Vol.5, No.9
Spring & Summer 2025
Research Article

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature, Arts and Humanities

10.22077/islah.2024.7751.1463

Received: 13/06/2024 **Accepted: 30/12/2024**

Masculinity Rhizomes as Deconstructed in Tobias Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow": A Psycho-Sociological Study

Ali Taghizadeh[1]

Roya Abbaszadeh[2]

Abstract

The issue of masculinity has always proved radically challenging. In Tobias Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow" (1981), each character, constantly exercising their masculinity, attempts to gain the upper hand over his peers. As the story unfolds, the volatility of this concept causes each character's masculinity to undergo minor to major transformations. In this state of flux, the current research analyzes Wolff's short story via the lens of Connell's model of gender and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's schizoanalysis to trace the manifestations of different masculinity types and study their transformations respectively. Raewyn Connell's three-fold model of gender is based on power, production relations, and cathexis, thus the present research initially studies each masculinity type in the world of Wolff's three male characters as a certain rhizomatic zone in society and, then, how they are swapped in a process of deterritorialization to establish new ones (reterritorialization). At the opening of the story, each one of Wolff's characters (Kenny, Frank, and Tub) represents a certain type of masculinity; while Kenny exercises dominance by bullying others (hegemonic), Frank serves as his accomplice in taking advantage of Tub (complicit and marginalized respectively). However, as the story reveals, these long-held rhizomes are de/reterritorialized in a moment of role reversal, leading to a tragic ending. The findings indicate that the two extreme ends of the masculinity hierarchy can be equally harmful to society as the experience of abuse adversely affects both the abuser (hegemonic and complicit) and the abused (marginalized), leading to corruption and devastation.

Keywords: Masculinities, Schizoanalysis, Rhizome, De/Reterritorialization, Three-Fold Model of Gender

1. Assistant Professor of American Studies, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran (Corresponding Author) altaghee@razi.ac.ir
2. Lecturer and PhD student of English Language and Literature, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran r.abbaszadeh@razi.ac.ir

How to cite this article:
Ali Taghizadeh; Roya Abbaszadeh. "Masculinity Rhizomes as Deconstructed in Tobias Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow": A Psycho-Sociological Study". Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature, Arts and Humanities, 1, 5, 2025, 73-92. doi: 10.22077/islah.2024.7751.1463

Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Licensee Journal of *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature, Arts & Humanities*. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

The concepts of masculinity and femininity, extremely volatile as they are, have been defined and categorized in numerous ways throughout history, in terms of various criteria including social norms, race, class, etc. (e.g. Edward 2004; Connell 2005; Johnson & Brady 2011; Franklin 2012). Gender, which was formerly presumed to be the same as biological sex, has assumed new meanings and classifications, associated with social roles, since the late modern era. Accordingly, gender is considered a social construct showing a person's position in society based on the factors other than what their bodies dictate.

Masculinity as a position in the gender order is mostly defined in opposition to femininity. However, Connell implicitly describes masculinity by defining the opposite term, "unmasculinity," as behaving "differently: being peaceable rather than violent, conciliatory rather than dominating, hardly able to kick a football, uninterested in sexual conquest, and so forth" (Connell 2005: 67). The present study resorts to a novel and combined methodology, which renders it interdisciplinary, as it seeks to analyze the representation of Raewyn Connell's three-fold model of masculinity in Tobias Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow" in light of Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis.

Wolff's story is set on a snowy day when the three main characters, Kenny, Frank, and Tub, go on a hunting trip. Although at the outset of the story, their behavior might seem rather normal, with the progress of the plot, the reader starts discerning the evidence of increasing conflict amongst them. Wolff's dismal and gloomy story fulfills its supposed task by ending in the Tub-Frank unexpected bonding, and hence the semi-deliberate murder of Kenny by Tub. Thus, the present research aims to analyze the representation and applicability of Raewyn's masculinities in Wolff's short story in light of Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis.

2. Significance of the Study

As social constructs, masculinity and its counterpart, femininity, profoundly impact social dynamics. Throughout history, attempts have been made to establish and define them for the betterment of society. Literature is, to say the least, one of the best mediums to reflect these constructs and their resulting dynamics. Thus the current study focuses on the representation of masculinity types, their dynamics, and associated consequences in Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow" to provide a deeper insight into these issues. This particular story was aptly chosen for its masculine world in which mostly male characters are active, while the female characters are either insignificant or silenced. By assuming each masculinity type as a rhizomatic zone, to employ Deleuze and Guattari's term, the research studies how they transform and are transformed by each other simultaneously. The de/reterritorialization of these rhizomatic zones in society and the transformation of these masculinities reveal intriguing facts about their social dynamics. The article contributes to masculinity

studies by integrating masculinity and schizoanalysis, exposing the psycho-social implications of masculinity types and their dynamics.

3. Objectives of the Study

Deleuze and Guattari maintain that society resembles an assemblage or multiplicity, divided into imaginary segmentations. In such a field of full variety, it can be argued that characters' masculinity types are one instance of these segmentations, which are established through their social interactions. Thus, each of these masculinity types is itself a rhizome, which is exposed to some alterations. At the moment of climax in Wolff's short story and due to the increasing pressure on Tub, these rhizomes are de/reterritorialized and new ones emerge as a result. However, the research initially seeks to identify the types of masculinities represented in the story as the rhizomatic zones (to use a schizoanalytic term), using Connell's typology.

Connell has proposed a model of gender, differentiating between the male and the female based on three criteria: power, production relations, and cathexis (power dynamics, social roles, and men's objects of desire respectively). The same model is used to identify types of masculinities: hegemonic, complicit, subordinate, and marginalized (Connell 2005: 73- 74). Since Wolff's characters in "Hunters in the Snow" incarnate three types of Connell's masculinities, the current study aims to provide an analysis of this typology in this predominantly masculine story, which mostly portrays male characters, pushing the females (the insignificant farmer's wife or the silent babysitter or Frank's passive wife, Nancy) to the margins. Assuming each of these masculinity types as a rhizomatic zone in society, the research investigates why and how these zones are swapped and transformed, employing Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis.

4. Research Questions

1. How does each of the three main characters represent a specific type of masculinity, according to Connell's three-fold model of gender?
2. How are the characters' masculinities (rhizomatic zones) established in the rising action through a process of territorialization?
3. At the moment of climax, how and why are the characters' masculinities deconstructed or deterritorialized? What are the social implications?
4. How does the reterritorialization take place and contribute to the devastating roles of the radical types of masculinities?

5. Literature Review

Few studies have examined "Hunters in the Snow" from a psychological perspective. In a research, which studies the same literary work through a mostly psychological viewpoint, Patrick Schorn (2004) tracks the concept of "deception". He maintains that Wolff's characters, as agents of deception, are not what they seem

to be. For example, Tub, who activates the reader's sympathy, comes to fool everyone including his own family. Schorn argues that in the first half of the story, where Kenny and Frank converse about the latter's mistress, their conversation is vague enough to withhold information from Tub. After Kenny is shot, Tub and Frank, who beg for emotional inclusion, dishonestly approve of one another's grave mistakes to bond together (Schorn 2004: 123- 125). Thus, while the study discusses the transformation of characters' personalities, it not only excludes the characters' masculinity types and how they affect their fates but also does not dive deeply enough into the psychoanalytic aspects of these changes.

Likewise, another study which is concerned with a psychological analysis of the characters' personalities and the changes they undergo investigates "the nature of sin in human beings" (Edman et al. 2018: 793), yet fails to make a connection between these psychological transformations and masculinity types. The authors discuss three short fictions, "Young Goodman Brown," "The Demon Lover," and "Hunters in the Snow" through the lens of Jungian and Freudian psychoanalyses. In each of these stories, the characters, traveling somewhere far from home, struggle with evil inclinations. For instance, Wolff's "Hunters, looking for an adventure, go far away from their homes into the wild, barren and vast snowy land" and reveal the everlasting nature of sin in human beings (793 & 804). Just like the previous instance, this study overlooks the masculinity types represented in the story and does not exclusively examine Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow."

However, the only study focusing explicitly on masculinity was a doctoral dissertation by Kevin Daniel Gleason, which studied three masculinity types, namely "nascent masculinity, hypermasculinity, and man-womanliness" in a selection of Wolff's literary works. Gleason's study draws on Todd W. Reeser's masculinity theory along with trauma studies (2018: iii- iv). Those performing a nascent masculinity often take "deeply flawed models to construct their masculinity as both survivors and perpetrators of trauma," while "A hypermasculinity domineer and traumatize less powerful individuals including children, women, minorities, and other men . . . outside of hegemonic masculinity" and manwomanliness is a positive image, referring to those who enjoy both masculine and feminine features (iii). Though this work is the only published research analyzing masculinity in Wolff's works, it does not exclusively discuss the short story in detail. It also employs a different typology and mostly highlights the traumatic experience associated with masculinity types.

Overall, the prior studies provide no considerable psychoanalytic examination of the de/reterritorialization of masculinity types as rhizomes in this story by Wolff, so the current research is novel in this regard. Another novelty of this research lies especially in the fact that it employs Connell's typology of masculinity to identify and, hence, analyze the different types of masculinities observed in the short story and then considers each one of them as a separate rhizomatic zone, exposed to de/reterritorialization(s), in Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis. This framework

helps elucidate why and how they are transformed into each other by focusing on the desiring machines, leading the readers to draw inferences on the social implications of these transformations. The following section, therefore, provides an elaborate account of the theoretical framework.

6. Theoretical Framework and Methodology

"Hunters in the Snow" portrays a trio of male friendship in which the masculinity types are swapped, resulting in a potentially disastrous denouement. Accordingly, to analyze the issue and its implications, the research employs Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis, establishing a connection between literature and psychology. Further, it attempts to identify the masculinity types through Connell's model of gender, adding a sociological perspective to the study. In the following section, a detailed account of the theoretical framework is presented.

Just as a book with its "lines and measurable speeds, constitutes an *assemblage*" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 3- 4 [emphasis, mine]) of discourses facing various strata, society is an assemblage of large varieties of life and ideologies whose strata and *rhizomes* are the social segments. Every society can be segmented and divided into rhizomes based on numerous different criteria, including masculinity types, which are themselves "liable to internal contradiction and historical disruption" as are any rhizomatic zones (Connell 2005: 73; Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 9). In this short story, for instance, the hierarchy of masculinity types represents an assemblage of different masculinity rhizomes as each character belongs to a distinct rhizome (in this case, the masculinity type).

Deleuze and Guattari theorize that "Every rhizome contains lines of segmentarity according to which it is stratified, territorialized, organized, signified, attributed, etc., as well as lines of *deterritorialization* down which it constantly flees" (9). Thus, it can be argued that rhizomes are the imaginary segmentations of social ideologies, which are liable to transformation and disruption, an instantiation of which can be the hierarchy of masculinity. Hence, each character is distinguished from the others through the imaginary segmentations of their masculinities.

However, the establishment of these rhizomes often happens through a process called *territorialization*, which has been in progress since the beginning of the story as Kenny and Frank almost run Tub over as a prank. Territorialization is defined as the process through which territories are organized and fixated (2). Yet Deleuze and Guattari maintain that social ideologies are far from fixed and stable. The territories of these social ideologies are, thus, subject to disruption, resulting in *deterritorialization*. Subsequently, new ideological territories are gradually established, leading to a process of *reterritorialization* (1 & 10). This process, though in progress since the opening of the story, is officially finalized at the moment of climax, when Tub shoots Kenny.

As a result of *deterritorialization*, a *body without organ* is created, which can

be defined in terms of lack of organization and order; it is a form of chaos, resulting from a disruption of previous orders (3). The "immanent" forces of the unconscious, responsible for these changes, also called the "desiring machines" (Deleuze & Guattari 1983: 2-3) in the rhizomes, act as "anarchic deformations in the transcendent system" of society, leading to the disruption of the long-held beliefs and principles (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 2). As a result of this state in the story, the formerly-estranged friends seek a fake bonding, which ends in a disaster.

Although these two critical thinkers have subsequently stopped using the concept of desiring machine in their later work, *A Thousand Plateaus* (1987), it is still commonly used by literary critics. According to a Deleuzo-Guattarian standpoint, sexuality is constantly in a process of "becoming", impacted by a variety of factors in society and, hence, liable to transformations (Ortega 2013: 169). It is argued that every member of a society is impacted by the "practices of this gendered and sexual becoming" because their identity is shaped by claiming to belong to a special gender group in society (169).

Furthermore, a rhizome is claimed to be "made only of lines: lines of segmentarity and stratification" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: I), as is the hierarchy of masculinity in this case. "The maximum dimension [of each rhizome] after which the multiplicity undergoes metamorphosis" or some "changes in nature" is called deterritorialization (I). The same happens to the masculinity types in the story as they are transformed at the moment of climax, stimulated by the hidden, unconscious desiring machines at work. Due to all these commonalities, it is possible to use gender and masculinity, in particular, as a form of rhizomatic zone in society, where "each element ceaselessly varies and alters its distance in relation to the others" (3).

Accordingly, this research takes the hierarchy of masculinities in society as the rhizomes and attempts to examine the social implications of their de/reterritorialization in the story. The study particularly assumes masculinity types in the small community of Wolff's short story for a representation of this hierarchical segmentation in the whole human world. Thus, to identify and examine the different types of masculinities, Connell's tripartite model of gender is employed, which is analyzed in more details in the rest of this section.

It was at the turn of the twentieth century that masculinity was first profoundly studied by Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis. However, the gravest impact of Freud's psychoanalysis is typically associated with the idea of the "Oedipus complex" as "the emotional tangle of middle childhood involving the desire for one parent and hatred for the other, as the key moment" in the development of a child's sexuality (Connell 2005: 9; Freud 2010: 281). Yet, while Freud's notions of dreams and masculinity were later severely criticized by several scholars including feminists and queer theorists (Luepnitz 2021: 619), those of his notions associated with the psychoanalytic theory have left an everlasting impact on the studies of masculinity. Nonetheless, the question as to what masculinity is still remains unanswered.

A short but most obvious answer to this question is usually an essentialist one, which defines masculinity as opposed to the female weakness, whereas, a positivist view centers on the psychological differences between the man and the woman. Yet a third answer, called the normative approach, tends to define the concept based on the social norms. And a last answer returns to the same opposition of the first view, while defining it through "a system of symbolic difference" (Connell 2005: 68-70). However, integrating the elements of all these different approaches to masculinity, Connell eventually defines the term as "simultaneously a place in gender relations" and "the practices through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture" (71). This highlights masculinity as a social construct, closely related to both men and women's actions and personalities.

Overall, although different typologies of masculinity have been introduced throughout history, the current research intends to focus on one of the most recent ones, proposed by Raewyn Connell. This theorist has developed "a three-fold model of gender based on *power*, *production relations*, and *cathexis*." She comes to elaborate on how power dynamics, social roles, and men's objects of desire can channel their masculinity types. Accordingly, Connell defines four distinct types of masculinities, namely "hegemonic", "complicit", "subordinate", and "marginalized" (Connell 2005: 73-76), which the present research elaborates in the following paragraphs.

Hegemonic masculinity is defined as that "configuration of gender practice which embodies the . . . answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy" ensuring "the dominant position of men and the subordination of women" (77). The factors guaranteeing this form of gender relationship vary depending on several elements including the context, while physical power could yet be regarded as one of the most prominent ones. This type of masculinity is embodied by the character of Kenny in Wolff's story.

Complicit masculinity does not share all the features of hegemonic masculinity; however, it simultaneously benefits from some of its advantages. Connell argues that the men who incarnate these two types of masculinities typically "realize the patriarchal divided, without the tensions or risks of being the front-line troops of patriarchy" (79). Thus while characters like Frank are not exposed to the serious consequences of practicing hegemonic masculinity, they enjoy some of their merits.

However, unlike the first two types of masculinities, the subordinate masculinity, not manifested in this short story, is mostly associated with homosexuals, who are typically placed at the bottom of the male hierarchy. And finally, the last type of masculinity, the marginalized, is typically defined in terms of lower economic status or the lack of hegemonic masculinity attributes (Connell 2005: 76- 81), which is to be found in the character of Tub. Accordingly, the subsequent part of this research provides an elaborate discussion of the territorialization and de/reterritorialization of these masculinity rhizomes in "Hunters in the Snow."

7. Discussion

7. 1. Before the Climax: Rhizomatic Zones of Masculinity

Every society contains segmentations in its different blocks and subareas, including the masculine world. Connell argues that the masculine world, as an example of human communities, consists of four main territories or rhizomatic zones, which might be disrupted as a result of the instability of various ideologies as well as the presence of immanent forces or desiring machines.

At the outset of Wolff's story, two of the characters, Frank and Kenny, arrive late on a snowy day to pick Tub up and go hunting. Each of the characters exercises their own masculinity types during the rising action and establishes their territories (territorialization). Yet reaching this dramatically intense point, the reader notices a rather latent process of transformation in the personality of Wolff's characters. And eventually, in the moment of climax, when Kenny is shot by Tub, their masculinities are transformed as their power relations and their roles in the trio are swapped, indicating the occurrence of a de/reterritorialization.

Accordingly, this section provides a detailed analysis of how these rhizomatic zones are established or, technically speaking, how in the first part of the story, territorialization takes place. Given the above-mentioned points, the zones of masculinity types will be construed through the framework of Connell's masculinities by studying the central male characters in this short story.

The three-fold model of gender, proposed by the theorist to study masculinity types, is comprised of three criteria, namely *power, production relations*, and *cathexis*, based on which different masculinity types are identified. In other words, power dynamics, the role played by the representatives of these masculinities in society, and finally men's objects of desire are of fundamental significance in defining Wolff's characters' masculinities (or rhizomatic zones in this case) and how they are dynamically transformed into other ones. While the three hunters in the story might be considered central characters simultaneously, it is recommended to start with the one possessing the dominant position (or hegemonic masculinity) at the beginning of the story.

As the dominant rhizome, hegemonic masculinity, according to Connell, is not a stable concept, so she recommends that it be studied through a discursive approach. This perspective, "influenced by Foucauldian post-structuralism, postmodernism and discursive Psychology," confirms the dynamic nature of this issue. It depends on various factors including race, ethnicity, social class, etc. (Connell 2005: xviii- xix). Hegemonic masculinity is generally "understood as the pattern of practice (i.e., things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allowed men's dominance over women to continue," legitimizing patriarchy (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005: 832). Thus, it might be associated with "men's engaging in toxic practices—including physical violence—that stabilize gender dominance in a particular setting" (840).

"Sporting prowess," especially among school boys, is another factor which

can establish this type of masculinity (Connell 2005: 37). However, this does not necessarily prove that "the most visible bearers of hegemonic masculinity are always the most powerful people" as "Individual holders of institutional power or great wealth" like the highest-ranking roles in a company, including managers and entrepreneurs, may not necessarily represent this masculinity type in their personal lives (77). Further, in the field of criminology, hegemonic masculinity is associated with a higher degree of violent behavior as the majority of criminals are men rather than women (Messerschmidt 1983: 16). Nonetheless, there is no information about the three characters' occupations. Consequently, it can be claimed that they possess roughly the same socioeconomic status.

In the opening scenes of the story, Kenny holds the dominant position. First, he arrives late, almost running Tub over as a prank and accusing him of doing nothing other than complaining, instead of apologizing to him (Wolff 1983: 10). Kenny's aggressiveness towards Tub, who is the target of most of their humiliating pranks and sarcasm, is observed in other sections of the story as well: "'You ought to see yourself,' the driver [Kenny] said. 'He looks just like a beach ball with a hat on, . . . Doesn't he, Frank?'" (10).

Nevertheless, Tub is not the only target of Kenny's offensive attitude, because he occasionally bullies Frank as well, mostly verbally, almost to the point of revealing his secret affair: "And you—you're so busy thinking about that little jailbait of yours you wouldn't know a deer if you saw one." (10). Still in another section, when the narrator reveals that "Some juvenile delinquents had heaved a brick through the windshield on the driver's side" (10), he implicitly refers to the probably violent background of this character. The desiring machine to control and dominate others drives most of his actions.

As for the production relations, Kenny is the driver, symbolically responsible for leading the group. Kenny is the one who decides where to go hunting, while the other two characters mostly follow his orders. He is also the character who insists on continuing hunting while the others have already given up: "'You go with them,' Kenny said. 'I came out here to get me a deer, not listen to a bunch of hippie bullshit. And if it hadn't been for dimples here I would have, too'" (15). This form of masculinity is further manifested properly in "media representations of men, for instance, the interplay of sports and war imagery" (Jansen & Sabo 1994: 1). Thus hunting as a type of masculine activity adds to the evidence pointing toward the hegemonic masculinity of Kenny.

The third strand of this model, *cathexis*, is associated with men's objects of desire. As Sabo and Gordon claim, hegemonic masculinity has been frequently employed to explain men's health practices, including playing hurt and risk-taking sexual behavior (Sabo & Gordon 1995: 194). Surprisingly, as suggested by the story, Kenny is associated with no woman, neither a wife nor a mistress. He does not even mention any women or talk about romantic issues apart from when he merely intends

to teasingly threaten Frank to reveal his secret affair with a fifteen-year-old babysitter.

He objectifies the girl by calling her not by her first name, but by her occupation and age. This implies that the love affair, although considered an important part of Kenny considers Frank's love life a trivial issue that can be made fun of. In the heat of their argument, he calls her mistress a "little jailbait" (Wolff 1983: 10), signifying her role as an insignificant and illegal object of Frank's desire due to being a minor (Thorne 2005: 237). The reflexive pronoun, "of yours," highlights Kenny's idea of women as property. These, along with his lack of close ties to any women, might implicitly highlight the triviality of the issues of love and women to Kenny. Nonetheless, he is not the only interesting male character in Wolff's short story that is worth discussing. Therefore, this research, now, shifts to another leading character in Wolff's trio of friends: Frank.

Frank enjoys a complicit masculinity as he seems to "realize the patriarchal dividend, without the tensions or risks of being the front-line troops of patriarchy" (Connell 2005: 79). Thus with regard to power relations, one might argue that although Frank is not the leading figure in the trio, he can be considered the mediator or the second most powerful character. Frank, unlike Tub, is not physically inferior to Kenny, so he possesses this aspect of a hegemonic masculinity, yet he does not exhibit all the dominant, controlling behavior of a hegemonic masculinity. Frank further shares some common features with Kenny, among which one can refer to verbally bullying Tub or resisting Kenny's abusive behavior (Wolff 1983: 11 & 12). He is sitting next to Kenny in the truck and remains close to him up to the climax of the story. So he acts as an accomplice to Kenny in bullying Tub, justifying and supporting his harsh attitude:

> "You almost ran me down," Tub said. "You could've killed me." "Come on, Tub," said the man beside the driver. "Be mellow. Kenny was just messing around." He opened the door and slid over to the middle of the seat. (Wolff 1983: 10)

Further, the narrator refers to Frank as "the man in the middle," probably implying his position in the trio:

> "Tub, you haven't done anything but complain since we got here," said *the man in the middle*. "If you want to piss and moan all day you might as well go home and bitch at your kids. Take your pick." (10, emphasis added)

However, while he is helping Kenny in bullying the weakest of the three, he seems to be simultaneously bullied by Kenny for the huge secret he has shared with him as his confidante: "'Okay,' Kenny said. 'I won't say a word. Like I won't say anything about a certain babysitter'" (11). He is also presented as the voice of reason, especially when Kenny is disappointed with hunting and Tub is complaining about the hardships: "'Relax,' Frank said. 'You can't hurry nature. If we're meant to get that

deer, we'll get it. If we're not, we won't.'" (13); hence, he is depicted as a moderate character between the two opposite extremes: the violent Kenny versus the passive Tub.

Nevertheless, he has a secret, grave enough to endanger his personal life, leading the readers to the third fold of Connell's model, which is cathexis. As a married man with a seemingly perfect family, Frank is exercising his masculinity through an extramarital affair with a fifteen-year-old babysitter (a minor). He makes sure to withhold this valuable piece of information from Tub: "'What did Kenny mean about the babysitter?' 'Kenny talks too much,' Frank said. 'You just mind your own business'" (14). Not until after the moment of climax does he reveal the truth to both Tub and the reader. This form of power through domination over women, especially a woman of lower age (a minor, for example) as well as social class (such as a babysitter) is the desiring machine that helps Frank to feel closer to those enjoying a hegemonic masculinity as women "provide heterosexual men with sexual validation" (Donaldson 1993: 645). Nonetheless, while he is manipulating women around him (both his wife and the mistress), he is unconsciously distancing himself from the hegemonic type by confessing love to both of them as well as showing rather genuine emotions (Frank 1991):

> "Not yet. It's not so easy. She's been damned good to me all these years. Then there's the kids to consider." The brightness in Frank's eyes trembled and he wiped quickly at them with the back of his hand. (Wolff 1983: 23)

Still, the second element of this model, production relations, has remained untouched with regard to Frank. Though there is no explicit discussion concerning these characters' financial statuses, implicit clues expose his financial security, thus giving him an upper hand, at least to some of the characters: "He wore a heavy wedding band and on his right pinky another gold ring with a flat face and an 'F' in what looked like diamonds" (12). However, since this aspect is not highlighted in the text with regard to the three main characters, it might be safely assumed that they are of almost equal financial statuses. Consequently, this is the least effective item in determining the masculinities of Wolff's characters.

The last but not the least person in the trio is Tub, who can be called the most vulnerable character, yet a game-changer simultaneously. As mentioned above, in the first half of the story, he is depicted as a weak character, who attempts to be emotionally included in the trio by hiding the truth about the cause of his obesity or lying about it. He is the one who is always left behind by his companions and also mocked for his appearance. Thus, it can be argued that he does not have the upper hand in his relations with both his family and friends. This reveals that he is the least powerful of the three.

Marginalized masculinity is defined as "The interplay of gender with other structures such as class and race creates further relationships between masculinities"

(Connell 2005: 80). Accordingly, "the relations between the masculinities in dominant and subordinated classes or ethnic groups" can be referred to as marginalization (80). No ethnic minorities can be observed in Wolff's short story and the class bias is almost irrelevant as well, so this ethnicity issue can be generalized to metaphorically include all the issues of people's physical or facial features, including disability or overweight, which potentially push them to the end of the masculinities hierarchy.

First of all, Tub is humiliated and even insulted for his physique by his friends, especially the hegemonic Kenny, who is prone to bullying him as already discussed. The symbolism of his name similarly indicates his obesity as it reminds the reader of a big container, typically used in a bathroom (Bull 2019: 477). Frank is also occasionally involved in insulting the character for his obesity as he confirms Kenny's sarcastic remarks: "You're just wasting away before my very eyes. Isn't he, Frank?" (Wolff: 12). Frank responds to this instance of verbal irony by body shaming Tub and emphasizing on Tub's disability to bend over and see his lower body due to obesity (12).

Thereupon, Tub is mostly treated as insignificant and, hence, not held responsible for the trio. He is neither the driver nor the one sitting next to him. Tub is, unlike Kenny, not even here for deer hunting; he is depicted as merely seeking emotional inclusion in his friendship circle:

> "I used to stick up for you." "Okay, so you used to stick up for me. What's eating you?" "You shouldn't have just left me back there like that." "You're a grown-up, Tub. You can take care of yourself. Anyway, if you think you're the only person with problems I can tell you that you're not." (14)

Tub, who is already disappointed with gaining Kenny's sympathy, is desperately seeking Frank's compassion. However, his attempts are all thwarted, because he is, as the weakest member of the trio, obviously not prioritized so long as Kenny is still occupying the dominant position.

Furthermore, the third fold of the model, which is cathexis, reveals more intriguing evidence about Tub's personal life as both a husband and a father. Similar to his friendship circle, his family environment proves oppressive to him. This is implied when he discloses his dishonesty about being on a diet. While the audience might sympathize with Tub as he is not emotionally supported by his family, his wife in particular, the fact potentially serves as a warning sign to the reader. In the story, we read that Tub counteracts this lack of support by leading "a double life like a spy or a hit man" (25), and this desiring machine to win people's sympathy, in turn, potentially foreshadows and justifies his seemingly abrupt outburst and change of character at the moment of climax.

> This sounds strange but I feel sorry for those guys, I really do. I know what they go through. Always having to think about what you say and do. Always feeling like people are watching you, trying to catch you at something. Never

able to just be yourself. Like when I make a big deal about only having an orange for breakfast and then scarf all the way to work. Oreos, Mars Bars, Twinkies. Sugar Babies. Snickers. (25)

Tub is so self-centered that he is not concerned about betraying his family's trust. His dishonesty, along with these clues about his egocentrism, contributes to the reader's rather negative perception of his personality and, hence, leads one to the main conclusion of the study, which will be analyzed in detail below.

This section provided the reader with a profound insight into the personalities as well as personal lives of Wolff's main characters with a focus on Connell's typology of masculinity before the moment of climax. The desiring machines which control the relationship dynamics and establish their respective rhizomatic zones have also been elucidated. Therefore, the following section clarifies how Wolff's characters gradually change roles in a process of deterritorialization and how these alterations are socially and psychologically significant.

7.2. After the Climax: the De/reterritorialization of Masculinity Rhizomes

The desiring machines of every masculinity rhizome set in motion some transformations that eventually lead to the deterritorialization of those rhizomes at the moment of climax. Though at the outset of the story the territories of these masculinity types seem stable and fixed, the moment of climax proves otherwise. In Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis, the desiring machines produce flows and forces resulting in a disruption of the previously established territories (Deleuze & Guattari 1983: 312).

These desiring machines in Wolff's fiction, as previously mentioned, include Kenny's struggle to exercise power through manipulation, Frank's pursuit of intimacy with those in power along with his need for approval, as well as Tub's search for emotional belonging. As the story approaches the point of climax, these desiring machines stir and set the long-held power dynamics in motion, thus turning the wheel of their fates. Now, Tub is the one holding the dominant position in the trio. Long oppressed by both Kenny and Frank, this character is consequently stimulated to shoot Kenny apparently in self-defense:

> "I hate that dog." Kenny was behind them. "That's enough," Frank said. "You put that gun down." Kenny fired. The bullet went in between the dog's eyes. . . . "What did he ever do to you?" Tub asked. "He was just barking." Kenny turned to Tub. "I hate you." Tub shot from the waist. Kenny jerked backward against the fence and buckled to his knees. (Wolff 1983: 16)

Excluded from the duo of Frank and Kenny for a long time, he has constantly craved to replace either of them. Yet as he has represented a marginalized masculinity all his life, his transformation is not finalized abruptly and completely. He initially starts "weeping from the eyes and nostrils" (17), still displaying signs of the rhizomatic zone he has been previously representing. However, his intense emotional reaction

is far from sincere and mostly a result of entering a new zone, far different from the previous one.

Ergo, one of the manifestations of Deleuze and Guattari's desiring machines in Wolff's story appears in Tub's pretty gradual transformation in his climactic role reversal and the deterritorialization of his long-established masculinity role. Nonetheless, this change is itself the result of several factors simultaneously working together from the beginning of the short story, including being bullied by a representative of hegemonic masculinity among others. The second element here is Frank's desiring machine as a representative of complicit masculinity, which leads him to cover up Tub's crime and label it "an accident" (17). Frank is currently serving as Tub's accomplice only since the role reversal has given Tub the upper hand.

On the other hand, the process of deterritorialization is not instantly completed as Wolff's characters need time to get accustomed to the new masculinity rhizomes. Thus Frank, infuriated by Tub's irresponsible deeds, takes up Kenny's role as the hegemonic masculinity model and calls him a "fat moron", to which Tub responds by grabbing "Frank by the collar and" backing "him hard up against the fence" (19). Tub, instead, replaces Frank in resisting the bullying behavior. The reader, presently shocked at the scene, learns the fragility of the seemingly fixed masculinity territories.

Surprisingly enough, this temporary state takes the hegemonic masculinity mask from Frank and offers it to Tub since deterritorialization in Wolff's story leads to the establishment of new masculinity territories, which are themselves subject to subsequent deterritorialization(s). The reader might also realize a temporary substitution of Frank's complicit masculinity rhizome with Kenny's hegemonic one. As a result, Frank assumes Kenny's roles and behavior as the latter is pushed to the lower rhizomes after losing his physical strength. Yet this dislocation is transient and Frank eventually returns to the same rhizomatic zone he has already occupied (complicit masculinity).

Accordingly, in the next step, the two formerly estranged friends start to bond, acting as partners in crime. In an outburst of anger, Tub implicitly seeks Frank's sympathy, blaming his "glands" for his obesity problem (21) and, hence, rejecting one of the factors by which he was marginalized (Kimmel and Coston 2018: 101). Kenny, whose production relations allowed him to be the truck driver and symbolically in charge of everything, is now "rolled . . . back onto the boards and . . . into the bed of the truck" (Wolff 20). This figuratively implies his transformation and degradation to a lower social position, compared to his friends.

These newly bonded friends start the reterritorializing process by apologizing to each other for their thoughtless and selfish behavior:

> "Tub," Frank said, "what happened back there, I should have been more sympathetic. I realize that. You were going through a lot. I just want you to know it wasn't your fault. He was asking for it." (20)

Tub eventually mirrors Kenny when he finds the opportunity, and hence, he changes from a marginalized to a hegemonic masculinity type: [Tub:] "No more talking to me like that. No more watching. No more laughing" (20). Tub also replaces Kenny in the truck, taking charge of the drive. He, more notably, reflects Kenny's egotistical attitude as he starts teasing the fatally wounded Kenny and ignoring his suffering: "Don't feel like the Lone Ranger" (21).

Frank, on the other hand, starts treating Kenny as he used to treat Tub before the climax:

> "Now look, Kenny," Frank said, "it's no use whining about being cold if you're not going to try and keep warm. You've got to do your share." He spread the blankets over Kenny and tucked them in at the corners. (21)

As Tub and Frank sit in the tavern to save their lives from the freezing weather outside, they share secrets, strengthening their new bond. Initially, Frank admits to ignoring and disrespecting Tub up to that point, stating his obsession with "the old number one" as his excuse (21). This clue justifies the claim about Kenny's hegemonic masculinity as the dominant member as well as Frank's complicit masculinity and the associated impact of these rhizomes on their actions.

After Frank reveals the true story of the underage "babysitter" as well as his intention to leave his wife, Tub shocks the reader by exposing the real reason behind his obesity, which is eating "Day and night . . . In the shower[,] On the freeway" (24). Ironically, although Frank is shocked at the truth and disapproves of this behavior, he responds to it in an apparently supportive manner, asking the waitress to "bring four orders of pancakes, plenty of butter and syrup" (25). The outrageously absurd sight of Tub, breathlessly eating without even wiping his face, serves as a warning sign to the reader. This gets even much murkier when the reader learns about Kenny's whereabouts:

> Kenny had tried to get out of the truck but he hadn't made it. He was jackknifed over the tailgate, his head hanging above the bumper. They lifted him back into the bed and covered him again. He was sweating and his teeth chattered. "It hurts, Frank." (23)

When they are busy sharing secrets, Kenny is naively encouraged to repeat the same sentence ("I'm going to the hospital" (24)), while ironically everyone, including the reader, knows they are not even considering going to the hospital. The warning is ultimately reaffirmed as the narrator describes them heading to a direction where "Right overhead was the Big Dipper, and behind, hanging between Kenny's toes in the direction of the hospital, was the North Star, Pole Star, Help to Sailors" (26), while Kenny is lying in the back of the truck "with his arms folded over his stomach, moving his lips at the stars" (26). The context description further highlights the intentionality of this incident.

Therefore, the new rhizomes are established with Tub, apparently assuming the position of a hegemonic masculinity type, and Kenny, stumbling into the lowest or the marginalized. As a result, a process of reterritorialization takes shape in the story. No longer is Frank supportive of Kenny after the downfall. And this allows them to laugh at the fact that Kenny did not indeed intend to shoot the dog or even Tub in cold blood, yet the dog's owner had told Kenny to kill the dog out of sympathy (26).

Nonetheless, this apparently intimate bonding and mutual understanding is naturally fragile and, hence, prone to deterritorialization due to the evidence confirming its shallowness. Although Tub has gained the upper hand, compared to Kenny and Frank, he is still considered marginalized as many of those criteria previously mentioned (including his physique) have still remained intact. Both of these characters seek to strengthen the bond by affirming the legitimacy and rightfulness of such heinous sins and crimes as hypocrisy, gluttony, adultery, and statutory rape (23). The warning signs, already mentioned, inform the readers of the approaching risk of another deterritorialization. Based on the arguments in this as well as the preceding sections, the last part of this research presents a conclusion of the whole discussion from a psycho-sociological perspective.

8. Conclusion

The current research fills the gap between literature, psychology, and sociology by investigating masculinity roles and their transformations in the light of Raewyn Connell's model of gender and Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis in the three main characters of Tobias Wolff's "Hunters in the Snow". While his characters are initially the showcases of three certain types of masculinities, after the climax, they go through radical transformations to assume different roles. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis was employed to examine the implications of their power dynamics. Although at the outset, Kenny represents a hegemonic masculinity via bullying both Frank and Tub, he ends up both marginalized and struggling with death. Yet based on the desiring machines of control and submission, Tub substitutes Kenny, mirroring his actions. It is argued that their power dynamics can be interpreted in terms of a process of deterritorialization proposed by Deleuze and Guattari. As previous masculinity rhizomes are displaced via the swapping of hegemonic and marginalized masculinities, new ones appear in society. However, as one can observe in Wolff's short story, both these two extremes of masculinity types can lead to devastating consequences. While Kenny's extreme desiring machine to control others results in Tub shooting and, eventually, unintentionally murdering him, Tub's desiring machine as a long-oppressed character and his later role as a hegemonic masculinity leads to his superficial and harmful bonding with Frank. In either case, the complicit masculinity is also involved in the process since he is driven to unhealthy, toxic relationships with both Kenny and Tub as the characters representing hegemonic masculinity. Accordingly, it can be concluded that the extreme ends of these social

roles can both devastate the other rhizomes and be devastated by them in a never-ending process of becoming and unbecoming as both the abuser and the abused are profoundly and adversely affected by each other.

Acknowledgments
This research has received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Endnotes
1 The Lone Ranger is a heroic, fictional former Texas Ranger who fought outlaws in the American Old West with his Native American friend Tonto.

References

Bull, Victoria (2019). *Oxford Pocket Dictionary*. 4th Edition. London: Oxford University Press.

Connell, Raewyn (1983). *Which Way is Up?: Essays on Class, Sex and Culture*. Australia: Globe Press Ltd.

Connell, Raewyn (2005). 2nd Edition. *Masculinities*. London: Routledge.

Connell, Raewyn, et al. (1982). *Ockers and Disco-Maniacs: A Discussion of Sex, Gender and Secondary Schooling*. Sydney: Inner City Education Center.

Connell, Raewyn, and Messerschmidt, James W. (2005). "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender & Society*, 19:6, pp. 829- 859. doi: 10.1177/0891243205278639

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari, Felix (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published in 1972)

Deleuze, Gilles, and Guattari, Felix (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi, London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Donaldson, Mike (1993). "What Is Hegemonic Masculinity?". *Theory and society*, 22:5, pp. 643- 657. doi: www.jstor.org/stable/657988

Edman, Timuçin Buğra, et al. (2018). "Devil May or May Not Hide". *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15:2, pp. 793-806.

Edwards, Tim (2004). *Cultures of Masculinity*. London: Routledge.

Frank, Blye (1991). "Everyday/Everynight Masculinities: The Social Construction of Masculinity among Young Men". *SIECCAN Journal*, 6, pp. 27-37.

Franklin II, Clyde W. (2012). *The changing definition of masculinity*. Berlin: Springer Science & Business Media.

Freud, Sigmund (2010). *The Interpretation of Dreams.* Translated by James Strachey, New York: Perseus Books Group. [In English]

Gleason, Kevin Daniel (2018). *Traumatized Masculinity: Men and Boys in the Works of Tobias Wolff*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania. Ph.D. dissertation.

Jansen, Sue Curry, and Sabo, Donald (1994). "The Sport/War Metaphor: Hegemonic Masculinity, the Persian Gulf War, and the New World Order." *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 11:1, pp. 1- 17. doi: 10.1123/ssj.11.1.1

Kimmel, Michael, & Coston, Bethany (2012). "Seeing Privilege Where It Isn't: Marginalized Masculinities and the Intersectionality of Privilege." *Journal of*

Social Issues, 68:1, pp. 97- 111. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01738.x

Luepnitz, Deborah Anna (2021). "A Return to Freud's 'Complete Oedipus Complex': Reclaiming the Negative." *American Imago,* 78:4, pp. 619-630. doi: 10.1353/aim.2021.0029

Messerschmidt, James W. (1993). *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ortega, Dolors (2012). *Deterritorialising Patriarchal Binary Oppositions: Deleuze and Guattari, Virginia Woolf, Masculinities and Film Adaptations*. The University of Barcelona. Ph.D.dissertation.

Sabo, Donald, and Fredrick Gordon, David (1995). "Part I Masculinity, Health, and Illness". In *Men' s Health and Illness: Gender, Power, and the Body*. Ed. Alex Broom and Philip Tovey. California: Sage Publications.

Schorn, Patrick (2004). "Tracking Deceptions of 'Hunters in the Snow'". *The Harper Anthology,* 122. pp. 123- 125.

Thorne, Tony (2005). *Dictionary of Contemporary Slang*. 3rd Edition. London: A & C Black.

Wolff, Tobias (1983). "Hunters in the Snow". In *The Garden of the North American Martyrs*. Ed. Gary Krist. pp. 9- 26. New York: HarperCollins.