

Introduction

“Are you men?”

At the National Negro Convention of 1843, held in Buffalo, New York, Henry Highland Garnet delivered his controversial appeal to the slaves of the United States. In this address, Garnet offered a powerful call to resist the violence and degradation of slavery, as well as emotive and sympathetic descriptions of the trauma of the “Peculiar Institution.” Yet his sympathy did not extend equally to all victims of American slavery. Instead, Garnet specifically demanded action from enslaved men, castigating them for their lack of resistance and openly tying this to ideas about masculine identity. Having noted the violence directed toward enslaved women as particularly shameful, Garnet’s demand for a response was explicitly gendered: “In the name of God, we ask, are you men?”¹ Such language was not unique to Garnet. Contemporaries from both pro- and antislavery positions consistently utilized a gendered discourse to decry or defend slavery, as well as to explain, justify, and criticize the acts of enslavers and enslaved alike. However, the belief not only that this was an important question to pose, but also that the enslaved, formerly enslaved, and free black men to whom he appealed should know what actions were required to answer it, shows the centrality of gender to antebellum ideas on identity. In suggesting that some acts were proof of manhood while others were not, Garnet’s question highlights the contested nature of masculinity in the antebellum period.

¹ Henry Highland Garnet, “A Former Slave Appeals to the Slaves of the United States,” in Abraham Chapman (ed.), *Steal Away: Slaves Tell Their Own Stories* (London: Ernest Benn Ltd., 1973), 115–127, 125.

This question – “Are you men?” – was of the utmost importance to enslaved men: Masculine identity was key to their sense of self. Individuals such as Garnet declared that only certain choices denoted manhood – indeed, that some explicitly denied it – but these exclusionary views could be a site of tension as enslaved men sought to craft a masculine identity in different ways. Much recent historical work has identified multiple models of manhood with which enslaved men identified, drawing upon different ideals and values to create a gendered sense of self.² What scholars have struggled to address, however, is how these ideals could ask for very different responses to slavery; these different responses, in turn, could lead to tension and division in slave communities.

Enslaved people did not agree among themselves that there was one route to manhood, and these disagreements influenced social dynamics and interactions among the enslaved population of the American South. To solidify their own gendered sense of self, enslaved men implicitly and, at times, explicitly rejected tropes and behaviors that other people claimed were central to masculine identity; the justifications for doing so affected personal relationships but also shaped and reflected diverse responses to slavery as an institution. Enslaved people who navigated and survived slavery passed judgments on the actions and choices of men they lived with. In exploring disputes between enslaved people who prioritized different masculine ideals, as well as the collisions triggered by men who strove to assert their vision of manhood at the expense of others, *Contesting Slave Masculinity* highlights the fluidity of gender within slave communities. It also develops contentious and ongoing debates over community, resistance, and accommodation to slavery. The diverse strategies for survival that enslaved people employed were influenced by and

² See, for example, Darlene Clark Hine and Earnestine Jenkins (eds.), *A Question of Manhood: A Reader in U.S Black Men's History and Masculinity. Volume 1. "Manhood Rights": The Construction of Black Male History and Manhood, 1750–1870* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999); Sergio Lussana, *My Brother Slaves: Friendship, Masculinity, and Resistance in the Antebellum South* (Lexington: Kentucky University Press, 2016); Rebecca Fraser, “Negotiating Their Manhood: Masculinity amongst the Enslaved in the Upper South, 1830–1861,” in Sergio Lussana and Lydia Plath (eds.), *Black and White Masculinity in the American South, 1800–2000* (Newcastle under Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009), 76–95; Kenneth Marshall, *Manhood Enslaved: Bondmen in Eighteenth- and Early Nineteenth Century New Jersey* (Rochester: Rochester University Press, 2011); Mark Okuhata, *Unchained Manhood: The Performance of Black Manhood during the Antebellum, Civil War, and Reconstruction Eras* (PhD dissertation, University of California, 2014).

connected to gendered expectations and identities. This could lead them on different paths when negotiating a life in bondage.

Manhood is not a timeless or natural essence, and enslaved people created identities and navigated a world in which a range of characteristics or actions were connected to perceived and actual differences between men and women. As Joan Scott has argued, cultural and social scripts provide ideas about what it means to be a man or a woman and present standards of behavior by which people are expected to abide in their everyday life.³ Gender standards are not abstract, but rather signs and symbols within a broader cultural framework which govern how men and women are supposed to live their lives. Gender’s centrality to lived experiences means these ideas are not simply imposed upon individuals by an external power, but are made use of by people seeking to position themselves within a given community. As R. W. Connell has explained: “People construct themselves as masculine or feminine. We claim a place in the gender order – or respond to the place we have been given – by the way we conduct ourselves in everyday life.”⁴ In her study of race and masculinity in the United States at the turn of the nineteenth century, Gail Bederman similarly noted the significance of gender to experiences and identities: “And with that positioning as ‘man’ or ‘woman’ inevitably comes a host of other social meanings, expectations, and identities. Individuals have no choice but to act upon these meanings – to accept or reject them, adopt or adapt them – in order to be able to live their lives in human society.”⁵

Contesting Slave Masculinity thus reiterates the performative nature of gender, highlighting the significance of stylized demonstrations of gendered attributes and the public nature of these identities. Connell has argued that “being a man or a woman . . . is not a fixed state. It is a becoming, a condition actively under construction,” while Judith Butler has stressed how this construction is presented for wider consumption: “one does not ‘do’ one’s gender alone. One is always ‘doing’ with or for another, even if the other is only imaginary.”⁶ Different people

³ Joan Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Analysis,” *The American Historical Review*, 91.5 (December 1986), 1053–1075, 1067.

⁴ R. W. Connell, *Gender* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002), 4.

⁵ Gail Bederman, *Manliness and Civilization: A Cultural History of Gender and Race in the United States, 1880–1917* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 7.

⁶ Connell, *Gender*, 4; Judith Butler, *Undoing Gender* (New York; London: Routledge, 2004), 1. See also Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1999; 1st edition 1990), xv.

interacted with the cultural symbols, resources, and understandings associated with manhood in the American South in different ways, but the public and performative nature of gender identities meant these interactions were open for debate. Enslaved people connected a range of attributes to ideas on masculine identity, expected certain actions or behaviors of men in their community, or positioned themselves as men through public performances and displays. Tension sometimes developed when enslaved people prioritized different elements of masculinity; men and women dealt differently with the perceived failures of individuals to perform or conform to the masculine values they idealized.⁷

In pioneering work on the significance of public comparison and “tests” to masculine identity, anthropologist David Gilmore explained how “so many places regard the state of being a ‘real man’ or ‘true man’ as uncertain or precarious, a prize to be won or wrested through struggle.”⁸ Michael Kimmel, in a more historically rooted discussion, declared that in nineteenth-century America, “the idea of testing and proving one’s manhood became one of the defining experiences in American men’s lives.”⁹ Historians of white Southern men have consistently explained the significance of communal perceptions of manhood, with ideas about a culture of honor and the importance of public reputation driving studies on the topic since Bertram Wyatt-Brown’s seminal book *Southern Honor*, published in 1982.¹⁰ Scholars disagree on the degree to which ideas on Southern masculinity were fixed or open to interpretation, but Craig Thompson Friend has reiterated the significance of public performance in affirming (or denying) white Southern men’s claims to manhood: “While not all men had subscribed to the ideals of honor and mastery, all shared a sense of the very public nature of their private characters ... unlike femininity, which occupied the domestic realm,

⁷ Scott noted some of the tensions here, highlighting that “real men and women do not always or literally fulfil the terms either of society’s prescriptions or of our analytic categories.” Scott, “Gender,” 1068.

⁸ David Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 1. See also John Tosh, “What Should Historians Do with Masculinity? Reflections on Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *History Workshop*, 38.1 (1994), 179–202.

⁹ Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), 2.

¹⁰ Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007; 1st edition, 1982).

antebellum masculinity had required regular public performance.”¹¹ John Mayfield likewise noted the importance of homosocial competition for white Southern men seeking to establish and prove a masculine sense of self, highlighting the concern with domination, even humiliation, that drove such encounters: “humiliation, or rather the fear of it, drives manly codes of whatever stamp. Manly behavior in the Old South – whether based on honor, market success, or evangelical self-discipline – was fundamentally assertive and competitive.”¹²

White male Southerners had a variety of masculine models available to them and competition and comparison between men was an integral component of demonstrations of white masculinity.¹³ However, historians have paid less attention to contested views on manhood among the enslaved. In part this relates to the historical and historiographical significance accorded to refuting the idea that black men were emasculated by slavery. Claims that black men were innately childlike and incapable of reaching manhood were integral to nineteenth-century proslavery arguments and early Southern histories which served to mythologize the antebellum era and justify the continued subjugation of black people.¹⁴ While the more sympathetic literature in the 1950s disagreed with the racial animus which motivated much of the earlier work, it reinforced

¹¹ Craig Thompson Friend, “From Southern Manhood to Southern Masculinities: An Introduction,” in Craig Thompson Friend (ed.), *Southern Masculinity: Perspectives on Manhood in the South since Reconstruction* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2009), vii–xxvi, x.

¹² John Mayfield, *Counterfeit Gentlemen: Manhood and Humor in the Old South* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2009), 109.

¹³ Mayfield, *Counterfeit Gentlemen*, xv; Amy Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2007); Toby L. Ditz, “Afterword: Contending Masculinities in Early America,” in Thomas A. Foster (ed.), *New Men: Manliness in Early America* (New York: New York University Press, 2011), 256–267; Craig Thompson Friend, “Sex, Self, and the Performance of Patriarchal Manhood in the Old South,” in L. Diane Barnes, Brian Schoen, and Frank Towers (eds.), *The Old South’s Modern Worlds: Slavery, Region, and Nation in the Age of Progress* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 246–265; David T. Moon Jr., “Southern Baptists and Southern Men: Evangelical Perceptions of Manhood in Nineteenth-Century Georgia,” *Journal of Southern History*, 81.3, (2015), 563–606.

¹⁴ Winfield H. Collins, *The Truth about Lynching and the Negro in the South in which the Author Pleads That the South Be Made Safe for the White Race* (New York: Broadway Publishing, 1918), 47, 140; Vernie Alton Moody, *Slavery on Louisiana Sugar Plantations* (Reprinted from 1924 ed., original copy in University of Virginia Library; New York: AM Press, 1976), 17–19; Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1929), 187–217.

claims of emasculation. In stressing the victimization that enslaved people faced, scholars focused on the damage done to enslaved men, who, having been robbed of the supposedly natural patriarchal role, were left emasculated and uncertain of their identity or place within society.¹⁵ These interpretations faced significant challenge from scholars in the 1970s. The changing depiction of enslaved men was part of a broader shift in which historians and activists stressed that the enslaved strove against outrageous odds to successfully forge autonomous social, cultural, and physical spheres of existence.¹⁶ This “slave community” helped protect enslaved people from the worst excesses of slavery and offered a space for enslaved men to demonstrate masculinity.¹⁷ Revisionist historians of the 1970s recognized the negative psychological and physical effects of

¹⁵ Kenneth Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution: Slavery in the Antebellum South* (New York: Knopf, 1956), 343. The emasculation thesis found particularly controversial expression in Stanley Elkins’ *Slavery – A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life* and in Daniel P. Moynihan’s “The Case for National Action.” Elkins’ psychologically influenced discussion on “‘infantile regression’ – regression to a previous condition of childlike dependency,” and comparison of slavery to the concentration camps of World War II, led him to claim that the “plantation offered no really satisfactory father-image other than the master.” To Elkins, the absolute power of the enslaver entailed “absolute dependency for the slave – the dependency not of the developing child but of the perpetual child.” Stanley Elkins, *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), 130; Daniel T. Moynihan, “The Moynihan Report,” in Lee Rainwater & William L. Yancey (eds.), *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1967), 39–125, 61–62. On emasculation in family life, see also E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Family in the United States* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 60.

¹⁶ The literature here is extremely broad, but significant work includes: John Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972); George P. Rawick, *From Sundown to Sunup: The Making of the Black Community* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1972); Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York; London: Pantheon Books, 1976); Herbert Gutman, *The Black Family in Slavery and Freedom, 1750–1925* (New York; London: Pantheon Books, 1976); Leslie Howard Owens, *This Species of Property: Slave Life and Culture in the Antebellum South* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976); Lawrence W. Levine, *Black Culture and Black Consciousness: Afro-American Folk Thought from Slavery to Freedom* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); Charles Joyner, *Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Sterling Stuckey, *Slave Culture: Nationalist Theory and the Foundations of Black America* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

¹⁷ John Blassingame noted: “Although unlettered, unarmed, and outnumbered, slaves fought in various ways to preserve their manhood.” Despite significant theoretical disagreements, Eugene Genovese also rejected claims of emasculation: “although slave men suffered deeply, there is no evidence that most felt themselves less than men.” Blassingame, *Slave Community*, 184; Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 149, 491.

slavery but stressed that enslaved men strove to meet contemporary masculine ideals nonetheless, and not just through violent resistance. They provided for families, fought bondage, succeeded in work, and acted as religious and community leaders.¹⁸

Despite important challenges to the “slave community” model, the emphasis on collectively resisting emasculation remains influential among historians.¹⁹ Darlene Clark Hine and Earnestine Jenkins’ readers on black masculinity, published in 1999 and 2001, neatly encapsulate the direction in which studies of enslaved men had turned by the end of the twentieth century. In the preface to the second volume, Aldon Morris argued that “an important goal of slavery was to prevent the emergence of a sense of Black manhood.” However, the emphasis was firmly on triumph over adversity: “despite the aims of the slaveholders, a strong and noble sense of what it meant to be a Black male developed in the eighteenth century among both slaves and free Blacks.” Notwithstanding the tragedies of bondage, a strong sense of manhood “took deep root and flourished” among African American men.²⁰ Edward Baptist offered a nuanced consideration of multiple models of masculinity available to enslaved men on the cotton frontier, but much work continues to emphasize a resistant and

¹⁸ Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 486.

¹⁹ Peter Kolchin, “Re-Evaluating the Antebellum Slave Community,” *Journal of American History*, 70.3 (December 1983), 579–601; Brenda Stevenson, *Life in Black and White: Family and Community in the Slave South* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); William Duminberre, *Them Dark Days: Slavery in the American Rice Swamps* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Daniel P. Black, *Dismantling Black Manhood: An Historical and Literary Analysis of the Legacy of Slavery* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1997); Orlando Patterson, *Rituals of Blood: Consequences of Slavery in two American Centuries* (Washington, DC: Civitas/Counterpoint, 1998). More recent work in this vein includes Dylan Penningroth, *The Claims of Kinfolk: African American Property and Community in the Nineteenth Century South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); Jeff Forret, *Slave Against Slave: Plantation Violence in the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2015). Scholars had also criticized the tendency of revisionist historians to focus on enslaved men and the seeming expectation of patriarchal dominance. See, for example, Michelle Wallace, *Black Macho and the Myth of the Superwoman* (New York: Dial Press, 1978); Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith (eds.), *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women’s Studies* (Westbury: Feminist Press, 1982); Bell Hooks, *Ain’t I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism* (London: Pluto Press, 1982); Angela Davis, *Women, Race & Class* (London: The Women’s Press, 1982).

²⁰ Aldon D. Morris, “Foreword,” in Darlene Clark Hine and Earnestine Jenkins (eds.), *A Question of Manhood: A Reader in U.S Black Men’s History and Masculinity, Vol. 2, the 19th Century: From Emancipation to Jim Crow* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), xiii; Hine and Jenkins (eds.), *A Question of Manhood, Vol. 1*.

unifying nature to masculinity in slave communities.²¹ Sergio Lussana, for example, has stressed the significance of supportive homosocial subcultures in slave communities for enslaved men seeking to carve out a masculine identity: “It was here, together, that they fought the humiliating, degrading, and emasculating features of their enslavement. In this homosocial world, they became men.”²²

Historians who emphasize a collective response to emasculation as the principal means of understanding enslaved manhood have, however, underestimated the importance of internal comparison and exclusion from within slave communities in the formation of gendered identities.²³ In framing the construction of masculine identities as evidence of resistance and agency, scholars have also understated the tangled cultural space within which enslaver and enslaved alike engendered their world, both in opposition and in relation to one another. Recent work which argues that “black men carved out an alternative culture of masculinity and even resistance from the limited social, economic, and cultural resources available to them” thus flattens the complex relationships enslaved men had with one another and with those who enslaved them, neglecting the varied, even contradictory ways in which enslaved people conceived of masculine attributes and values.²⁴ In defining enslaved men as a unified group seeking to affirm a collective manhood in the face of

²¹ Edward Baptist, “The Absent Subject: African American Masculinity and Forced Migration to the Antebellum Plantation Frontier,” in Craig Thompson Friend and Lorri Glover (eds.), *Southern Manhood: Perspectives on Masculinity in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 136–173.

²² Lussana, *My Brother Slaves*, 7. See, also: Fraser, “Negotiating Their Manhood,” 88; Okuhata, *Unchained Manhood*, 134.

²³ Riche Richardson has indicated the problems of black men being depicted “as an undifferentiated and monolithic racial and gender category.” Timothy Buckner has stressed the need to acknowledge that “black men, both free and enslaved, adopted different positions when it came to masculinity.” See: Riche Richardson, *Black Masculinity and the US South: From Uncle Tom to Gangsta* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007), 8; Timothy R. Buckner, “A Crucible of Masculinity: William Johnson’s Barbershop and the Making of Free Black Men in the Antebellum South,” in Timothy R. Buckner and Peter Caster (eds.), *Fathers, Preachers, Rebels, Men: Black Masculinity in U.S History and Literature, 1820–1945* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2011), 41–60, 54; Maurice Wallace, *Constructing the Black Masculine: Identity and Ideality in African American Men’s Literature and Culture* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002); Roland Murray, *Our Living Manhood: Literature, Black Power, and Masculine Ideology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).

²⁴ Sergio Lussana, “‘No Band of Brothers Could Be More Loving’: Enslaved Male Homosociality, Friendship, and Resistance in the Antebellum American South,” *Journal of Social History*, 46.4 (2013), 872–895, 872.

emasculation by white society, we risk neglecting the diversity of interactions in the American South and underestimating the divisions that developed in slave communities.

Enslaved men defined their masculine identity through a comparative lens, and there were consequences if men were perceived by their peers to have “failed” a test of manhood. Rather than automatically support or assist one another against an emasculatory white society, the comparison to or disavowal of other enslaved men’s behaviors and actions was an important means of determining masculine identity and social standing for black men. Disagreements over the actions required of men could divide slave communities, and these divisions offer insight into the diverse ways enslaved people negotiated with bondage and interpreted their actions in surviving slavery. Exploring the complex relational context in which enslaved people crafted identities, and not purely in resistance to white social and cultural norms, demonstrates the fluidity of gender as a social and cultural construct and the limitations to any monolithic model of black solidarity.

Historians have successfully moved beyond caricatures of broken communities, emphasizing instead how enslaved people creatively and collectively fought against the worst effects of their enslavement.²⁵ Scholars have argued that enslaved peoples’ values and identities were crafted within a supportive black community and that enslaved people understood, but ultimately rejected, the worldviews of their enslavers. In such depictions, acts which could be viewed as accommodation to slavery are said to have masked resistant identities and ideals which protected and united enslaved people.²⁶ Yet in portraying enslaved people as free agents united against white power, there is a risk of neglecting the very real structural impact of slavery and the significance of the relationships with

²⁵ See footnotes 10 and 13. While acknowledging limitations on agency or resistance, excellent recent work emphasizes the strength of slave communal bonds and collective resistance. See Stephanie Camp, *Closer to Freedom: Enslaved Women and Everyday Resistance in the Plantation South* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 2–8; Walter Johnson, *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), 211–217; Edward Baptist, *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery and the Making of American Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 2014), 145–147, 415–419.

²⁶ Much of this literature on slave resistance developed arguments from James C. Scott’s work on “hidden transcripts.” See Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985); Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). See, for example: Lussana, *My Brother Slaves*, 9; Camp, *Closer to Freedom*, 2.

their enslavers into which enslaved people were forced. Brute force underpinned all elements of slavery but the hegemonic cultural, social, and political power wielded by enslavers was an integral part of the system and influenced how enslaved people negotiated a life and identity in bondage.²⁷ Gendered scripts were not simply imposed by enslavers, but the cultural world which bound enslaved people with those who enslaved them was shaped by the conditions and unequal power dynamics of enslavement. This does not mean enslaved people uncritically accepted their status as slaves or that enslavers were kind and loving. However, the structural constraints and repressions of enslavement were both personal and political, and the choices enslaved people made were conditioned by, though not reducible to, the environment in which they lived. Agency, as Walter Johnson has argued, is not a synonym for resistance.²⁸ In establishing a gendered identity, enslaved people accepted, rejected, and refashioned the ideals and influence of those who sought mastery over them. Similar tensions developed in conversation with families, friends, and the wider slave community.²⁹ Enslaved people conceived of gender roles and developed identities in contest, resistance, and negotiation with enslavers and with one another.

In focusing on enslaved masculinity and interactions within slave communities, I make extensive use of slave testimony. This includes the large body of published narratives from the nineteenth century, postbellum memoirs, and oral histories collected in the twentieth century as part of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) project. These sources offer

²⁷ On paternalism and cultural hegemony, see Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll*, 25–49, 147–149, 597. On the chronological development of paternalism as a political ideology and strategy of management, see Lacy Ford, *Deliver Us from Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), esp. chapters 5–6. On paternalism, resistance, and cultural hegemony, see Kathleen M. Hilliard, *Masters, Slaves, and Exchange: Power's Purchase in the Old South* (New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 2–5; Walter Johnson, “A Nettlesome Classic Turns Twenty-Five,” *Common-Place*, 1.4 (2001), common-place.org/book/a-nettlesome-classic-turns-twenty-five/. On how gender relates to and is reshaped by hegemonic power, see R. W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995); Karen Harvey and Alex Shepard, “What Have Historians Done with Masculinity? Reflections on Five Centuries of British History, circa 1500–1950,” *Journal of British Studies*, 44.2 (2005), 274–280, 277.

²⁸ Walter Johnson, “On Agency,” *Journal of Social History*, 37 (2003), 113–124, 121.

²⁹ Anthony Kaye, “The Problem of Autonomy: Towards a Postliberal History,” in Jeff Forret and Christine Sears (eds.), *New Directions in Slavery Studies: Commodification, Community, and Comparison* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2016), 150–175, 165.