of steel. ‘But no living man am I! You look upon a woman. Éowyn I am, Eomund’s daughter. You stand between me and my lord and kin. Begone, if you be not deathless! For living or dark undead, I will smite you, if you touch him.’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 841)

This declaration appeared to shake the Ringwraith's confidence, as it gave no response, and this type of reaction is common indicative of a cultural masculine disregard for women. Being the deadliest and feared “man” on the field of battle, to

be challenged by a “mere” woman who seems immune to his horrors is a psychological blow to the Witch King, as could be to a hypermasculine man. She is a disrupting element to his authority, and hegemonic masculinity has no tolerance for women even trying to question its rule, let alone challenge it. It is worth noting that Éowyn uses the Ringwraith's prophecy to her advantage. Éowyn fulfils the Elven prophecy as it is known as “the Lady of the Shield-arm” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 1070) Éowyn shows a perfect example of extreme bravery in her fight against the Witch King, a quality which most people, especially men, would have expected from a man:

The winged creature screamed at her, but the Ringwraith made no answer, and was silent, as if in sudden doubt. Very amazement for a moment conquered Merry's fear. He opened his eyes and the blackness was lifted from them. There some paces from him sat the great beast, and all seemed dark about it, and above it loomed the Nazgul Lord like a shadow of despair. A little to the left facing them stood she whom he had called Dernhelm. But the helm of her secrecy had fallen from her, and her bright hair, released from its bonds, gleamed with pale gold upon her shoulders. Her eyes grey as the sea were hard and fell, and yet tears were on her cheek. A sword was in her hand, and she raised her shield against the horror of her enemy's eyes..... Suddenly the great beast beat its hideous wings, and the wind of them was foul. Again it leaped into the air, and then swiftly fell down upon Éowyn, shrieking, striking with beak and claw. Still she did not blench: maiden of the Rohirrim, child of kings, slender but as a steel-blade, fair yet terrible. A swift stroke she dealt, skilled and deadly. The outstretched neck she clove asunder, and the hewn head fell like a stone. Backward she sprang as the huge shape crashed to ruin, vast wings outspread, crumpled on the earth; and with its fall the shadow

passed away. A light fell about her, and her hair shone in the sunrise. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 841-2)

It is important to note that the hero is being a woman, rather than a woman disguised as man, is critical to defeat the Witch King. A further reading of this scene could be expanded if we look at Shakespeare's *Macbeth* (2007). The three witches tell Macbeth that he should be careful against "no man born of woman." (V.III.8) Macbeth's last scene perfectly fits the scene in which Witch King and Éowyn finally come to blows in the climax of the battle. When Macduff kills Macbeth because he is not "woman born," as he was born by a caesarean section, fulfilling the prophecy given by the three witches, and completing Macbeth's downfall and his assurance to the impossibility of his prophecy. The same thing may be seen in *The Lord of the Rings* (2005), as Macbeth, the Witch King was sure not to be killed since he thinks the person in front of him is man, and according to prophecy "no man can kill him." A similar scene brings Éowyn and Macduff into similar shoes and she fulfils her part by her strength, bravery and the fate is fulfilled. Éowyn clearly does not need to be transformed into a man to achieve anything; in fact, her being a woman changes the course of the war. Of course, Éowyn kills the Witch King with the help of a hobbit, Merry, who was also banned from battleground. It is an unmistakable coincidence for the greatest and most dangerous creature of the battle to be taken down, one that was assumed to be unkillable by any man, by those who were considered unfit to be there. In *Tolkien's Art*, Jane Chance gives the importance of their killing of the Witch King by these words: "The service they render, a vengeance impelled by pity and love for their lord, is directed not only to the dead king and father Théoden, or to Rohan and Gondor, but to all of Middle-earth" (Chance, 2001, p. 174). Éowyn is more than "a

traditional woman” or “a traditional warrior.” She does not have just pure feminine qualities; she has both feminine and masculine qualities which makes her all the more interesting and important. “A traditional passive female,” for instance, possibly has only feminine aspects, or if it could be perceived as such, they are not allowed to have masculine qualities at all, and any such attempt would be stomped under the feet of social standards. Yet, if Éowyn allowed her qualities which are defined as “masculine,” she would not have the possibility of ever changing her fate, as well as those who she loves. Therefore, Tolkien looks very positively for such qualities to be in women and see them as a benefit to all the good in the world, quite like de Beauvoir’s and other feminists’ ideals for women.

Éowyn transforms into four phases, first “court lady,” then “acting-lord,” then “female knight” and lastly “wife and healer” (Linton, 2005, p. 277). The last transformation of Éowyn happens with her love relationship to Faramir, the new Steward of Gondor. They have both been waiting the news of the Great War in the Houses of Healing, they are both wounded. Some critics prefer to see Faramir as an oppressive man who chains Éowyn. Fredrick and McBride (2001) asserts “Éowyn's healing is a victory, not only for Faramir but for their civilization; an unruly impulse to transcend prescribed gender roles has been successfully thwarted” (Fredrick & McBride, 2001, p. 113). They also add that “Éowyn's healing comes from accepting the role that her civilization demands from her as a woman: to be a beautiful, helpful, and cheerful companion to a man” (Fredrick & McBride, 2001, p. 113). On the other hand, Faramir accepts that Éowyn “wished to have renown and glory and to be lifted far above the mean things that crawl on the earth” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 964). When Faramir tells Éowyn his affection and says that he understands and empathizes her affection for Aragorn, Éowyn tells him:

‘I wished to be loved by another,’ she answered. ‘But I desire no man’s pity.’

‘That I know,’ he said. ‘You desired to have the love of the Lord Aragorn. Because he was high and puissant, and you wished to have renown and glory and to be lifted far above the mean things that crawl on the earth. And as a great captain may to a young soldier, he seemed to you admirable. For so he is, a lord among men, the greatest that now is. But when he gave you only understanding and pity, then you desired to have nothing, unless a brave death in battle. Look at me, Éowyn!’ And Éowyn looked at Faramir long and steadily; and Faramir said: ‘Do not scorn pity that is the gift of a gentle heart, Éowyn! But I do not offer you, my pity. For you are a lady high and valiant and have yourself won renown that shall not be forgotten; and you are a lady beautiful, I deem, beyond even the words of the elven tongue to tell. And I love you. Once I pitied your sorrow. But now, were you sorrowless, without fear or any lack, were you the blissful Queen of Gondor, still I would love you. Éowyn, do you not love me?’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 964)

Faramir highlights the idea that Aragorn pities Éowyn, not because of her love, but because of her great and pristine battle skills. Also, he mentions he does not pity her, rather accepts that “she has a weakness and wants her to grow as individual” (Hatcher, 2007,p.51). According to Faramir, Éowyn is his equal, and he does not try to oppress her , or to pity her. When Faramir expresses her love and shows Éowyn her vanity, he helps Éowyn to realize the limits of her desire and potential. That is because the moment Faramir confesses his love for her “the heart of Éowyn changed, or else at last she understood it. And suddenly her winter passed, and the sun shone on

her” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 964). In the end, when Faramir “asks that Éowyn Lady of Rohan should be his wife, and she grants it full willing” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 977). It can be interpreted that they will have equal partnership throughout life. In *The Mythology of Power*, Jane Chance insists that “the rebirth of Middle-earth is matched by the healing of two 'stewards; Éowyn of Rohan and Faramir of Gondor—the one hurt in spirit and the other in body” (Chance, 2001, p. 143). This emphasizes Éowyn's significance as a chosen character who represents Tolkien's theme of fighting for peace rather than glory. Faramir may put an end to Éowyn's vanity-driven quest, but he does not put her in “a cage.” Tolkien himself mentions that in his letter 244 “this tale does not deal with a period of 'Courtly Love' and its pretences; but with a culture more primitive (sc. less corrupt) and nobler” (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 244, p. 469). What Tolkien means is that there is no political agenda or courtly intrigue in the relationship, and it is completely emotional. What is more, it is also a non-political marriage, decided by rulers and this allows the reader to see that Éowyn is completely involved in the relationship, she has no oppressing power that forces her into a relationship with him. Faramir and Éowyn can be seen as a modern marriage ideal, bringing together equal life partners. As a result, Éowyn's love story and subsequent "healing" process should be viewed as a self-determined transformation of an independent woman. After, Éowyn declares that: “the Shadow has departed! I will be a shieldmaiden no longer, nor vie with the great Riders, nor take joy only in the songs of slaying. I will be a healer and love all things that grow and are not barren” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 965). Éowyn finally realizes that it is necessary to fight in order to protect and preserve the world for the good. She has fought and now will bring life to the barrenness that war has left behind. Tolkien, however, does not depict Éowyn simply marrying and having children; instead, he gives her an active role in

recovering Middle-Earth as a healer. In *The Mythology of Power*, Chance mentions that “fertility and renewed vitality of the Shire [and all of Middle-earth] symbolize the power of restored community in its enablement of healing through love and care” (Chance, 2001, p. 126). Sam and Éowyn are both given the important task of taking care of and healing the land.

In *the Lord of the Rings*, women are not passive, like Anglo-Saxon women, best portrayed in another fiction character as discussed above, Rowena of Scott, but they are self-realized and powerful women who seek for peace and justice. In *The Mythology of Power*, Chance adds that *the Lord of the Rings* "reflects Tolkien's genius in providing a voice for the dispossessed in the modern world" (Chance, 2001, p. 2). Modern scholars who believe that women do not exist in *The Lord of the Rings* are quite mistaken. Éowyn, in spite of their negative perspective, not only represents equal physical strength, but she is also fitted to pursue what is most important: peace, preservation, and cultural memory. Tolkien believes that gender and sex are not the same, and that gender, either as masculine and feminine, is an aspect of the universe that extends beyond sex, mere male and female, and the necessities of reproduction. The feminine and masculine are present throughout the story; when they are in balance and harmony, there is good; evil, on the other hand, is the result of an inadequacy or disharmony of one or both genders' attributes. Feminine and masculine concepts, as well as their tributes and roles, are thus associated with the concepts of Good and Evil, and are thus near the centre of Tolkien's story, which is, after all, a story about the struggle between Good and Evil.

3. MASCULINE, NON-FEMININE & THE SECOND SON

3.1 Masculinity

Masculinity can be analysed as, in short, a set of behaviours and roles attributed to men. There are various debates and research on masculinity and many of these studies indicate that masculinity is formed both socially and biologically. However, the subject of this study will focus on “socially constructed” masculinity. This is due to the fact that when masculinity is taken into perspective of the “biological,” it can be considered that both male and female sex can have masculine or feminine traits. Traditionally and historically, masculinity is mostly associated with “strength,” “courage,” “independence,” “leadership” and “pride,” which are easily identifiable traits in *The Lord of the Rings* with several leading characters coming to mind. While Aragorn and Faramir partake in these traits, they are not simply characterised by them alone. However, Boromir and Denethor, possibly Éomer and Théoden can be taken as characters completely endowed in them.

Feminism has also brought interest into masculinity studies as well. Masculinity studies explore such issues as the difficulties of concepts like the "classic man" finding a place in the modern world, as well as discussing concepts like the "new man" and what it has to say to the world, the problems of masculinity, as well as forgoing issues under race, nationality, race, etc. The first wave of masculinity studies appeared during the period of second-wave feminism. Women were calling for their solidarity, and male activists felt that masculinity was a similarly defined problematic modality that found itself in a crisis, whereupon a new level of consciousness was needed to be created. Therefore, they created some personal growth groups where men could talk about their issues and tormented relationships with other men. These male activists' main argument was that women are not the only ones who suffer from

roles in society. Masculinity studies see “masculinity” as a “social construction,” in any age or time, as society tormented women to fit into decided boundaries, so it did for men. As a result, men who did not, or could not conform to these boundaries suffered similarly with the women and continued to do so. This study takes this reality and uses it as a lens to interpret the relationship of Denethor, Boromir and Faramir, in order to discern why Faramir is a character Tolkien himself identifies with and if he sees Faramir as an ideal male figure of a new age.

Since the concept of masculinity has changed and continues to do so both historically and culturally, according to Raewyn Connell (2005), it must be discussed under the terms of there being more than one definition pertaining to masculinity. During Antiquity and in ancient literature, masculine ideals were implied in gods, myths, and heroes. In Ancient Greco-Roman literature, men and women were portrayed in stereotypes, men for instance, with “virtues” and women with “vices.” Men were pictured as “strong” and “brave,” whereas women were portrayed as “weak,” and even “vindictive,” sometimes “naive,” and “superstitious.” They also lacked “courage,” while negative aspects such as “arrogance,” “deception” and “lust for power” were also given features which were attributed to female characters. It was believed all these features were caused by women’s lack of “masculine” reason and self-control. In the Medieval ages, on the other hand, both perspectives towards the female and the male changed. The European masculinity, as described by the terms “Christian” and “chivalric” saw a greater change (Richards, 1999, p. 213- 234). Men also were portrayed as brave, respectful, and generous in the literary works of the day. According to David Rosen (1993), for traditionalist scholars like J.R.R. Tolkien, masculinity as a concept can be exemplified with the traditional figure of Beowulf: the hero, strong and powerful (Rosen, 1993, p. 11). However, there are a number of

contrary arguments to Rosen's assumption on Tolkien's concept of "hero," which will be discussed in the following chapter. During the Victorian Era, the idea of masculinity started to change from the traditional "medieval hero;" yet, still, capabilities in regards strength and physicality were seen as the true source of masculinity. Starting from 20th century to our contemporaries, men have been considered as "the provider" of the house, and women have been considered as "the lady of the house." Even though women participated in labour force and got paid, men's central role stood the same. In this period, a man's level of masculinity is commonly measured by his economic prowess. It can be seen as "power" or even "strength" in some level. With the rising levels of education with the modern era, intellect and intellectual capabilities also came to be intricately connected to the male persona, even ascending over physical strength, which can be connected to economic skill, and power through income and power over other men. The modern men, as to be expected, deny any resemblance of softness, delicate emotions or dependence which are attributed towards women. In short, even though it has been changing through time, "being strong and powerful" lie inherently with the masculinity. Similarly, in Tolkien's world, Denethor, Steward of Gondor, always looked to Boromir as the answer to his troubles. Boromir, the commander of soldiers, Boromir, the strong warrior, Boromir, the dauntless conqueror; instead, a more emotional, wise, tactical, stealthy, ambushing captain of the rangers appeared to be a polar opposite of the "burly" Boromir. Denethor's favouritism seems intricately connected to Denethor's praise of masculine traits over those that can be attributed to more feminine ones.

The term of masculinity started to emerge with the rising waves of feminism; however, it eventually become popular after the 1970s. It establishes the differences between sex and gender, and it defends that gender is socially constructed. It

obviously has nothing to do with sex, but with what society expects of that sex. The social norm, mostly stemming from within the family and the head of the family, the father, is so strong that men who do not have the traits that are considered “masculine” or “manly,” fall under the derogatorily implied label: “feminine.”

We could just speak of 'men's' and 'women's', or 'male' and 'female'. The terms 'masculine' and 'feminine' point beyond categorical sex difference to the ways men differ among themselves, and women differ among themselves, in matters of gender. (Connell, 2005, p. 69)

As Connell (2005) explains, the terms of “masculinity” and “femininity” are not used to describe the sex, but to convey the ways how women and men are different from themselves. Since masculinity is not some quality that all men have, maleness is biological; however, masculinity can be constructed (Whitehead and Barrett, 2001, p. 16). Masculinity conveys the ideals that what man is like or how a man should have (Williams, 1999, p. 4). Craig Williams explains these ideals for men of society as:

Masculinity refers to a complex of values and ideals that can more profitably be understood as a cultural tradition than as a biological given: the concept refers to what it is to be fully gendered as ‘a man’ as opposed to merely having the physical features held to signify ‘a male.’ (Williams, 1999, p. 4)

In the society of man, all men should fulfil the ideal, and for a man to be accepted as masculine, his masculinity should be favoured by other men. According to Connell (2005), there is not just one masculinity, but there are forms of it and they are not equal; therefore, it should be considered as “masculinities” as plural. Connell

understands this as a form of social hegemony, as derived from Antonio Gramsci, along with a line of scholars studied upon the effects of society on persons:

The concept of 'hegemony', deriving from Antonio Gramsci's analysis of class relations, refers to the cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life. At any given time, one form of masculinity rather than others is culturally exalted. Hegemonic masculinity can be defined as the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women. (Connell, 2005, p.77)

Connell introduces "hegemonic masculinity" as the masculinity of the dominant group. She continues her ideas with the relationships between femininities and other masculinities as well as hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005, p. 44). Connell explains hegemony as "a social ascendancy achieved in a play of social forces that extends beyond contests of brute power into the organization of private life and cultural process." (Connell, 1987, p. 184). What is also interesting in this position about hegemonic masculinity is that the hegemony is forms does not mean just social and cultural dominance over women, also to other forms of masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity is the type of masculinity that oversees most gender relationships in a certain configuration. It strives to be the dominant power, undermines others as "the others," and tyrannizes the minorities. It can be assumed that this hegemonic rule prevents both a right to voice, and a right to "be" without constraints. Those who wish to live under it are either marginalized or hidden under a fake masculinity. It may be

possible to see the relationship between Faramir's exile from his father's good graces, as well as Éowyn's need to assume a fake masculinity with an armour and helmet.

Most men are not able to have all the features of "masculinity," if any, due to the fact that hegemonic masculinity is an ideal. Nevertheless, it allows a power position to men, which means that some men have advantages over women and children. Therefore, since some men get some benefit from hegemonic masculinity, they do not complain about it. Connell mentions this as "complicit masculinity" (Connell, 2005, p. 79). It could be described as an unspoken agreement with the hegemony. Connell believes that in our modern era, the most group of men are engaged in hegemonic masculinity, but it cannot be presumed that it is the situation in every culture (Connell, 1997, p. 8). Complicit masculinity can still be taken under the hegemonic masculinity as it conforms into its rules, even if those inside it are not perfect examples of the ruling masculinity. However, those who both do not fit and do not conform are the problematic issues of this masculinity. Since hegemonic masculinity is established in relation to other masculinities, relations between groups of men are dominated and subordinated. "Subordinated masculinity" relates to femininity. Hegemonic masculinity defines femininity as anything that is not masculinity and hence subordinated masculinities are described as stereotypically having feminine features. Thus, subordinated masculinity can be seen as "the other" by the hegemonic culture.

From the beginning of *The Lord of the Rings*, it is explicit that according to Tolkien, "gender" and "sex" are not the same thing; and gender, with the aspects of masculine and feminine, is deeper, wider, and more complex than just "sex," pure male or female. When a selection of prominent and important male characters in the story are observed, it can be seen that many of them carry what we may call feminine

features, while some possess solely “hegemonic” masculine features. Moving forward with the types of masculinity and masculine/feminine in the novels will be analysed, specifically focusing on the relationship between the brothers Faramir and Boromir, and their father Denethor. It may be assumed that one of the main feminine characteristics chosen by Tolkien is the capability of “understanding” while the main masculine trait remains that of “power.” However, not all masculine traits can be considered to be roots of evil or just negative by Tolkien. Both sides have both positive and negative aspects. The capability of “understanding” nature and beings is reserved for characters who has feminine features such as Faramir and Gandalf, and in accordance with their gifts, they are befitted to give counsel; in contrast, those with a claim on “power,” the ones with masculine features act. There are lots of positive aspects of feminine and masculine traits inside the novel, for instance, “mercy and compassion, intuition” are related to a feminine aspect, while “law, reason and justice” are related to the masculine. On the other hand, both have negative aspects as well; “impotence, passivity and consuming” as feminine negative traits, and “rashness, aggression and self-aggrandizement” for masculine (Rawls, 2015, p. 112). It can be assumed from this point that Tolkien possibly called for a combination of good traits in people, as investing too much in one will bring its negative sides as well as the good. What is most suitable would be, a balance of traits to provide a complete characteristic with benefits to him or herself, as well as their milieu. Both Faramir and Éowyn can be seen as characters having both feminine and masculine sides, finding each other as an ideal woman and man, in a new age of peace in Middle-earth.

In *The Lord of the Rings*, characters like Aragorn, Gandalf, and Faramir are the models for men who have feminine features, as discussed previously. Of course, all Hobbits have feminine features, and most Elves are the same. Although looking at

the oldest Elves, such as Glorfindel or the stories of previous ages, Elves were more masculine than they appear in the novel, a warrior culture prevailing over the beings of harmony and beauty. Coming back to primary characters, Aragorn is no Elf or Hobbit, yet he is raised in Elvish lands, therefore he is raised with Elvish values. Looking to the wizards of Middle-earth, by many older cultures “sorcery” and “witchcraft” being considered as feminine and attributed to the female, Gandalf can be considered as a character who has feminine traits. Being an Odinic figure, and Tolkien being a scholar of Northern cultures, the specific poem of *Lokasenna* comes to mind; in which Loki insults Odin for using *seiðr*/sorcery and condemns it as an unmanly/non-masculine art. It is common in such cultures for use of magic to be seen as feminine. Similar characters appear in Greek mythology, as all characters who experiment in magic are women. Looking back at the characters other than listed above, having feminine features is not quite common, on the contrary, most men are “hegemonic” in their nature, as well as it seems to be the natural way of things at the end of the 3rd Age of Middle-earth.

3.2 Denethor and Faramir: A Hegemonic Father?

In this chapter, feminine features of Faramir and hegemonic masculinity of Boromir and Denethor will be analysed. Why does Denethor favour Boromir over Faramir? Why is Faramir the “second” son? Of course, Faramir literally is the “second son;” however, there is more to it than that; his favours with his father Denethor are egregiously lesser in contrast to that of Boromir, who is alike in terms of masculine features. Both Denethor and Boromir carry the features of what can be described as “hypermasculinity.” In contrast to this, Faramir is more of a man with strong feminine aspects, or as Connells (2005) puts forward, he has “subordinated

masculinity.” In addition, he takes counsel from Gandalf, another character who also subordinated his masculinity beyond its constraints. Apart from being a wizard, Gandalf is one of the oldest beings in Middle-earth and a spirit created by the Gods of Tolkien’s world, although not omnipotent, his wisdom is still beyond any man. This shows Faramir’s interest in taking counsel not to his benefit but of the objective realities in his world. Hence, he knew that he should let the Ring Bearer go on his way rather than taking him to Minas Tirith as his father Denethor or his brother Boromir would or might have done. Boromir’s masculine approach of gaining more power to tackle another was never the way to fight Sauron, and Faramir’s wisdom and “inaction” allowed the journey to continue.

Looking at his characteristics, Faramir is curious and intuitive, he acts according to his intuitions, but he is never impulsive, he always ponders on his actions very carefully, and at the same time he is witty. Tolkien talks about Faramir as “courageous and decisive but also modest, fair-minded and scrupulously just and very merciful” (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 244, p. 468). Many of these features are attributed as feminine aspects. His father, Denethor though, have the aspects of hypermasculinity, and this difference create a conflict into the relationship of father and son:

‘Denethor II was a proud man, tall, valiant, and more kingly than any man that had appeared in Gondor for many lives of men; and he was wise also, and far-sighted, and learned in lore.’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 1056)

Denethor proves to be a dominant and oppressive ruling steward, in that he tries to control everyone around him, which can be exemplified by the notion of masculinity that is founded on domination and oppression. He even uses this power over his sons, with whom he does not have a perfect relationship, and he displays his

preference for his elder son, Boromir, in public, which adds to the endless frustration in the family. Faramir gives much more importance towards Gandalf's counsel, unlike Boromir. According to his description above, Denethor has wisdom and knowledge to empower his position, however, Faramir prefers the wisdom of Gandalf over that of his father. This denial of his wisdom, which is probably formed around his hypermasculine character, is also a part of the conflict between them. Faramir does not see Denethor as his role model, which Boromir might do so, who is quite similar to his father in many aspects. Therefore, ensued by jealousy and drive to reach a level of superiority against Gandalf, Denethor becomes both a hegemonic and distant father for Faramir, and an unjust liege. He is not capable of seeing Faramir's efforts and victories for his land: "I would ask you, my father, to remember why it was that I, not he, was in Ithilien"(Tolkien, 2005, p. 813), and even though he tries to prove that he is also a son of Gondor and outperforms his resources and capabilities to keep their lands safe, Denethor replies his sacrifice by blaming Faramir for Boromir's death:

'Do you wish then,' said Faramir, 'that our places had been exchanged?' 'Yes, I wish that indeed,' said Denethor. 'For Boromir was loyal to me and no wizard's pupil. He would have remembered his father's need and would not have squandered what fortune gave. He would have brought me a mighty gift.'

(Tolkien, 2005, p. 813)

In contrast to Faramir, Boromir is more like Denethor, so he is favoured by Denethor as the good son. Boromir does, or is tempted to do whatever Denethor wishes for himself and his reign in Gondor, without much hesitation and against better judgement. Boromir tries to take the ring back to Minas Tirith, even though his wishes were rejected many times, and eventually turns against Frodo due to his fears of

weakness of Gondor against Sauron's forces. Denethor feels similarly with Boromir and hopes to gain the Ring as the only way of defeating Sauron. Both father and son also hoped to ignore the return of the King of Gondor, although their position have always been temporary. Denethor, due to his pride and masculine ego, does not give away his throne. Denethor also acts sometimes without thinking about the bigger picture ahead, ignoring any possible retreat for a better chance at a later confrontation and cannot tolerate defeats:

'That was but a trial,' said Faramir. 'Today we may make the Enemy pay ten times our loss at the passage and yet rue the exchange. For he can afford to lose a host better than we to lose a company. And the retreat of those that we put out far afield will be perilous, if he wins across in force.' 'And what of Cair Andros?' said the Prince. 'That, too, must be held, if Osgiliath is defended. Let us not forget the danger on our left. The Rohirrim may come, and they may not. But Faramir has told us of great strength drawing ever to the Black Gate. More than one host may issue from it, and strike for more than one passage.' 'Much must be risked in war,' said Denethor. 'Cair Andros is manned, and no more can be sent so far. But I will not yield the River and the Pelennor unfought.. (Tolkien,2005, p. 816)

Faramir lists their losses and informs Denethor that going back is not a logical move; however, the only thing Denethor cares is the glory or victory, he cannot tolerate defeat, especially in Faramir's hands. This reaction could be also a response to losing his favourite child to a task he sent for, and he blames Faramir for his own shortcomings. Whatever the reason, he is disappointed with Faramir because he has not returned with the victory he had hoped for, but in the current condition of Gondor,

it is almost impossible to gain a victory by strength of arms alone. Denethor even tantalizes Faramir's feelings by asking rhetorical questions: "...–‘ not if there is a captain here who has still the courage to do his lord's will" (Tolkien, 2005, p. 816), and uses his emotional power on Faramir to make him go back and gain an impossible victory. Since things are not the way he wants them to be, he uses his power as a father and lord by calling to the expected masculine qualities of a soldier and son: courage, loyalty, power to overcome any obstacle.

Then all were silent. But at length Faramir said: 'I do not oppose your will, sire. Since you are robbed of Boromir, I will go and do what I can in his stead – if you command it.' 'I do so,' said Denethor. 'Then farewell!' said Faramir. 'But if I should return, think better of me!' 'That depends on the manner of your return,' said Denethor. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 816)

Denethor speaks bitterly and forgets that Faramir is as much his son as Boromir was. He is blind with the fear, fears that his authority will fall in danger. He has all the negative features of the masculine: rashness, aggression, and self-aggrandizement. Without thinking he sends Faramir to battle, he acts aggressively, and he talks in a similar fashion. His arrogance and fear contribute to Faramir's suffering in his hands. To such a point that Gandalf feels to need to reassure him, and counsel him into not doing what Denethor feels that he should do:

Gandalf it was that last spoke to Faramir ere he rode east. 'Do not throw your life away rashly or in bitterness,' he said. 'You will be needed here, for other things than war. Your father loves you, Faramir, and will remember it ere the end. Farewell!' (Tolkien, 2005, p.817)

Denethor's excessive pride and obsession forces into a deep depressive state and his decisions are not well-thought. Since his son Boromir died, he starts to lose his control over his emotions, stability of his mind and senses, and when Faramir returns heavily wounded, he starts to lose his grip on power, self-control and begins to assert a sick modality of hypermasculinity. He wants to burn both himself and Faramir:

There Pippin, staring uneasily about him, saw that he was in a wide vaulted chamber, draped as it were with the great shadows that the little lantern threw upon its shrouded walls. And dimly to be seen were many rows of tables, carved of marble; and upon each table lay a sleeping form, hands folded, head pillowed upon stone. But one table near at hand stood broad and bare. Upon it at a sign from Denethor they laid Faramir and his father side by side, and covered them with one covering, and stood then with bowed heads as mourners beside a bed of death. Then Denethor spoke in a low voice. 'Here we will wait,' he said. 'But send not for the embalmers. Bring us wood quick to burn, and lay it all about us, and beneath; and pour oil upon it. And when I bid you thrust in a torch. Do this and speak no more to me. Farewell!'

(Tolkien, 2005, p.826)

After Denethor falls into despair and tries to kill both himself and Faramir, Pippin says to Beregond: "I think you have a madman to deal with, not a lord. I must run. I will return if I can" (Tolkien,2005, p. 827). Denethor is no longer fit to rule, losing everything, including his sense of identity and tries to preserve what was left from it by committing suicide, "and advises everyone else to do the same, rather than be a slave under a puppet government" (Croft,2002, p.8). He chooses death over

losing his hegemony. However, it was his unbending masculinity that caused him to lose all he had, at the darkest moment in mankind's history in Middle-earth.

3.3 Day & Night, Masculine & Feminine, Boromir & Faramir

Boromir has been brought up to take control and succeed as the oldest son of Denethor, the steward of Gondor, the next to come in a long line of stewards who rule in the absence of a king from the ancient line of Numenor (Tolkien, 2005, p. 1054). Moreover, he is a soldier, and he is described as “strong, fearless and proud:”

Boromir, five years the elder, beloved by his father, was like him in face and pride, but in little else. Rather he was a man after the sort of King Earnur of old, taking no wife and delighting chiefly in arms; fearless and strong.

(Tolkien, 2005, p.1056)

...

And seated a little apart was a tall man with a fair and noble face, dark-haired and grey-eyed, proud and stern of glance. He was cloaked and booted as if for a journey on horseback; and indeed though his garments were rich, and his cloak was lined with fur, they were stained with long travel. He had a collar of silver in which a single white stone was set; his locks were shorn about his shoulders. On a baldric he wore a great horn tipped with silver that now was laid upon his knees. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 240)

Faramir, on the other hand, is described as “gentle and modest:”

Faramir the younger was like him in looks but otherwise in mind. He read the hearts of men as shrewdly as his father, but what he read moved him sooner to pity than to scorn. He was gentle in bearing, and a lover of lore and of music,

and therefore by many in those days his courage was judged less than his brother's. But it was not so, except that he did not seek glory in danger without a purpose. He welcomed Gandalf at such times as he came to the City, and he learned what he could from his wisdom; and in this as in many other matters he displeased his father. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 1056)

Even though they are completely different characters, there is not a hint of jealous rivalry between the brothers, instead they look out for each other:

'Yet between the brothers there was great love, and had been since childhood, when Boromir was the helper and protector of Faramir. No jealousy or rivalry had arisen between them since, for their father's favour or for the praise of men. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 1056)

Therefore, in this chapter, their masculine and feminine features will be analysed especially with their parts in the war. Although similar in physique, they are different as night and day, even though both are nurtured by the same society. However, the greatest factor could be the nurturing counsel of Gandalf for Faramir, something which he was inclined to take, possibly due to his nascent character, which was lured towards the wisdom of Gandalf, rather than towards the stern masculine worldview of Denethor. However, Faramir is not solely made of feminine aspects, and a close study of masculine and/or feminine aspects shown by the two brothers will be analysed and their contributions to the war put up against Mordor. Boromir seems strong and proud in the Council of Elrond, and of course, he represents Gondor in the manner Denethor assumes to be:

Boromir stood up, tall and proud, before them. ‘Give me leave, Master Elrond,’ said he, ‘first to say more of Gondor, for verily from the land of Gondor I am come. And it would be well for all to know what passes there. For few, I deem, know of our deeds, and therefore guess little at their peril, if we should fail at last. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 245)

When he makes a wish towards claiming the Ring, he does it for Gondor; yet, he does not think of the consequences, nor he does know what consequences it may bear. Although he is knowledgeable enough to know the Ring as Isildur’s Bane, an item which consumes the souls of men and only brings destruction. Therefore, it is possible that he ignores the consequences and/or assume that he is above them, unlike Isildur. He only thinks that the Ring will solve their problems, because they are the ones who fight the armies of Mordor every day. However, he does not ponder to imagine what the Ring could do either to his beloved Gondor or himself. Jane Chance mentions in *The Mythology of Power* (2001) that from the very beginning, his excess of pride and his absence of both wisdom and humility had condemned his future. (Chance, 2001, p. 76) From the moment they meet, he feels threatened by Aragorn, who he learns in the Council of Elrond is to be the rightful king of Gondor. He now sees his hierarchical position in Gondor challenged, as the king-to-be has shown up and his authority and masculinity are being challenged. With this, his moral decay overcomes his good will, and when he understands, the Ring does not go to Gondor, he tries to take it from Frodo:

‘Why are you so unfriendly?’ said Boromir. ‘I am a true man, neither thief nor tracker. I need your Ring: that you know now; but I give you my word that I do not desire to keep it. Will you not at least let me make trial of my plan?’

Lend me the Ring!’ ‘No! no!’ cried Frodo. ‘The Council laid it upon me to bear it.’ ‘It is by our own folly that the Enemy will defeat us,’ cried Boromir. ‘How it angers me! Fool! Obstinate fool! Running wilfully to death and ruining our cause. If any mortals have claim to the Ring, it is the men of Númenor, and not Halflings. It is not yours save by unhappy chance. It might have been mine. It should be mine. Give it to me!’ Frodo did not answer, but moved away till the great flat stone stood between them. ‘Come, come, my friend!’ said Boromir in a softer voice. ‘Why not get rid of it? Why not be free of your doubt and fear? You can lay the blame on me, if you will. You can say that I was too strong and took it by force. For I am too strong for you, halfling,’ he cried; and suddenly he sprang over the stone and leaped at Frodo. His fair and pleasant face was hideously changed; a raging fire was in his eyes. Frodo dodged aside and again put the stone between them. There was only one thing he could do: trembling he pulled out the Ring upon its chain and quickly slipped it on his finger, even as Boromir sprang at him again. The Man gasped, stared for a moment amazed, and then ran wildly about, seeking here and there among the rocks and trees. ‘Miserable trickster!’ he shouted. ‘Let me get my hands on you! Now I see your mind. You will take the Ring to Sauron and sell us all. You have only waited your chance to leave us in the lurch. Curse you and all halflings to death and darkness!’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 399)

On the one hand, this action is motivated by his patriotic desire to save his people, but at the same time, he has completely capitulated to temptation and believes that he can control it; therefore, due to his arrogance, he assumes that the only way he

can reclaim his status and power is to take the One Ring from the Ring-bearer. Wayne G. Hammond and Christina Scull portray him as “a tragic figure with many good qualities but with weaknesses that lay him open to temptation. The Ring has been able to play on his wish to save his country and on his desire for personal glory” (Hammond & Scull, 2005, p. 349). Therefore, it can be observed through these examples that having “hypermasculinity” may lead men to be tempted by exterior forces, because they do not want to lose their hegemony. In addition to that, they are too proud to admit that there is another power beyond their own capabilities and strengths, which they may not conquer at any given time. However, even though Boromir is tempted by the ring, he also finally manages to redeem himself, first overcoming his moment of weakness to take the ring and later by giving his life to preserve his companions, who have nothing to do with Gondor or the ring:

He rose and passed his hand over his eyes, dashing away the tears. ‘What have I said?’ he cried. ‘What have I done? Frodo, Frodo!’ he called. ‘Come back! A madness took me, but it has passed. Come back!’ (Tolkien, 2005, p. 400)

Although his sacrifice in his battle with the Uruk-hai of Isengard is not depicted, the scene of battle shows the number of arrows that were needed to take down Boromir, a last sign of his hypermasculinity, and that he fought until his sword was broken. Despite his sacrifice at the end, Boromir shows hypermasculinity throughout the quest. Hypermasculinity, which appears to be based on death as a means of achieving personal glory, appears to be a destructive pattern, as it bases its power on the ultimate downfall of others, or oneself. In Boromir’s case, hypermasculinity causes the ultimate downfall of himself.

Faramir, on the other hand, does not fit the traditional patterns of masculinity or hypermasculinity. His wish is to preserve all life and creating a possibility of a life in which peace and harmony reigns. Faramir, of course, is highly affected by Gandalf and his valuable counsel. Faramir represents Tolkien's own ideas, in one of his letters, he writes about Faramir as: "As far as any character is 'like me' it is Faramir" (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 180, footnote 47, p.655). It can be seen why Tolkien identifies himself with Faramir, because he is more of a "down-to-earth" character, and more modern in thought and action. In one of his letters to his son Christopher Tolkien, he writes: "a new character has come on the scene I am sure I did not invent him, I did not even want him, though I like him" (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 66, p.188). Tolkien does not have to invent him, because Faramir apparently reflects a modern man in his mind, which is needed for a change in the destiny on Middle-earth. He is far from his father and brother's hypermasculinity. His modern attitude can be found in his approach to war, with changing balance of power Faramir holds the modern aptitude to change and adapt, which can be seen as a feminine aspect. Another connection that can be made is from Tolkien's memories from World War I. The British and French attitude towards the war in the beginning was one of obstinacy to the changes in modern warfare. They still expected the battle to be won by sweeping cavalry charges, which were decimated by their hundreds with the fire of the machinegun. Eventually, very slowly, after the deaths of hundreds of thousands they started to accept change and adapt to modern war. Boromir reflects an old attitude towards war, while Faramir adapts to numeric and industrial supremacy of Mordor.

Supporting this argument above, the way Boromir and Faramir fight and their respective views on battle can give some insight. Boromir embodies the chivalric medieval ideal, with sword, shield, and face-to-face combat. Boromir is pictured as

“Boromir had a long sword, in fashion like Andúril but of less lineage, and he bore also a shield and his war-horn” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 279). Faramir, on the other hand, is more modern, uses both a bow and a sword to increase his potential to reach targets, prefers lighter armour, utilizes stealth and speed, and instead of fighting for glory, he fights only for the protection of his land and eventual peace. He would not bother if he were commemorated for his actions as long as peace and victory is achieved. He is similar to armies adopting guerrilla warfare to oppose a stronger adversary and achieves greater lengths with his resources in contrast to one that might be achieved with Boromir’s. Faramir initially appeared in *The Two Towers* with his group of rangers, and his men show great details and insights on their leader's methods and strategies. Sam and Frodo face a group of Ithilien Rangers who arrive suddenly in different directions while traveling across the woods while trying to find a more secretive way to enter Mordor. Tolkien gives a description of the rangers with their equipment and clothing which explains how they operate:

Four tall Men stood there. Two had spears in their hands with broad bright heads. Two had great bows, almost of their own height, and great quivers of long, green-feathered arrows. All had swords at their sides, and were clad in green and brown of varied hues, as if the better to walk unseen in the glades of Ithilien. Green gauntlets covered their hands, and their faces were hooded and masked with green, except for their eyes, which were very keen and bright.
(Tolkien, 2005, p. 657)

The rangers, who are under Faramir's direct command, are equipped with long bows, allowing them to attack across greater distances than most of their enemies. The chivalric knights, who are considered as having hypermasculinity features like

Boromir, considered this type of warfare to be cowardly and dishonourable. According to hypermasculine men, this kind of attack is feminine, because they are hiding and there is not face-to-face combat. In popular culture, “arrow and bow” is considered to be a more feminine weapon since one does not face to their enemies. Even the famed Amazons of Greek literature and myths are renowned for their prowess with the bow and spears, almost similarly with the rangers of Ithilien. While the Greek hoplite would be armed with the great shield, spear and sword, much similarly with Boromir. Possible as Tolkien believes himself, Faramir sees this way of combat to be much more effective than the other. According to John Keegan (1993), a ranger in Faramir’s command is capable of:

without any of the long apprenticeship to arms necessary to make a knight, and equally without the moral effort required of a pike wielding footman, kill either of them from a distance without putting himself in danger. (Keegan, 1993, p .333)

The traditional warriors are against these tactics and according to them, warriors who used these tactics “on the ground that their weapon was a cowardly one and their behaviour treacherous” (Keegan, 1993, p. 333). It is a known fact that the English armies of the medieval age were renowned for their use of the longbow, especially against the French and their armies of knights. Therefore, the might of the longbow is hewn into the mind of both the British and the French, as a superior weapon that can equalize the difference created by sheer force of numbers. One similar difference also apparent between Gondor and the combined forces of Mordor. Faramir also demonstrates that he is a conscientious leader by reducing the risk to his rangers while increasing their combat effectiveness. Faramir has been aware of the

danger he has been putting his men in, so he ignores any idea of glorious face-to-face combat, this style of combat is less attractive to men like Boromir but far more effective. Boromir and the chivalric heroes of history prefer face-to-face combat. When an enemy prefers to act with their minds rather than their pride, the results are mostly destructive for the latter. Faramir and his rangers prefer cunning tactics to sneak up close to their enemies and targets, and they try to avoid making themselves known until “flight and hiding were no longer possible” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 656). This attitude is quite an opposite to Boromir’s approach. This does not mean that Boromir was devoid of any capability to strategy or tactics. This is a whole new approach to war, one that can be maintained in Gondor with their dwindling numbers against the hordes of Mordor. In *The Fellowship of Ring*, he expresses the idea of being seen and not hiding. It is normal for an officer who leads men to be seen by his troops. He is a source of courage, direction, and hope. His horn is the perfect symbol of this stand, as he mentions and uses it in Rivendell:

‘Loud and clear it sounds in the valleys of the hills,’ he said, ‘and then let all the foes of Gondor flee!’ Putting it to his lips he blew a blast, and the echoes leapt from rock to rock, and all that heard that voice in Rivendell sprang to their feet. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 279)

Even though Elrond warns him about the sound of the horn and what it may bring, Boromir insists on using it if it is necessary for him:

‘Slow should you be to wind that horn again, Boromir,’ said Elrond, ‘until you stand once more on the borders of your land, and dire need is on you.’

‘Maybe,’ said Boromir. ‘But always I have let my horn cry at setting forth,

and though thereafter we may walk in the shadows, I will not go forth as a thief in the night.’ (Tolkien, 2005, p.279)

Boromir is so proud that even it is unwise to blow the horn, he prefers doing it rather than hiding in the shadows. His “masculinity” prevents him to get a sensible counsel which he sees as cowardly and likely finds it “feminine.” “A true warrior does not hide, he faces his enemy head on, and either defeats it or gets killed while trying” seems to be the mindset of Boromir, which is hypermasculine way of seeing life and battle. On the contrary, “going forth as thieves in the night” is exactly what Faramir and his ranger would do. Rather than notifying the enemy and engaging them in a traditional face-to-face combat, Faramir plans an ambush for the Southron troops, and takes the advantage of surprise and attacks from cover to defeat the enemy more efficiently, and maybe the with the only possible way. Sam describes them:

He could see them stealing up the slopes, singly or in long files, keeping always to the shade of grove or thicket, or crawling, hardly visible in their brown and green raiment, through grass and brake. All were hooded and masked, and had gauntlets on their hands, and were armed like Faramir and his companions. Before long they had all passed and vanished.

(Tolkien,2005, p. 660)

Using camouflage, Faramir and the rangers under his command separate themselves from the traditional “manly” combat. They do what they must do to be efficient and to kill with minimum loss or damage. As Faramir later explains to his father, Mordor may lose legions and can easily fill the gaps but even a hundred men loss is damaging to Gondor. Seeing their incapability of sustaining any more damage,

Faramir only attacks when he knows he can win and will not lose many men.

Faramir's relationship with his rangers is also different from Boromir's relationship to his soldiers. While commanders have physical differences in arms and armour to be easily discernible in combat, Faramir is almost identical with his rangers. While soldiers respect and fear their commanders, Faramir and his rangers share a bond of brotherhood. Beregon pictures the love between Faramir and his rangers, and he compares Faramir to Boromir:

‘But things may change when Faramir returns. He is bold, more bold than many deem; for in these days men are slow to believe that a captain can be wise and learned in the scrolls of lore and song, as he is, and yet a man of hardihood and swift judgement in the field. But such is Faramir. Less reckless and eager than Boromir, but not less resolute. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 766)

Faramir is portrayed as “wise and learned,” these features are considered as feminine, especially in a medieval perspective, than masculine. Faramir accepts that Gondor is weak, unlike Boromir. Therefore, Faramir adjusts his strategy accordingly. He turns Gondor's weakness into a strength, which exactly portrays feminine wisdom. Although he does not seek glory, he is also a heroic figure in himself, but quite different from Boromir; his heroism does not lie in strength as a soldier but lies in his wisdom and search for peace. One of his letters Tolkien talks about Faramir as:

He had been accustomed to giving way and not giving his own opinions air, while retaining a power of command among men, such as a man may obtain who is evidently personally courageous and decisive, but also modest, fair-minded and scrupulously just, and very merciful. He had been accustomed to giving way and not giving his own opinions air, while retaining a power of

command among men, such as a man may obtain who is evidently personally courageous and decisive, but also modest, fair-minded and scrupulously just, and very merciful. (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 244, p. 468)

Faramir shows this honesty and mercy with Frodo and Sam when he says that he ““would not snare even an orc with a falsehood””(Tolkien, 2005, p. 664), and he also mentions that he does “not slay man or beast needlessly, and not gladly even when it is needed. Neither do I talk in vain. So be comforted”” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 665). Faramir is depicted in this passage as an empathetic warrior who refuses to kill unnecessarily or without cause, even having the ability to sympathise with an orc. The same kind of “wise heroic” model can be seen with the scene in which Faramir comes face-to-face with the temptation of the Ring, which has led to Boromir’s downfall.

‘But I am not such a man. Or I am wise enough to know that there are some perils from which a man must flee. Sit at peace! And be comforted, Samwise. If you seem to have stumbled, think that it was fated to be so. Your heart is shrewd as well as faithful, and saw clearer than your eyes. For strange though it may seem, it was safe to declare this to me. It may even help the master that you love. It shall turn to his good, if it is in my power. So be comforted. But do not even name this thing again aloud. Once is enough.’ (Tolkien, 2005, p.681)

Faramir realises that Frodo carries the Ring, yet he does not try to gain power by taking it, instead he comprehends the burden Frodo carries. In this scene, Faramir describes himself “wise enough to know that there are some perils from which a man must flee” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 681), a beautiful description of knowing oneself and

strength in knowing one's weaknesses and shortcomings. Faramir's wisdom opens a path to victory, he does not allow his fears to overcome his senses. In that moment, Faramir understands how Boromir may have been tempted by the Ring and understands what came on the greatest fighter of mankind and sees it as a premonition to his and Gondor's future if he does the same mistake. Forasmuch as, Boromir is a traditional heroic warrior who wants glory and honour to his death, his thoughts would be seized by the Ring. Even though he has wanted the Ring with good intentions, evil power of the Ring made Boromir to try to claim it. Boromir calls himself and his people "true-hearted men" and tries to legitimize his claim to the Ring, although it is both the wrong way to do it, and his arguments were rooted from fear. As a soldier, he knew that they could not hold Mordor for long:

True-hearted Men, they will not be corrupted. We of Minas Tirith have been staunch through long years of trial. We do not desire the power of wizard-lords, only strength to defend ourselves, strength in a just cause. And behold! in our need chance brings to light the Ring of Power. (Tolkien, 2005, p. 398)

Yet using the ring itself is essentially evil and it goes beyond a line which Faramir refuses to consider. When Faramir and Frodo discuss about the Ring, Faramir says "Fear not! I do not wish to see it, or touch it, or know more of it than I know (which is enough), lest peril perchance way lay me and I fall lower in the test than Frodo son of Drogo" (Tolkien, 2005, p. 681). Faramir acknowledges that the power of the Ring is beyond him unlike Boromir whose pride misleads him into believing he can take the Ring for himself. This acceptance of weakness, and not trying to find another path to peace comes from his acceptance of what we may call feminine aspects. Eventually, the battle for Middle-earth is won in a manner Boromir would

probably consider unmanly. The Ring was snuck into Mordor, like a thief, and Sauron was fooled by trickery to think that the Ring was in Minas Tirith, and Aragorn taking a small retinue of soldiers against him increased this belief that someone was challenging his power head on. Therefore, a character who thinks in a similar way with Denethor and Boromir, was Sauron himself, and it resulted in his downfall as well.

4. SECONDARITY: TO WHOM THE WORLD IS LEFT FOR

4.1 Samwise the Brave

Up until now, this study focussed on three characters: Samwise Gamgee, Éowyn and Faramir. All three have their similarities and of course, dissimilarities. They are not similar characters according to their functions in the plot, yet they have one major similarity: they all share a position of the secondary. They are secondary, either in their social positions, or in their class structures, or their normality regarding the heroes of the text, or in other contexts. From this point onwards, this study will prefer to call this position of a character, “secondarity.”

What is this secondarity all three characters share? Starting with Sam, who is a gardener and a servant to Frodo Baggins, comes not from a family or renown or wealth, is actually a simple person. He has little pleasures and did not travel much before the events starting with the War of the Ring. While Frodo is easily discernible as the main hero, Sam primarily starts more like a sidekick. However, as the adventure progresses, Sam, with his great devotion to Frodo, overcomes all obstacles and he is the only one strong enough to walk the lands of Mordor without fear or the power of the Ring affect him. Some similarities can be seen between the relationship of Sam and Frodo, to the relationship of Wiglaf and Beowulf. As he is battling the

dragon, all of his thanes escape in fear, but Wiglaf stays with him until the end, and as Beowulf saves their world from the dragon, he leaves all behind for Wiglaf, his worthy companion, everything he ever had. However, unlike Beowulf's slaying of the dragon, Frodo could never hope to end his quest without Sam's aid. No one expects Hobbits to change the fortunes of all in Middle-earth to begin with.

When the Fellowship is decided in the Council of Elrond, he means to send Elves of prominence after the primary members of the Fellowship are decided. However, Sam and later Merry and Pippin take up remaining positions of the Nine put against the Nine of Mordor. Eventually, all the Hobbits had more effect on the world than any other elf might have. Merry and Pippin forced Treebeard to take action against Saruman, both had dealings in Rohan and Gondor, which affected the course of the world. Therefore, this particular utilization of secondariness can be seen in the general characterization of the Hobbit-folk as well. They are small, neither they are fighters of great renown nor people of great wisdom. Yet, their little acts of good and kindness create some of the largest ripples in the course of events. Coming back to Frodo as a hero figure, he is an Elf-friend, both a title and a state of self that can be seen by all the Elves of Middle-earth, who is also schooled by Gandalf and knew Elvish, knew more about the world and is known to be a wise person. In contrast to Frodo, Sam is just a good person. If we consider Sam to be a sidekick, usually sidekicks have skills or knowledge which the hero may not have and aid the hero in their quest, sometimes covering side stories. Sam's job is to allow Frodo to complete his quest, covering all the daily needs he continues to possess. However, Sam has no side quest, and he is more like a shadow to Frodo and his fate is completely connected to him. Without Frodo, he would not have left the Shire to protect the world, that is the calling of the hero, who is endowed with qualities that make him or her a hero.

However, even if the calling belonged to Frodo, through him Sam also reaches a point of heroism. While Sam only sees himself as an extension of Frodo, someone with no deep importance to be recounted, Frodo disagrees:

‘It’s saying a lot too much,’ said Frodo, and he laughed, a long clear laugh from his heart. Such a sound had not been heard in those places since Sauron came to Middle-earth. To Sam suddenly it seemed as if all the stones were listening and the tall rocks leaning over them. But Frodo did not heed them; he laughed again. ‘Why, Sam,’ he said, ‘to hear you somehow makes me as merry as if the story was already written. But you’ve left out one of the chief characters:

Samwise the stouthearted. “I want to hear more about Sam, dad. Why didn’t they put in more of his talk, dad? That’s what I like, it makes me laugh. And Frodo wouldn’t have got far without Sam, would he, dad?” (Tolkien, 2005, p. 712)

Sam’s naïve and selfless expressions make him a most loveable character. His only wish is to end the curse that befell them and return to Shire. Not once does he lament or bicker about their condition. He just does what needs to be done, and with utmost perfection and he becomes the true hero. Nothing is given to him to do his job other than his willpower and love. As Frodo warns him while trying to leave him behind: “‘But I am going to Mordor.’ Sam: ‘I know that well enough, Mr. Frodo. Of course you are. And I’m coming with you’” (Tolkien, 2005, p.406), and ignores all the possible dangers to himself. The common man, and not the “real hero” changes the course of the story. This is an important aspect of secondarity in Tolkien’s *The Lord of the Rings*.

Every hero has things that make him a hero, a quality that makes him different. Frodo is a Baggins, some of the famed and solid bloods in Shire-folk, an aristocratic line with famous forebearers like Bilbo, also an Elf-friend, a friend of Gandalf, and carries the sword of an Elven king, and an armour worth more than the Shire. Sam has potatoes and a frying pan. He is not given much in this respect, yet he carries Frodo up the slopes of Mount Doom, battles the Orcs of Cirith Ungol, and expects nothing in return other than the good health of his dear Mr. Frodo. Sam is a common man, a good man, but he has no aspect that make him superior. He is a character any reader may identify with. Quite similarly with Dr Watson in Sherlock Holmes stories, while Holmes is man with mind extraordinaire, his sidekick Watson is usually incapable of understanding what he came up with until Sherlock explains it. The reader, who easily identifies with Watson, is not expected to understand Sherlock's deductions to begin with, he is the hero and he creates all the difference. However, Tolkien does not leave it at that. He makes a hero out of a frying pan; he elevates the common man the position of the real hero. Tolkien (2000), in his letter to a real-life Sam Gamgee: "I can only say, for your comfort I hope, that the 'Sam Gamgee' of my story is a most heroic character, now widely beloved by many readers, even though his origins are rustic" (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 184, p.355), openly accepts Sam's position as one of the primary heroes of the War of the Ring. In return, Middle-earth and the Shire is gifted to Sam, and the common men to live in. The 3rd Age can be signified as the ending of a magical era, the Elves leave the shores of Middle-earth, and the Age of Men follow. This is not due to the fact that Men are stronger than they have ever been, the 2nd Age and the first half of the 3rd Age see a golden ages for mankind, yet always with a gradual decline. Now, with the days of the king returned and Sauron banished for good, peace returns to the land. But it is preserved for those

who remain behind. Although Frodo managed to take the Ring from Shire to Mordor, he would never recover entirely. His stab wound would always remain, his health always problematic and eventually he left Middle-earth and went with the Elves beyond the Sea.

‘Where are you going, Master?’ cried Sam, though at last he understood what was happening. ‘To the Havens, Sam,’ said Frodo. ‘And I can’t come.’ ‘No, Sam. Not yet anyway, not further than the Havens. Though you too were a Ring-bearer, if only for a little while. Your time may come. Do not be too sad, Sam. You cannot be always torn in two. You will have to be one and whole, for many years. You have so much to enjoy and to be, and to do.’ ‘But,’ said Sam, and tears started in his eyes, ‘I thought you were going to enjoy the Shire, too, for years and years, after all you have done.’ ‘So I thought too, once. But I have been too deeply hurt, Sam. I tried to save the Shire, and it has been saved, but not for me. (Tolkien,2005, p. 1029)

Being the primary hero, although bestowed with gifts to manage the journey, pays a price, a heavy toll and could no longer stay in what he saved. However, although a hero, as his heroism is born out of personal courage and love for Frodo, Sam is allowed to stay and enjoy his life. He becomes one of the growing and nurturing characters of the 4th Age, along with other characters who shared his secondarity; Éowyn and Faramir.

4.2 Representation of the Modern Man & Woman

After the Battle of Fields of Pelennor, Éowyn and Faramir's roles in the story comes to an end. At least for the time being. They have no effect on the continuing events that end with Sauron's destruction and they enter a time of recovery. This is quite symbolic with the events that will follow the end of the War of the Ring. The deeply scarred world would need to be rebuilt, and even though the "fairy" king Aragorn and his Elvish queen take over the governance of the new age, they are the last boon, or gift the old world gives to the new Age of Men. They can be seen as representing what was good in the times past, and act as a symbol of ideal to follow. They are the last of their kind and after them only common men and women will be left in Middle-earth, with the exception of Dwarves and Hobbits, and Wood Elves, who all live in isolation from the world of men.

As mentioned before, they represent a modern representation of a man and a woman as they should be in the 4th Age of Middle-earth, and their connection to secondarity has much to do with this aspect. Looking at their position as secondary, Faramir is literally the "second" son of Denethor, second in line to the stewardship of Gondor, and secondary in Denethor's eyes as a son. For the people of Gondor, Boromir had been the golden child, brave and flashy in contrast with Faramir. As for Éowyn, being a woman, she belonged to the second sex, as de Beauvoir calls it. Even though she is regarded as brave and capable, all that she is allowed is the rule of Edoras while the men went on fighting. She was not expected to take the crown of Rohan, or to lead people in king's stead when he and the fighting men left for Helm's Deep. It is only after Hama's intervention did Théoden realize that she is also from the House of Eorl and may lead the people to Dunharrow. Although she proved admirably, she was not allowed to ride to battle in Gondor. Her sex always became

hindrance to her wishes, however, Gandalf in the end declares how unjust this treatment have been:

‘My friend,’ said Gandalf, ‘you had horses, and deeds of arms, and the free fields; but she, born in the body of a maid, had a spirit and courage at least the match of yours. Yet she was doomed to wait upon an old man, whom she loved as a father, and watch him falling into a mean dishonoured dotage; and her part seemed to her more ignoble than that of the staff he leaned on.

(Tolkien, 2005, p. 867)

Born from the mould of secondarity, both Faramir and Éowyn gave their battles that changed the course of events. Faramir’s greatest test was to let the Ring and the ring-bearer to leave to their desired path. Outcast from his father’s good graces, he does not think of presenting Denethor the Ring he has sought for this whole time and does what is right. This correct course of action only came from the details that mark him with secondarity. His ignorance of masculine conditions, wise and emphatic approach to life, and perceptiveness of a larger picture of events put him at odds with Denethor, pushing him to a secondary place in his father’s eyes. Tolkien talks of their relationship as: “Denethor was tainted with mere politics: hence his failure, and his mistrust of Faramir” (Tolkien, 2000, Letter 183, p. 350). Yet it is precisely these details make him a model man of a modern age. Tolkien himself sees most of himself in Faramir: “I am not Gandalf, being a transcendent Sub-creator in this little world. As far as any character is 'like me' it is Faramir – except that I lack what all my characters possess (let the psychoanalysts note!) Courage” (Letter 180, footnote 47, p. 655).

Éowyn, fulfils her greatest role also with her connection to secondarity, being a woman, and her Macbeth-like prophecy fulfilling battle with the Witch-king and after fulfilling her task as Dernhelm, proving herself completely as a warrior, there is no longer a use for such a warrior in the 4th Age. She humbly accepts a position as a healer and wife of a man who will understand her and nurture Middle-earth. Although she is the hero of the Fields of Pelennor, she cannot continue to be a hero. When there is no more evil left to fight, heroes lose their need in society and either become a new villain, or depart the lands, or accept a new role. Frodo, as the main hero of the story, leaves the shores of Middle-earth. Sam becomes a nurturer, leads the Shire-folk as mayor and lives a long life until it is his time to leave as well. Éowyn, similarly with Sam, turns her attention to healing the world, and healers are the heroes of this new age, and this cannot be perceived as renouncing her voice which she gained by everything she did. Eventually, the new world is left in the hands of the secondary characters, those who were not given much choice or chance in life, who were not bestowed with great gifts, and power. Yet, they are all nurturing characters, with a close connection to nature, growing and healing aspects. They are all good hearted, and they can muster the needed courage when it is asked from them. Another similarity is their connection to femininity as well as masculinity, in some form of equilibrium. While Faramir has qualities which are feminine, Éowyn has masculine abilities that allows her to match with Faramir. In the new world, men or women cannot be and should not be contained in general stereotypes, as this makes them weak in the complexity of the modern world. Tolkien could be hinting at the need for empathy, connection to nature, equality of sex, and not solely thinking politically, or for industrial profit. Although a mediaeval-esque story immersed in magic and fantasy, his secondary characters really highlight his contemporary messages.

CONCLUSION

The above arguments and close readings that provide a nuanced gender-based perspective to read *The Lord of the Rings*, allow us to see how Tolkien provides the reader an almost contrary world view that has been previously attributed to him in terms of gender politics. Many critics, including feminists and those who are interested in gender studies make claims of sexism against Tolkien and read erotic connotations in the friendship of Sam and Frodo. Such common readings appear to be missing out on a more nuanced position that attempts to identify the complexity of the works gender politics rather than simply labelling it. Thus, we can deduce that a close reading of the novel, an understanding of gender norms and world view from a part of history from which Tolkien took a great portion of his inspirations may prove otherwise.

Three gender-based approaches are taken to understand Tolkien's understanding of gender relations in the novel. A homosocial approach to the foremost relationship in the novel, that of Frodo and Sam; a feminist approach to Éowyn and her social position and rights as a woman in Middle-earth; and finally a masculinity/femininity approach to Faramir and her position as a secondary son resulted in a distinct understanding regarding how Tolkien may have taken into hand the topics in question. In communication with the personal perspectives of Tolkien himself on sexuality and gender, this study nevertheless focused on the novel and what the novel talks to its audience. What Frodo and Sam's relationship apparently convey is thus a brotherhood close to what many soldiers had, along with Tolkien and the people he personally witnessed during the World War I, a life so devoid of what can be considered normal that new forms of relationships were formed. To better explain this relationship the concept of homosociality was introduced by this study, in

contrast to some critics and scholar looking at the intimacy shared by Frodo and Sam as a form of erotic desire. Although not at all detached from concepts such as desire, love and intimacy, this relationship would not simply be explained away through the lens of only sexuality. The relationships of World War I veterans, officers and their batmen, the need of intimacy of soldiers upon the field of war where there is nothing other than death, constant danger and loneliness are concepts and realities which are in direct relationship with the experiences shared together by Frodo and Sam. Also, they form a relationship akin to what we may call a “Bromance” in popular culture, and they mean much to each other.

To answer the critics who think otherwise the question is asked clearly: “How can they feel otherwise?” They are alone, they are in constant danger, they love each other both as master and servant, and as friends. Sam is ready to give his life for Frodo, and Frodo is ready to give his life for the Shire, and all the Free Folk of Middle-earth. How can emotions such as respect, love, admiration, dependence, protectionism, and such be absent in their relationship while trying to sneak their way through Ithilien or while climbing the stairs into Mordor? They are trying to accomplish the impossible and are trying to stay alive. In this sense, homoerotic readings seem to be coupled with those of homosociality. This study backs the ideas of critics who see a deep male friendship and a close relationship that surpasses all others for Frodo and Sam, and Tolkien as someone who breathed the very air of war and witnessed the relationships formed among soldiers possibly wished to convey this when Frodo and Sam held hands, or when they slept in each other’s arms, as there were no one else to fulfil their humane needs to stand against the darkness.

As Tolkien’s lack of important female characters and apparent importance of many male characters fuel the critics' claims of sexism against Tolkien and his work,

this study claims otherwise by establishing a close study of both Éowyn and Faramir, through the lens of equality feminism and masculinity to prove that Tolkien, at least in his novel, is against a hypermasculine and hegemonic masculine suzerainty over the feminine. Throughout the novel the audience is presented three women, who are all quite important for the storyline. Galadriel is one of the mightiest of Elves, as well as the oldest and a queen of great power, Arwen is the only immortal capable of disregarding her gift for love, and finally the most transformative character of all, Éowyn, gives a storyline that allows a woman constrained by the social position to break free and achieve what other men cannot, or even imagine. Tolkien, who is inspired by Simone de Beauvoir's philosophies, is probably acquainted with her ideas of equality feminism, and while his letters show a disdain of women's success in the Academia, his novel seems to empower the idea that society needs women of power, and blocking their path is only pulling those women back and their possible claim for greatness. While some women, as in history, break through these chains, they are solely a minority. Tolkien himself was also aware of the suffragette movement in Great Britain that was highly passionate and fought long years to finally gain the rights they asked for. Looking at the evidence from these characters, it is unlikely that Tolkien was a sexist, and even if he seems disappointed at women's achievements or activities, he seems to hope for more.

Another perspective that reinforces the previous argument can be made from the future spouse of Éowyn, the second son of the Steward of Gondor, Faramir. He is one of Tolkien's favourite characters, one that he likens himself to. What is more, Faramir is given in a sharp contrast with his brother Boromir, which only highlights his difference of approach to life all the more. Faramir is a character that we may perceive to be endorsed with feminine qualities, in contrast to Boromir's and

Denethor's hypermasculine traits. His unlikeness to Boromir is a great distress to Denethor, who only assumes that masculine and absolute power is all that matters, while Faramir is a much more modern man against the archaic medievalism of his father and brother. Faramir uses weapons and a combat style that can be considered more feminine, he fights a guerrilla war and utilizes the bow and ambushes to harm the enemy as much as possible. While Denethor asks for frontal charges, fighting to the last man, and glory in battle; Faramir is quite aware that such a war cannot be fought and won against Mordor's numerical and industrial prowess. Faramir represents a man who seeks counsel, gives importance to wisdom and well-thought decisions, disregards chivalric codes for better success although being fair and just in life, puts the lives of his men before glory, and prefers intelligent combat. He is the opposite of what Denethor sees as true, and what Boromir is capable of. Boromir disregards a thief-like approach in the novel, while Frodo and Sam eventually manage to achieve victory through similar means. Faramir also heeds to the counsel of Gandalf, unlike Boromir and Denethor who only see victory through their own manner of hypermasculinity.

Sauron and Saruman both utilize heavy industry, modern approaches to warfare, excessively larger forces similar to conscripted armies of modern European warfare, a hypermasculine approach to war which mostly prizes excessive power and a destructive and disregarding angle towards nature. Tolkien is mostly attributed with a critique of modern industrial and capitalist society which disregards a balance between man and nature. This perspective is understandable, and quite plausible, as nature is considered to be feminine as well, the disconnection of the hypermasculine from the feminine always ends in the downfall of characters, such as Boromir, Denethor and even Sauron. While women, who disregard the socially acceptable

boundaries of the feminine and prize masculine traits on top of their femininity, Éowyn, can be seen as capable of greatness. Faramir, although carrying masculine traits, also understands the importance of what are accepted as feminine traits and utilizes them to the fullest. These two characters eventually find themselves, fall in love and create a union that can be seen as a representation of a modern couple, man and woman, wife and husband, friend and lover, a unity that balances each other and partakes from each other's traits. From such approaches, Tolkien, cannot simply be pushed around as a thorough sexist who see women as secondary citizens.

Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*, unlike what many critics see as filled with sexism and homoerotic connotations, is filled with great messages of how friendship must be, how dear are the little attempts of goodness, how important for women to speak up and act according to their own will, how powerful women can be and how much they can accomplish, how men as much as women should not be constricted to social norms of masculinity, how masculine approaches are no longer satisfactory for life, how dangerous a disconnection with nature and a complete submission to industrial gains and power may be. Therefore, the readers of the text must realize that they are looking into the novel through contemporary understandings and must actually understand the context in which Tolkien actually wrote his novel. They also must disregard the number of female characters, and rather focus on quality rather than quantity in them. Even though the narrative is filled with successful men, they are also filled with the fall, wrongs, ills and weaknesses of many of them. What is more, more successful are the men who disregard and conquer the masculine hegemony over them.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, E, (2009). *Inclusive masculinities: The Changing Nature of Masculinities*. London, England: Routledge.
- Beauvoir, D.S (2013). *A Very Easy Death* (Pantheon Modern Writer Series). Pantheon
- Beauvoir, D.S. (2014). *The Second Sex* (Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books
- Bird, S. R. (1996). Welcome to the men's club: Homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society*, 10, 120-132.
- Bourke, J. (1996) *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Bray, A. (2003). *The friend*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Butler, Judith (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge
- Carpenter, H. (2000). *J.R.R. Tolkien: A Biography*. Boston: Houghton
- Carter, S. (2012). Faramir and the Heroic Ideal of the Twentieth Century; or, How Aragorn Died at the Somme. *Mythlore*, 30(3/4 (117/118)), 89-102. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26815502>
- Chance, J. (2001). *Tolkien's Art: A Mythology for England* (Revised ed.). University Press of Kentucky.
- Chance, J. (2001). *Lord of the Rings: The Mythology of Power* (Revised ed.). University Press of Kentucky.
- Chen, E. J. (2012). Caught in a Bad Bromance. *Texas Journal of Women and the Law*, 21(2), 241-266.
- Cole, S. (2001). Modernism, Male Intimacy, and the Great War. *ELH*, 68(2), 469-500. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30031977>
- Connell, R. (1987) *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Connell, R. (1997) Men, Masculinities and Feminism. *Social Alternatives*, 16, 7–10.
- Connell, R. W, (2000). *The Men and the Boys*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Connell, R.W, (2005). *Masculinities*. 2nd ed. 1st ed. 1995. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Coad, D. (2008). *The metrosexual: Gender, Sexuality, and Sport*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Craig, D. M. (2011). Queer Lodgings: Gender and Sexuality in The Lord of the Rings. *Mallorn* 38, 11-18.
- Croft, J. (2002). The Great War and Tolkien's Memory: An Examination of World War I Themes in "The Hobbit" and "The Lord of the Rings". *Mythlore*, 23(4 (90)), 4-21. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26814263>
- Crossley-Holland, K., & O'Donoghue, H. (2008). *Beowulf*. Oxford University Press.
- DK Publishing. (2019). *The Feminism Book: Big Ideas Simply Explained* (Illustrated ed.). DK.
- Donovan, L.A (2015) The Valkyrie Reflex in J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings: Galadriel, Shelob, Éowyn, and Arwen. *Perilous and Fair: Women in the Works and Life of J. R. R. Tolkien*. (Ed. Croft J.B. & Donovan L.A) Altadena, CA: Mythopoeic Press
- Dunai, A. (2019). Ofermod and Aristocratic Chivalry in J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings. *Journal of Tolkien Research*: Vol. 8 : 1,1 Retrieved from <https://scholar.valpo.edu/journaloftolkienresearch/vol8/iss1/1>
- Enright, N. (2008). Tolkien's Females and the Defining of Power. *J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings*. (Ed. Bloom, H.) New York: Infobase Publishing
- Flood, M. (2008). Men, Sex, and Homosociality: How bonds between men shape their sexual relations with women. *Men and Masculinities*, 10, 339-359.
- Fredrick, C. and McBride, S. (2001) *Women Among the Inklings: Gender, C.S. Lewis, J.R.R. Tolkien, and Charles Williams*. Westport CT: Greenwood Press
- Fussell, Paul. (1975). *The Great War and Modern Memory*. New York: Oxford UP
- Garth, J. (2003). *Tolkien and the Great War: The Threshold of Middle-Earth*. Boston: Houghton
- Grown Rhome (2015, October 15) *J.R.R. Tolkien: Death* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mgU2wLCuGv0>
- Gunkel, H. (2009). What's Identity Got to Go with It? Rethinking Intimacy and Homosociality in Contemporary South Africa. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 17, 2006-2221.
- Hammond, W. G., and Scull, C. (2005) *The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin

- Hammarén, N. (2008). *Förorten i huvudet: Unga män om kön och sexualitet i det nya Sverige [The Suburb in the Head. Young Men's Thoughts on Gender and Sexuality in the New Sweden]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Atlas.
- Hammarén, N., & Johansson, T. (2014). Homosociality. *SAGE Open*, 4(1), 215824401351805. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013518057>
- Hatcher, M. (2007). Finding Woman's Role in "The Lord of the Rings". *Mythlore*, 25(3/4 (97/98)), 43-54. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26814606>
- Hooker, M.T (2008) Frodo's Batman. *J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings*. (Ed. Bloom, H.) New York: Infobase Publishing
- Hodgson, W.N. (1917) *Verse and Prose In Peace And War*. London: Smith, Elder & Co.
- Hutchison, G.S. (1929). *Biography of a Batman*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.
- Johansson, T. (2007). *The Transformation of Sexuality: Gender and Identity in Contemporary Youth Culture*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate.
- Keegan, J. (1993). *A History of Warfare*. New York: Vintage Books
- Lewis, C.S, (1960). *The Four Loves*. New York: Harcourt Brace
- Licence, A. (2018) *Henry VI and Margaret of Anjou: A Marriage of Unequals*, Pen And Sword History
- Linton, P.C, (2015) Speech and Silence in the Lord of the Rings: Medieval Romance and the Transitions of Éowyn. *Perilous and Fair: Women in the Works and Life of J. R. R. Tolkien*. (Ed. Croft J.B. & Donovan L.A) Altadena, CA: Mythopoeic Press
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1976). Toward a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions. *Signs*, 1(3), 15-31.
- Mill, J. S., & Mill, H. T. (2009). *The Subjection of Women*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Miller, J. (2016). Mapping Gender in Middle-earth. *Mythlore*, 34(2 (128)), 133-152. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26816039>
- Rawls, M.A, (2015) The Feminine Principle in Tolkien. *Perilous and Fair: Women in the Works and Life of J. R. R. Tolkien*. (Ed. Croft J.B. & Donovan L.A) Altadena, CA: Mythopoeic Press
- Reinhard, B. (2020). Tolkien's Lost Knights. *Mythlore*, 39(1 (137)), 177-194. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26937591>

- Richards, J. (1999). From Christianity to Paganism: The New Middle Ages and the Values of 'Medieval' Masculinity. *Cultural Values*, 3 (2): 213–234.
- Rosen, D. (1993). *The Changing Fictions of Masculinity*. University of Illinois Press.
- Scott, W. (1994). *Ivanhoe (Penguin Popular Classics)*. Penguin Books Ltd.
- Sedgwick, E. K., (1985). *Between men: English literature and homosocial desire*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Shakespeare, W. (2007). Macbeth. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (Wordsworth Library Collection)*. Wordsworth Editions
- Shakespeare, W. (2007). Twelfth Night; or, What You Will. *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare (Wordsworth Library Collection)*. Wordsworth Editions
- Shippey, T. (1995) Tolkien as a Post-War Writer. *Proceedings of the J.R.R. Tolkien Centenary Conference* (Ed. Patricia Reynolds and Glen GoodKnight. Milton Keynes, Eng.): Tolkien Society and Mythopoeic Press, 84-93
- Shugart, H. (2008). Managing Masculinities: The Metrosexual Moment. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 5, 280-300.
- Smol, A. (2004). "OH... OH... FRODO!": Readings of Male Intimacy In The Lord of The Rings. *Modern Fiction Studies*, 50(4), 949-979. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26286386>
- Smol, Anna. (2008). Male Friendship in The Lord of the Rings: Medievalism, the First World War, and Contemporary Rewritings. *The Ring Goes Ever On: Proceedings of the Tolkien 2005 Conference: 50 Years of The Lord of the Rings*. (Ed. Sarah Wells.) Coventry, UK: The Tolkien Society, I. 320-26.
- Stanton, M.N (2008). Mind, Spirit and Dream in The Lord of the Rings. *J.R.R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings*. (Ed. Bloom, H.) New York: Infobase Publishing
- Thurnell-Read, T. (2012). What Happens on Tour: The Premarital Stag Tour, Homosocial Bonding, and Male Friendship. *Men and Masculinities*, 15, 249-270
- Tolkien, J.R.R. (2005). *The Lord of the Rings*. Hammersmith, London: HarperCollins
- Tolkien, J. R. R., Tolkien, C., & Carpenter, H. (2000). *The Letters of J.R.R. Tolkien*. Mariner Books.
- Whitehead, S.M. & Frank J. B. (2001) The Sociology of Masculinity. *The Masculinities Reader*. MA: Polity Press, 1–26.

- Williams, C.A. (1999) *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Williams, T. (2011). *Inventing Womanhood: Gender and Language in Later Middle English Writing (Interventions: New Studies Medieval Cult)*. Ohio State University Press.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How Working Class Kids Gets Working Class Jobs*. London, England: Saxon House.
- Wollstonecraft, M. (2021). *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman With Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. Independently published.
- Yates, J. (2000). Arwen the Elf Warrior? *Amon Hen* ,165, p.11-15

