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Beyond the Panopticon: Reading Masculinity through Foucault, Bourdieu, and Joyce

Introduction

Literary fictions of captivity tend to establish strong links between confinement and the matrix of gender and sexuality. The Gothic novel, for instance, is founded on the dichotomy of a pure and innocent heroine on the one hand, and the masculine space of her depraved and corrupt Gothic prison on the other. Paradigmatic for this pattern is Horace Walpole's *The Castle of Otranto* (1764), which creates a Gothic space characterised by a constant "threat of imminent sexual assault" (Groom 2014, xxxv). My aim in this essay is not, however, to offer another discussion of confinement in terms of gender, but I would like to ask how confinement itself can be used as a concept to better understand constructions of gendered subjectivity. More specifically, I am interested in the figurative use of confinement as an analytical tool to analyse masculinity and the homosocial space.

Historically, gender as a form of prison has been analysed extensively by feminist scholars of the second wave, whose critique of the oppressive nature of patriarchy implies an understanding of gender as confining for women. In the literary field, for example, such feminist classics as Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's *The Madwoman in the Attic* (1979) or Elaine Showalter's *A Literature of Their Own* (1977) have demonstrated the pervasiveness of this pattern in various literary texts. During the same time, social theorists such as Joseph Pleck or Deborah David and Robert Brannon began to critique the male sex role in Western societies as a form of identity that confines boys and men within a rigid and unhealthy stereotype of masculinity (see Whitehead 2002, 21). More recently, Judith Butler's postmodernist theorisation of gender as "tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylized repetition of acts" (1999, 179; original emphasis), has offered a way to conceptualise gender as a compulsory performance, a form of confinement within a sexed identity. This necessity to repeat, which Butler claims is the only essential core of gender, also means that the construction of gender can never rest; to exist at all, it needs to be re-affirmed endlessly. As Pierre Bourdieu writes, "a 'real' man is someone who feels the need to rise to the challenge of the opportunities available to him to increase his honour by pursuing glory and distinction in the public sphere" (2001, 51). As Bourdieu's use of inverted commas around this notion suggests, "real" masculinity is never fully achievable because the challenges to create distinction do not cease, and so the pursuit for honour on the public stage is constantly repeated. In this sense, gender is unobtainable, and the subject is therefore trapped in the prison of a continuous chain of gender signification which significantly depends on the affirmation of an audience of others.
The emphasis on the need to conform to recognised forms of masculinity and to constantly visualise this gender publicly, can be used to theorise masculinity as a version of Foucault's panopticon, that is, masculinity as a performance that depends on constant monitoring and policing (see Buchbinder 2013, 79-81). From this perspective, men are seen as resembling Foucault's docile bodies who perpetuate their own form of confinement within gender stereotypes. Foucault's concept could thereby help to explain in a more subtle way the functioning of what earlier sex role research had already identified as a form of gendered confinement. Attractive as this might seem on a theoretical level, this usage also poses problems, because it ignores important questions about individual agency and makes men appear like victims of a constellation of power they are not able to resist. The strong emphasis on surveillance in such a usage unduly stresses the aspect of the audience, the invisible overseer in the panopticon, at the expense of a focus on the complicity of the seemingly docile body with his own suppression. As I will suggest, therefore, the concept of Foucault's panopticon can be usefully complemented by Pierre Bourdieu's thought on a gendered habitus and its shaping of the modes of perception that define the terms of gender policing.

The fiction of Irish modernist James Joyce (1882-1941) provides a fascinating illustration of the potentials, but also limitations, of understanding masculinity as a form of panoptic confinement. First, his works are dominated by the dichotomy of the images of paralysis and exile, which both can be viewed as exemplifying a constellation resembling panopticism. Joyce perceived Ireland as provincial and lagging behind the cultural developments on the European continent. This provinciality, to him, was an effect of a wider social and cultural sterility, for which he blamed Ireland's domination by the British Empire and the Catholic Church. Ireland therefore paralyses the Irish, and, in consequence, the most sensitive, most gifted of her children are forced into exile to find the artistic and intellectual freedom that Ireland cannot provide. For Joyce, this means that his homeland and its culture are a prison, whose inmates are both prisoners and the most vigilant guards. The paralysing grip of Ireland's citizens on the individual psyche is often realised with regard to gender. Joyce's male artist protagonists frequently face the gender regulation of society in Ireland's capital, Dublin. Thus, they are repeatedly portrayed as under the critical eyes of others who seem to restrict their artistic and sexual liberty.

Second, as critics have observed, Joyce's treatment of these artist heroes is ambivalent in that the justification of their escape is counterbalanced by an ironic distance towards their egotism and self-complacency.1 While thus their surroundings are often narrow-minded and hostile, the protagonists' own actions and attitudes are equally responsible for the inevitability to flee into exile. As Joyce's fiction shows, a conceptualisation of masculinity as a gendered panopticon may miss important aspects of gender construction and the dynamics between individual dispositions and external pressure. This ambivalence towards his heroes undermines any notion of victimhood

1 For a discussion of Joyce's dual stance toward his alter ego Stephen Dedalus, the prototype of all of Joyce's artists, see Peake (1977).
of a prison of masculine subjectivity. Rather, they repeat patterns of masculinity that they find oppressive and unbearable.

In my reading of theories of masculinity and of Joyce's texts, I therefore argue that an uncritical adaptation of the panopticon as a tool in the study of masculinity runs the danger of reducing the scope of such research. This is not to demand that Bourdieu's concepts should replace Foucault's in the analysis of masculinity. Both systems, in fact, similarly address the problem why masculinity as an ideology is so enduring and why men are following this unachievable ideal at all cost. But while panopticism may serve as a means to understand the durability of masculinity and patriarchy, it overestimates the role of peer group pressure in the construction of masculinity and neglects the role of individual responsibility for the maintenance of patriarchal patterns of thought. Habitus, on the other hand, avoids the metaphor of the male subject as a victim of discipline and identifies the masculine world-view as the element which needs to be addressed to resist this ideology.

To give an outline of my argumentation, I will first elaborate further on why and to what extent it might be useful to approach masculinity in terms of Foucault's panopticism, but I will then introduce aspects of the thinking of Pierre Bourdieu which highlight that those "panoptic approaches" miss the important aspect of individual agency in gender construction. After that part, I will trace analogies between elements of Foucault's panopticon and James Joyce's vision of Ireland's social and emotional paralysis at the beginning of the 20th century. Finally, I will present a reading of Joyce's story "The Dead" through both a Foucauldian and a Bourdieusian lens. In the course of that reading, I argue that the story engages with the panoptic construction of gender, but that it also points to the blind spot of such a construction in the way it concludes the protagonist's development.

1. Masculinity and the Modes of Confinement

While the field of masculinity studies offers a creative take on notions of confinement, it thereby also provides useful insights into the theoretical problems that arise from an uncritical adaptation of Foucault's panopticon. Even a cursory glance at the research output in masculinity studies indicates the field's bewildering array of theoretical angles, approaches and concepts. An often occurring view conceptualises masculinity in terms of confinement, restriction or oppression: While psychoanalytical perspectives have also stressed the confining nature of boys' psycho-sexual development, it was especially approaches affiliated with the social sciences that have emphasised the confining grip of masculine gender roles which prescribe certain social behaviours and proscribe others. An influential contribution in this respect was Deborah David and Robert Brannon's positing of the detrimental effects of the male sex role. In their essay "The Male Sex Role: Our Culture's Blueprint of Manhood, and What It's Done for Us Lately" (1976) they posit a model of four themes of the male sex role that every man

---

2 The scope of heterogeneous approaches can be gauged from textbooks like Jack Kahn's An Introduction to Masculinities (2009).
needs to follow if he wants to be accepted by his peers: "No Sissy Stuff," "The Big Wheel," "The Sturdy Oak," and "Give 'em Hell!" (12). Although these have to be seen as idealised notions, the model posits "that all men compare themselves to, and attempt to achieve, these masculine benchmarks" (Kahn 2009, 57). As Stephen Whitehead comments, "[a] fundamental argument in the critique of the male sex role was the cost to men which the ideology of a dominant but dysfunctional masculinity elicited, particularly in terms of fractured relationships, damaged health and inflexibility" (2002, 21).

Perspectives such as this have gained further support through David Gilmore's anthropological work on the ubiquity, almost universality, of an abstract concept of "manhood" in various cultures around the globe:

"Among most of the peoples that anthropologists are familiar with, true manhood is a precious and elusive status beyond mere maleness, a hortatory image that men and boys aspire to and that their culture demands of them as a measure of belonging. [...] [T]rue manhood in other cultures frequently shows an inner insecurity that needs dramatic proof. Its vindication is doubtful, resting on rigid codes of decisive action in many spheres of life: as husband, father, lover, provider, warrior. A restricted status, there are always men who fail the test. These are the negative examples, the effete men, the men-who-are-no-men, held up scornfully to inspire conformity to the glorious ideal. (1990, 17)"

Two elements here indicate a basis on which the masculine gender role can be understood as a form of confinement. First, manhood, as Gilmore indicates, is an image that all men are measured against. In other words, there is no social existence for men other than in relation to manhood as "a measure of belonging." So, men are restricted in their social existence because, in order to be a part of a sexually binary culture, they must avoid being one of those "who fail the test" or "the men-who-are-no-men." Therefore, they seek to represent the elusive ideals of manhood or, more commonly, masculinity. As Pierre Bourdieu aptly writes, "[m]ale privilege is also a trap" because the continuous hunt for masculinity through gendered social acts is both never-ending and "sometimes verging on the absurd" (2001, 50). Furthermore, it is others who dictate what counts as meeting the requirements of manhood, and it is others who formulate the conditions of the testing and who evaluate its successes.

This model of masculinity as a confining gender role has gained influence especially through Michael Kimmel's work on the historical shifts in the construction of masculinity in America. Like Gilmore, Kimmel emphasises notions of insecurity and testing as well as possible failure, but he furthermore adds a distinctly visual element in his conceptualisation of masculinity. In this way, he writes:

---

3 It has to be noted, however, that David and Brannon are careful not to avoid the term "oppression" of men through that role (1976, 5). Another important contributor to sex-role theory is Joseph Pleck, (cf. Pleck 1995 for an updated account of this research.) For a critical assessment on sex role theory, see Connell (2005, 21-27) and Whitehead (2002, 19-23).

4 Other researchers who posit the notion of confinement as a defining element of masculinity are Victor Seidler (1997) and, from a psychoanalytic perspective, Rutherford (1992).
Other men: We are under the constant careful scrutiny of other men. Other men watch us, rank us, grant our acceptance into the realm of manhood. Manhood is demonstrated for other men's approval. It is other men who evaluate the performance. [...] Masculinity is a homosocial enactment. We test ourselves, perform heroic feats, take enormous risks, all because we want other men to grant us our manhood. (2001, 275)

While Kimmel does not draw on Foucault's ideas about the panopticon in this discussion, it is possible to establish an analogy between Foucault's ideas and Kimmel's conception of masculinity as a gender role which is policed by a ubiquitous audience of other men. Thus, Kimmel's emphasis on "the constant careful scrutiny of other men," which he claims constitutes masculine subjectivity, bears a similarity to Foucault's model, in which the subject becomes a docile body who is monitored not by a central authority but disciplined by its very visibility. In Foucault's original formulation, the efficacy of panoptic power is achieved by "induc[ing] in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power" (1998, 470).

This, in turn, manifests the disciplining power in the inmate himself:

He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes in himself the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection. (471)

David Buchbinder makes the connection between masculinity and panopticism more explicit when he writes that "[i]t is useful therefore to think of the patriarchal order as a kind of panopticon, keeping all males under observation in order to control their behavior to ensure that the criteria of masculinity are observed and maintained" (2013, 81). These approaches, then, view masculinity itself as a constellation of confinement within patriarchy: male subjects are analogous to Foucauldian docile bodies which police one another in terms of the credibility of their performance of a gender role: "each man must perform his masculinity to the satisfaction of other men, and, in turn, must function, with other men, as the observer and judge of the gender performance of other males" (Buchbinder 2013, 81). In this framework, the function of Foucault's invisible guardian or supervisor, whose authority over the inmates guarantees their mutual monitoring, is fulfilled by other ordinary men, whereas the normativity of masculinity's discipline is mirrored by the powerful status of societies' male movie stars or other quasi-mythical figures who seem to represent the prestigious manhood that men often try to imitate.5

While the notion of what we might call masculinity-as-panopticon is theoretically attractive because it addresses the durability of manhood as an elusive but powerful

5 Cf. Connell (2005). Regarding the power of popular culture on the naturalisation of masculinity, Antony Easthope concludes: "In films, television programmes, advertising, newspapers, popular songs and novels, in narratives and images that press in from every side, men are invited to recognize themselves in the masculine myth. The myth posits masculinity as natural, normal and universal. In fact it embodies a particular definition of masculinity with its own particular structure" (1990, 166).
myth, it equally has significant drawbacks. First, it effects a curious shift in which women’s oppression through patriarchal structures is put into the background in favour of a notion of men’s victimhood to their own gender role. Arguably, this regrettable neglect of women’s perspective is emblematic of the difficult relationship between masculinity studies and academic feminism. Second, the approach basically represents a closed circuit. In Kimmel’s and others’ application of the panopticon in the study of masculinity, there seems to be no possibility for the male subject to resist the fear of being unmanned by others. Therefore, manhood remains static and societal change towards sexual equality seems impossible. Furthermore, although this model suggests that men are responsible for upholding the structure which confines them in their gender role, the emphasis is on male victimhood and not on male responsibility. While the panopticon is thus a powerful theoretical tool for understanding the lasting impact of masculinity on patriarchy it also closes off the discussion of masculinity by becoming confined in the very metaphor it uses to conceptualise confinement in male gender roles.

The work of Pierre Bourdieu does not directly offer a concept to solve these problems, but his theorisation of masculine domination and symbolic violence as a result of habitus highlights underdeveloped aspects within the framework of gender as panopticon. Gender and the sexed body are, for Bourdieu, the effects of social practice, which includes the formation of a gendered habitus:

Existing only relationally, each of the two genders is the product of the labour of diacritical construction, both theoretical and practical, which is necessary in order to produce it as a body socially differentiated from the opposite gender [...], i.e. as a male, and therefore non-female, habitus or as a female and therefore non-male habitus. (2001, 23-24)

The concept of habitus is complex and not easily graspable, but in this context one specific facet of it emerges as especially important for our discussion. As Karl Maton writes, "habitus emphasizes the underlying structures of practices; that is, acts are underpinned by a generative principle" (2012, 55). In Bourdieu’s own words, "The habitus [...] is that which one has acquired, but which has become durably incorporated

See, for instance, Judith Kegan Gardiner’s introduction to her edited volume *Masculinity Studies and Feminist Theory* (2002).

See Raewyn Connell’s structural model of hegemonic masculinity, in which the large mass of men do not meet the prestigious standards of hegemonic masculinity but are nevertheless “complicit” with upholding the system from which they can expect to gain the “patriarchal dividend,” that is, the material and symbolical benefits from the oppression of women (2005, 79).

In all fairness, Buchbinder is aware that the analogy between the panopticon and patriarchy is not without its flaws (2013, 80-81). See Mills for a generally sceptical view of “over-enthusiastic Foucauldian analyses [which] have traced the figure of the Panopticon as a disciplinary structure excessively” (2003, 46-47). For a different and more nuanced application of Foucault’s conceptualisations of power in the study of masculinity, which, however, avoids the trope of the panopticon, see Whitehead (2002).
in the body in the form of permanent dispositions" (1993, 86). Social practice, and this involves gendered performances, is shaped by a "practical logic of actors" (Maton 2012, 53), which Bourdieu characterises as a "feel for the game" (1990, 63) of social life. More than a simple following of rules, the habitual naturalisation of social regularities "is the social game embodied and turned into a second nature" (63). As such, it generates the way we perceive the social world and what seems to us natural and appropriate. In one of the central formulations of the concept, Bourdieu refers to habitus as "a system of dispositions which generate perceptions, appreciations and practices" (Maton 2012, 50). With regard to gender, this concept allows him to argue that

the social relations of domination and exploitation that are instituted between the sexes thus progressively embed themselves in two different classes of habitus, in the form of opposed and complementary bodily hexis and principles of vision and division which lead to the classifying of all the things of the world and all practices according to distinctions that are reducible to the male/female opposition. (Bourdieu 2001, 30)

In other words, there is a feedback loop through which gender itself frames the subject's perception of the world both in terms of relationality and underlying hierarchy. This gendered social viewpoint effects what Bourdieu refers to as "symbolic violence," which in turn produces and maintains "masculine domination" (1) or, in other words, the patriarchal order. The important point is that the constellation appears natural, because it is based on gendered 'doxa,' a way of seeing the world analogous to sexual binarism. In result, he writes, "the androcentric representation of biological reproduction and social reproduction is invested with the objectivity of a common sense, a practical, doxic consensus on the sense of practices" (33).

While Bourdieu thus focuses on the individual's gendered schemes of perception and the resulting worldview, it is worth noting that he also writes about masculinity as a form of confinement for men. Men are, for instance, seen as "prisoners" (49) who are, borrowing Marx's phrase, "dominated by their domination" (69). However, his work also points beyond Foucault and the panopticon. Significantly, Bourdieu's work probes the ways in which modes of thinking are themselves masculinist and queries how this "androcentric unconscious" (5) makes the surveillance and constant reiteration of masculine performance appear natural rather than arbitrary. Bourdieu's emphasis on habitus and its "doxa," that is, the perceptions and evaluations concerning gender as a social practice, which are unquestioned and seem natural (that which "goes without saying"), are helpful concepts to investigate why the terms of masculine performance are never questioned. The attempt to make the arbitrariness of doxa transparent promises to destabilise the view of masculinity as an abstract and seemingly

---

9 As Cécile Deer elaborates, "[i]n modern societies, doxa refers to pre-reflexive, shared but unquestioned opinions and perceptions conveyed within and by relatively autonomous social entities – fields – which determine 'natural' practice and attitudes via the internalized 'sense of limits' and habitus of the agents in those fields" (2012, 115).
unchangeable structure. In turn, this move then enables a critique of the way in which individuals contribute to masculinity’s endurance.

Both masculinity and social surveillance as a metaphorical confinement are prominent topics in the fiction of James Joyce. In the remainder of this essay, I will therefore turn to Joyce's works, in which masculinity is embedded in a sense of confinement and social paralysis. His fiction lends itself to both a reading of masculinity as a panoptic structure and a form of male habitus, and in his story "The Dead" his ambivalence about male privilege and male self-pitying suggests the fruitfulness of reading both concepts in dialogue.

2. Joycean Paralysis: Confinement and Gender

Referring to Joyce's short story collection, *Dubliners* (1914), critic Florence Walzl writes that Joyce portrays the capital of Ireland as a patient suffering from a paralyzing disease that affects all aspects of life. She concludes that "[b]y means of this unusual personification, he shows the Irish people as successively paralyzed in emotion, will, action and social values" (1961, 228). When focusing more concretely on the relationship between individual and society, Foucault's panopticon offers a helpful tool to dismantle the disciplinary structures supporting this Irish malaise. Again and again, Joyce's texts suggest that mother Ireland is "the old sow that eats her farrow" (Joyce 2007, 179) and that she confines her citizens by monitoring their behaviour through social institutions like nationalism, Catholicism and the patriarchal nuclear family.

This link between institutions and the confinement of the subject is made explicit, for instance, in a passage of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916). Towards the end of that novel, the protagonist, Stephen Dedalus, explains to his nationalist friend Davin why he needs to flee Ireland and go into exile to become a truly independent artist: "When the soul of man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. You talk to me of nationality, language, religion. I shall try to fly by those nets" (Joyce 2007, 179). Stephen's image pictures the artist's soul as a bird or butterfly whose freedom is curtailed by disciplinary structures attempting to force it into docility. The Foucauldian analogy is indeed fitting because, although Joyce's fiction is also full of authority figures like stern priests, it is the individual citizens who monitor each other's social practice. Institutions like nationalism and Catholicism thus function as panoptic structures in Dublin whose supervisors are indeed invisible for the most part in Joyce's fiction. Whereas Catholic priests do occur occasionally in the texts,10 nationalist heroes and politicians are mostly absent in person, while the citizens themselves have become docile bodies watching each other's adherence to the disciplines of religion and nationalism.

The young and fervent nationalist Davin represents this function paradigmatically with his retort to Stephen's call for artistic liberty: "But a man's country comes first.

---

10 Most notably in the third chapter of *A Portrait*, which features the notorious Hellfire sermon scene.
Ireland first, Stevie. You can be a poet or mystic after" (179). In this vein, Joyce's fiction is littered with characters voicing implicit warnings to the individualistic protagonists to live in conformity according to the modes of conduct which Irish nationalism, Catholicism and patriarchy prescribe. The frequently occurring artist protagonists, however, need to break through the paralysis that this docility creates in order to follow the call of art, and often they can only find this freedom in literal or metaphorical exile.

This Foucauldian reading of the well-known patterns of Joyce's theme can be complemented by a closer focus on the implications that Irish paralysis has for the gendered economy of Dublin. A further example from *A Portrait* shows how the novel modulates the effects of this panoptic vision of Ireland towards a question about masculine subjectivity. In this passage, Stephen is overwhelmed by a host of "voices" in his head, which urge him to conduct himself by following various discourses:

[H]e had heard about him the constant voices of his father and of his masters, urging him to be a gentleman above all things and urging him to be a good catholic above all things. These voices had now come to be hollow-sounding in his ears. When the gymnasium had been opened he had heard another voice urging him to be strong and manly and healthy and when the movement towards national revival had begun to be felt in the college yet another voice had bidden him to be true to his country and help to raise up her fallen language and tradition. In the profane world, as he foresaw, a worldly voice would bid him raise up his father's fallen state by his labours and, meanwhile, the voice of his school comrades urged him to be a decent fellow, to shield others from blame or to beg them off and to do his best to get free days for the school. (73)

I quote this passage at length because it shows how Joyce portrays the panopticism of Irish paralysis as a vast intersection of gender, religion, nationality, and other parameters. Masculinity is a question of following a variety of calls, a number of complex overlaying modes of conduct and gender performance. And it is thereby a mode of identity which is policed by one's peers. In Kimmel's words, the result is a form of literal homo-phobia: "Homophobia is the fear that other men will unmask us, emasculate us, reveal to us and the world that we do not measure up, that we are not real men" (2001, 277). The artist's necessary exile can be read along these lines, namely as the recognition of this fear and the unwillingness to submit himself to it.

The panoptic paradigm is a compelling way to read paralysis as well as the depiction of masculinity in Joyce's fiction. But the fact that this trope works so well for his texts threatens to conceal that it is also a self-serving portrayal of himself as an artist and the sluggish provincialism of his Irish compatriots. The highly ambiguous ending of the novel exemplifies that even in moments of breaking from the panoptic vision, the heroes of Joyce's fiction have their own gendered biases as well. The ending of *A Portrait* contains the fictional diary of Stephen Dedalus just as he is about to embark on his escape from Dublin to Paris:

16 April: Away! Away!

---

11 For an extended discussion of the roles of these voices throughout the novel see Harkness (1990).
The spell of arms and voices: the white arms of roads, their promise of close embraces and the black arms of tall ships that stand against the moon, their tale of distant nations. They are held out to say: We are alone. Come. And the voices say with them: We are your kinsmen. And the air is thick with their company as they call to me, their kinsman, making ready to go, shaking the wings of their exultant and terrible youth.

26 April: Mother is putting my new secondhand clothes in order. She prays now, she says, that I may learn in my own life and away from home and friends what the heart is and what it feels. Amen. So be it. Welcome, O life! I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race.

27 April: Old father, old artificer, stand me now and ever in good stead. (Joyce 2007, 223-224, original emphasis)

Although left open, this ending suggests Stephen's great enthusiasm for his adventure to leave Ireland and become a free artist on the culturally liberal continent. It further portrays his self-confidence and his courage to leave his home for good in order to fulfil his artistic destiny. Put side by side with the earlier passage which represented the din of voices monitoring and admonishing Stephen, the optimism of the passage begins to fade, however. Although Stephen implicitly distinguishes between his compatriots, like Davin, and his proper "kinsmen," he relies on the same image (voices) to render what can appropriately be called his artistic calling. Thus, the second passage seems to indicate that Stephen's modes of cognition for comprehending his situation remain basically the same. Therefore, the radical break with his past which the ending of the novel suggests may not be so radical after all. With regard to gender, the analogy (rather than dissimilarity) in thinking becomes apparent as well. If the first passage indicates Stephen's weariness of being told "to be strong and manly and healthy" and to "raise up his father's fallen state by his labours," the second passage's reference to Stephen's mythical artist-predecessor Daedalus, the "Old father, old artificer," must be seen as suspect. Are Stephen's heroic flight and his search for guidance from another male master not also "a homosocial enactment" (Kimmel 2001, 275)? Is not his self-confident defiance against Ireland's paralysis also rather an unconscious way in which he "want[s] other men to grant" him his masculinity as an artist (275)? In sum, the comparison of both passages makes it clear that Stephen may escape panoptic Dublin with its regiments of nationalism and religion, but he does not leave behind what Bourdieu theorises as Stephen's "system of dispositions which generate perceptions, appreciations and practices" (Maton 2012, 50). This emphasis on a gendered point of view can account for the ambivalence about masculinity in Joyce's works, and it indicates why a panoptic approach to masculinity alone runs the danger of imagining the individual as a victim of disciplining forces, which thereby occludes his own contribution to gender discipline. I would therefore conclude this essay with a more
extended discussion of the story "The Dead," which lays emphasis on masculinity as a scrutinised performance as well as an internalisation of a gendered worldview. These two dimensions of masculinity in the story, I argue, can be fruitfully discussed through a complementary application of Foucault's and Bourdieu's concepts. Joyce's text thereby invites a reading of Foucault and Bourdieu alongside each other.

3. Panopticism and the Androcentric Vision in "The Dead"

In "The Dead," Gabriel Conroy goes through a rite of passage, beginning his emotional journey as a well-respected but insecure patriarch at a bourgeois Christmas party and ending up as a dejected husband whose self-image has been turned upside down by an intimate revelation from his wife, Gretta. Joyce portrays Gabriel's masculinity as a dynamic process which begins as a panoptic structure of scrutinising peers and develops into an insight into Gabriel's gendered habitus when Gabriel processes his wife's revelation about a mysterious first lover, who died of consumption. In the course of the Christmas party which provides the setting of the story, Gabriel Conroy is constantly forced to prove his masculinity before an audience that critically watches his actions. For instance, at the beginning, his elderly aunts, the hosts of the gathering, are seen anxiously awaiting his arrival because they expect Gabriel to reign in a troublesome guest, the allegedly drunken Freddy Malins:

"— Slip down, Gabriel, like a good fellow and see if he's [Freddy Malins] all right and don't let him up if he's screwed. I'm sure he's screwed. I'm sure he is. [...] — It's such a relief, said aunt Kate to Mrs Conroy, that Gabriel is here. I always feel easier in my mind when he's here ..... (Joyce 2006, 158; 2nd ellipsis in original.)"

This function as emblematic male authority figure becomes obvious, furthermore, as Gabriel is asked to preside over the meal and carve the goose: "At that moment, aunt Kate came toddling out of the supper room, almost wringing her hands in despair. — Where is Gabriel? she cried. Where on earth is Gabriel? There's everyone waiting in there, stage to let, and nobody to carve the goose!" (170). And, finally, as a guest of honour, it is Gabriel's obligation to give a laudatory speech in praise of his aged hosts — a proud performance of his male authority that cements his central status among all party guests:

Gabriel glanced down at his aunts and, seeing the large smile on Aunt Julia's face and the tears which had risen to aunt Kate's eyes, hastened to his close. He raised his glass of port gallantly while every member of the company fingered a glass expectantly and said loudly:

"— Let us toast them all three together. Let us drink to their health, wealth, long life, happiness and prosperity and may they long continue to hold the proud and selfwon position which they hold in their profession and the position of honour and affection which they hold in our hearts. (178)"

When Gabriel thus concludes his speech by referring to a "proud and selfwon position" as well as a "position of honour and affection," he implicitly references his own situation at the party, too. Taken together, all these scenes in which he explicitly
performs his manhood therefore contribute to the image of Gabriel as "model paterfamilias" (Norris 2003, 223) and the party's elected patriarch.13

In the course of the narrative, the scenes in which Gabriel can shine and prove his masculinity are complemented, as critics have often commented on, by challenges to his masculinity through various female characters. Already at the beginning, the young servant Lily defies his half-flirtatious, half-paternalistic remark that "I suppose we'll be going to your wedding one of these fine days with your young man, eh?" (Joyce 2006, 154). Lily is not responsive to his clumsy geniality, and her answer, given "with great bitterness," that " – The men that is now is only all palaver and what they can get out of you," leaves him "coloured as if he felt he had made a mistake" (154). If Gabriel's masculine self-image becomes slightly deranged in this early female encounter (Leonard 1993, 297), the next one is even more challenging to his masculine pride. A colleague called Molly Ivors, a self-confident, young female nationalist, brashly interrogates Gabriel during their dance together, which leaves Gabriel embarrassed and insecure. She not only questions Gabriel's allegiance to Irish culture by calling him a "West Briton,"14 but she also challenges his interest and regard for "your own people and your own country" because he professed to prefer going to the continent for holidays (Joyce 2006, 165). More so than the encounter with the servant Lily, the verbal skirmish with Molly Ivors makes him anxious about his masculinity: "It unnerved him to think that she would be at the supper table, looking up at him while he spoke with her critical quizzing eyes. Perhaps she would not be sorry to see him fail in his speech" (167). Referring to his speech, which one might see as the star turn of his masculine performance, Gabriel is self-consciously aware of the fact that its very visibility renders this performance fragile. That Gabriel fears the woman Molly's eyes more than that of other men at the party does not contradict a reading of his masculinity in terms of panopticism as Molly, like Lily before her, is characterised in the text as representing an unfeminine lack of demureness, which challenges Gabriel's claim to gender superiority. Referring to Gabriel's boastful gendered performances throughout the evening, critic Tracey Schwarze has claimed that the story exposes "the nullification of masculine identity that results when vociferous women refuse to cooperate in the phallic charade" (2002, 174), of these performances that is, when they refuse to remain silent and admiring audiences. By becoming active observers, they thus assume the role of competitors like other men.15 From a more specifically Foucauldian perspective on masculinity, these scenes discussed so far are dominated by "critical quizzing eyes" of other docile bodies which question Gabriel's masculinity while trying to make him comply with the disciplines of patriarchy and nationalism. In this way, although he seems to hold the greatest prestige at the party, Gabriel is constantly tested and thereby

13 For a critical and rather unfavourable assessment of Gabriel's role, see Bauerle (1988).
14 That is, somebody who considers Ireland a western province of England (Gifford 1982, 116).
15 This reading is underlined by the fact that Gabriel is aware of the similarity between himself and Molly, noting that "they were friends of many years' standing and their careers had been parallel, first at the university and then as teachers: he could not risk a grandiose phrase with her" (Joyce 2006, 163).
controlled by those others, and the authority and power he seems to have are therefore really the result of his own powerlessness.

This application of Foucault's panopticon to the gendered economy of "The Dead" captures the dynamic of the first part of the story. The open and ambivalent ending of the narrative, however, complements this view with a different approach to masculinity as confinement, which can be much better grasped by using Bourdieu's notion of habitus. The ending is dominated by Gabriel's famous epiphany, which includes a disillusioning moment of clarity concerning his marriage. While Gabriel is excited by the prospect of being alone with Gretta this night, far away from domestic duties and family, Gretta reveals to him that earlier she was thinking about her first love, a young boy from the west of Ireland named Michael Furey. Gabriel's reaction is one of dejection, and, on one level, Gretta and, implicitly, Michael Furey, are two more pairs of scrutinising eyes which measure and critically probe his masculinity. However, the way in which Gabriel lets himself be drawn into a competition with Gretta's dead lover speaks volumes about the gendered disposition with which he reads her confession. The resulting deflation of his own self-image is therefore a direct result of an androcentric worldview with which he processes the innocuous information she gives him:

Gabriel felt humiliated by the failure of his irony and by the evocation of this figure from the dead, a boy in the gasworks. While he had been full of memories of their secret life together, full of tenderness and joy and desire, she had been comparing him in her mind with another. A shameful consciousness of his own person assailed him. He saw himself as a ludicrous figure, acting as a pennyboy for his aunts, a nervous wellmeaning sentimentalist, orating to vulgarians and idealising his own clownish lusts, the pitiable fatuous fellow he had caught a glimpse of in the mirror. Instinctively he turned his back more to the light lest she might see the shame that burned upon his forehead. (Joyce 2006, 191)

In this passage, Gabriel's thoughts move into two directions, which can be aligned with the two approaches to masculinity outlined above. In the first part, Gabriel is attached to the idea that his self is "under the constant careful scrutiny of other men" (Kimmel 2001, 275). The fact that he believes that Gretta "had been comparing him in her mind with another" is only a decoy, though, because his fear concerns Michael Furey's eyes more than Gretta's. From this perspective, Gabriel's feeling of humiliation is the result of being scrutinised by another man, a form of literal homo-phobia, which Kimmel sees at the heart of masculine performances:

That nightmare from which we never seem to awaken is that those other men will see that sense of inadequacy, they will see that in our own eyes we are not who we are pretending to be. What we call masculinity is often a hedge against being revealed as a fraud, an exaggerated set of activities that keep others from seeing through us, and a frenzied effort to keep at bay those fears within ourselves. (2001, 277)

The second part of the passage, however, introduces a distinctly Bourdieusian element into Gabriel's self-pitying. Stylistically, the second part is distinguished from the first by its strongly coloured choice of words with which Gabriel refers to himself ("pennyboy," "wellmeaning sentimentalist," "his own clownish lusts," "pitiable fatuous fellow"). As these attributes suggest, a depressed Gabriel imagines here seeing his
"real" self, as opposed to the illusory image of the authoritative male persona he deemed himself up until now. However, according to Bourdieu, no seeing and evaluating in this sense is ever objective but rather the result of an acquired habitus, understood as a "generative principle" which shapes the way the subject thinks about the world including him or herself. The denigration of Gabriel's self, thus, springs from his own evaluative mindset. Thus, as Joyce makes abundantly clear, if Gabriel considers himself a victim of the expectation of others, it is a peculiar mixture of timidity and arrogance which makes this image absurd.

Gabriel's share of responsibility for his confinement in narrow conceptions of masculinity can furthermore be seen in the way he brings the dead Michael Furey back to life as a tragic hero of his wife's past. In the course of their interview and Gabriel's subsequent reflections, Michael Furey becomes an all-powerful, invincible figure. However, this status is not due to the fact that he is already dead or that he was Gretta's first lover. More importantly, Gabriel uses Gretta's explanations about her past to construct a quasi-mythical image of Michael Furey. Suzette Henke writes: "This Irish suitor who died for love acted the melodramatic role of a legendary knight who, in good chivalric fashion, laid at the feet of his courtly lady the ultimate gift of his life. By sacrificing all for Gretta, he took permanent possession of her heart" (1990, 45). When Gretta thus sadly reminisces that "– I think he died for me" (Joyce 2006, 191), Gabriel inflates this suggestion to mythical proportions and imagines his dead rival as the protagonist in a "sacrificial tragedy" (Henke 1990, 45):

A vague terror seized Gabriel at this answer, as if, at that hour when he had hoped to triumph, some impalpable and vindictive being was coming against him, gathering forces against him in its vague world. [...] So she had had that romance in her life: a man had died for her sake. (Joyce 2006, 191-193)

Gabriel's habitus, formed by his status as a middle-class male member of the Dublin intelligentsia, makes it seem natural for him to interpret Gretta's memory in terms of plot patterns derived from patriarchal fairy tales. Viewed through this androcentric, and therefore unquestioned, doxa, he processes the innocent information given by his wife and constructs a story of tragic love as the archetypal pattern of male romantic suffering. This inflation of Michael Furey is almost as bizarre as the complementing deflation of his own self. So, the caricature-like ending 16 dramatises Gabriel's confinement in his masculine gender role in a way that complements his earlier panoptic anxieties. Here, at the end of the story, Gabriel is not under scrutiny from others, and, instead, his self-pity about his supposed failure as a man is essentially his own fabrication.17 The confinement that the pressures of his gender put on him are therefore only partly explicable with the demands of his peers. They also have to a great extent to do with his androcentric, masculinist worldview, that is, with the ways in

---

16 As Henke aptly writes, Gabriel is essentially "[c]uckolded by a dead man" (1990, 46).
17 Whether Gabriel or Gretta's imagination is responsible for the resurrection of Michael Furey from the dead is a contested issue. Compare, for instance, the readings of Henke (1990), Spoo (1993), Kershner (1989) and Brandabur (1971).
which gender colours and inflects his perception and his modes of processing social experience. The concepts of Bourdieu and Foucault should therefore not be seen as competing for the more suitable reading of masculinity in "The Dead." Both are valuable for an understanding of the cohesive appearance of masculine performances and why these do not attempt to resist masculine ideology. But what Bourdieu's concept highlights is that discipline's patterns of thought are pervasive and inflect the subject's discourse completely, while it eschews the notion of the male victim of the "critical quizzing eyes" of other men (and women) that a panoptic conception of masculinity seems to suggest.

Conclusion

In this essay, I have discussed the applicability and usefulness of Foucault's panopticon for the study of masculinity. The travelling of concepts from one area of research to others can be fruitful as a way of seeing issues in a new light. It can become problematic, however, when the concept puts too narrow a focus on the subject matter and thereby excludes other relevant aspects of it. In my discussion, I have argued that the study of masculinity can benefit from the application of Foucault's panopticon because this tool can account for the strength of patriarchal notions of masculinity, which necessitate the constant masculinising of social acts. In endless repetitions, masculinity needs to be proven by men because they are afraid otherwise to lose their manhood. When viewed as a panoptic structure, the durability of masculinity and its constancy can thereby be adequately described. Still, if masculinity is only conceived as a series of gendered acts which are performed for the eyes of others, I have argued, this image obscures the crucial question how to resist such a powerful regime. Here, Bourdieu's approach to the underlying regularities of social practice can be seen as maybe not a replacement but a helpful addendum, which widens the scope of the analysis. The concept of gendered habitus, and more specifically the symbolic violence resulting from it, address the question why the subject acts the way it does even if there is no single authority formulating explicit rules of behaviour. It is only in the questioning of what is taken for granted that resistance within the patriarchal panopticon becomes possible. Bourdieu's habitus is thus a link between Foucault's invisible guardian and the docile bodies acting in fear of it. The question should therefore not be whether we use either Foucault or Bourdieu. Both thinkers provide powerful concepts for understanding the subject's fundamental lack of freedom within social interaction, and, as my essay suggests, these concepts are compatible and can be read in dialogue.

In order to show how such a dialogue between Bourdieu and Foucault can be achieved, I have turned to selected passages from the texts of James Joyce. The dichotomy between paralysis and exile is the dominant theme in Joyce's fiction, and issues concerning masculinity and femininity play an essential role in the individual elaborations of this theme. This Joycean notion of Irish paralysis can further be closely aligned to a panoptic understanding of confinement. The discourses of Catholicism and nationalism, with their strict attempts to regulate gender and sexuality, are present in
Joyce's texts through minor characters who function as fellow inmates of the panopticon who monitor the praxis of his artist protagonists and thus powerfully represent the function of the invisible guard. However, Joyce's ambivalent and sometimes ironic treatment of his artist heroes highlights a central problem of the panoptic approach to masculinity, which, although it also points to the individual's own support of the structure, threatens to perpetuate the endurance of masculinity when it conceives of men as victimised prisoners of a system they cannot escape. In this way, "The Dead" also highlights Gabriel Conroy's part in the way that gender confines him, by exposing the androcentric doxa and the gendered habitus with which he views his world and acts in it. "The Dead" is, of course, not Joyce's argument, 'avant la lettre,' for the abandonment of the panopticon as a concept in the study of masculinity. Still, his criticism of Gabriel Conroy's self-pitying gives a nuanced account of masculinity as "[t]hat Nightmare from which we never seem to awaken" (Kimmel 2001, 277), and it offers angles for resistance to gendered ideology which in Foucault's work are often left opaque.18

Finally, this is not to say that Joyce wrote with an andro-critical thrust when he criticised his fellow Dubliners for their paralysis of heart and mind. His attitude towards masculinity remains ambivalent, which is reflected in the openness and ambiguity of his fiction, for which "The Dead" stands paradigmatically. While the author clearly exposes the masculine lament of Gabriel Conroy and others as self-serving and originating from their own agency, he equally celebrates these characters and makes them part of his radically ambiguous Modernist art. Thus, the ending of "The Dead" does not only present Gabriel as "a creature driven and derided by vanity" (Joyce 2006, 26), to quote another of his self-pitying artists.19 It also features one of the most lyrical passages in Anglophone prose fiction: "His soul swooned slowly as he heard the snow falling faintly through the universe and faintly falling, like the descent of their last end, upon all the living and the dead" (194). Gabriel's swooning soul can be read as an almost androgynous exit from the confines of masculinity.20 But this possibility is only hinted at, and through the final reference to the dead the text simply refuses to be drawn into the question of gender and gives the narration a humanist, or should we perhaps say post-humanist, closure. Above all, Joyce's fiction remains anti-didactic; he held up to his countrymen what he called his "nicely polished looking-glass" (Ellmann 1975, 90), but, at the same time, he was under no illusion that the recognition therein had to be done by the reader and the reader alone.
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