RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH (RJOE)
www.rjoe.org.in | **Oray's Publications** | ISSN: **2456-2696**
An International Approved Peer-Reviewed and Refereed English Journal
Impact Factor: *8.373 (SJIF)* | **Vol. 11, Issue 1 (Jan/Feb/Mar;2026)**

Bodies at Work: Gender, Labour, and Narrative Form in Victorian Fiction

Alivia Banerjee
Independent Scholar, English and Gender Studies,Kolkata, India

Paper Received on 28-12-2025, Accepted on 30-01-2026
Published on 3 1 -01-26; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.01.252

Abstract

This article challenges the enduring belief that men alone built the physical foundations of society, while women remained peripheral to strenuous labour. I argue that women have always performed a substantial share of society's most physically demanding work, yet this labour has been systematically ignored, aestheticised, or moralised rather than recognised as productive force. Drawing on English literary texts, labour history, and feminist political economy, I examine how bodily endurance, repetition, and sustained exertion have been excluded from dominant definitions of strength and work.

Rather than treating women's labour as symbolic or supplementary, I foreground its materiality. Domestic and industrial tasks such as laundering, ironing, textile production, agricultural work, and caregiving required prolonged physical effort that shaped bodies over time. Nineteenth-century fiction and visual culture preserve traces of this exertion, even as historical narratives continue to privilege masculine-coded labour associated with visibility, machinery, and monumentality. Through close readings of literary and cultural texts, I show how women's work is repeatedly represented as natural, moral, or self-evident, and therefore rendered uncountable.

This article does not seek to recover forgotten heroines or to invert gender hierarchies. Instead, it exposes how definitions of labour and strength have been structured to exclude forms of work that do not align with linear progress, individual achievement, or public recognition. By reframing heavy lifting as endurance rather than spectacle, I argue that women's labour has functioned as physical infrastructure while remaining conceptually invisible. Recognising this erasure is essential to rethinking both historical and contemporary assumptions about work, value, and contribution.

Keywords:women's labour; physical work; gender and strength; domestic labour; English literature; labour history

Introduction

A persistent cultural fantasy continues to shape how work, strength, and historical contribution are imagined. According to this narrative, men built civilisation through centuries of strenuous labour, while women remained sheltered from physical exertion, contributing primarily through care, sentiment, or moral support. This story survives in school textbooks, popular history, and contemporary online discourse alike. It appears in celebratory accounts of industrial progress, in nostalgic invocations of "traditional" gender roles, and in the repeated claim that modern comforts are the result of male sacrifice. The endurance of this fantasy is striking not because it is accurate, but because it has proven so resistant to evidence.

This article begins from a simple refusal. Heavy lifting is not a metaphor. It is a description of bodily work. Women have always carried weight, hauled water, scrubbed floors, lifted children, dragged laundry, worked looms, bent over fields, and stood for hours at presses, irons, and washboards. These actions required strength, stamina, and physical resilience. They shaped bodies and shortened lives. Yet they rarely appear in narratives of civilisation as acts of building. Instead, they are relegated to the margins of history, treated as background conditions rather than constitutive labour.

The idea that men alone built the world rests on a narrow definition of work. Strength is imagined as explosive force rather than sustained endurance. Labour is associated with machinery, tools, and visible production rather than with repetition, maintenance, and bodily wear. When strength is defined as spectacle, women's work disappears by design. This is not an oversight. It is a structural feature of how labour has been valued and recorded.

English literature has long registered this disjunction, even when historical writing has not. In *North and South*, Elizabeth Gaskell offers a detailed portrait of industrial England that includes not only factories and strikes, but the domestic economies that sustain them. Women's labour appears as constant, exhausting, and

materially necessary. Yet it is rarely framed as heroic. Similarly, in *Mary Barton*, the labouring female body is omnipresent, bent over household work and caregiving while male characters occupy the narrative foreground of political struggle. The physical toll of women's work is visible, but its historical significance is muted.

The myth of male-built civilisation also depends on the moralisation of women's labour. Domestic and caregiving work is framed as natural rather than learned, as instinctive rather than skilled. This framing removes it from the category of labour altogether. As Ruth Schwartz Cowan demonstrates in *More Work for Mother*, technological change did not reduce women's workload, but intensified it. Labour-saving devices redistributed effort rather than eliminating it. Women continued to perform physically demanding tasks, often with less social recognition than before. The persistence of exhaustion alongside narratives of progress reveals how deeply women's labour has been discounted.

This discounting is not confined to domestic space. In nineteenth-century Europe, women made up a substantial portion of the industrial workforce, particularly in textiles, laundry, and food production. Ironing alone was an arduous and dangerous occupation before electrification. As visual records such as Edgar Degas's *Repasseuses* attest, the work required prolonged standing, repetitive motion, and significant upper-body strength. Yet such labour was rarely described as building the modern world. It was aestheticised, sentimentalised, or treated as an extension of feminine duty.

Literary modernism, often celebrated for its attention to interiority, also preserves traces of this erasure. In *Mrs Dalloway*, Virginia Woolf registers the invisible labour that underwrites social life. The novel's elegant surfaces are sustained by women whose work remains unnamed, uncounted, and physically taxing. Woolf's later insistence in *A Room of One's Own* that women's creative production has been constrained by material conditions gestures toward this reality, even as the physicality of labour itself remains largely untheorised.

The persistence of the "weaker sex" trope depends on this selective vision. Women are described as weak because their strength does not conform to dominant models. Endurance, repetition, and the capacity to sustain life over time are treated

as lesser forms of exertion. Yet these are precisely the capacities upon which societies depend. As E. P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* makes clear, class formation is inseparable from labour practices. What Thompson's account leaves largely implicit is how much of that labour was performed by women, often in forms that resisted heroic narration.

This article argues that women's labour has been foundational, physical, and structurally erased. It has been erased not because it was hidden, but because it was misclassified. By treating women's work as background, nature, or moral obligation, dominant narratives have excluded it from definitions of building, progress, and civilisation. The result is a historical imagination in which men appear as architects of the world, while women appear as its caretakers. This division is false. Care itself has been a form of construction, requiring strength, time, and bodily sacrifice.

The task here is not to replace one myth with another, nor to claim that women built civilisation alone. It is to dismantle the fantasy that civilisation was built without them. By returning to literary texts, labour histories, and visual archives, I examine how women's heavy lifting has been consistently visible yet conceptually absent. Recognising this absence is not an act of nostalgia or recovery. It is a necessary step toward rethinking how work, value, and contribution are defined.
The sections that follow move from bodily definitions of strength to historical accounts of women's labour, and from literary representation to visual culture. Together, they aim to show that women have not merely supported the world men built. They have borne it.

Strength, Work, and the Gendered Body

Strength has rarely been defined neutrally. Across medical discourse, labour history, and cultural representation, strength has been aligned with visible exertion, short bursts of force, and measurable output that culminates in an object or achievement. This definition privileges lifting, striking, and building in ways that produce immediate, observable results. Endurance, by contrast, has been treated as secondary or passive, even though it requires sustained bodily output over long periods of time. The consequence of this distinction has been the systematic exclusion of women's labour from dominant understandings of strength.

The association of strength with spectacle has shaped both cultural imagination and scientific classification. Male bodies have been taken as the standard against which exertion is measured, while female bodies have been assessed in terms of limitation, fragility, or deviation. Yet the forms of work historically performed by women demand a different metric. Carrying water over long distances, washing and wringing heavy fabric by hand, maintaining fires, preparing food for large households, and caring for children and the sick require sustained muscular engagement and resistance to fatigue. These tasks do not culminate in a single act of completion. They persist. Their success lies in continuation rather than conclusion.

Reproductive labour intensifies this dynamic. Pregnancy, childbirth, and postpartum recovery involve prolonged physiological strain that alters the body permanently. These processes are not intermittent. They demand endurance under conditions of pain, risk, and limited recovery time. Yet because reproductive labour does not align with industrial models of productivity, it has been treated as natural rather than skilled, inevitable rather than demanding. The body's capacity to endure has been reclassified as instinct rather than strength.

Domestic labour further reinforces this misrecognition. Tasks such as laundering, cleaning, cooking, and childcare are repetitive by design. Their completion is temporary. A washed garment will need washing again. A meal must be prepared daily. Floors must be scrubbed repeatedly. This repetition has been interpreted as evidence of triviality rather than difficulty. In fact, repetition is what makes such labour physically taxing. Muscles are engaged continuously. Bodies accumulate strain rather than release it. Endurance here is not the absence of effort, but its constant renewal.

The logic of the "weaker sex" depends on ignoring this form of exertion. Women are described as weak because their labour does not resemble the labour that has been culturally elevated. When strength is defined as the capacity to dominate, endure-and-maintain labour appears passive by comparison. This logic collapses under scrutiny. Endurance is not the absence of strength. It is strength distributed across time.English literature has repeatedly recorded this distribution, even when it has failed to theorise it explicitly. In *North and South*, women's bodies bear the consequences of industrial life in ways that extend beyond factory walls. Fatigue

follows them home. Illness accumulates. Care work compounds exhaustion. The narrative does not frame this labour as weakness, yet it does not name it as strength either. It remains suspended in a conceptual gap.

Medical and scientific discourse have historically reinforced this gap. Nineteenth-century physiology often portrayed women as constitutionally unsuited for strenuous work, even as women performed it daily. The contradiction was resolved not by revising definitions of strength, but by denying the labour itself. Women were said to be less capable precisely because their work was rendered invisible. The category of strength was preserved by narrowing its scope.

This narrowing has had lasting effects. Modern fitness culture continues to valorise explosive power and visible muscle over endurance and recovery. Workplaces reward outputs that can be quantified quickly. Domestic and reproductive labour remain excluded from economic calculation because they resist standardisation. The gendered body persists as an organising principle even as social conditions change.

What emerges from this history is not a claim that women are inherently stronger than men, nor a reversal of hierarchy. The point is more precise. Strength has been defined in ways that exclude the labour most women have historically performed. The exclusion is conceptual rather than empirical. Women's bodies have endured precisely because they have had to.

Reframing strength as endurance exposes the fragility of the "weaker sex" narrative. Weakness has never described women's capacity for work. It has described a refusal to recognise certain kinds of work as strength. When endurance is acknowledged as a form of bodily power, the foundations of gendered labour hierarchies begin to shift.

The persistence of women's labour under conditions of exhaustion is not evidence of natural resilience. It is evidence of structural demand. Bodies adapt because they must. Recognising this does not romanticise suffering. It clarifies responsibility. Strength, understood properly, is not about who lifts the most at once. It is about who keeps lifting, day after day, without the possibility of rest.

The Hidden Industries of Women's Work

The Industrial Revolution is conventionally narrated through images of male bodies at machines, forging iron, mining coal, and constructing railways. These figures have come to stand in for industrial labour itself. Yet this account rests on a partial view of production. It foregrounds mechanised work that was visible, waged, and spatially concentrated, while marginalising forms of labour that were equally essential to industrial expansion but dispersed across households, workshops, and fields. Women's work formed the infrastructural base of industrial society, even as it was excluded from its heroic narratives.

Laundry and ironing offer a revealing starting point. Before electrification, laundering was among the most physically demanding forms of work in urban and rural economies. It involved hauling water, chopping fuel, heating large vats, lifting and wringing heavy, water-soaked fabric, and standing for long hours performing repetitive motions. In nineteenth-century Europe, laundering was often done for multiple households, turning domestic labour into a commercial service. Historical records indicate that in cities such as Paris and London, a significant proportion of working women were employed in laundry-related trades. This was not light work performed in private. It was an industry that depended on strength, endurance, and exposure to heat and injury.

Ironing intensified these demands. Flat irons were heavy and had to be repeatedly reheated. The work required sustained upper-body strength and constant attention to prevent burning fabric or skin. Despite this, ironing was rarely classified as skilled labour. It was framed as an extension of women's domestic role, even when performed for wages. The physical toll of this work was evident in contemporary accounts of exhaustion and early disability, yet it remained largely invisible in economic histories of industrialisation.

Textile production further complicates the myth of male-built industry. Women and girls constituted a substantial portion of the workforce in spinning, weaving, and finishing processes. Long before the factory system, textile work was embedded in household economies, where women produced cloth for both domestic use and market exchange. With the advent of mechanised production, women's labour did not disappear. It was reorganised. Women operated machinery, managed

threads, and performed tasks that required fine motor control alongside physical stamina. Factory records from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries consistently show high levels of female employment, particularly in early industrial centres.

Yet these workers rarely appear as builders of the industrial world. Their labour was framed as supplementary, temporary, or unskilled, even when it sustained entire industries. The designation of skill was itself gendered. Tasks performed by men were more readily recognised as skilled, while tasks requiring dexterity, endurance, and attention were naturalised when performed by women. The result was a hierarchy of labour that reflected social values rather than physical demands.

Agricultural labour presents a similar pattern. Women worked in fields, tended animals, carried loads, harvested crops, and processed food. In many regions, women's agricultural labour intensified during periods of industrial transition, as male labour was drawn into factories or military service. Far from retreating into domesticity, women absorbed additional physical work to maintain food production. This labour was seasonal, repetitive, and exhausting. It was also essential. Yet it was rarely counted as building the modern economy.

Non-fiction accounts of labour history repeatedly note women's presence while stopping short of integrating their work into central narratives. Studies of working-class life document women's contributions as background detail rather than structural force. Even sympathetic accounts often describe women as supporting male workers rather than as workers in their own right. This framing reproduces the very erasure it seeks to correct.

The absence of heroic masculinity in women's industrial labour is not accidental. Heroism depends on visibility, singularity, and identifiable achievement. Women's work resists these criteria. It is collective rather than individual, repetitive rather than climactic, and oriented toward maintenance rather than transformation. These qualities have been treated as signs of insignificance, even though they are precisely what allowed industrial societies to function.

The physical costs of this labour were substantial. Historical health records indicate high rates of injury, chronic pain, and early mortality among women engaged

in laundry, textile work, and agriculture. Exposure to heat, chemicals, repetitive strain, and long hours took measurable tolls on bodies. These effects were rarely framed as evidence of strength. Instead, they were treated as unfortunate byproducts of women's roles.

The Industrial Revolution without heroic masculinity looks markedly different. It appears as a dense network of labouring bodies whose work was continuous rather than spectacular. It reveals an economy sustained by women's endurance, adaptability, and physical resilience. It also exposes the selective memory through which industrial history has been written.

Recognising women's labour as industrial does not require denying men's contributions. It requires expanding the definition of building to include maintenance, repetition, and bodily wear. Civilisation was not constructed solely through acts of invention and conquest. It was sustained through daily physical work that prevented collapse. Women performed much of that work.

The persistence of women's labour across sectors and centuries suggests that its marginalisation cannot be explained by rarity or insignificance. It must be explained by narrative choice. Histories of industry have privileged forms of work that align with dominant ideals of strength and progress. Women's labour has been excluded not because it was peripheral, but because it challenged those ideals.

By returning to the hidden industries of women's work, it becomes possible to see industrial society not as a monument built by a few, but as a structure upheld by many. The weight of that structure was borne daily, often silently, by women whose labour was essential precisely because it was uncelebrated.

Literature and the Labouring Female Body

If historical narratives have struggled to recognise women's physical labour as foundational, English literature has often recorded it with greater fidelity, even when it has lacked the language to name it as such. Fiction does not simply mirror social reality. It registers what official histories omit by embedding labour into bodies, routines, and narrative rhythm. In nineteenth-century industrial fiction, the labouring female body appears repeatedly as tired, strained, and worn, yet rarely celebrated. Its persistence across texts reveals how deeply women's work was woven into everyday life, even as it resisted heroic framing.

Elizabeth Gaskell's *North and South* offers one of the clearest literary records of this dynamic. While the novel is frequently read for its engagement with class conflict and industrial relations, its attention to women's bodily endurance is equally striking. Female characters move constantly between spaces of labour, care, and emotional management. The work they perform is not confined to factories or homes. It extends across social boundaries, demanding physical and emotional exertion that accumulates over time. Fatigue is not an event in the novel. It is a condition.

Gaskell does not frame this labour as exceptional. Instead, its very normality becomes its narrative weight. Women's exhaustion appears in small gestures, shortened tempers, and bodies that must continue despite strain. The repetition of tasks, rather than moments of dramatic struggle, structures the text's depiction of work. This repetition mirrors the nature of the labour itself. By refusing climactic resolution, Gaskell allows exhaustion to shape narrative texture. What history might dismiss as mundane, fiction preserves as lived reality.

A similar pattern emerges in *Mary Barton*. The novel is often remembered for its portrayal of working-class hardship and political unrest, yet women's labour again forms the substrate upon which these conflicts unfold. Female characters labour continuously, often invisibly, sustaining households under conditions of scarcity and grief. Their work does not produce tangible progress or recognition. It produces survival. The physical toll of this labour is evident in illness, premature aging, and emotional depletion.

What is notable is how rarely this labour is framed as strength. Women endure, but endurance is treated as expected rather than remarkable. Male suffering, by contrast, is more likely to be narratively foregrounded, linked to economic injustice or political struggle. Women's suffering is quieter, less legible, and therefore easier to overlook. Fiction registers this imbalance even when it does not explicitly critique it.

Charles Dickens's industrial novels reinforce this pattern, though often more ambivalently. In *Hard Times*, the machinery of industrial capitalism dominates the narrative landscape, and male labourers are positioned as emblematic victims of dehumanisation. Women, however, appear as stabilising figures whose labour absorbs

the consequences of industrial life. They care for the sick, manage households, and maintain emotional order amid economic disruption. Their work is continuous and physically demanding, yet it is rarely described in the language of labour at all.

Dickens frequently sentimentalises women's endurance, presenting it as moral fortitude rather than bodily exertion. This sentimentalisation does not erase the labour itself, but it reframes it. Exhaustion becomes virtue. Suffering becomes character. The labouring female body is visible, but its physicality is softened by narrative tone. In this way, Dickens's fiction both preserves and obscures women's work. It records its effects while diverting attention from its material demands.

Repetition functions as a key narrative device across these texts. Women cook, clean, nurse, and mend in cycles that resist narrative progression. These actions recur without resolution, mirroring the structure of domestic and reproductive labour. Unlike male-coded labour, which often culminates in strikes, confrontations, or political change, women's work sustains continuity. Fiction captures this through scenes that return to the same spaces and tasks, allowing weariness to accumulate rather than dissipate.

Exhaustion, in these novels, is not merely a physical state. It shapes perception, emotion, and social relations. Characters respond more slowly, dream less expansively, and narrow their expectations. The labouring female body becomes a site where economic conditions are inscribed over time. Fiction is particularly adept at rendering this inscription, tracing how repetitive labour alters posture, health, and possibility.

What literature achieves here is not recovery but preservation. It holds traces of work that history has preferred to summarise or exclude. Through attention to routine, fatigue, and bodily constraint, novels record the cost of sustaining everyday life. They make visible forms of labour that resist quantification and heroic narration. This visibility is partial and often compromised by gendered conventions, yet it remains invaluable.

The labouring female body in these texts also complicates assumptions about passivity. Endurance requires agency, even when it is constrained. Choosing to continue, to adapt, to manage scarcity, and to care under pressure are forms of action

shaped by necessity. Fiction registers these actions not as triumphs, but as conditions of existence. The absence of celebration is itself instructive. It reveals how deeply women's labour has been normalised.

By reading repetition and exhaustion as narrative strategies rather than background detail, it becomes possible to see how literature documents what economic and political histories marginalise. These novels do not argue that women built civilisation. They show it. They do so by embedding labour in bodies rather than monuments, in time rather than events.

The cumulative effect of these literary representations is a challenge to dominant myths of work and strength. Civilisation appears not as the product of singular feats, but as the outcome of sustained, embodied effort. Women's labour does not interrupt history. It underwrites it. Fiction, in its attention to the everyday, preserves this truth even when other archives fail to do so.

Art, Visibility, and the Politics of Representation

Women's labour has often been visible without being legible. Nowhere is this paradox more evident than in visual culture, where the labouring female body appears frequently, even obsessively, yet rarely registers as work in any meaningful economic or historical sense. Painting, illustration, and later photography have made women's exertion available to view while stripping it of its status as productive labour. Visibility, in this context, does not produce recognition. It produces aesthetic distance. The work of Edgar Degas is emblematic of this dynamic. His paintings of laundresses and ironers, particularly *Repasseuses* from the 1880s, are often praised for their realism and attention to working-class life. The women he depicts bend over heavy irons, their bodies contorted by effort, faces flushed, muscles visibly strained. The physical demands of the work are unmistakable. Yet the labour itself is transformed through composition, lighting, and painterly technique into an object of contemplation rather than analysis.

Degas's laundresses are undeniably working, but their work is aestheticised. The strain of their bodies becomes texture. The repetition of their movements becomes rhythm. What is erased in this transformation is not the effort itself, but its economic and historical meaning. The viewer is invited to observe fatigue, not to

account for it. The labouring body becomes an image, detached from the systems that require and benefit from its exertion.

This aestheticisation reflects a broader tendency in visual culture to treat women's labour as a spectacle rather than a contribution. Scenes of washing, ironing, cleaning, and caregiving recur across nineteenth-century art, yet they are rarely framed as scenes of production. They are domestic, intimate, and therefore assumed to be outside the sphere of building and making. Even when such work is performed for wages, its representation collapses it back into the private and the personal.
The distinction between seeing and counting is crucial here. Women's labour is often seen because it is familiar, expected, and visually accessible. It is counted rarely because counting requires abstraction, valuation, and institutional recognition. To count labour is to recognise it as productive force rather than moral disposition. Visual representation alone does not accomplish this shift. In some cases, it actively prevents it by satisfying the demand for acknowledgement without challenging underlying hierarchies.

John Berger's *Ways of Seeing* offers a useful framework for understanding this mechanism. Berger argues that images are never neutral. They are structured by ideologies that determine what is worth looking at and how it should be interpreted. In the case of women's labour, visual culture has repeatedly framed work as an extension of femininity rather than as an economic activity. The labouring female body is presented as expressive rather than productive, as a site of feeling rather than force.

Berger's insight that "men act and women appear" is particularly relevant here. Women's labouring bodies appear constantly, but their actions are rarely granted narrative weight. Appearance substitutes for agency. The viewer is encouraged to look, empathise, and move on. The conditions that make such labour necessary remain unexamined. Visibility becomes a substitute for accountability.

This substitution has consequences. When women's work is aestheticised, it becomes available for admiration without demanding redistribution or recognition. The strain visible in Degas's paintings does not translate into questions about wages, working hours, or bodily damage. The image contains the labour within the frame,

neutralising its disruptive potential. The viewer is positioned as witness rather than participant in a system of exploitation.

The politics of representation thus mirror the politics of labour valuation. Work associated with maintenance, care, and repetition is rendered timeless and placeless. It appears as something women have always done and therefore as something that requires no explanation. Visual culture reinforces this logic by presenting such labour as natural scenery rather than historical activity. Women's bodies are shown working, but the work itself is detached from processes of industrialisation, urbanisation, and economic change.

This detachment helps explain why women's labour can be both omnipresent and uncounted. It is everywhere in art, yet nowhere in accounts of production. The problem is not invisibility. It is misrecognition. Labour that is constantly represented as background becomes conceptually unavailable as foundation.

Art, then, plays a dual role. It preserves evidence of women's physical exertion while simultaneously shaping the terms under which that exertion is understood. The labouring female body is rendered legible as image but illegible as infrastructure. The result is a cultural archive rich in representation and poor in acknowledgment.

Recognising this dynamic does not require dismissing artistic achievement. It requires reading images with the same critical attention applied to texts. When strain is aestheticised, it is not erased. It is managed. Visual culture allows societies to see women's labour without having to reckon with its centrality.

The persistence of this pattern suggests that representation alone cannot correct historical erasure. To be seen is not to be counted. Until women's labour is recognised as productive force rather than visual motif, it will remain available for contemplation but excluded from claims about who built the world.

Why This Erasure Persists

The erasure of women's physical labour has endured not because evidence is lacking, but because powerful systems benefit from its disappearance. Capitalism, domestic ideology, and cultural romance have worked together to produce a narrative in which certain kinds of work are elevated as world-building while others are relegated to the realm of duty, love, or nature. Women's labour persists within this framework as necessary but uncounted, essential yet structurally undervalued.

Capitalist valuation has played a central role in this process. Labour that generates profit directly, particularly labour tied to machinery, infrastructure, and visible production, is more easily recognised as productive. Work that sustains workers themselves, including cooking, cleaning, childcare, and emotional regulation, is treated as external to the economy, even though it enables all other forms of labour to occur. This separation between production and reproduction is not neutral. It assigns economic value to some bodies while rendering others economically invisible.

Domesticity has provided the moral language that supports this separation. Women's work within the home has been framed as an expression of love, virtue, or natural inclination rather than as effort. Moralisation transforms labour into character. When work is described as devotion, its physical cost becomes irrelevant. Exhaustion is reinterpreted as selflessness. Endurance is praised without being compensated. This framing allows societies to rely on women's labour without acknowledging its demands.

The moralisation of effort also explains why technological change has failed to reduce women's workload in meaningful ways. Labour-saving devices have often increased expectations rather than diminished effort. Cleaner homes, more elaborate meals, and intensified standards of care have absorbed any gains in efficiency. Because women's labour is understood as moral obligation rather than finite resource, there is no threshold at which enough becomes enough. Work expands to fill the space available.

Alongside capitalism and domestic ideology operates the romance of male labour. Cultural narratives celebrate men as builders, providers, and protectors whose work is arduous, dangerous, and transformative. This romance depends on visibility and drama. It privileges labour that produces monuments, machines, or crises. Men's work is framed as sacrifice for the greater good, even when it is well compensated or socially rewarded. Women's work, by contrast, is framed as routine, even when it is equally demanding.

This romantic framing shapes collective memory. Industrial history remembers strikes, inventions, and conquests. It forgets the daily labour that sustained bodies and communities through these upheavals. The romance of male labour

simplifies history by focusing on moments of disruption rather than on the continuous work of maintenance. Women's labour does not fit this narrative arc. It does not culminate in triumph or transformation. It prevents collapse. As such, it resists romanticisation.

Contemporary discourse reveals how resilient these narratives remain. The resurgence of "traditional" gender ideals, often marketed through lifestyle branding and social media, recycles the fantasy of male provision and female ease. Women are encouraged to embrace softness, rest, and domestic retreat, even as they continue to work, often in multiple roles. The aesthetic of domesticity masks the persistence of labour. Softness becomes a performance layered over endurance.

This discourse relies on historical amnesia. It imagines a past in which women were protected from physical strain, ignoring centuries of evidence to the contrary. The appeal of this fantasy lies in its promise of relief from exhaustion, yet it is built on a misrepresentation of history. By romanticising male labour and sanitising women's work, it obscures the structural conditions that produce inequality in the present.

The persistence of erasure is also reinforced by measurement practices. What is counted shapes what is valued. Labour that can be clocked, priced, and recorded is more likely to appear in economic and historical accounts. Women's work often resists such measurement because it is continuous, overlapping, and relational. This resistance is treated as a flaw rather than as a challenge to existing metrics. Instead of revising how labour is measured, societies accept invisibility as inevitability.

The combination of capitalist valuation, moralised domesticity, and romanticised masculinity creates a self-reinforcing system. Women's labour is expected, therefore it is unpaid or underpaid. Because it is unpaid, it is treated as less valuable. Because it is less valued, it is excluded from narratives of building and progress. The cycle repeats.

Understanding why this erasure persists is crucial because it clarifies that misrecognition is not accidental. It is functional. It allows societies to benefit from women's labour without confronting its cost. It sustains myths of strength and

provision that flatter existing hierarchies. It also limits the imagination of what work can look like and who can be recognised as a builder of the world.

Conclusion

The argument traced across this article does not seek to restore women to a history from which they were accidentally excluded. Nor does it propose a counter-myth in which women replace men as the singular builders of civilisation. Recovery narratives, however well intentioned, often leave intact the frameworks that made erasure possible in the first place. What must be rethought instead is the grammar through which labour, strength, and contribution have been defined.

The belief that men built the world endures because it rests on a narrow understanding of work. Labour that culminates in visible transformation has been privileged over labour that sustains life over time. Strength has been equated with force rather than endurance, with spectacle rather than repetition. Within this framework, women's work appears secondary not because it lacks physical demand, but because it resists heroic narration. It does not announce itself. It persists.

Reframing labour requires recognising endurance as a form of power. The ability to repeat physically demanding tasks day after day without recognition or relief is not evidence of natural aptitude. It is evidence of structural necessity. Women's bodies have carried the weight of domestic economies, industrial transitions, and social reproduction precisely because that weight was rendered normal. Normalisation has functioned as erasure.

This erasure has consequences beyond historical misrepresentation. It shapes contemporary debates about work, value, and worth. When women's labour is understood as background rather than foundation, inequality appears natural. When strength is defined in ways that exclude endurance, women's exhaustion is interpreted as personal failure rather than structural outcome. These interpretations continue to inform policy, workplace norms, and cultural expectations.

The point of naming women's heavy lifting is not to sanctify suffering. It is to challenge the systems that depend on it. Recognition alone is insufficient if it remains symbolic. To see women's labour without counting it reproduces the problem.

Counting requires valuation, redistribution, and institutional change. It requires revising what is measured and why.

English literature, labour history, and visual culture together reveal how thoroughly women's work has been woven into the fabric of everyday life. They also reveal how persistently it has been framed as incidental. Fiction records fatigue where history records progress. Art captures strain where economics tallies output. These archives do not offer closure. They offer interruption.

Looking forward, rethinking who built the world demands more than acknowledgment. It demands a shift in what is considered foundational. Maintenance must be understood as construction. Care must be recognised as infrastructure. Endurance must be valued as strength. These are not abstract ideals. They are practical recalibrations with implications for how labour is organised, compensated, and respected.

The world was not built in a single act of creation, nor by a single kind of body. It was built, and continues to be built, through sustained physical work that prevents collapse as much as it produces change. Women have always done that work. The question now is not whether this is true, but whether societies are willing to let it matter.

Ending the romance of male-built civilisation does not diminish history. It clarifies it. It opens space for a more accurate account of how worlds are made and maintained. If value is to mean more than visibility, and recognition more than admiration, then the heavy lifting that has long been ignored must finally be counted.

Works Cited

Berger, John. Ways of Seeing. Penguin Books, 1972.
Berg, Maxine. Women's Work and the Industrial Revolution. Polity Press, 1985.
Cowan, Ruth Schwartz. More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave. Basic Books, 1983.
Degas, Edgar. Repasseuses [Two Ironing Women]. c. 1884. Oil on canvas.

Dickens, Charles. Hard Times. Edited by George Ford and Sylvère Monod, Norton Critical Edition, W. W. Norton, 2001.

Evaristo, Bernardine. Girl, Woman, Other. Hamish Hamilton, 2019.

Federici, Silvia. Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation. Autonomedia, 2004.

Fraser, Nancy. Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis. Verso, 2013.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. Mary Barton. Edited by Shirley Foster, Oxford World's Classics, Oxford UP, 2006.

Gaskell, Elizabeth. North and South. Edited by Angus Easson, Oxford World's Classics, Oxford UP, 2008.

Griffin, Emma. The Woman's Labour: Women's Work in England, 1750–1914. Yale UP, 2020.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling. University of California Press, 1983.

Lowenthal, David. The Past Is a Foreign Country. Cambridge UP, 1985.

Marçal, Katrine. Who Cooked Adam Smith's Dinner? A Story About Women and Economics. Pegasus Books, 2015.

Mistry, Rohinton. A Fine Balance. Vintage International, 1996.

Thompson, E. P. The Making of the English Working Class. Vintage Books, 1966.

Tickner, Lisa. Women's Work and Representation. Virago Press, 1988.

Tressell, Robert. The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists. Edited by Peter Miles, Penguin Classics, 2004.

Woolf, Virginia. Mrs Dalloway. Edited by Stella McNichol, Penguin Classics, 1996.

Woolf, Virginia. A Room of One's Own. Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1929.

How to Cite this article?
Banerjee, Alivia. "Bodies at Work: Gender, Labour, and Narrative Form in Victorian Fiction." *Research Journal of English (RJOE)*, vol. 11, no. 1, Jan.–Mar. 2026, Oray's Publications, doi:10.36993/RJOE.2026.11.01.252.