Hegemonic Masculinity in Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*

Elmira Ebadi[1*] and Leila Baradaran Jamili[2]

1- MA Student, Postgraduate Department of English Language and Literature, College of Humanities, Boroujerd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Boroujerd, Iran.
2- Assistant Professor of Postgraduate Department of English Language and Literature, College of Humanities, Boroujerd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Boroujerd, Iran

Corresponding author: Elmira Ebadi

ABSTRACT: Based on gender study, hegemonic masculinity refers to those cultural rules by the help of which men sustain a leading position over women or even other men in a society. This paper intends to explore the hegemonic masculinity depicted by Virginia Woolf (1882-1941) in *The Waves* (1931). In order to understand the subject better, it is crucial to clarify the issue of hegemonic masculinity by giving definition of the matter based on viewpoints of Raewyn Connell (1944-). Hegemonic masculinity is a subject that cannot be defined separately from the concept of masculinity, for these concepts are deeply interlocked and cannot be discussed discretely. On the other hand, the subject of masculine dominance is closely associated with subordination of femininity and the subjugation of other men. This subjugation and submission to the power of patriarchal dominance of the male figures is illustrated by Woolf in *The Waves*, and in this way, she creates a criticism of the patriarchal system of British society at that time. This paper explores the signs of hegemonic traits of *The Waves*' male characters; hence, the critical viewpoints of Connell will be scrutinized. At the same time, the practicable details of the notion would be applied to the life of characters by using their soliloquies to reveal their hegemonic traits.

Keywords: Dominance, Femininity, Gender Study, Hegemonic Masculinity, Subordination.

INTRODUCTION

In western culture, those men who are white and physically stronger than other man represent hegemonic masculinity; moreover, the heterosexual, married, and authoritarian men are the symbol of controlling masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is a term first introduced by Raewyn Connell and refers to "the dominant form of masculinity within the gender hierarchy" (1987: 344). Based on Connell's view hegemonic masculinity is "the particular type of masculinity" that is in power in a particular society, set in a specific time period (1995: 34). One of the most important characteristics of hegemonic masculinity is its impossibility; "no man is ever man enough" according to its standards (ibid). It is this factor that gives hegemonic masculinity the power as a disciplinary force. However, Connell believes that "men are accordant to these ideals even though they cannot attain them" (ibid), because they help secure their livelihood, prevent victimization, as well as continue the systematic subordination of women.

Virginia Woolf spent a lifetime struggling with various kinds of sexual apprehension. Through her writings, she attempts to destroy the influence of patriarchal domination by depicting the masculine power and the lack of equality between men and women presented in the British society during her lifetime. Much of Woolf's difficulty in relating to the opposite sex came from her early vulnerability when forced to conform to the ideas of her male family members. The subordinate behavior required by her father Sir Leslie Stephen and the sexual exploitation of her half-brother George Duckworth taught her the fact that to be a feminine is to be eternally vulnerable to male aggression in all its various forms. Woolf attempts to articulate her personal sexual neuroses with the goal of obliterating them, and to expose the destructive power of the patriarchy in hopes of reducing its hold over all the "daughters of educated men" who experience their sex as a social limiter that bars them from professional and artistic autonomy (Woolf 2006: 84). She fears male sexual aggression and initially equates it with the violation and destruction of the females in general.

Woolf, in her novels, tries to depict every dimension of an individual's life. This paper intends to show how she traces, in *The Waves*, the signs of masculine dominance of male individuals in British society on her time. The masculine power and dominance, which the male characters use through the narrative, are covered under their delicate traits and fine words and the aim of this paper is to reveal these hidden hegemonic behaviors through their soliloquies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The concept of hegemonic masculinity is used to analyze Woolf's *The Waves*, based on the view points of Raewyn Connell. Before addressing the subject of male-domination, it is crucial to have a look on the system of masculinity. The twentieth century researches have failed to produce a coherent meaning of masculinity. However, relative understanding can be obtained about the issues raised in these attempts. Masculinity can be seen not as an isolated object, but as an aspect of a larger structure. The task of this section is to give a clear definition of the term masculinity based on the critical views of contemporary analyses of gender relations, in order to make a firm ground to explain Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity.

The definition of the basic term in the discussion of masculinity has never been clear in the previous critical debates and articles; therefore, it is crucial to have a definite meaning of the word. Arthur Brittan believes that any account of masculinity must begin with its place in general discussion of gender. This means that masculinity and femininity are continuously subject to a process of reinterpretation, because "gender does not exist outside of history and culture" (Brittan 51). All societies have cultural accounts of gender, but not all have the concept of masculinity; however, versions of masculinity may vary over a limited period of time.

Connell considers masculinity as a relational concept and defines it as "a set of qualities, characteristics, or roles generally considered typical of, or appropriate to, a man" (1995). Masculinity does not exist except in contrast to femininity. Connell assumes that "a culture that does not treat women and men as bearers of polarized character types (…) does not have a concept of masculinity in the sense of modern European/American culture" (ibid, 71). Historical research suggests that this was true of European culture itself before the eighteenth century. Women and men were not seen as bearers of qualitatively different characters; therefore, "this conception accompanied the bourgeois ideology of separate spheres in the nineteenth century" (ibid). Gender is not simply an arrangement in which the roles of men and women are decided into a random and contingent way. It reflects the material interests of those who have power and those who do not. Therefore, masculinity does not exist in isolation from femininity. It is an expression of the image that men have of themselves in their relation to women.

The concept of masculinity has many definitions which have mostly followed different strategies to characterize the type of the person who is masculine. Gender is a way of structuring social practices in general. It is involved with other social structures. According to Connell, gender is a social practice that constantly refers to bodies and what bodies do, in other words "it is not a social practice reduced to the body" (1995). Connell believes that gender constantly interacts with "nationality or position in the world order" (ibid, 77). This fact also has implications for the analysis of masculinity. It has become common to recognize multiple masculinities, but it risks a kind of oversimplification that there are only specific clear-cut kinds of masculinities, such as white masculinities, black masculinities, or working-class masculinities.

Connell puts emphasis on the need for a threefold model of the structure of gender in order to have a better view of the issues about masculinity. She distinguishes them as "relations of power," "production," and "Cathexis" (Connell 1987). The first is power relations as "the overall subordination of women and dominance of men"; the structure of which women's liberation movements called "patriarchy," which exists despite various role reversals, for example female teachers with male students (ibid, 44). However, these role reversals continuously challenge patriarchal legitimacy. They define a problem of legitimacy which has great importance for the politics of masculinity.

The second is production relations which are "the gender divisions of labor and the attributions of task that extends to economic divisions of labor" (ibid, 37). This is the whole idea of gendered occupations and roles, as well as unequal wage rates for men and women. Furthermore, production relations extend to the idea of a gendered aggregation process, in that men, and not women, control the major corporations and the great private fortunes.

According to Connell, the third model of structure of gender is "Cathexis," which is "the emotional investment of an individual over one gender more than the other" (ibid, 51). Gender plays an important role in the shaping of the desires of individuals. In the social sphere, this refers to people focusing their attentions on a particular person of a particular gender that possibly turns into negatively or positively biased treatment. An example could be a man objectifying a female he finds sexually attractive. Accordingly, Connell asks some political questions about the relationships involved, whether they are "consensual or coercive" or whether pleasure is given or received equally (ibid, 52). In feminist analyses of sexuality these have become important questions about the relations of men's

position of social dominance over women. By combining the ideas of power relations, production relations, and "Cathexis" the idea of hegemonic masculinity can be understood better.

Connell believes that "the task of being a man involves taking on and negotiating hegemonic masculinity" (1995). In every period of time, one form of masculinity will become superior to the others. Connell defines hegemonic masculinity as the formation of gender practice which "embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees or is taken to guarantee the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (ibid). It does not mean that the practitioners of hegemonic masculinity are always the most powerful people. They might be instances of such a concept.

On the other hand, hegemonic masculinity is a dynamic standard. It is not a fixed character type, and there is a range of personalities that can be found throughout history and in different cultures. Michel Foucault's (1926-84) works have been used by many theorists belonging to different fields of study. The concept f hegemonic masculinity is one which belongs to such a theory. Connell agrees with Foucault that "all identities are socially constructed and non-essential" (1987). Foucault argues that because masculinities are socially constructed, "it is within the realm of possibility to change them" (qtd. in Moller, 263). Using Foucault's idea, Connell maintains that socially constructed masculine identities emerge from "gender regimes found in different cultures at different times" (1987). To elaborate this, she puts forward the notion that some masculine identities become dominant "wining styles," and men have to engage with them (Connell, 1987). Men benefit from the wining style of masculinity regardless of whether they conform to, or resist them. However, Connell argues that hegemonic masculinity is not a fixed character type, which is the same always and everywhere; rather it is "a masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position (…), a position always contestable" (ibid, 52). Hegemonic masculinity allows men to act and behave based on some pre-established characteristics identified among them as superior.

Connell elaborates more on the concept of hegemonic masculinity by arguing that men "sustain their dominance over women and other men by propagating certain forms of masculinity" (1987). According to her, there are two key factors in producing a hegemonic masculinity: "domination and marginalization" (ibid). The domination establishes the ideal qualities by which some men are promoted, but marginalization describes the oppression involved, and the actual ranking of men based on masculinities.

There are relations of dominance and subordination between groups of men over women. Yet, not many men can attain the principled standards of hegemonic masculinity, and the number of men "practicing hegemonic pattern in its entire form" is quite small (Connell, 2005). However, since the majority of men profit from the patriarchal benefit and its hegemony, Connell adds that they in general gain benefits from "the overall subordination of women" (ibid, 854). She asserts that hegemonic masculinity is likely to be raised, only if there is "conformity between cultural ideal and institutional power" (ibid, 855). Hegemonic masculinity embodies a currently accepted strategy, and Connell believes that when conditions for the defense of patriarchy change, "the bases for the dominance of a particular masculinity are eroded" (ibid, 858). New groups of men may challenge old ways and construct a new hegemony.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The recent works on the subject of masculinity have opened up new possibilities for reading Woolf's The Waves. The novel overturns the traditional theories of gender, and creates a space for various expressions and understanding of masculinity. David Mraz asserts that the masculinity of the novel, to which this paper has also referred to, is related to the "norms established in England during the Edwardian and Post World War I periods" (4). In The Waves, the three male voices, Bernard, Neville, and Louis, are introduced at school to a pro-imperialist vision of masculinity which is then reinforced through their relationship with the silent Percival. By employing the idea of masculinity, it can be seen that through The Waves Woolf destabilizes traditional male roles by normalizing expressions of masculinity outside patriarchal prescriptions.

The focus, in this paper, will be directed toward the male characters of The Waves. By keeping in mind the definitions of the idea of masculinity and also the concept of hegemonic masculinity, the male characters and their tendency toward dominance and patriarchal traits will be analyzed. Masculinity is not a fixed character type, which can be characterized exactly; nevertheless, the male characters of the novel try to demonstrate the masculine side of their personalities more than the feminine one.

Connell assumes that the masculine hierarchy is based on relationships; especially the relationships between "the masculine stereotypes" and what she terms as "countertypes" (1995). Critics have focused on the ways in which Woolf's female characters rage against the oppressive masculine hegemony; however, in The Waves, she illustrates that not only were women subjugated to the "hyper masculine," but men are also "subjected to hegemonic masculinity" (Mraz, 14). In The Waves, not all men are to blame for the suppression of others, but the minorities of men such as Percival, Louis, and Neville, who hold the power of hegemonic masculinity, are to blame.

By referring to John Tosh's study, the male voices in the text "destabilize the masculine hierarchy through their inability to be properly constructed as a true masculine ideal," except for Percival (41). It means that the male figure of the novel subverts the masculine stereotypes by their inability to be truly masculine based on its previously discussed standards, except for Percival. Once the centrality of Louis', Neville's, and Bernard's personal connection to the masculine ideal, Percival, is removed they are free to create their own center of masculinity.

For Louis, this center becomes "an embrace of capitalism," while Neville embraces his "homosexuality and aesthetic sensibilities" (Mraz, 22). Bernard chooses a traditional way by taking a wife and having a family; however, his true center is his struggle to become an author, and as Leila Baradaran Jamili (1965) believes, "(Woolf) portrays Bernard as a writer, a biographer or historian who writes the history of multi-faceted imperial power in the colonies. (…) Bernard gives a brief (…) biography of (…) England's and the empire's life" (274). Bernard's conscious decision to remain outside the "homosocial patriarchy" places him in a position to "destabilize traditionally masculine methods" (Mraz, 47). However, it is Bernard's final act of writing the lives of the voices that destabilizes the notions of what constitutes masculinity.

The Waves begins with the characters discovering their identities through the differences at their childhood: their differences as the individuals of opposite sexes, and their relations to the world around them. Gender identity becomes more complicated when the characters enter school, because, based on Mraz's idea, gender becomes not only about differences between male and female anatomy, but it is also about "the characteristics within their own gender that individualizes them" (12). When the children grow up they should involve in the first institutional system of every society which is school. They have to be separated from each other based on their sexes. As Bernard describes their first night at the school, the first thing which he emphasizes is about this separation: "this is our first night at school, apart from our sisters" (W, 16). This impelled seclusion, which is imposed by the norms of the society and the social institutions, shows that the male individuals have to be separated from their female friends because of their gender discrepancies.

At Woolf's time, the school systems were set up to divide the sexes; for instance, boys and girls did not attend the same school. Furthermore, the nature of education that boys and girls received was much different. Women were seen as different from men in that they were "incomplete or inferior" (Connell, 2005). Boys were taught to be leaders of the nation, while girls were taught domestic skills, because of "having less of the faculty of reason" (ibid, 853). A higher priority was paid to boys' education as they were the ones who went on to attend universities. The girls were barred from higher education until twentieth century. As Tosh asserts, at school both sexes are confronted with "societal influences which attempt to dictate the proper expression of their genders" (50). It is at school when the novel introduces the seventh individual, Percival; however, his thoughts are not narrated through the novel. Percival, who is the instance of Connell's definition of power relation and exhibits the masculine qualities of the patriarchy, acts as the center to which the other characters compare their own gender expressions, particularly the males who are outside the homosocial network.

Bernard's Hegemonic Masculinity: an Identity Confusion in Society

According to Connell, hegemonic masculinity is "an ideal, a set of social norms prescribed by society" (2005: 837). This means that it is the society which impels some pre-established norms upon the individual, and the individual has to follow those norms in order to be accepted in that society as a normal being. Getting married, having a wife and children, and owning a house are among these ideals. Bernard tries to be compatible with these prescribed norms of society, by creating a sense of ownership, in order to be an ideal man: "for many years I crooned complacently, 'My children (…) my wife (…) my house (…) my dog'" (W, 98). In another part Bernard mentions, "once I had a biographer," who would here say, "'About this time Bernard married and bought a house (…). His friends observed in him a growing tendency to domesticity (…). The birth of children made it highly desirable that he should augment his income'" (W, 137-8). However, at the time when Bernard becomes older, he doubts the masculine identity he has obtained in the society.

Bernard questions his self whether he is Bernard or not: "which of these people am I? (…) When I say to myself, 'Bernard', who comes? A faithful, sardonic man, disillusioned, but not embittered. A man of no particular age or calling. Myself, merely" (W, 42). This indicates that Bernard has lost his identity which was going to be compatible with standards of hegemonic masculinity. Bernard thinks that he has no name or an exact age, and he cannot gather his thoughts and is unable to focus exactly on one matter:

'Here's Bernard!' (…) There are (…) many Bernards. There was the charming, but weak; the strong, but supercilious; the brilliant, but remorseless; the very good fellow, but, I make no doubt, the awful bore; the sympathetic, but cold; the shabby, but (…) the foppish, worldly, and too well dressed. What I was to myself was different; was none of these. I am inclined to pin myself down most firmly there before the loaf at breakfast with my wife, who (…) gave me that feeling of existing in the midst of unconsciousness. (W, 138).

Bernard thinks that his life is not one single life which belongs to him; rather it is constituted of multiple lives. He doubts his sexual identity, as he says, "this is not one life; nor do I always know if I am man or woman, Bernard or Neville, Louis, Susan, Jinny, or Rhoda, so strange is the contact of one with another" (W, 149-50). He fails to be a perfect example of hegemonic man, based on the norms of an ideal hegemonic masculine figure.

Bernard believes that he and his friends are one united whole as he refers to their unification as "a seven sided flower, many-petalled" (W, 66). On the other hand, they are separated and disintegrated identities as well, which are living separately from each other under the guise of their names and sexes: "I saw blaze bright, Neville, Jinny, Rhoda, Louis, Susan, and myself, our life, our identity" (W, 148). Bernard thinks that his identity is combined with the identity of his friends, and they share one unified identity. However, Neville believes that the unity of their friendship is the result of Percival's presence: "now we are together. But without Percival there is no solidity. We are silhouettes, hollow phantoms moving mistily without a background" (W, 64). Neville thinks that it is Percival who gives their friendship its unification and as Baradaran Jamili argues "Percival is the central figure who supplies the catalyst of British power and creates a moment of unity and communication" (273). With Percival's presence everything obtains its natural order: "all oppression is relieved. All impediment is removed" (W, 64). It is Percival who rules on and gives order to everything around with his hegemonic traits. Percival keeps the unity which exists among the characters.

Percival's Hegemonic Masculinity: an Instance of British Imperial Power

In Percival's absence, everything has lost its real existential order, and when he arrives, he returns the natural existential essence of things to make them normal; however, as it is obvious, this order is imposed. It means that Percival, with his hegemonic traits, rules on everything. The discipline and the order which he gives to things around are the result of his hegemony and compulsion: "the reign of chaos is over. He has imposed order. Knives cut again" (W, 64). This natural order of things is highly dependent on Percival's presence for when he starts his departure to India again things around lose their order: "Percival is going (…) we sit here, surrounded, lit up, many coloured; all things, hands, curtains, knives and forks, other people dining, run into each other" (W, 71). Percival, with his unconscious hegemonic traits rule over everything and this is a proof of his hegemonic masculinity.

Woolf in The Waves creates two dinner parties as a form of reunion of the characters' friendship. At Percival's dinner party, Bernard, in his monologue, refers to him as a "hero," a "Capitan" who comes to give order to his undisciplined soldiers: "we who yelped like jackals biting at each other's heels now assume the sober and confident air of soldiers in the presence of their captain" (W, 64). Percival, a "hero," is the instance of hegemonic masculinity imposed on his surroundings, especially his friends, as Louis has mentioned his authoritative behavior before at school time which impressed his friends in an obedient manner to act as loyal soldiers: "his magnificence is that of some mediaeval commander. (…) Look at us trooping after him, his faithful servants, to be shot like sheep, for he will certainly attempt some forlorn enterprise and die in battle" (W, 18, 19). They follow and obey him in their personal acts, and they seek permission even for their laughter: "(Percival's) curious guffaw seems to sanction our laughter" (W, 19). As Neville argues, Percival's grandeur makes everyone pay attention to him and admire his magnificence: "when you stand in the door (…) you inflict stillness, demanding admiration, and that is a great impediment to the freedom of intercourse. You stand in the door making us notice you" (W, 68). His hegemonic traits isolate him from others around him.

Percival's joining to army and his departure to India is regarded as the continuation of the British hegemony over the weak and inferior countries not having enough power to get rid of this dominance. England, which spread its dominance on India and other marginalized countries, resembles the symbol of patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity in Woolf's novels, as Baradaran Jamili assumes: "The Waves is Woolf's critique of Europe's imperiality and its imposing power" (274). Percival is, as Baradaran Jamili calls him, "the British imperial power's (representative)" (273). His friends reflected that he, with his magnificent and grandeur gestures and traits, will be regarded as a "God" among the Indian people (W, 72). Bernard mentions Percival's god-like presence for Indian people by giving a description of Percival solving a trivial problem easily with his commands. The Eastern people, then, regarded Percival as one of their gods:

Percival (…) by applying the standards of the West, by using the violent language that is natural to him, the bullock-cart is righted in less than five minutes. The Oriental problem is solved. He rides on; the multitude cluster round him, regarding him as if he were, what indeed he is, a God. (W, 71-2).

The images of Percival's travel to India can be considered as a gentle derision and irony of British imperialism and its patriarchal dominance over the weaker countries. Helen Wussow notes that Percival is the one who embodies "the self-centred (sic) imperialism that the author of The Waves mockingly exposes" (111). Nevertheless, Percival is considered among his friends as a commander or a judge who could bring justice and peace to the world, though if he was not dead. This puts emphasis on Connell's definition of hegemonic masculinity, as she argues that hegemonic masculinity is "competitive and reflects a tendency for males to seek to dominate other males and subordinate

females" (2005: 833). Therefore although he is absent, Percival's traits resemble a hegemonic masculinity dominant over those around him.

Neville's Hegemonic Masculinity: Cathexis in the Form of Misogyny

Neville, on the other hand, shows a dependent masculinity; a kind of personality looking for protection and help from others. These individuals are those who accept the dominance of other men because of their need for aid and support. They think of themselves as weak and feeble: "I am ugly, I am weak" (W, 95). During school time, Neville seeks Percival's attention and kindness: "he despises me for being too weak to play (yet he is always kind to my weakness)" (W, 24). He regarded himself as a weak and lean boy, unable to attend to boys' plays. These weak and needy personalities are mostly subjected to the hegemonic dominance of other men. However, Neville, though he himself is subjected to Percival's dominance, practices hegemonic masculinity in his own way.

Based on Sigmund Freud's (1856-1939) theory of child's pre-oedipal and oedipal stage, Bernard's and Neville's entrance into adolescence is going to be discussed. The boy, the same as the girl, starts off "pre-oedipally and in the same emotional place attached to the mother" (Freud, 114). They are not yet distinct or sexually differentiated. It is for this reason that Freud maintains the idea of a "single, masculine, libido" (ibid). The libido is not neutral in Freud's view since its original object is the mother, and this desire for the mother is associated with masculinity and activity in Freud's view. The boy's oedipal attachment to the mother is brought to an end by "the threat of castration" emanating from the father (ibid, 116). Therefore, he is forced to be separated from the mother and has to identify himself with his father and start to be a masculine individual.

In the novel, when the stage of infancy is over, the characters have to be separated from their families, leave the nursery and go to the dormitory. But this separation is agonizing, as Bernard describes it:

Pressing our new bowler hats tightly over our eyes to hide our unmanly tears, we drove through streets in which even the housemaids looked at us, and our names painted in white letters on our boxes proclaimed to all the world that we were going to school (…). A second severance from the body of our mother. (W, 65).

The first "severance" from the body of the mother refers to the process of birth and growing up till the stage of pre-oedipal is passed and the boy starts his identification with his father. Bernard refers to his tears as "unmanly tears." He is also ashamed that the "housemaids" are looking at them and see that they are crying, for he regards his crying as an inglorious, feminine act which he has to "hide" in order for him to be characterized as a masculine individual. But as they grow up, they again desire to be united with the femininity that they were joined with at first which is the body of their mother:

We are in that passive and exhausted frame of mind when we only wish to rejoin the body of our mother from whom we have been severed (…) And sadness tinges our content, that we should have left you, torn the fabric; yielded to the desire to press out, alone, some bitterer, some blacker juice, which was sweet too. But now we are worn out. (W, 123-4)

Neville, now middle aged, desires to be rejoined with the body of mother and to return again to the first place from which all the individuals come. He is regretful for the separation from the womb and thinks that this disintegration brings nothing but misery and the feeling of loss. Margaret Whetherell and Nigel Edley's idea, as it is asserted in Karen Henwood's book, is that "the human subjects mistakenly describe themselves as unified and complete" (180). Neville thinks that he is complete in his self without the need of others. He wished to be powerful enough in order to rule over the others: "those who have despised me shall acknowledge my sovereignty. But by some inscrutable law of my being sovereignty and the possession of power will not be enough" (W, 31). He finds this power in being more and more disciplined. He thinks that life itself has its order, and everyone has to follow this natural order, Neville thinks that life, "could wear that permanence, (…) life could have that order, for above all he desires order" (W, 47). This order or discipline in the manner of life provides Neville with sense of power.

Mark McCormack defines the other hegemonic traits as "homophobic, misogynistic, and aggressive" (84). David D. Gilmore elaborates misogyny as "(a)n unreasonable fear or hatred of women that takes on palpable form in society," and he adds that "(i)ts expression includes anti-female behavior and belief among private citizens and collective institutions"; therefore, "(m)isogyny is an enmity toward the female sex, a disgust or abhorrence toward women as an undifferentiated social category" (qtd. in Kimmel, 551). Like other prejudices, misogyny is symbolically shared among men. It has no formal program or ideological position other than hating women. Misogyny occurs in all societies, from the primitive to the civilized cultures. One theory, proposed by David Gilmore, about what causes misogyny in men explains that "males are ambivalent about their equally powerful nonsexual needs for women such as alimentary, caretaking, comforting, and mothering," and thus they feel inferior and dependent (ibid, 553). Because of this discomfort, men attack the object of their needs by being hateful and aggressive toward women.

In The Waves, Neville plainly shows his hatred of women: "it would be better to breed horses (…) than to run in and out of the skulls of Sophocles and Euripides like a maggot, with a high-minded wife, one of those University women" (W, 37). He clearly shows his hatred of women with this mocking sentence that breeding horses is more

preferable than to have company with an educated woman. Elsewhere he says, "I cannot endure that there should be shop-girls. Their titter, their gossip, offends me; breaks into my stillness, and nudges me, in moments of purest exultation, to remember our degradation" (W, 44-5). He fears that women tease him or make fun of him and as a result he hates them. He fears that in the presence of women his credits will be in jeopardy. He feels this danger especially when he sees Susan:

I feel in my private pocket and find my credentials—what I carry to prove my superiority. (…) I have papers in my private pocket that prove it. But your eyes, Susan (…) disturb me. These papers in my private pocket (…). Now it has died down altogether, under Susan's stare. (W, 112)

He fears of whatever he sees in Susan's eyes, whether it is mockery or an unuttered superiority that Susan possesses: "what then remains, when I cannot pull out my papers and make you believe by reading aloud my credentials that I have passed? What remains is what Susan brings to light under the acid of her green eyes, her crystal, pear-shaped eyes" (W, 112). His dependency and inferiority are the instant result of his need for maternal care. Susan resembles the symbol of mother; however, Neville starts to deny his need for care in order to put away the danger of being inferior:

I want to diminish your hostility, your green eyes fixed on mine, and your shabby dress, your rough hands, and all the other emblems of your maternal splendor, have stuck like a limpet to the same rock. Yet (…) I (want) to refresh and furbish up my own belief in myself that failed at your entry. (W, 113)

Neville also reflects the idea that one's identity probably is superior enough to impress others' under its presence, he sees almost always a person "who refuses to be submerged; whose identity therefore one wishes to make crouch beneath one's own. For me now, it is Susan. I talk to impress Susan" (W, 112). For the sake of that danger, and in order to feel safety, he starts to impose his dominance on Susan by despising her way of simple, domestic, rural life: "your husband, the man who slapped his gaiters, pointing with his whip at the barren cow, grumbles. You say nothing. You see nothing. Custom blinds your eyes. (…) your relationship is mute, null, dun-coloured" (W, 112). He teased Susan for her rusticity in order to overwhelm her solid personality: "let solidity be destroyed" (W, 112). Neville puts his dominance on Susan by attempting to destroy her self-confidence in the way of teasing her and her life.

Mike Donaldson asserts that hegemonic masculinity was coined by Connell primarily to maintain the idea that "the general relationship of men to woman is oppressive" (653). On the other hand, and based on what Tim Carrigan asserts, "hegemonic masculinity makes women as sexual objects for men" (185). Jinny, with her charm and beauty, is somehow a symbol of sex and free living. She, as a victim of men's sexual desires, tries to get the attention of men. Donaldson argues that "women provide heterosexual men with sexual credibility for which men challenge with each other" (654). Neville, feeling a great sexual desire for Jinny, represses it through pretending to be indifferent to her: "I pass Jinny's house without envy, and smile at the young man who arranges his tie a little nervously on the door-step (…) let him find her. I shall find her if I want her; if not, I pass on" (W, 103). Jinny is the symbol of the present time and resembles the famous phrase 'Carpe Diem', or seize the day. She is the victim of men's sexual needs and desires:

Now slackness and indifference invade us. Other people brush past. We have lost consciousness of our bodies uniting under the table. I also like fair-haired men with blue eyes. The door opens. (…) That is an old man- I should be a child with him. That is a great lady- with her I should dissemble. (…) The door opens. O come, I say to this one, rippling gold from head to heels. 'Come,' and he comes towards me. (W, 55).

For this reason, she, though unconsciously, is the subject to men's Cathexis, which is one's sexual investment on the opposite sex. She, unknowingly, becomes the subject of men's hegemonic dominance by being a sex object which satisfies men's sexual desires. Neville imposes his hegemonic masculinity on Jinny by considering her as an object which is available for him any time he needs to satisfy his sexual and emotional desires.

Louis' Hegemonic Masculinity: Production Relations and Cathexis

Louis is an "unhappy, unfriended" being "in exile," who is always ashamed of his background and his roots (W, 129). The son of a bankrupt Australian banker, he feels degraded for his nationality and his Australian accent. Fearful of others' mockeries, he is even afraid of his friends: "Jinny and Susan, Bernard and Neville bind themselves into a thong with which to lash me. They laugh at my neatness, at my Australian accent" (W, 10). Bernard reveals what Louis felt about his own inferiority: "'my father, a banker at Brisbane,' being ashamed of him he always talks of him, 'failed'" (W, 48). Louis suffers from inferiority complex. He, based on Connell's definition of production in her three-fold model of hegemonic masculinity, tries to get rid of this destructive and corrosive feeling of degradedness by improving his career in the world of business, and the only way to achieve this aim is to have dominance over others.

Entering into the world of business, he tries to rise to the upmost degrees of commercial success. Despite his Australian accent, he seeks approval among his clerks: "(I) tried to make the clerks accept me, yet never forgotten my solemn and severe convictions and the discrepancies and incoherences that must be resolved" (W, 106). In another part of the novel Louis again mentions: "if I speak, imitating their accent, they prick their ears, waiting for me

to speak again, in order that they may place me, if I come from Canada or Australia, I, who desire (…) to be taken to the arms with love, am alien, external" (W, 49). He imagines himself to be like the other fictional characters and associates himself with other great politicians and artists in the world, in order to satisfy his need for admiration and acceptance, "I think myself the friend of Richelieu, or the Duke of St. Simon holding out a snuff-box to the King himself. It is my privilege. (…) I am then Virgil's companion, and Plato's. I am then the last Scion of one of the great houses of France," or once again he reflects, "I (…) place my stick there, I like to fancy that Richelieu walked with such a cane. Thus I divest myself of my authority. (…) I am immensely respectable" (W, 27, 105). He considers himself, in his past life, as a great historical character with astonishing background. However, he sorrowfully regrets that eminent and splendid extinct chronicles:

This Louis, is only the cinders and refuse of something once splendid. I was an Arab prince; behold my free gestures. I was a great poet in the time of Elizabeth. I was a Duke at the court of Louis the Fourteenth. I am very vain, very confident; I have an immeasurable desire that women should sigh in sympathy. (W, 67).

Underneath Louis' self-assured and self-confident gestures and behaviors there is a disintegrated and destructed masculine soul which tries to wash away his feeling of inferiority and shame of his father's failure, his nationality, and his Australian accent. He tries to gain more and more praise through claiming how important and crucial his duties are, for instance his task and his burden have always been greater than other people's task: "I have tried to do a colossal labour (sic). I have driven a violent, an unruly, a vicious team. (…) and tried to make the clerks accept me," "the weight of the world is on my shoulders" (W, 106, 90).

Susan is the first person who informs the readers about Louis' strong desire of leadership and dominance: "we must (…) walk in order, (…) with Louis going first to lead us, because Louis is alert" (W, 12). This indicates Louis' intensive desire to control the others even his own friends. Rhoda also refers to Louis' tendency to take the control of others and says, "he will shepherd us if we will follow. If we submit he will reduce us to order," (W, 84) which demonstrates Louis' tendency of leadership.

Louis, demonstrating his Cathexis, admits that he loves Rhoda: "Rhoda sometimes comes. For we are lovers" (W, 89). However this claim is only made by Louis alone and Rhoda never declares it. Based on Connell's definition of Cathexis, people focus their attention on a particular person of a particular gender and their attention may turn into negatively or positively biased traits. Louis prefers that the person he loves to be as domestic and obedient as Susan, for she gives the sense of security and maternal "safety" and care giving to Louis (W, 50). He saw himself as the weakest and the youngest person among their friends who needs maternal care. This kind of love gives him safety and assurance; therefore, he tries to make Rhoda love him in the way he wanted. This love, rooted from Louis' domineering manners, is imposed on Rhoda by Louis. Nevertheless, this love is more coercive rather than being consensual.

Rhoda, never accepting to be under the dominance of others, even those who loves her, rejects Louis' love and prefers to be alone rather than to be under his controlling manners. She thinks that Louis, by loving her, is taking away her freedom: "what dissolution of the soul you demanded in order to get through one day, what lies, bowings, scrapings, fluency and servility! How you chained me to one spot, one hour, one chair, and sat yourselves down opposite!" (W, 108). This "you" may refer to Louis; nevertheless, Rhoda absconded from Louis by pretending that she fears intimate relationship: "I left Louis; I feared embraces" (W, 108). Louis regrets his lost love by declaring that they are no longer together and their separation is eternal. She cannot accept the dominance of Louis, manifested in the form of a coercive love. Therefore she left Louis in order to be free of Louis' masculine dominance.

Neville, also mentioning Rhoda's escape, refers to Louis' ruling manners of governing and leading others around when he said that Louis works hard in his office and gives instructions in order to reform "an unborn world" (W, 104). Rhoda, being unable to resist the burden of other people, leaves Louis and decides to live alone. While thinking that people around are continually making fun of her, she cannot endure that life: "oh, life, how I have dreaded you (…) oh, human beings, how I have hated you" (W, 108). Rhoda prefers to leave Louis and live alone on her own. She rejects Louis in order not to be under his dominance and controlling manners, for these governing traits limit her freedom.

Susan's Father: A Silent Master of Patriarchy

There is also another hidden hegemonic masculinity in the narrative, whose dominance influences the life of one of the female characters of The Waves. Susan's father, an absent character who is known through Susan's soliloquies, is a rural "clergy man," (W, 9) who fulfills at the same time both Connell's definition of power relation and Cathexis. He is a salient master or model of patriarchy and a person whose excessive love makes a cage for the beloved one. Woolf, in Three Guineas (1938), theorizes that patriarchal oppression is the first stage in the destruction of freedom: "we have in embryo the creature, Dictator as we call him when he is Italian or German, who believes that he has the right, whether given by God, Nature, sex or race is immaterial, to dictate to other human beings how they

shall live; what they shall do" (53). Susan's father, by destroying her freedom, can be regarded as the symbol of patriarchy based on Woolf's statement.

Susan openly expresses her affections for her father, "I shall tremble. I shall burst into tears," (W, 27); however, beneath her feelings lies latent traces of her father's dominance and sovereignty over her. Susan, being wholly attached to her father, is unable to get herself free of his father's dominance. As soon as she returns home, she takes the role of a nurse for her father by taking care of him and the house: "I sit waiting for my father's footsteps (…) (I return) home to make the kettle boil for my father" (W, 52). Susan's father, as a controlling model of patriarchy, practices hegemonic traits and takes the control of her daughter's life in his hands by taking away Susan's freedom of thinking and behaving. She is subjected to the hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy which is imposed on her by her father.

Gradually as she grows up, she chooses a husband who somehow resembles her father's character. Susan's husband has the same domineering manner as her father. However, she eventually realizes that this "natural happiness" (W, 91) is not what she wanted from her life. She was being blind from realizing her true ideals by her father's patriarchal manners of loving her in the way of controlling her life, as Helene Cixous demonstrates: "a female individual sees herself not in the way she chooses but in a manner a man desires her to be" (259). Susan gradually finds that she is continuing her mother's futile way of living, "I pad about the house all day long in apron and slippers, like my mother who died of cancer" (W, 90). She eventually loses her true identity and feels vanquishing of her feminine self under the patriarchal manners of her father, and then her husband, who take the control of her life.

CONCLUSION

Any understanding of the innate nature and the meaning of hegemonic masculinity is based on the feminist notion that the relationship of men to women is oppressive in general. The term hegemonic masculinity is used to maintain this central focus on the critique of masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity, as it appears in the works of Connell, involves a specific strategy for the subordination of women. In her view, hegemonic masculinity concerns the horror of and the running away from women. It is both a personal and a collective concept, and is the common sense about manhood. However, while it is mainly connected with the traditions of male-dominance, not all men practice it; though most benefit from it.

Woolf was writing at a time when the modern distinctions between sex and gender were hardly thought of. She uses the terms "masculine" and "male," "feminine" and "female" interchangeably. Woolf tends to view certain behavioral manners as innate in the biology of individuals rather than the products of socialization. However, she is aware of the binding power of culture in making people act in a given gender roles.

She is familiar with the power of patriarchy to limit her life and to negate her artistic efforts. There are lots of references in Woolf's novels to the issue of hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy. Woolf's works are usually directed toward the fight against the fathers and those masculine people who practice patriarchy and hegemonic masculinity. In *The Waves*, the male characters show traces of hegemonic masculinity, though not all of them practice its various forms.

REFERENCES

Baradaran Jamili L. 2006. "Virginia Woolf: Travelling, Travel Writing and Travel Fictions." Diss. Berlin: FU.

Brittan A.1991. *Masculinity and Power*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Carrigan T. 1987. "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity." *Journal of The Making of Masculinities: The New Men's Studies*. Ed. Harry Brod. London: Routledge, 180-202.

Cixous H. 1999. *The Third Body*. Trans. Keith Cohen. Evanston: Northwestern UP.

Connell R. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Journal of Gender and Society*, 19 (6), 829-59.

Donaldson M. 1993. "What is Hegemonic Masculinity?" *Journal of Theory and Society, Special Issue: Masculinities*, 22 (5), 643-657.

Freud S. 2010. *On Freud's Femininity (IPA Contemporary Freud: Turning Points & Critical Issues)*. Eds. L. G. Fiorini and G. Rose. London: Karnac Books.

Henwood K. 1998. *Standpoints and Differences: Essays in the Practice of Feminist Psychology*. Eds. Christine Griffin and Ann Phoenix. New York: SAGE Publications.

Kimmel M. S. 2004. *Men and Masculinities: A Social, Cultural, and Historical Encyclopedia*. California: ABC-CLIO.

McCormack M. 2011. "Hierarchy without hegemony: Locating boys in an inclusive school setting." *Journal of Sociological Perspectives*, 54 (1), 83-101.

Moller M. 2007. "Exploiting patterns: a critique of hegemonic masculinity." *Journal of Gender Studies*, 16 (3), 263-76.

Mraz D. 2009. "Reading Masculinity in Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*." M. A. Thesis. Cleveland: Cleveland UP.

Tosh J. 2004. *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*. Manchester: Manchester UP.

Woolf V. 2006. *Three Guineas (Annotated Ed)*. New York: Mariner Books.

Wussow H. 1998. *The Nightmare of History*. Bethlehem: Lehigh UP.