ACTA UNIVERSITATIS LODZIENSIS
FOLIA SOCIOLOGICA 70, 2019

http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/0208-600X.70.05

Ewa Kępa*

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1836-3083

KNITTING – (WO)MEN'S OCCUPATION

Summary. Does a man who knits demonstrate courage? The question refers to the meanings attributed to knitting, which has traditionally been perceived as a female occupation performed in private space. In this article, referring to the past and the analysis of contemporary craft practice, I describe the process of deconstruction in this area. I am particularly interested in men knitting in public. The aim of my considerations is to analyze the difference between the meaning of what is male and female in knitting, and between hegemonic practice and subversive acts of deconstruction.

Keywords: hegemonic masculinity, inclusive masculinity, knitting, subversion, heteronormativity.

1. Introduction

Knitting is traditionally perceived as a feminine activity performed in a private space. When a man reaches for yarn and knitting needles, he provokes questions about the boundaries between masculinity and femininity. From the perspective of gender research, it is not only the reasons why he spends his free time knitting that are of interest. What is also important, perhaps above all else, are the effects of men's knitting on the shape of modern social life. Within the framework of the presented article, referring to the past and drawing on the analysis of contemporary handicraft practices, I describe the deconstruction process taking place in this area. I pay special attention to the analysis of the activity of men who knit in public, violating the stability of meanings stretched between the male and non-male, between hegemonic practice and subversive acts of questioning it.

* Dr, Międzywydziałowy Instytut Studiów Kulturowych, Uniwersytet w Białymstoku, ul. Świerkowa 20, 15-328 Białystok, e-mail: e.kepa@uwb.edu.pl

2. The history of hand-knitting, at a glance[1]

The old ways of producing knitted and woven fabrics are mainly of interest to historians of material culture and archaeologists. In modern research on textiles, experimental archaeology attempts to comprehensively explore and reconstruct old textile production techniques – from the stage of sourcing raw materials to the analysis of the functionality of textile tools and the social and economic aspects of work (Ulanowska 2013: 18–20)[2]. The scientific findings so far allow us to state that the production of knitted fabrics was already known in the early Bronze Age. Its traces were found in the form of imprints on the remains of ceramics from that period (Sagona 2018: 283). The oldest form of manufacturing textiles using threads and needles was the *looping* needle stitch (Turnau 1979: 11). This method was based on the gradual stitching with a needle and thread. This technique is also known as the *Coptic stitch*[3], or the *Tarim stitch*[4]. The Scandinavian term "*nalbinding*", derived from the words nålbinding or *naalbinding* (Sagona 2018: 283), is also used to describe the method of making single stitches with an ear needle.

Knitting developed from the need to obtain tight-fitting but elastic head, arm and leg covers (Turnau 1979: 9). Over time, the difficult and extremely laborious needle stitch was replaced by two, and later also four and five knitting needles. Iconographic reports, written sources as well as the archaeological remnants of knitting prove that in the past both women and men engaged in knitting. Among the knitting men are the nomadic knitters and shepherds, whose figures are depicted in drawings dating back to the 14th–18th centuries. Since the 14th century, many European countries have had their own craft guilds of knitters. Some of the first were created in Paris and Barcelona. Knitting craftsmen made items such as stockings, socks, gloves and headgear. The knitting artisans repeatedly located themselves "at the top of the guild ladder". Women at that time produced knitted fabrics for domestic use (Turnau 1979: 29–34, 185). The extensive iconographic material from all over Europe dating from the 14th to 18th centuries proves that

[1] In the presented article I use the term "knitting" mainly to describe "a textile technique that allows the production of rows of elastic mesh from a thread of an unlimited length using two or more knitting needles or a machine" (Turnau 1979: 19). I refer much less frequently to this term in the context of crocheting, which, like knitting, is a knitting technique involving the production of a series of loops from a single thread (Turnau 1979: 10).

[2] An example of a report on the research done in the fields of experimental archaeology is the article by Malcolm-Davies Jane (2018), *Knitting virtual tribes together: new audiences for cultural objects*, [in:] *Florence Heri-Tech – The Future of Heritage Science and Technologies, IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering* 364, http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1757-899X/364/1/012031/pdf [access 21.01.2019].

[3] The name comes from textiles from ancient Coptic Egypt.

[4] The term *Tarim stitch* comes from the woolen mummy headgear found in the Kashgar Basin (*Tarim Basin*) – a geographical region in Central Asia, in the western part of China. These mummies date back to 1000 BC. (Claßen-Büttner 2015: 34; Vajanto 2014: 22; Graves 2008).

professional knitters made effective movements by slightly bending their hands, while in amateur women's knitting one can see broader movements of hands (Turnau 1979: 119).

The invention of the knitting machine and the resulting technical revolution in the textile industry changed the face of hand knitting (Turnau 1979: 169). Knitting workshops produced exquisite knitted fabrics used for special events. Home knitting production, on the other hand, satisfied the daily needs of the inhabitants of towns and villages. Knitting evolved into a typically feminine activity, with the emergence of cheaper and faster methods of clothing manufacture. Due to the development of machine knitting at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, the guild's restrictions on students and apprentices were lifted and the mass use of the female labour force began. When ready-made knitted products ceased to be luxury goods for consumers of average wealth, their hand knitting became a source of small savings, testifying to the resourcefulness of women (Turnau 1979: 181–183), and an occupation filling the time of wealthy women belonging to the upper classes.

Although in the history of knitting we find many other examples of men's involvement in hand knitting[5], following the industrial revolution knitting became an activity that women most often engaged in within their private space.

3. Knitting as a *gendered* activity

In all likelihood, when asked to give an example of a typically male hobby, most people today would mention football, fishing, model building or poker. It is likely that few people would think of knitting or crocheting as being among the activities practiced by men in their free time. Knitting is traditionally associated with femininity. This is because it was women who, for thousands of years, took care of the household and were responsible for making clothes, bedding and towels (Haveri 2013: 2). Weaving and sewing has been an important part of their daily routine for years (Parker 2010: 6; Leslie 2007: XI). From a historical point of view, "knitting was one of the many repetitive activities that had to be done to maintain a home" (Turney 2013: 10).

Knitting is seen primarily as a feminine activity performed in the home, and as such is an element of stereotypically conceived femininity (Parker 2010: 6). Hand knitting is therefore a skill usually possessed by women, which they learn from other women (Kokko 2009: 726; Avramsson 2016: 8). In addition, knitting is often seen today not only as a typically feminine activity, but also as an "old-fashioned" activity performed by an elderly woman sitting in a rocking chair (Turney 2014: 22).

[5] Due to the volume of the presented article, I deliberately omit detailed considerations concerning the issue.

Knitting is certainly an activity "dominated" by women. To find evidence in support of this statement, it is enough to take part in handicraft festivals (Roemer 2017: 47, 70). In Poland, since 2015, an increasingly popular convention of knitting enthusiasts, entitled "Drutozlot", has been held in Toruń. And although the organizers of the event do not refer to gender in their invitation, it is mainly women who take part in it.

Men's interest in this feminised sphere is facilitated by the Internet as a tool to access sources that enable them to find out about and learn knitting techniques without leaving their homes, and without having to reveal their identities. In cyberspace, the handicraft activity of the knitters takes many forms (Pentney 2008). Today, Internet users are able to not only learn how to perform the simplest stitches – they also have the possibility to use knitting patterns and techniques developed in different cultures and historical periods (Wei 2004: 6). Cyberspace offers the possibility of belonging to groups of handicraft enthusiasts when "in real life" nobody is engaged in similar activities. Male knitters admit that the Internet helps them to overcome their knitting concerns by enabling them to communicate with other men with similar passions (Boria 2018).

4. Knitting and the performative enacting of masculinity

The existence of polarized definitions of femininity and masculinity rooted in cultural practices (Bem Lipsitz 2000: 116–122) is the reason why a man reaching for knitting needles or crochet is perceived as peculiar and subversive, rebelling against *the dominant heteronormative patriarchal paradigm*. A male knitter violates an unspeakable taboo by automatically becoming less masculine because of his "feminine" behaviour. Enacting a social spectacle, he astonishes the audience, provokes commentaries, and even causes amusement by disturbing the stability of the recognised norms (Avramsson 2016: 8–9, 34). He is a peculiarity – an *outsider, interloper, and oddity* (Avramsson 2016: 92).

Does the participation of men in knitting, perceived as a typically female form of handicraft activity, contribute to the renegotiation of masculinity? When investigating this issue, I decided to base my deliberations on a constructivist understanding of the concept of cultural gender, which locates the cause of gender differences and behaviours in socialisation, and in intercultural and structural processes (Leszczyńska, Dziuban 2012: 13). To this end, I draw on the social gender theory of Raewyn Connell (1987); the sociological theory of Candace West and Don H. Zimmerman, which is based on the category of *doing gender*, referring to the permanent production of gender in the course of everyday and routine social activities (West, Zimmerman 1987); the performative gender theory of Judith Butler (Butler 2008); and the inclusive masculinity theory of Eric Anderson (Anderson 2015).

Raewyn Connell believes that "being a man or a woman is not a predetermined state. It's a process of *becoming*, a construction that we actively create" (Connell 2013: 22). An Australian sociologist tracks the formation of "masculinity" and "femininity" through everyday practices. In her opinion, constructing a gender is about practicing the behaviours that shape it. Connell thus refers to the theses formulated by Candace West and Don Zimmerman in the famous article *Doing Gender* (West, Zimmerman 1987: 129).

The concept of *hegemonic masculinity*, which the author defines as "a configuration of gender practices that accept and legitimize patriarchy, while guaranteeing at the same time the dominant position of men and the subordination of women", occupies an important position in Connell's social gender theory (Connell 1987: 77, for Arcimovich 2015: 59). Its main elements are authority, physical strength, heterosexuality and a high position in the social hierarchy. Apart from the hegemonic masculinity in a given culture, there are: *complicit masculinity* and *subordinated masculinity*. Although most men aspire to the ideal of hegemonic masculinity, not everyone can or wants to meet its requirements. The complicit masculinity model allows for the privileges of patriarchal gender hierarchy *without* enacting *a strong version of masculine dominance* (Connell, Messerschmidt 2005: 832). Subordinated masculinity concerns non-heterosexual men and permeates the processes of marginalisation of men due to their class, race and ethnic affiliation. It is also often associated with femininity (Schippers 2007: 88).

The performative character of gender shaped in everyday life was also noted by the philosopher Judith Butler. The creator and precursor of *queer theory* notes that the multiplication of gender patterns is achieved by repeating/quoting gender norms (Butler 2008: 252–254). According to Butler, an individual's gender identity is constructed through a series of acts that are renewed, corrected and combined in time (Butler 2004: 157). Gender is therefore doing, it is an act (Barad 2003: 808). It is not a rigid identity that is decisive for human behavior, but a "diluted identity" established in time and approved in public space by repetition (Butler 2008: 252–254). Judith Butler's observations are valuable because of the potential for change in performativity. The author *Gender Trouble* writes: "If the basis of gender identity is a stylized repetition of acts in time, and not their essence, then the possibility of gender transformation gives arbitrariness of relations between such acts, the possibility of a different kind of repetition, change of style or a subversive repetition" (Butler 2007: 27).

If we assume that gender is socially and culturally shaped, we can postulate that changes in its structure take place especially in a crisis situation. And gender structures today undoubtedly show "crisis tendencies" understood as "internal contradictions or trends that question current patterns and force changes" (Connell 2013: 156).

Recognising the processes of change in the way masculinity and femininity were defined, Eric Anderson initially used the concept of hegemonic masculinity.

In time, however, he gave up using Connell's theory, which did not allow him to interpret the results of his research. Anderson noticed that the concept of hegemonic masculinity remains useful in times of "homophobic hysteria", when the level of homophobia decreases; however, different forms of masculinity can function side by side in a horizontal order. In the course of his research, Anderson realized that there may exist parallelly different, coexisting and socially non-combating archetypes of masculinity. In his opinion, today there are two recognized versions of masculinity: highly homophobic and misogynous *orthodox masculinity*, and *inclusive masculinity*, which constitutes the opposite of the former (Anderson, McGuire 2010: 250–251; Anderson 2015: 432; Kluczyńska, Wojnicka 2015: 2). Anderson observed that "men who counted themselves in inclusive masculinity did not aspire to or value orthodox masculinity, and those who aspired to it did not feel culturally upset to become more inclusive" (Anderson 2015: 433).

In the next part of the article, which is an introduction to the research on the issue of masculinity constructed while knitting, I will look into selected issues concerning the process of forming one's own gender identity by men who publicly admit to their unusual hobby.

5. Male knitting – the discourse of hyper-masculinity and subversive repetition

Men's hand knitting, as an activity in the feminised area of human activity, is stigmatised (Morneau 2015: 44–45). This means that male knitters often feel uncomfortable and insecure. They are accompanied by the fear of being accused of being effeminate – of weakness, lack of power, homosexuality. Therefore, many of them concentrate excessively on the permanent strengthening of their own masculinity. The images created by knitting men repeatedly suggest that a man can only feel safe when knitting if he is sufficiently masculine and "tough enough"; in other words, when the excess of masculinity he presents may compensate for any loss he incurs in this regard. *Hypermasculinity* becomes in this case the antidote to effeminacy (Avramsson 2016: 93, 101, 104).

Men who reach for knitting needles thus straddle the socially established gender border. On the one hand, they trespass the border by incorporating typically feminine behaviours in the repertoire of their actions, while on the other hand they overly emphasize their masculinity, torn between the violation of the existing status quo and the need to feel safe. Talking about their interest in knitting, they repeatedly refer to the traditional attributes of masculinity. The narrative of strength, self-confidence and masculinity is manifested, among others, in the popular slogan *Real Men Knit*. The film of the said title, encouraging men to take up knitting, evokes classic areas of the representation of masculinity, such as lifting weights, American football or the automotive industry (Eidson 2006).

Leather jackets, military uniforms and cars often add confidence to knitting men (Avramsson 2016: 101).

The members of the Californian knitting group SF Men Knit (SF – short for San Francisco) emphasize their masculinity. In a video about their passion, one of them says: "*it's for me really nice to be surrounded by guys that are just real men, and just guys that love the same kind of craft that I do*". The SF Men Knit Club also argues that knitting is not only suitable for women ("*knitting isn't just for women*") (SF Men Knit 2018).

The author of the knitting blog publishing under the pseudonym The Straight Male Knitter points out that he is a husband and father, drinks Scotch whisky, likes excellent cigars and Italian motorcycles, and uses classic razors. He informs his potential female readers, also on the behalf of knitting colleagues, that while admiring their unique neckline, he can be distracted by the softness of a mohair sweater that adheres to the curves of their breasts: "*If we ask to touch that delicate fabric, rest assured we do want to experience the fabric. But that probably isn't all we want to touch. We are men. We love women. And we knit*" (The Straight Male Knitter).

The creator of *Brooklyn Boy Knits*, Louis Boria, wearing a T-shirt with the inscription "*#Masculi-knitty*" argues that his mission is to change the face of knitting and make young people, especially men, not afraid to break the borders of the knitting domain (Boria; Brown 2018). According to a New York knitter, men often give up knitting because they are afraid. Boria admits that when he started knitting himself, he was full of fears for his masculinity (Boria).

Sometimes, in order to distance themselves from that which is associated with femininity, men stress that their knitting is unusual – a rebellious activity requiring special skills, creativity and design skills (Morneau 2015: 40). This is how Maciej Potępa[6] speaks about his passion. The first knitting blogger in Poland is actively working on a version of his own "handicraft masculinity". He stresses that crocheting reflects his "rebellious nature". His blog, entitled "Maciek dzierga. A male take on crocheting", presents itself as a "fashion" or "lifestyle" blog. In his pages he shares his projects with others, writes about his workshops and attained skills. He presents a tongue-in-cheek approach to the masculinity of the knitters. He does so, however, by invoking arguments which appeal to hyper-masculinity. He notes that there are reasons why men have an advantage over women in knitting, and his writing is characterised by sentences like the following: "We're the ones with the balls, so the hanging skeins of the yarn look much more natural between our legs" (Potępa 2014).

Men's knitting is also justified by utilitarian reasoning: it is depicted as an activity that has a positive influence on health (Morneau 2015: 19). A good

[6] Maciej Potępa personally deals only with crocheting. Many times, however, he touches upon the subject of masculinity in the context of knitting.

example of this is an article entitled *Men's Knitting: is it 'the New Yoga'?* (Mertz 2014). The presented argumentation refers to research indicating the positive impact of knitting on human health and well-being (Collier 2011; Riley et al. 2013; Maddock 2014).

Confessing to knitting in the male world is a difficult task, and is sometimes compared to coming out. It is an expression of willingness to face the watchful gaze of others, including those of a chauvinistic persuasion (Latif 2013). A man who knits in public draws attention to himself and provokes questions. He cannot be left alone. Jesse Loesberg, known as Yarn Boy, complains *people speak to me when I don't want to be spoken to*. For example, when he returns home by train tired after a whole day's work (Loesberg).

"Knitting takes balls", not only in terms of shaping and defending male identity. It is also an expression of courage, as an act of "a different repetition", as an act of breaking the norms. A knitting man, even when he exaggerates in his efforts to save his own masculinity, shifts the gender boundaries by using hyperbole, creating confusion and violating the hegemony of heterosexuality (Brickell 2005: 33). According to Kery Wills, men knitting in public places perform a subversive act, the essence of which is to act against social expectations, in spite of existing gender stereotypes (Wills 2007: 62).

Homosexual male knitters are in a special situation. They do not attempt to prove they are man enough to knit. Homosexuals engage in knitting because it is a scorned activity that attracts them precisely because they themselves are marginalised (Avramsson 2016: 144). Kristoff Avramsson, referring to his personal experiences, writes that for him knitting is a way of releasing the anger and frustration caused by the overwhelming heteronormativity that penetrates into knitting in a special way (Avramsson 2016: 109). Avramsson is the author of the idea that male knitting can become an element of a *queer pedagogy* that shapes the attitudes of openness towards what is controversial and inconsistent with socially and culturally established patterns (Avramsson 2016: 2016).

Importantly, homosexual male knitters are not stigmatised as non-heteronormative people in groups of knitting men. In these communities there is room for inclusive versions of masculinity[7]. Research shows that belonging to the community of knitting men often results in a decline in homophobia among heterosexual knitters. Knitting communities are evidence of changes in the perception of homosocial male relationships, which have traditionally been based on behaviours corresponding to homophobia and hegemonic masculinity – rivalry, contempt for women, and strengthening heterosexuality. Today, homosocial ties between men are more nuanced (Morneau 2015: 59–66).

[7] The SF Men Knit Group, mentioned previously, even records among its achievements the implementation of the project under the slogan "The Blanket of Pride" for the LGBTQ community. The action concentrated on making a blanket of equal size rainbow-coloured squares, which was later presented at the exhibition of one of the local yarn shops (SF Men Knit 2017).

6. Summary – (re)defining masculinity

Contemporary knitting practices can be seen as contradictory and performative acts which can both negate and maintain traditional gender roles and social divisions. Craftspeople can, depending on their objectives and values, continue or, on the contrary, distance themselves from the experience of generations of women who engaged in this kind of manual labour for centuries (Sallee 2016: 6). Depending on the context, knitting can therefore be a hegemonic or subversive practice (Avramsson 2016: 93).

The development of the Internet, which facilitates access to many forms of acquiring and developing handicraft skills and enables men to share their passion with millions of people with similar interests, has significantly contributed to the increase in men's involvement in hand knitting.

If we assume that handicraft activity may contribute to shaping the sense of identity (Dusselier 2005: 172), male knitters should be defined as being engaged in a practice of shaping masculinity in the space reserved for women. For, despite the fact that today we are not able to clearly define the line between what is masculine and what is feminine (Herudzińska 2015), many people still think that men do not care for, have never cared for, or should not care for knitting because knitting is the domain of women (del Vecchio 2006: 7).

The conducted analyses allow us to conclude that practices undertaken by knitting men undermine the stability of patriarchy. A man who reaches for knitting needles in public enacts a spectacle that causes disturbances in the established image of social reality. These interferences take different forms. On the one hand, groups of knitting men constitute communities of reduced homophobia, which become a place for the formation of patterns of inclusive masculinity. On the other hand, men's knitting continues to evoke socially established meanings by referring to the category of femininity and homosexuality. Therefore, many men still fear the accusation of being effeminate and homosexual when engage in knitting. In order to remedy this and reduce anxiety, some of them decide to stress the extreme version of their own "hard" masculinity (Wills 2007: 62). Their actions are not so much the result of aspiring to hegemonic masculinity as an expression of fear of being assigned to subordinated masculinity.

The image of men who knit in public is not homogeneous. Some of them share their "unique" passion, looking for people with similar interests in social media, while others take an active part in actions undertaken by *craftivists*[8]. Among knitting men there are also celebrities and people who made their handicraft hobby a professional occupation. The description of all the above-mentioned forms

[8] I wrote articles on the activism of people knitting: *Wydziergać siebie i świat. Bombardowanie włóczką jako zjawisko społeczno-kulturowe* (2016); *Dzierganie alternatywne.* Knitting graffiti *jako twórcza praktyka konstruowania rzeczywistości społecznej* (2017).

of activity undertaken by knitting men significantly exceeds the scope of this article. Therefore, research on men's textile handicrafts is worth continuing, making it the subject of a broader academic analysis in the context of discussions on gender, identity, art, social activism, cultural products and economics.

Bibliography

Anderson Eric (2015), *Teoria męskości inkluzywnej*, transl. Piotr Sobolczyk, "Teksty Drugie", no. 2, pp. 431–444.

Anderson Eric, McGuire Rhidian (2010), *Inclusive Masculinity Theory and the Gendered Politics of Men's Rugby*, "Journal of Gender Studies", vol. 19, issue 3, pp. 249–261.

Arcimowicz Krzysztof (2015), *Współczesny ideał męskiego ciała – wybrane aspekty problematyki*, „Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Sociologica", no. 55, pp. 57–76.

Avramsson Kristof (2016), *Men Knitting: A Queer Pedagogy*, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, https://ruor.uottawa.ca/handle/10393/34500 [access 21.01.2019].

Barad Karen (2003), *Posthumanist Performativity. Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter*, "Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society", vol. 28, issue 3, pp. 801–831.

Bem Lipsitz Sandra (2000), *Męskość i kobiecość. O różnicach wynikających z płci*, transl. Sylwia Pikiel, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk.

Boria Louis (2018), *Men in the Knitting Community*, https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=31&v=YWhNevDVdcU [access 22.06.2018].

Boria Louis, https://www.brooklynboyknits.com/media [access 21.05.2018].

Brickell Chris (2005), *Masculinities, Performativity, and Subversion*, "Men and Masculinities", vol. 8, issue 1, pp. 24–43.

Brown Jocelynn (2018), *Handmade: 'Brooklyn Boy Knits' His Way to Prosperity*, "The Detroit News", 01.26, https://eu.detroitnews.com/story/opinion/columnists/jocelynn-brown/2018/01/25/brooklyn-boy-knits/109815634/ [access 21.06.2018].

Butler Judith (2007), *Akty performatywne a konstrukcja płci kulturowej. Szkic z zakresu fenomenologii i teorii feminizmu*, transl. Marek Łata, [in:] Mieczysław Dąbrowski, Robert Pruszczyński (eds.), *Lektury inności*, Elipsa, Warszawa, pp. 25–35.

Butler Judith (2008), *Uwikłani w płeć. Feminizm i polityka tożsamości*, transl. Karolina Krasuska, Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, Warszawa.

Claßen-Büttner Ulrike (2015), *Nalbinding – What in the World Is That? History and Technique of an Almost Forgotten Handicratf*, Books on Demand, Norderstedt.

Collier Futterman Ann (2011), *The Well-Being of Women Who Create With Textiles: Implications for Art Therapy*, "Art Therapy. Journal of the American Art Therapy Association", vol. 28, issue 3, pp. 104–112.

Connell Raewyn (2013), *Socjologia płci. Płeć w ujęciu globalnym*, transl. Olga Siara, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Connell Raewyn W., Messerschmidt James W. (2005), *Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept*, "Gender and Society", vol. 19, no. 6 (December), pp. 829–859.

Craftivist Collective, https://craftivist-collective.com [access 28.02.2017].

Drutozlot, http://drutozlot.pl

Dusselier Jane (2005), *Gendering Resistance and Remaking Place: Art in Japanese American Concentration Camps*, "Peace & Change. A Journal of Peace Research", vol. 30, pp. 171–204.

Eidson Wendy (dir.) (2006), *Real Men Knit*, Unconfined Mind, USA.

Graves, C. M., Jr. (2008), *„Early Nalbinding: Stitches of the Tarim Mummies". Workshop Given at Kings College 2008*, http://www.geocities.ws/ld_tadhg/Classes/BasicNaalbinding01.pdf [access 29.08.2018].

Haveri Minna (2013), *Urban Knitting – the Soft Side of Street Art*, "Synnyt – Taiteen tiedonal", no. 2, pp. 1–19.

Herudzińska Małgorzata (2015), *Męskość na manowcach? (Nie)męski mężczyzna w opiniach mężczyzn*, [in:] Małgorzata Olejarz, Emilia Paprzycka, Sylwia Słowińska (eds.), "Dyskursy Młodych Andragogów", no. 16, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Zielonogórskiego, Zielona Góra, pp. 293–309.

Kępa Ewa (2016), *Wydziergać siebie i świat. Bombardowanie włóczką jako zjawisko społeczno-kulturowe*, "Ars Inter Culturas", no. 5, pp. 241–252.

Kępa Ewa (2017), *Dzierganie alternatywne.* Knitting graffiti *jako twórcza praktyka konstruowania rzeczywistości społecznej*, "Kultura Współczesna", no. 4, pp. 151–165.

Kluczyńska Urszula, Wojnicka Katarzyna (2015), *Wymiary męskości*, "InterAlia. Pismo poświęcone studiom queer", no. 10, pp. 1–6, http://www.interalia.org.pl/media/10_2015/InterAlia_10_2015_wymiary_meskosci.pdf [access 21.09.2018].

Kokko Sirpa (2009), *Learning Practices of Femininity Through Gendered Craft Education in Finland*, "Gender & Education", vol. 21, issue 6, pp. 721–734.

Latif Anam (2013), *Men are Getting Hooked on Knitting and the Craft Culture is Catching up*, "National Post", 9.08, https://nationalpost.com/life/men-are-getting-hooked-on-knitting-and-the-craft-culture-is-catching-up [access 2.02.2019].

Leslie Amoroso Catherine (2007), *Needlework Through History: An Encyclopaedia*, Greenwood Press, Westport–Connecticut–London.

Leszczyńska Katarzyna, Dziuban Agata (2012), *Pomiędzy esencjonalizmem a konstruktywizmem. Płeć (kulturowa) w refleksji teoretycznej socjologii – przegląd koncepcji*, "Studia Humanistyczne AGH", vol. 11(2), pp. 13–34.

Loesberg Jesse, *Listen to Yarn Boy*, http://yarnboy.com/audio/ [access 12.02.2019].

Maddock Angela (2014), *Knitting and Well-being*, "Textile. The Journal of Cloth and Culture", vol. 12, issue 1, pp. 34–57.

Malcolm-Davies Jane (2018), *Knitting Virtual Tribes Together: New Audiences for Cultural Objects*, [in:] *Florence Heri-Tech – The Future of Heritage Science and Technologies, IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 364, http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1757-899X/364/1/012031/pdf [access 21.01.2019].

Mertz Teo (2014), *Men's Knitting. Is it 'the New Yoga'?*, "The Telegraph", 1.09, https://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/thinking-man/10552983/Mens-knitting-is-it-the-new-yoga.html [access 23.09.2018].

Morneau Ann (2015), *Knitting Takes Balls: Masculinity and the Practice of Knitting*, Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, https://curve.carleton.ca/7d526423-d9d2-41dc-86cb-e0140700916f [access 21.06.2018].

Parker Rozsika (2010), *Subversive Stitch. Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine*, I.B. Tauris, London–New York.

Pentney Beth Ann (2008), *Feminism, Activism, and Knitting: Are the Fibre Arts a Viable Mode for Feminist Political Action?*, "Thirdspace. A Journal of Feminist Theory & Culture", vol. 8, issue 1, http://journals.sfu.ca/thirdspace/index.php/journal/article/view/pentney/210#3back [access 14.02.2019].

Potępa Maciej (2014), *Dlaczego dzierganie może być męską pasją?*, 22.05, http://www.maciekdzierga.pl/dlaczego-dzierganie-moze-byc-meska-pasja/ [access 22.12.2018].

Riley Jill, Corkhill Betsan, Morris Clare (2013), *The Benefits of Knitting for Personal and Social Wellbeing in Adulthood. Findings from an International Survey*, "British Journal of Occupational Therapy", vol. 76, issue 2, pp. 50–57.

Roemer Robin (2017), *Knitting in 21st Century America: The Culture and Ideology of Knitting Groups in Rural Oregon*, "Honors Senior Theses/Projects", no. 136, Western Oregon University, https://digitalcommons.wou.edu/honors_theses/136 [access 12.10.2018].

Sagona Claudia (2018), *Two-Needle Knitting and Cross-Knit Looping: Early Bronze Age Pottery Imprints from Anatolia and The Caucasus*, "Oxford Journal of Archaeology", vol. 37(3), pp. 283–297.

Sallee Rosemary L. (2016), *Femmage and the DIY Movement: Feminism, Crafty Women, and The Politics of Gender Performance*, Albuquerque, The University of New Mexico, New Mexico. Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository: http://digitalrepository.unm.edu/amst_etds/48 [access 24.09.2018].

Schippers Mimi (2007), *Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony*, "Theory and Society", no. 36, pp. 85–102.

SF Men Knit (2017), *SF Men Knit Pride Blanket Project*, 30.07, https://www.sfmenknit.us/single-post/2017/07/30/SF-Men-Knit-Pride-Blanket-Project/ [access 20.06.2018]

SF Men Knit (2018), *Not just for your granny — these dudes started a men's knitting club*, 1.10, https://www.brut.media/us/news/welcome-to-the-men-s-knitting-club-7e7e47e0-7881-4252-afe4-cfd14f89df41 [access 15.12.2018].

The Straight Male Knitter, https://thestraightmaleknitter.blogspot.com/ [access 22.12.2018].

Turnau Irena (1979), *Historia dziewiarstwa europejskiego do początku XIX wieku*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław.

Turney Joanne (2013), *The Culture of Knitting*, Bloomsbury Academic, London–New Delhi–New York–Sydney.

Turney Joanne (2014), *(S)Mother's Love, or, Baby Knitting*, [in:] Anna Moran, Sorcha O'Brien (eds.), *Love Objects: Emotion, Design and Material Culture*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 21–30.

Ulanowska Agata (2013), *Egejskie techniki tkackie w epoce brązu. Zastosowanie archeologii eksperymentalnej w badaniach nad włókiennictwem egejskim*, Repozytorium Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa, https://depotuw.ceon.pl/bitstream/handle/item/464/A_Ulanowska_doktorat.pdf?sequence=1 [access 2.01.2019].

Vajanto Krista (2014), *Nålbinding in Prehistoric Burials – Reinterpreting Finnish 11th–14th-century AD Textile Fragments*, [in:] J. Ikäheimo, A.-K. Salmi, T. Äikäs (eds.), *Sounds Like Theory. XII Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group Meeting in Oulu 25.–28.04.2012*, "Monographs of the Archaeological Society of Finland", no. 2, pp. 21–33, http://www.sarks.fi/masf/masf_2/SLT_02_Vajanto.pdf [access 29.08.2018].

Vecchio del Michael (2006), *Knitting with Balls. A Hands-On Guide to Knitting for the Modern Man*, DK Publishing, New York.

Wei Carolyn (2004), *Formation of Norms in a Blog Community*, University of Minnesota, Digital Conservancy, pp. 1–10, http://hdl.handle.net/11299/172809 [access 10.02.2019].

West Candace, Zimmerman Don H. (1987), *Doing Gender*, "Gender and Society", vol. 1, issue 2, pp. 125–151.

Wills Kerry (2007), *The Close-knit Circle: American Knitters Today*, Praeger Publisher, Westport, CT.

Ewa Kępa

DZIERGANIE – (NIE)MĘSKIE ZAJĘCIE

Abstrakt. Czy mężczyzna, który robi na drutach, wykazuje się dziś odwagą? Tak sformułowane pytanie odsyła do znaczeń przypisywanych dzierganiu, tradycyjnie postrzeganemu jako zajęcie kobiece, wykonywane w przestrzeni prywatnej. W ramach prezentowanego artykułu, odwołując się do przeszłości oraz w oparciu o analizę współczesnych praktyk rękodzielniczych, opisuję proces dekonstrukcji dokonujący się w tym obszarze. Szczególną uwagę poświęcam analizie aktywności mężczyzn, którzy robią na drutach publicznie, naruszając tym samym stabilność znaczeń rozpiętych pomiędzy tym, co męskie i niemęskie, pomiędzy praktyką hegemoniczną i subwersywnymi aktami jej kwestionowania.

Słowa kluczowe: męskość hegemoniczna, męskość inkluzywna, robienie na drutach, subwersja, heteronormatywność.