



University  
of Glasgow

Chou, Hsing-chun (2002) *Joyce, Bakhtin, and postcolonial triologue: history, subjectivity, and the nation in Ulysses*. PhD thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/1800/>

Copyright and moral rights for this thesis are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

**Joyce, Bakhtin, and Postcolonial Trialogue:  
History, Subjectivity, and the Nation in  
*Ulysses***

**Hsing-chun Chou**

A Thesis Submitted  
for  
The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
to  
Faculty of Arts  
University of Glasgow

January 2002



## ABSTRACT

In the light of Bakhtinian theories, this research focuses on *Ulysses* as a postcolonial modernist text, in which Joyce appropriates modernist aesthetic strategies to serve the purpose of narrating the nation. Bakhtin is helpful here, not only because his theories serve especially well to explain the meeting and intersection of social, political, and cultural forces in periods of transition, but also because his attempt to establish a “historical poetics” helps both to explore discourse as social/individual ideology constituting the text and to interpret the dialogic interaction between sociohistorical forces and textual representation. As Bakhtin seeks to think through the issue of alterity and accentuates the all-importance of dialogic construction, his thought is useful for interpretation of Joyce’s endeavor to turn the hostility of binary opposition into polyphonic orchestration of heteroglossia. Mediating between such binary oppositions as Self and Other, private and public, inside and outside, the Joycean text demonstrates the importance of engagement with the past to transform its nightmarish impact into creative power for the composition of a postcolonial history; the significance of incorporating and negotiating dichotomies in a triangular structure and recognizing their coexistence for the constitution of a postcolonial subjectivity; and the consequence of integrating nationalist projects and cosmopolitan dimensions for the construction of a postcolonial nation. While Bakhtin sheds light on Joyce, Joyce complements what Bakhtin leaves unsaid, enlarging the scope and implication of Bakhtinian theories. The dialogue between the Irish author and the Russian thinker results in mutual enlightenment.

The introductory chapter surveys the relationship between Joyce, Bakhtin, and postcolonial modernism, concentrating on the applicability of Bakhtinian concepts to the Joycean text. From the notion of the chronotope, the first chapter examines Stephen’s ambivalent attitude toward history, and focuses on his transformation of the past in the present time-space for the construction of a divergent and ongoing postcolonial future. The next chapter explores Bloom’s relation to colonial Irish society and inquires into his shaping of an architectonic self, which results from the reaccentuation of public discourse and the mediation between individualism and collectivism. In the light of dialogism and grotesque realism, the third chapter deals with Molly’s dialogic answers to Bloom’s proposal of liberation, and investigates how her androgynously grotesque body transmits the external body, through her sexual body, into the textual body which is “Penelope.” The concluding chapter focuses on the interillumination of Joyce and Bakhtin: while Bakhtin helps refigure a postcolonial modernist Joyce, Joyce triangulates the binary structure of dialogue, underscoring the significance of triologue as potential technique for postcolonial construction.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe the heaviest debt of gratitude to Dr. Adam Piette, my supervisor, whose patient guidance and consistent support helped me accomplish the once impossible task. To Dr. Anne Fogarty and Dr. John Coyle, my examiners, I am grateful for their invaluable comments and generous encouragement.

Special thanks are given to Professor Yu-chen Lin and Professor Cheng-chun Chung, who respectively introduced me to Joyce studies and Bakhtin's theories.

To all the friends who kept me company or inspired me during this long journey, I would like to express my profound appreciation: Susan, who showered me with supplies from home; Zenobia, May, Shu-chen, Shu-hui, and Maria, who kept sending me best wishes; Wei-li, May-jung, Min-li, Bor-ming, Chia-yin, Sandra, and Gurdip, whose concern and understanding meant a lot to me; and Kevin, who kindly printed this thesis.

To Julia and John, I am indebted for their offer of a temporary but cozy home, where hospitality and entertainment were never wanting.

Finally, I would like to extend my profoundest thanks to my loving parents, whose wholehearted support enabled me to finish my studies.

# CONTENTS

Introduction	
Joyce, Bakhtin, and Postcolonial Modernism	1
Chapter One	
Chronotopic Encounter and Reenactment: Stephen's Reaccentuation of History	31
Chapter Two	
The Private, the Public, and the Subject: Bloom's Construction of the Architectonic Self	94
Chapter Three	
Dialogic Answers and the Grotesque Body: Molly's Bisexual Writing of the Nation	153
Conclusion	
Rethinking Joyce, Bakhtin, and Postcolonial Modernism	255
Bibliography	274

## ABBREVIATIONS

### Works by James Joyce:

<i>CW</i>	<i>The Critical Writings of James Joyce</i>
<i>D</i>	<i>Dubliners</i>
<i>E</i>	<i>Poems and Exiles</i>
<i>P</i>	<i>A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man</i>
<i>SL</i>	<i>Selected Letters of James Joyce</i>
<i>U</i>	<i>Ulysses</i>

### Works by M. M. Bakhtin:

<i>AA</i>	<i>Art and Answerability</i>
<i>DI</i>	<i>The Dialogic Imagination</i>
<i>RW</i>	<i>Rabelais and His World</i>
<i>SG</i>	<i>Speech Genres and Other Late Essays</i>

(All emphases in quotations are original unless otherwise indicated.)

## INTRODUCTION

### Joyce, Bakhtin, and Postcolonial Modernism

At the turn of the new millennium, as we celebrate the outcome or cope with the impact of the postmodern era, it may seem anachronistic, or at least outdated, to talk about “James Joyce and Modernism.” Decades after Joyce’s canonization as one of the chieftains of high modernism, indeed, there does not seem anything more to be said about Joyce in terms of literary modernism, frequently seen as an aesthetic and cultural reaction to modernity and modernization. In close connection with industrialization, urbanization, and secularization, modernity “describes the rise of capitalism, of social study and state regulation, of a belief in progress and productivity leading to mass systems of industry, institutionalisation, administration and surveillance,” characterized by “disintegration and reformation, fragmentation and rapid change, ephemerality and insecurity,” as Peter Childs delineates in his recent book on modernism (15-16). An art of a speedily transforming world, modernism therefore represents the paradoxical responses of artists to double-edged modernity: some of them, like the futurist Marinetti, celebrate speed, productivity, and progress engendered by machinery and new technology, whereas others, such as Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, and D. H. Lawrence, condemn or despair of the homogenization of personal differences, enslavement of individual autonomy, and fragmentation of humanity resulting from mechanical production and mass systems (Childs 16-17). Whether as movement, phenomenon, or principle, modernism is conventionally held to be about the metropolis as convergent center of modernity and modernization, with an automatic inclination toward internationalism or universalism, which acts as an approach to the resistance to the unfavorable effects of capitalism.<sup>1</sup>

With his technical innovations in styles, language, and perspectives, his concern with individual subjectivity in relation to mass culture and society, his depiction of

---

<sup>1</sup> For background and “interpretative cruxes of Modernism,” see also Michael Bell, “The Metaphysics of Modernism,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*, pp. 9-32. For modernists’ relation and attitude to internationalism, see Emer Nolan, *James Joyce and Nationalism*, pp. 2-6.

modern urban life in Dublin, the second city of the British Empire, his seeming detachment from the Irish nationalist movement, and his lifelong nomadism in European metropolises such as Trieste, Zurich, and Paris, Joyce has long been canonized as a metropolitan modernist, and *Ulysses* a metropolitan modernist masterpiece exploring modern urban individuals and their experiences, his supposed disavowal of petty nationalism and approval of wide-ranging internationalism taken as a sign of his ideological maturity and superiority. Morton P. Levitt's interpretation of Joyce is typical of this reading. In his article on Joyce's contribution to "the Modernist Age," Levitt registers the continual presence of Ireland in Joyce's works, but disregards what this might imply, and emphasizes instead that Joyce's significance lies in his divorce from Ireland and embracing of universalism: "We do not read Joyce, it seems, for any reasons that have very much to do with Ireland. *We read him because he left Dublin behind him, because he became at last a universal author*, the greatest of modern novelists, eponymous hero of the age" (135-36, emphases added).

Convinced that Joyce's cosmopolitanism transcends his Irishness, Levitt ignores the fact that, spiritually, Joyce never leaves Dublin behind him. His statement fails to justify the crucial importance of Ireland or Irishness in Joyce's texts, oblivious of the famous conversation between Joyce and Arthur Power, in which the elder author advised the younger Irishman to "write what is in [his] blood," as great writers must be "national first" so that "the intensity of their own nationalism" would make them "international in the end."<sup>2</sup> Readings of this kind, which celebrate Joyce's aesthetic achievement in terms of his espousal of universalism—or Pan-European humanism—and disregard his detailed depiction of Ireland, dominate not merely Joyce criticism up to the 1970s (though Levitt's essay was published in 1984); they appear in recent critiques as well. In his wide-ranging study of Joyce's works, Steven Connor places Joyce in the context of *European* modernism, and summarizes three historical stages of critical reception of *Ulysses* in relation to the modern world. In the 1920s, *Ulysses* was read as "a horrifying surrender or release of dark and ugly energies" identified

---

<sup>2</sup> For details of the meeting and conversation, see Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 505.



with “the forms of modern life.” From the 1930s through to the 1970s, the formative period of the Joyce industry, the corpus was explicated as a masterpiece “immers[ing] itself in the destructive element of modernity and mass culture in order precisely to transform that destructiveness into art.” Since the 1970s, when postmodernist interpretations of Joyce emerged and prevailed, “an enlarged understanding of the politics of voices, both in narrative and in social life,” has been advocated in interpretations of the text (1996, 71-72).<sup>3</sup> Connor himself adopts the postmodernist approach, and argues that Joyce “use[s] the novel form as a sounding board or receiving apparatus for the manifold voices, styles, and idioms which throng about and permeate modern subjectivity” (1996, 72). Where these voices derive from and what they embody, however, Connor fails to specify, as though they represented the collection of voices corresponding to Eurocentric modernism in general and had nothing to do with the Ireland which produced the sounding board. The modern subjectivity thronged about by these unspecified voices, as a result, is rendered universal and transnational—and Eurocentric—unrelated to Irish specificity and circumstances.<sup>4</sup>

These received readings of Joyce as a modernist and postmodernist aesthete, *a universal author* rather than *an Irish writer*, not only slight his lifelong enterprise to be “the poet of [his] race” (*SL* 169), but also reduce modernism to a simplistic, homogeneous phenomenon taking place only in imperial metropolises of Europe, with an automatic preference for internationalism over nationalism. Critics who interpret Joyce in this light, as Emer Nolan observes, are devoted to “a purely cosmopolitan and internationalist view of modernism,” and inappropriately equate European metropolitan modernism with universalist modernism (xiii). Reading Joyce in terms of his “pacifism and tolerant pluralism” in the transnational sense, Nolan goes on, overlooks the images of Ireland as a marginal and colonial community reflected in his

---

<sup>3</sup> For a more detailed critical history of *Ulysses*, see Margot Norris, ed., *A Companion to James Joyce's Ulysses*, pp. 21-46. *Icon Critical Guide on Joyce*, edited by John Coyle, also provides a history of critical reception of *Ulysses*, covering critiques from the 1920s up to the present day.

<sup>4</sup> In “Modernism, Ireland and Empire,” C. L. Innes also remarks that Connor’s emphasis on Joyce’s postmodernism fails to do justice to colonial and postcolonial perspectives in Joycean texts. See p. 138.

texts, as if marginalization and colonialism were somehow extraneous to Irish culture, but merely the “content of his experiments with literary form and language, lending colourful but essentially irrelevant local detail for humour or satire” (xi-xiii).

And yet literary modernism is anything but simplistic and homogeneous.<sup>5</sup> In his innovative study of postcolonial Joyce, *The Subaltern Ulysses*, Enda Duffy reminds us that modernity and modernization arises not only in imperial metropolises, but also in colonial cities, and usefully uncovers a postcolonial modernism as distinct from imperial metropolitan modernism (1-22). On the premise of the diversity of modernisms, Nolan argues for the necessity of “attend[ing] to the full complexity of nationalism in the political culture of modernity,” in order to comprehend the “importance of Irish literary modernism” in relation to the nationalist context (xiii). In a recent article, Patrick Williams examines the mutual impact of modernism and imperialism, and locates “modernism in expanded concepts of modernity and imperialism” (13). All these readings point to the complication and diversity of modernism, which, as Nolan states, is “not simply *of* or *about* the [imperial] metropolis, nor addressed solely to its values” (19). As modernity emerges in the European imperial metropolis and the non-European metropolis, the city where modernization takes place could be the imperial city or the colonial city, and modernism could thus refer to either imperial modernism or colonial/postcolonial modernism, which are not equivalent to each other. If we bear in mind the colonial tropes structuring the “Telemachus” episode, with which Joyce begins his book—the Martello Tower built and possessed by the English where Stephen lives, the Englishman Haines’s silver cigarette case inlaid with a green stone, the abject milkwoman’s service to her masters—it seems perverse to interpret Joyce solely in terms of European metropolitan modernism, which focuses on the metropolis as imperial center incorporating voices and speaking *for* them, and therefore implicitly marginalizes the non-European colonial city; it also sounds naïve to hail Joyce, as

---

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, Vassiliki Kolocotroni, Jane Goldman, and Olga Taxidou’s Introduction to *Modernism: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*; the anthology itself also speaks for the complication and diversity of modernism. See also Peter Childs, *Modernism*, and Michael Levenson, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*.

Levitt does, as the “eponymous hero” of the modernist age in view of his supposedly mature cosmopolitanism as transcendence of Irishness or nationalism. This interpretation of Joyce as an internationalist whose success lies in his turning away from Ireland and embracing the world—Europe in particular—easily falls into the trap of imperial centralization. The term internationalism, in this context, is paradoxical: on the one hand it can refer to a political ideal of transnational polyphonic orchestration which transgresses boundaries of cultures and nation states, but on the other hand it may imply an imperial mentality that attempts to lay claim to *the* voice that represents all other voices and to impose its policy universally, just as capitalism tends to level individuality.<sup>6</sup> Internationalism in this sense can therefore be either an ideal of equality and cooperation or an extension of Eurocentric imperialism. To equate Joycean modernism unreservedly with European metropolitan modernism, and to praise his celebration of internationalism without regard to the specifically Irish, runs the risk of centralizing the imperial modernism of the European metropolis and marginalizing colonial/postcolonial modernism in the supposed “outpost” of the empire. To put it more precisely, the internationalist Joyce should be read in the light of Irish specificity in relation to international contexts, as a Joyce who strives to bring Ireland from parochialism and marginalization onto the international stage, not as a Joyce who despises and discards Irishness altogether.

The empire might have been absent from critiques of Joycean modernism until recently—or from literary modernism in general, as Howard J. Booth and Nigel Rigby indicate (2)—but the empire is inseparable from colonial modernization. From the middle of the nineteenth century to the revolutionary years of 1916-22, Ireland underwent an abrupt and disastrous process of modernization, which, as generally admitted, was associated with the culture of the colonial power.<sup>7</sup> Considering the subject matter Joyce deals with and the intensely local detail he pays attention to, it

---

<sup>6</sup> Similarly, the interpretation of a socialist Joyce should be grounded on Irish circumstances in relation to European or international socialism, not solely on European socialism; otherwise it would run the risk of duplicating metropolitan mechanization of individuality characteristic of capitalism, which socialism resists.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Nolan, p. xii; and Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*, pp. 329-30.

seems more accurate to argue that Joycean modernism reacts more specifically to Irish modernity rather than generally to global modernity. “The modernity to which Joyce responds,” Nolan comments, “is not transnational or universal, and the major trends in Joyce criticism have occluded the particularity of Irish historical experience as it determines and is reflected in his fiction” (xii). This neglecting of the focus of Joyce’s modernism, Nolan continues, betrays critics’ “lofty indifference to cultural or political specificity” (9). But Joyce, if anything, is a writer of great cultural and political specificity. In the conversation with Arthur Power referred to previously, Joyce told the younger man: “For myself, I always write about Dublin, because if I can get to the heart of Dublin I can get to the heart of all the cities of the world. In the particular is contained the universal” (Ellmann 1982, 505). Critics of transnational Joyce, nevertheless, usually emphasize only the universal, and ignore the particular which is the key to the universal, the achievement of the latter relying on and beginning with the exploration and acknowledgement of the significance of the former. In overlooking Joyce’s efforts to depict a Dublin which is the convergent center of paralyzing forces, critics make Dublin an abstract city without sociopolitical and geographical specificities, and in the meantime align Joyce with imperial centralization and slight his intention to write about/for colonial/postcolonial Ireland. By getting to the heart of Dublin to anatomize the city as the periphery of imperial center and the center of colonial marginalization, Joyce attempts to simultaneously examine imperial operation and colonial resistance which fundamentally characterize colonial relationships, and thus to get to the heart of other cities of the world—both imperial and colonial—to gain a more comprehensive insight into the general pattern of imperial mentality and colonial mimicry. M. Keith Booker suggests the importance of reading Irish culture depicted in Joyce’s text *along with* broader historical phenomena in an age of worldwide empires (1997, 5). As we interpret Joyce’s text, indeed, both the local and the universal should be taken into consideration, for Joyce endeavors to mediate between the national and the international, unwilling to be confined by petty nationalism or to align himself with centralizing imperialism. If imperial metropolitan modernism speaks for what is incorporated into the metropolis

as imperial center, Joyce's modernism allows the colonial metropolis to speak for itself. It is in this regard that *Ulysses* is a masterpiece of metropolitan modernism: imperial metropolis shifts into colonial metropolis, with colonial alterity foregrounded and occupying the central stage, against the background of imperial centrality.

Not until the 1980s did critics begin to notice the critical blind spot and register the implication of imperialism and colonialism present in modernist texts. One of the earliest and most important criticisms which specifically connect modernist writings and imperial presence, as some critics suggest,<sup>8</sup> is Fredric Jameson's "Modernism and Imperialism," in which Jameson argues that "the formal and structural properties of British modernist literature often reflect the crucial presence of imperialism as a fact of British political life during the modernist period, even when imperialism is not a major object of inquiry in the text at hand" (Booker 2000, 1). Jameson takes E. M. Forster's *Howards End* as an example, and concludes his essay: "The traces of imperialism can therefore be detected in Western modernism, and are indeed constitutive of it; but we must not look for them in the obvious places, in content or in representation" (64). Notwithstanding some controversial points in his argument—for instance, his choice of the less representative *Howards End* instead of *A Passage to India* or Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* as the example of his discussion for the purpose of securing his idea of a representative absence<sup>9</sup>—Jameson links modernism and colonialism together, and notes the impact of the latter on the former and the response of the former to the latter. Following in the wake of Jameson, Patrick Williams, in his examination of "more complex models of modernism in the imperial context," also registers "imperialism's impact on the forms and structures of modernism," and observes that the empire "provided the material ground" for modernist texts, "first through the appropriation of non-Western artefacts, and second through the presence of the Other in the colonial metropolis" (13, 20-21). Significantly, the impact presents itself not merely in the center of the empire: as

---

<sup>8</sup> See, for example, M. Keith Booker, *Ulysses, Capitalism, and Colonialism*, p. 1; Booth and Rigby, pp. 5-6; Patrick Williams, p. 21; C. L. Innes, pp. 138-39.

<sup>9</sup> For details, see Patrick Williams, p. 22.

suggested earlier, the colonized respond to modernity promoted by the empire as well. Rod Edmond remarks that “although modernism was [an imperial] metropolitan phenomenon, it drew on the outposts of empire” (59)—a remark evincing the affinity between the empire and colonial/postcolonial modernism. All these critiques suggest the necessity of considering imperialism and colonialism as implicit or explicit in modernist writings, Joyce’s texts included.

As a consequence of the trend of rethinking modernism in the imperial and postcolonial context, colonial and postcolonial readings of Joyce have emerged in recent years. Seamus Deane’s “Joyce and Nationalism” is one of the earliest attempts to connect Joyce with the Irish nationalist movement, seeing his work as a model which incorporates within it all the mutations of nationalism and therefore acts as a counterweight to colonial forces—a stance Nolan adopts more than a decade later. Apart from Duffy’s innovative study mentioned above, Vincent J. Cheng’s *Joyce, Race, and Empire* is a ground-breaking work on the issue of race and colonialism in Joyce’s texts. Cheng investigates Joyce’s depictions and representations of race in relation to imperialism, and argues that Joyce wrote from the perspective of a colonial subject under a coercive empire in order to set up a trenchant and significant political commentary on British imperialism in Ireland and on colonial discourses and imperial ideologies in general. In *Inventing Ireland*, Declan Kiberd sees *Ulysses* as “the collective utterance of a community” and a postcolonial text, in which Joyce attempts to “express the sheer fluidity and instability of Irish experience [as the colony] in a form which would be nonetheless comprehensible to the arbiters of international order” (328-29). Also locating *Ulysses* in the postcolonial moment, David Lloyd deems the text to be “recalcitrant to the emergent nationalist as to the imperial state formation,” as demonstrated in its “refusing the homogeneity of ‘style’ required for national citizenship” and seeking instead the form of adulteration corresponding to colonial experience (6, 106-10). From the Marxist approach, M. Keith Booker explores *Ulysses* in the context of capitalism and colonialism, and reevaluates political discussions on Joyce emerging in the past decade or so (2000, 1-17). All these

readings rewrite the traditional view of Joyce as an apolitical modernist aesthete, and cast light on *Ulysses* in relation to Irish culture and colonial experience.

Rather than condemning the insufficiency of traditional interpretations of an aesthetic Joyce who cares only about literary matters, postcolonial approaches enrich the modernist point of view and widen its scope: to say the least, postcolonialism highlights the issue of the Other, which is a crucial concern of modernists, but often disregarded in criticisms of modernist writings. Edward W. Said points out imperial metropolitan modernists' ambivalence toward the Other: they systematically associate alterity and difference with "strangers" such as women, natives, and sexual eccentrics, who "erupt into vision" to "challenge and resist settled metropolitan histories, forms, modes of thought," and to this challenge modernism responds with an ambivalent attitude, unable to say yes or no. The "fundamental historical problem of modernism," Said indicates, is consequently that "Empire and the West . . . were being asked to take the Other seriously." This Other as stranger extends and applies to the colonial Other. Said expounds Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, and stresses the importance of thinking about European metropolitan history and colonial history together: "Despite its bitterness and violence, the whole point of Fanon's work is to force the European metropolis to think its history *together with* the history of colonies awakening from the cruel stupor and abused immobility of imperial domination" (222-23). This argument could be applied to Joyce's depiction of Dublin, an European metropolis (the "center") and a colonial city (the "periphery") where a double history coexists and needs to be thought together. The issue of Self-Other or center-periphery relationship plays an essential part both in modernism and in postcolonialism, a relationship which is colonialist in nature. Explaining Couze Venn's observation that "the subject in modernity has a constitutional instability that requires the 'other' to be at once present and subjugated," Booth and Rigby argue that the modern "is saturated to its core with colonialist attitudes," and the modern subject is hence "an inherently 'colonising' subject" (3-4). Modernism, Booth and Rigby continue, could be "the means for a diagnostic understanding of the colonial mentality," having "problematized the relation to the 'other,' and found ways of producing texts that

allowed for multiple voices and a respectful relation to alterity and difference” (5). Booth and Rigby’s argument of modernism’s positive attitude toward alterity and difference may differ from Said’s, which stresses ambivalence, but they both point out the significance of the Other in modernism and postcolonialism, the key which links the two seemingly unconnected trends together.

To the British modern metropolis as imperial center, London, Dublin plays the role of the Other, a colonial city at the outpost of the empire. Located in Europe, however, Ireland is also a center, from the vantage point of Eurocentrism. As the only Western European country with both an early and late colonial experience, Ireland possesses what Nolan calls the “double valence,” which offers both images of the center and of the periphery (4), regarded by Kiberd as an artistic advantage (344), a view Jameson shares. Despite his argument that imperialism can be detected only as a set of formal symptoms and not as subject matter in modernist writings, Jameson notes that Irish literature, and Joyce in particular, is exceptional, owing to the unique “national situation” of Ireland which “reproduces the appearance of First World reality and social relationships” but whose “underlying structure is in fact much closer to that of the Third World or of colonized daily life” (60). This double image, Jameson suggests, makes *Ulysses* a uniquely fertile territory for the exploration of imperialism’s relation to “British” modernism (61-64). It may also explain why Joyce regards Dublin as the key to the heart of the universe. But as Booker has it, not only does Dublin have this dual reality, but Joyce himself is an author with a dual status: he is a postcolonial writer within the canonical center of “British” modernism (2000, 1).

As a result of the postcolonial reaccentuation of modernism, the high modernist Joyce as apolitical aesthete focusing only on literary matters has been replaced by the politically subversive postcolonial Joyce intending to write the nation. And yet to eliminate the aesthetic aspects of modernism from Joyce criticism altogether also ignores the minute attention Joyce pays to stylistic innovations and artistic concerns, which relate him to other modernists such as Virginia Woolf and T. S. Eliot. Aesthetics, in fact, can be political, understood as a cultural representation of or response to the sociopolitical status quo. As an author with a double status writing about a city with a



dual reality, Joyce mediates between modernism and postcolonialism. Booker asserts the necessity of reading postcolonial texts in conjunction with works by writers from imperial powers in order to obtain a better understanding of modern culture and literature, and contends that *Ulysses* “offers unique possibilities for mediation between postcolonial literature and the canonical works of British modernism”: with British domination of Ireland as one of its important subtexts, Joyce’s work usefully highlights similarities and differences between British and postcolonial writers, and thus occupies an in-between cultural position and bears “dialogic echoes of both sides in the confrontation between the British and their colonial subjects” (1996, 136-37). The power of Joyce’s writing, Booker emphasizes,

arises not from his ability to transcend his Irish roots, but from his ability to draw upon his Irish background in especially direct and productive ways, *producing dialogues with colonialism, nationalism, tradition, modernization, religion, science, and so on* that make him not a unique genius, but a highly representative figure of modernity. (2000, 169, emphases added)

This modernity, as we may presume, is also double-sided, prevailing both in the imperial center and in the colonial periphery. By mediating between modernism and postcolonialism, Joyce not only negotiates between Ireland and the world, but also explains Ireland to itself, and thus participates in what Kiberd calls “inventing Ireland.” Joycean modernism, Kiberd comments, is characterized by an awareness of the need for dialogic mediation: the need to represent narratives of both the dialectics of liberation and the ethics of colonization *simultaneously*, inasmuch as Europe creates both narratives (343).

A mediator between modernism and postcolonialism, Joyce could aptly be called a postcolonial modernist, an appellation suggested by Duffy, which seems more appropriate than the title metropolitan modernist, in terms of the second label’s easy association with the empire, and in terms of Joyce’s double status as a canonical modernist author and a colonial/postcolonial writer, as well as the dual reality of Ireland as both European and Third-Worldly. Imperial metropolitan modernism may share features with postcolonial modernism—e.g., both act as response to modernity,

and both pay attention to the Other—but they differ from each other in significant ways, owing to the divergent politico-cultural backgrounds which engender them, one as imperial and central, the other as colonial and peripheral. In spite of its double image, Ireland at the turn of the twentieth century was after all a colony in reality, subordinate to the British Empire; Irish modernism is therefore colonial and postcolonial rather than imperial or European-metropolitan.

As C. L. Innes observes, anti-colonial writers such as Yeats and Joyce differ from imperial metropolitan writers in a distinct way: they place great emphasis on the “linking of space and time” and “relationships between specific places and autobiographical experience or personal history,” so that they might reclaim the lost land and narrate the colonized nation by narrating the self (146-47). Nevertheless, the establishment of an inseparable relationship between place and personal/communal identity functions not solely as a means of repossessing the land; it serves also to define an inside community against an outside community, called by Innes the double audience, the one an immediate community with inside knowledge of the place and its history, the other an outside or imperial metropolitan readership unfamiliar with the specificity of the described land (148). To a considerable extent, *Ulysses* is a novel appealing to a double audience. Innes sees Haines as “a figure of the *excluded* or outside reader, who fails to ‘get’ Stephen’s jokes or to understand the nuanced references in the speech and chatter of the Dublin community” (150). One may add that Haines’s absence from scenes of Dubliners’ meetings and gossips—whether the newspaper office in “Aeolus,” the library in “Scylla and Charybdis,” Barney Kiernan’s pub in “Cyclops,” or the Maternity Hospital in “Oxen of the Sun”—highlights his status as an outside reader, whereas Bloom, usually considered by his fellow Dubliners as outsider, participates directly or indirectly in all these occasions. To adopt Kiberd’s argument that Joyce attempts to mediate between his native land and the world and ultimately to explain Ireland to itself (334), we may regard the presupposition of the double audience as a way of achieving the primary purpose, an appeal to two readerships in a single text, which serves more to communicate and unite the insider and the outsider than to differentiate between and divide them.

Another feature distinguishing metropolitan modernism of the empire from colonial/postcolonial modernism is the deployment of the literary effects of defamiliarization: fractured viewpoints, impetus toward allegory, rhetorics of obscurity, comic defamiliarizations, etc. Whilst imperial metropolitan modernists deploy these techniques as strategies for reflecting the sense of alienation resulting from modernization, these strategies, Duffy declares, are “set off in the anticolonial moment by a mechanics developed out of fear” of coercive imperial domination and censorship (8). Moreover,

while the metropolitan modernist text’s obscurity is symptomatic of its disavowal of those real conditions experienced in the exploited colony that make possible the “refinement” of the society it describes, in the postcolonial text obscurity and novel textual strategies evidence rather a desperation to be as close as possible to the real conditions out of which the text is constructed. (8)

Similarly, fragmentation may characterize both imperial metropolitan and postcolonial modernist texts, but whereas in the former fragmentation reflects writers’ dissatisfaction or disappointment with modern reality, in the latter it reflects the dire reality itself, fractured and oppressed on account of the imperial rule.

These differences between imperial metropolitan and postcolonial modernisms, as C. L. Innes points out, could be regarded as anticolonial writers’ attempt to “create a different foundation from which to rebuild and reinvent a community outside of the categories imposed by the English colonisers,” and hence function as “a new starting point from which to sidestep the overwhelming colonial narrative” (149, 147). The postcolonial modernist Joyce, in this respect, could be seen as an author engaged in narrating the nation by adopting and adapting metropolitan modernist strategies, and *Ulysses* is consequently a postcolonial modernist text aiming to imagine a postcolonial history, subjectivity, and community as distinct from those structured by the empire. Duffy comments that the Joycean text distributes the literary effects of modernist defamiliarization on the one hand and the strand of realist mimeticism on the other to represent a postcolonial text, and therefore “marks, at the heart of the modernist canon,

the moment at which the formal bravura of the Eurocentric high modernisms is redeployed so that a postcolonial literary praxis can be ushered onto the stage of a new and varied geo-literature” (4); the corpus is hence “the starred text of an Irish national literature,” playing a “decisive role in redefining the issues at stake in imagining an Irish national identity” (2). Indeed, the significance of Joycean modernism lies not in its alignment with imperial metropolitan modernism, but in its appropriation of the latter for its own use: to forge the uncreated conscience of the Irish people.

In spite of the new light postcolonial readings shed on Joyce criticism, Mikhail M. Bakhtin is mysteriously missing from this recent trend. Many critics have suggested the high applicability of Bakhtinian approaches to Joyce’s texts,<sup>10</sup> and some have accomplished full-length and insightful studies on Joyce in terms of Bakhtin’s theories,<sup>11</sup> but no one has yet connected Bakhtin, Joyce, modernism, and postcolonialism together. Neither a critic nor a theorist of modernism and postcolonialism, Bakhtin is nevertheless helpful in understanding Joyce as a postcolonial modernist: his concepts of the novel, subjectivity, and culture serve well to define and explain the heterogeneity of modernism and postcolonialism emerging in transitional periods, and his ethical attitude toward the Other and emphasis on polyphony and dialogue suggest a constructive way of textualizing and conceptualizing a nation heteroglot in nature but monoglot in practice. Bakhtin and Joyce, in fact, share many characteristics in their respective careers as thinker and artist: both underwent the turbulent impact of transformative and revolutionary epochs, experienced exile from their hometown or homeland, suffered from the censorship by authoritarian rule, and, above all, tried to write in states of nomadism during chaotic

---

<sup>10</sup> See, for example, Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, *Mikhail Bakhtin*, p. 307; Sue Vice, *Introducing Bakhtin*, p. 82, pp. 156-57; David Lodge, *After Bakhtin*, pp. 34-40; Booker, *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition*, pp. 8-9.

<sup>11</sup> For example, R. B. Kershner’s *Joyce, Bakhtin, and Popular Literature*, and Booker’s *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition*. From the concept of dialogue, Kershner investigates the intertextuality between popular literary texts and Joyce’s earlier works, *Dubliners* and *A Portrait*. Booker aims to “explore the real implications of Joyce’s dialogues with his literary predecessors” such as Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare, and argues that “Bakhtin seems particularly promising as a resource” inasmuch as “a constant awareness of the social and political implications of aesthetic strategies lies at the very heart of Bakhtin’s project” (10).

periods of history and to rethink and transform chaos into constructive forces of some kind.

As Stacy Burton observes, by extrapolating from his discussion of discourse and narrative, critics have found Bakhtin useful in analyzing works from modernist writers such as Gertrude Stein and Joyce to postmodernist authors such as Donald Barthelme and Pat Barker (520-21). The popularity of Bakhtin among critics of modernist and postmodernist literature may derive from his insight into the sociohistorical determination of discourse, which casts light on modernist and postmodernist technical innovations. "In the case of modernism," Ken Hirschkop argues, "the works of the Bakhtin circle participate in the emphasis on linguistic 'material' so prevalent today, but give it, as it were, a socio-historical twist, associating avant-garde estrangement and shock with traditions of popular subversive discourse" (2).<sup>12</sup> Bakhtin's emphasis on narrative openendedness and opposition to absolute authority, as Daphna Erdinast-Vulcan suggests, also correspond to modernism's resistance to narrative closure, manifested in its ethical openendedness, the multiplicity of perspectives, voices, and judgments it offers, and its abdication of narrative authority (153). These correspondences between Bakhtinian concepts and modernist/postmodernist writings have made Bakhtin especially popular in recent years. Michael Gardiner and Michael Mayerfeld Bell remark on this phenomenon: "Bakhtin has been absorbed willy-nilly into the modernity versus postmodernity debate, and held up as an iconic figure to be either scorned or celebrated" (3). This popularity, however, results not in mutual enrichment of Bakhtinian thought and modernist/postmodernist texts, but rather in abusive exploitation of Bakhtin's works, which are often reduced to a set of labels such as double-voiced discourse, heteroglossia, and chronotope. It may be easy to make observations like "this discourse is double-voiced," "that text celebrates stylistic and sociocultural heteroglossia," "this passage demonstrates the chronotope of the threshold," etc. And yet this is far from enough. Burton points out the necessity of using Bakhtinian

---

<sup>12</sup> For a similar observation, see Norris, p. 208.

thought productively and constructively: “It is not in vocabulary alone, however, but in a more fundamental understanding of heteroglossia as a site of contestation and productive engagement that the considerable contribution of Bakhtin’s theories to the study of modernism may be found” (531). In a similar attitude, Booker also urges the importance of applying Bakhtin in illuminating ways—that is, exploring the writer’s response to literary predecessors and relation to sociohistorical forces—rather than simply indicating instances which exemplify Bakhtin’s theories (1997, 12). The essence of Bakhtin’s theories, indeed, lies not in a set of terms, but in the insistence of his theories as a whole upon the transformative power of the textual—understood in the broad sense of the word—which mediates between discourse and culture and potentially enacts and renews them. The failure to understand Bakhtin thoroughly and adopt his theories productively falls short both of grasping the profundity of Bakhtinian thought and of justifying the applicability of his thought to modernism.

Notwithstanding the fact that Bakhtin does not theorize specifically about modernist literature, he was, as were many of his contemporary intellectuals in the Soviet Union, engaged in the debate on the constitution and representation of the postrevolutionary speaking subject<sup>13</sup>—corresponding to modernists’ engagement in thinking the shaping of modern subjectivity or Joyce’s contemplation of subject positions within a postcolonial Ireland. The essence of Bakhtinian thought, which stresses interaction and transformation, could therefore help to cast light on modernist writings, viewed as responses to crises of modernity. A key point in Bakhtin’s theories is his conviction that an intrinsic affinity exists between culture and literary texts. Burton notes Bakhtin’s insistence on literary works’ inseparable relation to culture and society: “The emphasis, for Bakhtin, is always on the relation between the text and the larger cultural-critical narratives in which it is *both product and participant*” (523, emphases added). But this formula applies to the relation between discourse and the text as well: just as the text participates in and is forged by sociohistorical forces,

---

<sup>13</sup> For the argument concerning Bakhtin’s absence in analyses of modernist literature, see Burton, p. 521. For Bakhtin’s engagement in the debate on postrevolutionary subject-formation, see Donald Wesling, “The Speaking Subject in Russian Poetry and Poetics Since 1917.”

discourse constitutes and is renewed by textual representation. In this respect, the text mediates between discursive textuality and culture as ideology: it is both the process and outcome of the mediation, shaped by both, yet potentially transforming them. Significantly, this mediating process triangulates the discourse-culture correlation, turning the binary structure into a trinary one. Analogous to the text, Bakhtinian subjectivity could therefore be defined as radically mobile subjectivity, which negotiates between the ego and sociohistorical forces, and emerges as a third entity, or rather a social product with the potential for the transformation of social ideology. Similarly, Bakhtin's preference for the novel over other genres is due to the assumption that the novel serves as the best mediator in representing the complexity of social reality. The novel's "cultural significance," Burton comments, lies in its displacement—or rather carnivalization—of "high proclamatory genres" in favor of "a modern mode of narration that represents the secular, everyday experience of heteroglossia in all its messiness" (525). To put it differently, the novel manifests itself as the third power negotiating between high genres and social reality. Bakhtin's emphasis on the mediatory role of the textual, in brief, incorporates sociopolitical concerns into "apolitical" modernist aesthetics, and meanwhile triangulates the binary structures of, say, discourse and culture, ego and sociality, etc.

Another significant point of Bakhtin's theories is his opposition to solipsism and accentuation of alterity. As mentioned earlier, industrialization as a phenomenon of modernity requires the elimination of individuality and difference: with the tendency toward collectivization, modernity reduces Otherness to Sameness. In response to this tendency, modernist writings tend to advocate individualism or the solipsistic self—the Nietzschean superman, for instance—which is in fact the mirror image of the collective self, liable to level differences and incapable of accepting Otherness. Similar to modernists, Bakhtin endeavors to rescue Otherness from reduction to Sameness by stressing the significance of alterity. Wlad Godzich discusses Bakhtin's objection to the excesses of modernity: Bakhtin views modernity as "the epoch that has resulted from the confrontation with Otherness and then sought to avoid this Otherness at all costs by elaborating a complex strategy for its containment and

eventual reduction to Sameness”; to resist this phenomenon, Bakhtin “seeks to restore this Otherness to its rightful, and most effective, place” (quoted in Gardiner 1996, 140). Conscious of the danger of modernist philosophies such as Nietzsche’s, however, Bakhtin also tries to avoid the trap of solipsism, the other extreme of the excesses of modernity. Gardiner registers that Bakhtin develops a diagnosis of solipsistic tendencies within modernity, especially in his early writings on aesthetics and subjectivity (1998, 130). What Bakhtin values, indeed, is not anarchic solipsism, or the transformation of Sameness into Otherness, but the acceptance of Otherness within Sameness. Rather than reestablishing the binary opposition of Same-Other, Bakhtin attempts to triangulate the binary structure by undermining the fixed boundaries and mediating between them. His interest in carnival and advocacy of communal life could thus be seen as an attempt at mediation: to maintain collectivity and individuality, whilst avoiding the traps of the extremes of collectivization and solipsism. Whatever the specifics of his concepts of the novel, subjectivity, or culture, Bakhtin’s theories in a nutshell emphasize the importance of being with others and making connections, not the enhancement of opposition and escalation of antagonism.

As Burton states, “Refiguring modernism, perhaps first and foremost, requires reading both its profound alterity and its present familiarity” (542). A thinker reflecting upon the signification of alterity and the relationship between Self and Other, center and periphery, familiarity and strangeness, Bakhtin provides a more complex understanding of modernist literature and enlightens the refiguration of modernism, which is itself complicated, contradictory, and heterogeneous. By shifting critical attention from literary concerns to their relation to the heteroglossia of everyday life, Bakhtin refocuses modernist readings on the complex connection of the text with its historic-cultural context; the richness of his theories hence helps to read modernism as “a contradictory boundary phenomenon, a moment preoccupied at once with identity and otherness, authority and heteroglossia” (Burton 536). Heterogeneous in itself, modernism requires comprehension both of its profound alterity and of its present familiarity, a task depending on reading between the lines and reading along with extra-literary texts in order to situate the literary text’s sociohistorical context and



to comprehend the text's impact on and implications for that context. Burton's discussion about Bakhtin's stance toward modernist experimentation is worth quoting:

Bakhtin values literary innovation, fluid facility with language, and the novelization of genres, but not the death of the novel or the end of history: in his theories the strength of narrative is at once its sociohistorical ground and its elasticity. In effect, he embraces elements of both realist and modernist aesthetics, troubling naïve versions of the former through his emphasis on discourse and representation and rejecting extreme variations on the latter through his critique of artifice and predetermined outcomes.  
(526)

In this passage, the key words with regard to Bakhtin's refiguration of modernism may be "sociohistorical" and "representation." To put it another way, Bakhtin's theories as a whole could be seen as an attempt to figure out the mutual impact of the text as ideological representation and the sociohistorical background as ideology, helpfully relating modernist technical innovations to broader sociohistorical contexts. This characteristic again helps to locate modernism within the framework of imperialism and postcolonialism.

The attempt to engage Bakhtin in postcolonial criticism, in fact, has burgeoned only recently: the publication of *Bakhtin and the Nation*, a collection of articles dealing with the application of Bakhtinian thought to nation studies of African America, Russia, Britain, Algeria, India, and others, speaks for this new trend.<sup>14</sup> With his attention to alterity and elaboration on the Self-Other relationship, Bakhtin could properly be appropriated into postcolonial critique, in spite of the fact that he does not theorize specifically about colonialism or postcolonialism as Homi Bhabha, Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, and others do. Postrevolutionary Russia, after all, was not too distinct from postcolonial lands such as Ireland: both endeavored to reestablish a new order and reconstruct a new national identity after the hard times of a turbulent history. Postcolonialism, to a considerable degree, is the rethinking of the Self-Other

---

<sup>14</sup> For details, see Barry A. Brown et al., eds., *Bakhtin and the Nation*.

relationship, which characterizes all colonial relationships. The empire as the authoritative center is akin to a solipsistic self, which draws a fixed line between self and non-self and excludes from its framework what is considered the Other. This solipsistic self, as Gardiner argues with reference to Emmanuel Levinas, whose concept of Self-Other has much in common with Bakhtin's, is analogous to a prison-house, "prone to the illusion that it is self-originating and constitutes the external world." Such egoistic megalomania, whether of the individual, of the empire, or of European philosophy in general, is a source of domination and violence, because it fundamentally conceals the reality that "the self is heterogeneous, a product of its alterity with the Other" (1996, 130). The Cyclopean Citizen embodies such a megalomaniac subject, the counterpart to the imperial public self and producer and imposer of Self-Other discrimination, violent and domineering, incapable of listening to voices of the Other like Bloom, not to mention accepting "foreign cultures" such as British or French. It is thus important to "develop a profound receptivity to the concrete Other in daily life" (Gardiner 1996, 130), not only in order to emancipate the solipsistic self from the prison-house of megalomania, but also in order to break the vicious circle of the endless reproduction of indiscriminate solipsism.

To avoid the trap of imperial or colonialist solipsism, Bakhtin hence emphasizes the significance of dialogue, generally admitted to be the crux linking his theories together. The generation of dialogue, literal or metaphysical, requires at least two parties or consciousnesses, which demand a response from each other. Responsibility to the Other is therefore an essential factor of dialogism, a relationship based not on domination and subjection, but on mutual responsibility or answerability. Gardiner explains this responsibility: "I do not grasp the Other so as to dominate, but I respond to the face's epiphany as if to a summons that cannot be ignored" (1996, 132). This ethical attitude toward the Other would certainly be appreciated by Joyce, who, after all, represents the figure of the outsider as the hero of his modern epic of a burgeoning nation. Potentially, this attitude may offer a way out of the colonial Self-Other relation as domination and exploitation, turning control and exclusion into responsibility and cooperation. The imposition of Sameness or homogeneity upon a heterogeneous

society such as postcolonial Ireland—or the elimination of differences from a heterogeneous culture—is itself an index of tyranny and oppression. What Bakhtin’s works argue for, as Gardiner and Bell point out, is “the necessity to overturn structures of domination, to challenge illegitimate curtailments of human freedom, and to establish more just and equitable relations of power between individuals and groups” (7). Bakhtinian dialogism, indeed, speaks for communication and acceptance. It would be therefore wrong to reduce Bakhtin’s concept to another dualism of Self-Other and argue for his preference for Otherness over Sameness. As mentioned earlier, instead of emphasizing the Other over the Self, Bakhtin focuses on the mediation between them, and in so doing triangulates the binary structure, careful not to reproduce domination and subjection—and this is the true meaning of dialogism. Similarly, by representing a hybrid Bloom and an adulterant Molly as his new Irish couple for the new Irish Free State, Joyce attempts not to bifurcate the binary opposition of Self-Other or inside-outside, but to negotiate between the dual structure and find a way out of the imposed bifurcation.

Bakhtin’s lifelong enterprise, in a nutshell, is an endeavor to reconcile false dichotomies between Self and Other, center and periphery, private and public, familiarity and strangeness, and to sidestep the limitations of egological philosophies and totalitarian politics prominent in modern society, be it postrevolutionary Russia or colonial and postcolonial Ireland. Gardiner and Bell term this endeavor “radical tolerance”: “This is not a form of tolerance that simply allows us to ‘put up with’ the existence of a multiplicity of forms of life and world-views. Rather, it aims at mutual recognition and co-understanding in a manner that opens up each such form of life to a diversity of reciprocal influences and points of view” (6). Bakhtin’s “radical tolerance,” in this respect, might better be called “radical acceptance,” corresponding to and explaining Bloom’s advocacy of love as opposed to the colonial hatred reproduced by nationalists in “Cyclops.”

This radical tolerance or acceptance manifests itself in the Bakhtinian novelistic principle of heteroglossia, which is not merely a linguistic or stylistic device, but a sociocultural phenomenon and attitude, basically equivalent to colonial/postcolonial

hybridity and Joycean adulteration. Lloyd elaborates on the concept of adulteration, which signifies a thematic and stylistic principle that “institutes a multiplication of possibility in place of an order of probability.” Such adulteration and the threat it presents is correlative to the threat of adultery in the social sphere, forbidden under patriarchal law on account of “the potential multiplication of possibilities for identity that it implies as against the paternal fiction” based on “no more than legal verisimilitude.” To avoid the danger of undermining “the stable formation of legitimate and authentic identities,” it is hence necessary to exorcise adulteration/adultery out of patriarchal law and the nationalist project (109). Adulteration, in short, represents “the constitutive anxiety of nationalism” (106), threatening nationalism’s—as well as imperialism’s—project to produce simple and single-voiced subjects. Aware of the hidden violence of this project, Joyce refuses the homogeneity of a single style required for national citizenship, and adopts instead adulteration in *Ulysses*, a text “recalcitrant to the emergent nationalist as to the imperial state formation” (Lloyd 6). Lloyd comments on this strategy:

*Ulysses*’ most radical movement is in its refusal to fulfil either of these demands and its correspondent refusal to subordinate itself to the socializing functions of identity formation. It insists instead on a deliberate stylization of dependence and inauthenticity, a stylization of the hybrid status of the colonized subject as of the colonized culture, their internal adulteration and the strictly parodic modes that they produce in every sphere. (110)

By representing linguistic, stylistic, thematic, and perspective adulteration, Joyce represents the social hybridity and cultural heteroglossia of colonial Ireland struggling for freedom and postcolonial Ireland reconstructing a national identity, so as to honor and justify the multiplicity of voices raised during and after independence campaigns.

Joycean postcolonial modernism, in this light, comprises technical innovations and ideological revolution in order to respond to the new nation in the becoming. As Kiberd suggests, Joyce’s modernism differs from European modernism precisely in its representation of social heteroglossia: in its effort to “write a narrative of the colonisers and colonised, in which the symbiotic relation between the two becomes

manifest,” and in the attempt to “imagine a meaningful modernity which was more open to the full range of voices in Ireland than any nationalism which founded itself on the restrictive apparatus of the colonial state” (344-45). In Joyce’s schema, Kiberd emphasizes, Ireland “was one of those liminal zones” where “all binary thinking was nullified, and where there could be a celebration of manly women and of womanly men” (344). Joyce’s representation of manly Molly and womanly Bloom exemplifies, as it were, the manifestation of adulteration: both figures transgress the “purity” demanded by patriarchal law and the imperial/nationalist project and thus embody a third existence beyond dichotomy. Welden Thornton asserts that Joyce’s art is “a reconciliation of opposites” (41), but Joyce in effect goes a step further: his art is rather the reconstruction out of the reconciliation of opposites, just as Bakhtinian polyphonic orchestration of heteroglossia aims to formulate a new construct from the mere display of differences, a third force, brand-new and radically revolutionary, out of the negotiation of binary structures.

This characteristic leads to an even more remarkable feature of Joycean postcolonial modernism, which distinguishes itself from European metropolitan modernism in its active invitation of a third party into its scheme of inventing the nation. After all, adultery requires a third party—the outsider—to intrude into the framework of marriage bond. By acquiescing in Boylan’s affair with Molly and inviting Stephen into his family, Bloom deliberately breaks this bond, and in so doing simultaneously sets himself and Molly free. To put it differently, adultery as a thematic and social strategy blurs the boundaries between, say, center and margin, inside and outside. Bloom, the husband inside the marriage contract, is turned into the cuckolded outsider, while Boylan, the adulterer outside the marriage contract, becomes the victimizing insider. But in introducing Stephen into the family, Bloom overturns the power relation of the cuckold as outsider, and emerges as an active agent eagerly trespassing on the borderline between inside-outside and breaking the confines of the marriage bond. Strategic adultery also undermines the social myth of binary oppositions, transforming Self-Other dichotomy into a more open triangular structure which leaves a space for the voice beyond dualism. It is here that Joyce may help

Bakhtin out. As emphasized repeatedly, rather than reestablishing the binary opposition of Self-Other, Bakhtin tries to negotiate between them and pluralize the dual structure. But he never specifies his point, a lack which results in the reduction of his reaccentuation of the Self-Other relationship to another dichotomy. And yet Bakhtin does suggest the triangular structure of dialogue, which comprises the addresser, the addressee, and the superaddressee, the third party ever-present in an interlocution. Silent it may be, and yet the presupposition of the superaddressee essentially expands a two-person dialogue into a three-member triologue, and potentially transgresses the boundaries of Self-Other dualism. This silent, ever-present third party in Bakhtin's dialogical scheme is brought out and made concrete by Joyce in his active invitation of a third party into the family unit and national construction. No longer silent and invisible, this third party participates in dialogue and contributes to adulteration.

Adultery/adulteration, indeed, breaks the boundaries between center and periphery, inside and outside. But C. L. Innes argues that Joyce portrays Bloom as an insider rather than an outsider: Bloom's detailed consciousness of Irish history, culture, and geography, and his awareness of himself as an Irishman, not an Other, unite him with the inside readers of *Ulysses* and the inside community depicted by Joyce. Innes remarks that Joyce, writing *Ulysses* during the period when Ireland was struggling for independence, might have wished to constitute a readership that would identify Bloom as one among themselves and reject an outdated and xenophobic nationalism unable to recognize Bloom as an insider. By providing inside knowledge knowable only to the inside circle of Dublin community, Innes goes on, Joyce turns the Irish colonized into the insider, and the British ruler into the outsider, who lacks the knowledge and authority necessary for claiming and possessing the text (153-54). Joyce may have portrayed Bloom as an insider, a man among the inner circle of the Dublin community, and it is true that *Ulysses* abounds with inside knowledge familiar only to members of the community. But rather than turning outsider into insider, and insider into outsider, Joyce in fact endeavors to eliminate the boundaries between inside and outside: an adulterate, Bloom is both an insider and an outsider, and so is Molly. This adulterant

subject position enables Bloom to herald the construction of a new Irish state, which is itself adulterant in structure. What is important, accordingly, is not the reversion or redefinition of inside-outside, but the eradication of the fixed borderline between them. After all, it is of no avail if the boundaries between inside and outside persistently exist to define/confine them. Nationalism of this kind, which embraces the dichotomy of inside-outside, is simply an extension of colonialism, sexist and racist in nature. Kiberd remarks that Joyce admits social adulteration and challenges dualisms, and is aware of the significance of making home in disorder, as colonial/postcolonial modernity involves “perpetual disintegration and renewal” (329). The task to make home in disorder organizes and renews what has disintegrated, but does not eradicate individuality or exclude possibilities, equivalent to Bakhtin’s principle of diversity-in-unity<sup>15</sup>—or probably better rephrased as union-of-diversity—understood not as the reestablishment of boundaries of any kind, but as a cosmopolitan ideal which undermines boundaries and allows for and celebrates the polyphonic orchestration of heteroglossia within the unity or union. Instead of making a fetish of pure Otherness or difference, both Joyce and Bakhtin strive to positively construct something new out of binaries rather than merely subvert the boundaries themselves.

For Joyce and Bakhtin, most importantly, the text as product of and participant in a sociohistorical context could be an active agent in transforming sociohistorical forces. To put it more precisely: the power of textual representation lies in its potential for the reenactment of what has happened or is happening, allowing the sociohistorical to be examined and investigated, in the hope of casting insight into the status quo and even leading to its transformation. Pericles Lewis sees *Ulysses* as such a text: “[The events in the text] are at once re-enactments of past mythical events and perhaps gestures towards a future historical reality, one that, in the shape of an independent Ireland, was just emerging as Joyce wrote the novel” (49). One might add that in reenacting the past with a twist, Joyce actively participates in rethinking the present

---

<sup>15</sup> Gardiner argues that Bakhtin strives to “think through the ramifications of the cardinal principle of ‘unity-in-diversity’” (1998, 142). But in fact Bakhtin objects to the idea of unity-in-diversity, which ignores or even eliminates diversity; he seeks instead to achieve the aim of diversity-in-unity (though he does not use the term). See *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 274.

and forging a more open and less oppressive future. This, as a matter of fact, is the essence of the Bakhtinian chronotope, which is not simply a much-used term referring to a technical device: the significance of the chronotope rests on its potential for textual reenactment of the past with some revision in the present so as to sociohistorically enact divergent and prosperous possibilities for an alternative future. Here once again Joyce complements what Bakhtin leaves unsaid: the significance of chronotopic reenactments, which occur frequently in Joyce's text. Duffy correctly points out that Joyce in *Ulysses* has succeeded in "mapping some notions of independence" (21-22). But textual independence in a troubled land is not enough: prospectively at least, this textual independence must lead to some kind of ideological or even sociopolitical independence. This could be regarded as the value of *Ulysses* as a postcolonial modernist text: it blueprints a measure for genuine Irish freedom, a blueprint waiting to be put into practice. Similarly, the individual as textual may transfigure sociohistorical forces while shaped by them, just as Bakhtinian subjectivity is forged by social reality but possesses the power to reaccentuate it. This may explain Joyce's depiction of the process of Stephen, Bloom, and Molly's union and liberation: for individual freedom potentially liberates social ideology under confinement, and eventually leads to larger-scale national and cultural liberation.

Interpreting the implication of polyphony, Burton argues for Bakhtin's appreciation of ethics over aesthetics: rather than a "mere technique, a means to a high literary end," polyphony should be understood as "a rich embodiment of social life whose most important implications are ethical or political, not—at least not traditionally—aesthetic" (533). Notwithstanding his theories of aesthetics—of discourse, of speech genres, of the novel, etc.—what Bakhtin values is the ethical end of aesthetic strategies, ethics understood not as moralism or didacticism, but in terms of human experience as social involvement in historico-cultural reality. Bakhtin's attention, it could fairly be said, always falls on the human being as a social existence rather than as an abstract biological being, and on that human being's relation to sociohistorical contexts. His emphasis on "Being-as-event" reveals his concerns with the affinity between the human being and the social reality of everyday life, and



indicates the importance of participating in and being responsible or answerable to actual daily life. For Bakhtin, a text may be artistically aesthetic, and yet it should also be ethical: it should be related to human beings in the context of sociohistorical reality and potentially illuminate the context. In other words, Bakhtin appreciates the text as possessing both aesthetic and ethical ends. This accentuation of the ethical function of the text rooted in everyday life echoes and helps to account for Joyce's restoration of the human body at the finale of *Ulysses*, which ends with "Penelope," the most "human" and only episode dominated entirely by human voice, not with "Ithaca," the episode in which mechanical catechism intrudes upon and replaces human voice. Critics have noted Joyce's positive attitude toward social reality of everyday life. Nolan reads Joyce's texts as a celebration of urban life, "happily raiding the resources of modern technology both for subject matter and stylistic or typographical play" (1). Deane also comments on Joyce's embrace of the external world, viewing him as "one of the few authors who legitimizes the modern world, seeing its apparent randomness and alienation as instances of an underlying diversity and communion" (1990, 44). Nolan and Deane may somewhat overstate their cases: under surveillance, Bloom in the mechanical world of "Ithaca" could not possibly be "happy," and in his exposure of the hostile mechanical world, Joyce anatomizes rather than "legitimizes" the modern world. But they are right that Joyce incorporates the diversity of social reality into his text to reflect the complexity of modern urban life. To revise Nolan's and Deane's statements, we may add that Joyce's celebration of modern urban life depends on one premise: to transform technology for human use. The emphasis, in other words, falls on the human being in social reality, not technology; it is an emphasis appealing to an ethical end.

In the light of Bakhtin's theories, this research focuses on *Ulysses* as a postcolonial modernist text, in which Joyce appropriates modernist aesthetic strategies to serve the purpose of narrating the nation. To adopt Bakhtin fruitfully, a detailed reading of the text is indispensable, for only minute discursive analyses could possibly disclose the interaction of discursive mutation and sociohistorical contexts, and cast light on the connotations of the text as mediator and justify the applicability of

Bakhtinian theories. This, however, is often missing from Bakhtinian readings of Joyce or modernist texts on the whole. As both Joyce and Bakhtin endeavor to turn the hostility of binary opposition into polyphonic orchestration of heteroglossia and creative power, the dialogue between them results both in mutual enlightenment and interillumination—to use Bakhtin’s own words—and in the triangulation of the dialogical binary structure: it is not a two-person dialogue between Joyce and Bakhtin, but a three-member triologue between Joyce, Bakhtin, and postcolonial Ireland. To put it another way, the dialogue engenders a third textual construct, radically new and ideologically revolutionary, which is the reinvention of a postcolonial Ireland as narrated in *Ulysses*: a new Ireland writing a new version of postcolonial history, composed of adulterant postcolonial citizen subjects, and creating a new heteroglot postcolonial nation. Significantly, when Ireland struggled for independence—and when Russia underwent revolutionary turmoils—the Jews, under the intervention of the British imperial power, were striving to establish in Palestine a national home.<sup>16</sup> The Joyce-Bakhtin dialogue turns out to be also a triologue between the Irish, the Russians, and the Jews, shedding light on the three peoples’ way “home.”

To reflect the triangulation of the Joyce-Bakhtin dialogue, the structure of this study is trinal, divided into three chapters dealing with three episodes respectively. Haunted by the ghost of his mother, symbolic of the nightmarish history of the Irish colonial past, Stephen attempts to wake from the nightmare and render historical impact less harmful and more bearable. From the Bakhtinian notion of the chronotope, the first chapter examines Stephen’s ambivalent attitude toward history, and concentrates on how he mediates between the past and the present chronotopically, in expectation of redeeming the nightmarish impact of the past and transforming it into creative power for the construction of a divergent, ongoing, and respectful postcolonial future. This chapter deals mainly with “Telemachus,” “Nestor,” and “Proteus,” the son’s search for the father—“father” in the sense of the key leading the son out of the labyrinth of historical nightmares—but also discusses “Aeolus” and

---

<sup>16</sup> For details, see Tom Segev, *One Palestine, Complete: Jews and Arabs under the British Mandate*; and Naomi Shepherd, *Ploughing Sand: British Rule in Palestine 1917-48*.

“Scylla and Charybdis,” the episodes which climax chronotopic reenactments as Stephen’s construction of alternative versions of history.

The next chapter focuses on Bloom, the socio-racial outsider inside the Dublin community. A nomad on the alterity of inside and outside, Bloom tries to negotiate between them, and meanwhile to make a habitable home in disorder and nomadism. In the light of the Bakhtinian concept of architectonics, this chapter investigates Bloom’s relation to colonial Irish society and inquires into his construction of personal identity out of the negotiation and transformation of the dichotomy of inside-outside, private-public, etc. This new subject position opts neither for solipsism nor for collectivization, but instead wanders and mediates between the two extremes, maintaining individuality within community; it is an essentially plural subjectivity, always being with an other—as Bloom is always with Molly, his superaddressee, chronotopically. “Sirens,” “Cyclops,” and “Nausicaa” are the episodes for discussion, where songs as public voice threaten to collectivize Bloom, who reaccentuates them with private memories to avoid the danger of collectivization, and at the same time strives not to succumb to the unconscious fears and desires of the private.

In answer to Bloom’s idea of liberation, Molly dominates the third chapter, acting as Bloom’s superaddressee and then his respondent. A migrant herself, Molly literally transgresses boundaries of histories, cultures, and societies. Her sexual body represents also a textual body, where Bloom and Stephen are textualized and united, and where sociohistorical materials such as issues of sexuality, war, patriarchy/matriarchy, and petty nationalism are woven and unwoven into a new texture/text, which overturns the colonial relationship of domination and subjection and points to the possibility of open-ended cosmopolitan nationalism. Here Bakhtin’s idea of the grotesque body is helpful. Both personal and universal, the grotesque body incorporates various materials and regenerates what is incorporated; it is also a body undermining boundaries of genders, races, and cultures, a boundless, ongoing, cosmopolitan body indeed. As a close reading of Molly’s answers to Bloom and Stephen, this chapter exemplifies the principal Bakhtinian concept of dialogue in detail, and deals with the three most dialogical episodes in the text: “Circe,” the

dramatic episode consisting of literal dialogues, “Ithaca,” the catechetical episode of questions and answers, and “Penelope,” the coda in answer to all previous episodes. Through the dialogical process of Molly’s eventual affirmation of Bloom and renunciation of Boylan, the way to construct a postcolonial nation which leads to genuine freedom is revealed.

In his reading of *Ulysses*, Duffy argues that the text “is not a manifesto for postcolonial freedom, but rather a representation of the discourses and regimes of colonial power being attacked by counterhegemonic strategies that were either modeled on the oppressor’s discourses or were only beginning to be enunciated in other forms” (21). *Ulysses* may not be a manifesto for postcolonial freedom, but a Bakhtinian reading of the text indicates that it is not so much a mere representation of counterhegemonic discourses as the negotiation between hegemonic and counterhegemonic discourses. This negotiation transforms both discourses and engenders a new one, which might be the right discursive textualization for the draft of a manifesto for postcolonial freedom. Through the reenactment and reaccentuation of past chronotopes in the present, and through the representation of the textual union of Stephen, Bloom, and Molly who form a new open, decentered, triangular family unit which replaces the traditional patriarchal family unit, Joyce suggests the possibility of undermining the closed binary structure of colonialism, and offers a measure for the achievement of real postcolonial freedom, in the hope that textual freedom may finally lead to ideological and sociohistorical liberation—as long as the textual is enacted sociohistorically.

## CHAPTER ONE

### Chronotopic Encounter and Reenactment: Stephen's Reaccentuation of History

In spite of the absence of a consistent and systematic dialectics of history in his thinking, Bakhtin is not blind to the evolution of sociocultural history and its impact on the individual. His theorization of the rise of the novel as a genre is itself historical insofar as it postulates the novel's emergence as correlative to verbal-ideological disintegration and sociopolitical decentralization "in the history of European civilization" (*DI* 11).<sup>1</sup> To gain access to Bakhtin's perception of history, it would be necessary to comprehend the concept of the chronotope, which highlights his perspective of history in relation to literary texts. The study of the chronotopic relationship between historical contexts and literary texts is therefore "a historical poetics," as the subtitle of the Chronotope essay indicates. Literally time-space, the chronotope signifies "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature" (*DI* 84). Bakhtin regards time as the fourth dimension of space, stressing the inseparability of the two in the literary chronotope:

[S]patial and temporal indicators are fused into one carefully thought-out, concrete whole. Time, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. (*DI* 84)

It is the intersection and fusion of the two indicators that characterizes the chronotope as "a formally constitutive category of literature" (*DI* 84). Analogous to an "organizing [center] for the fundamental narrative events of the novel," or to the "place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied" (*DI* 250), the chronotope thus bears the significance of representing textualization: it "function[s] as the primary

---

<sup>1</sup> Bakhtin relates the emergence and development of the novel to the historical becoming of European civilization, arguing that the novel "becomes the dominant genre" in transitional eras such as the Hellenic period, the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and the second half of the eighteenth century, when European civilization evolves from social isolation and cultural deafness into "international and interlingual contacts and relationships" (*DI* 5, 11). For details, see "Epic and Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination*, pp. 3-40.

means for materializing time in space,” and “emerges as a center for *concretizing representation*, as a force giving body to the entire novel.” In this center of concretized time-space resides “the meaning that shapes narrative” (*DI* 250, emphases added). Chronotopicity, therefore, “lie[s] in the very event of representation” (Wall and Thomson 48), as all events and actions in the novel, whether physical or mental, occur ineluctably in chronotopes, where spatialized time and temporalized space interact with the speaking person and are laid bare for investigation. The chronotope is accordingly “a way of understanding experience,” “a specific form-shaping ideology for understanding the nature of events and actions” in literary texts (Morson and Emerson 367), and could act as a means for analyzing the four-dimensional world reflected in a text.

The fact that a chronotope specifies a fused sense of time and space renders each chronotope unique. Distinct in the fusion of specific temporal and spatial indicators, the chronotope is “highly sensitive to historical change”: for “different societies and periods result in different chronotopes both inside and outside literary texts” (Holquist 1990, 112). Consequently, the chronotope succeeds not only in elucidating represented events and actions incorporated into a text, but also in apprehending and interpreting the outer world—the world of the author, whose chronotope rests outside the text but runs tangentially to textual chronotopes and shapes them (*DI* 254-57). Despite the fact that Bakhtin emphasizes the presence and employment of the chronotope in literary works, its function and significance is also historical, cultural, and social: for it measures “how, in a particular genre or age, ‘real historical time and space’ and ‘actual historical persons’ are articulated, and also how fictional time, space, and character are constructed in relation to one another” (Vice 201). As Michael Holquist suggests, the chronotope may function as a medium for the study of “the relation *between* any text and its times,” and could serve as “a fundamental tool for a broader social and historical analysis” (1990, 113). Sue Vice also points out Bakhtin’s sociopolitical concern as revealed in “his historical and generic charting of the chronotope”: the subtitle to the Chronotope essay, “Notes toward a Historical Poetics,” evinces Bakhtin’s interest “in how texts relate to their social and political

contexts, rather than in simply drawing up a typology of how time and space relate to each other within different texts” (201). This may explain why Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson define the chronotope in culture as a “field of historical, biographical, and social relations” (371). As the location where a specific time-space encounters another, intersecting and interacting, the chronotope is itself the target for historical, biographical, and social investigation. Vice’s delineation of the three levels on which the chronotope operates well summarizes the consequence of the chronotope to a literary text and sociohistorical contexts:

first, as the means by which a text represents history; second, as the relation between images of time and space in the novel, out of which any representation of history must be constructed; and third, as a way of discussing the formal properties of the text itself, its plot, narrator, and relation to other texts. (201-2)

Significantly, chronotopicity resides not solely in literary images; languages and words are likewise chronotopic (*DI* 251): for different historical times and social spaces endow discourses with different meanings and interpretations. To put it more broadly, nothing related to ideology can be detached from chronotopicity. Rich in historicity, the chronotope can thus act as a strategy for exploring a text’s relationship with historical contexts, whether external history as represented in the text, the text’s own images of time and space, or the text’s formal construction generated in a specific era.

Chronotopicity, in this light, is essentially dialogical. As Bakhtin declares: “Chronotopes are mutually inclusive, they co-exist, they may be interwoven with, replace or oppose one another, contradict one another or find themselves in ever more complex interrelationships.” Above all, their “interactions . . . are *dialogical*” (*DI* 252). Although the interlocutors of a dialogue congregate in the chronotope of the main speaking person, each interlocutor may belong to a specific chronotope. When the main interlocutor enters into a dialogue with another, s/he conjures up the chronotope of the other in an act of chronotopic encounter. In this way, “all dialogues take place in a given chronotope, and chronotopes enter into dialogic relations” (Morson and

Emerson 427). The dialogue of chronotopes is so prevalent that it occurs in almost every human action, including thought and experience (Morson 1085). If history is understood as the thought and experience of the past, it may be defined as the dialogic encounter of chronotopes, conjured up by the speaking person into the present time-space in an attempt to grasp the meaning of the past, in the hope of enlightening the present and the future.

In spite of his emphasis on the relation to the past, Bakhtin's focus falls on the present: he refutes mere nostalgia for the estranged past disconnected from the present, which he calls "ghost." In his critique of Goethe's works, Bakhtin articulates his view of the necessary past in contrast to the "ghost":

[Goethe is characterized by his] dislike for the *estranged* past, for the past in and of itself, that past of which the romantics were so fond. He wanted to see *necessary connections* between this past and the living present, to understand the *necessary place* of this past in the *unbroken line of historical development*. And the isolated, estranged chunk of the past was for him a "ghost," profoundly loathsome and even frightening. (SG 33)

For Bakhtin, to "mix the past and the present mechanically, without making any real temporal connection," as evidenced by the stories Goethe hears from tour-guides, is "profoundly offensive," for this kind of tales are analogous to "ghosts," lacking "any *necessary* and visible connection with the surrounding living reality" (SG 32-33). What Bakhtin accentuates is the continuation of history, a "necessary and creative (historically productive) link" (SG 33) between the past and the present, one that traces the impact of the past upon the present instead of searching for "ghosts."<sup>2</sup> To put it another way, Bakhtin prefers a chronotopic encounter of two temporal indicators to a monologue of the estranged past. "[T]he past itself," Bakhtin emphasizes, "must be *creative*" and "must have its *effect* in the present" (SG 34). The creative effect of the past relies on its chronotopic encounter with the present, or, as Morson indicates, depends on its entering the "openness of time" (1073)—in Bakhtinian terminology,

---

<sup>2</sup> Joyce's impatience with revivalists could be said to derive from the same reason: they sought an idealized yet antiquated past rather than directing their attention to contemporary reality.



the “great time” (*SG* 4), i.e., the limitless continuation of historical time in which “all utterances are linked to all others, both those from the primordial past and those in the furthest reach of the future” (Holquist 1986, xxi). Within the great time, the present dialogizes the past and sheds light on the future, and all meanings experience “subsequent development[s]” and are renewed constantly. As Bakhtin states, “Nothing is absolutely dead: every meaning will have its homecoming festival” as long as it enters the great time of chronotopic encounters (*SG* 170). Bakhtin’s emphasis on “historical multitemporality” (*SG* 26)—remnants of the past, existence of the present, and rudiments of and tendencies toward the future—demonstrates his view of the inseparable and constructive relation between the three dimensions of time which authentically regenerates the old and forges the new. Morson has it that Bakhtin believes “deeply in tradition,” viewed “not as a compendium of outmoded social values but as a great liberating force” (1089). Persuasive it might be, yet Morson’s argument needs slight modification, for what interests Bakhtin is dialogue with tradition rather than tradition itself. It is the interaction with tradition which turns outmoded social values into a liberating force, bestowing upon the past creative and renewing capacity. As Samuel Kinser remarks:

Every gesture, every discourse, every sign is dialogically ever available for reinterpretation from a discursively ever-more-complex point of view, so that the past can never be considered closed, hegemonized, monologized in meaning, so that the past will continue to act on the present in ever new and unpredictable ways. (310)

For Bakhtin, the past is never a closed system in its relation to the present; it acts as a counterpoise to the present, exerts pressure on the present, and allows a chronotopic dialogue to be enacted between them. Many of Bakhtin’s critical theories, in fact, could be regarded as the result of his dialogue with the past—so is Joyce’s work, or literary work in general.

However dialogical the chronotopic encounter is, it always requires the subject to generate the chronotope. What concerns Bakhtin in terms of the concept of the chronotope is indeed the human subject’s role in relation to historical contexts. While

the world is in the act of becoming, the human “emerges *along with the world*” and reflects its “historical emergence,” and his/her becoming therefore “depends upon the degree of assimilation of real historical time” (SG 23, 21). To phrase it differently, in recognition of the impact of the past upon the present, the subject must perceive and participate in “real historical time”—the time of the present—to achieve a fuller becoming. Morson points out the writer’s ineluctable bond to tradition, which is fundamentally a modernist issue: in the course of reading and dialogizing works of the past, the writer recognizes his/her inherited potentials and nurtures two sorts of intention, “the expression of specific meanings and the creation of potentials” (1088). The best form of interpretation—or artistic work—the writer could achieve appreciates both sorts of intention and seeks to “realize some of the work’s potentials,” and, more importantly, creates “a dialogue between inherited potentials and *current experience*” (1089, emphases added). In other words, to construct an influential work that dialogizes the inherited and the current, the writer needs to generate chronotopic encounters between the past and the present, in expectation of giving new meanings to the past, enriching the present, and enlightening the future. The creation of a dialogue between inherited potentials and current experience is hence the writer’s lifelong task, through which the writer can assimilate chronotopes to the greatest extent and achieve the fullest becoming, and at the same time forge the best form of textual interpretation.

In his study of Bakhtin’s dialogism, Holquist invokes the distinction between *fabula* and *syuzhet*: the difference between “the way in which an event unfolds as a brute chronology (*fabula*), and as the ‘same’ event, ordered in a mediating telling of it, a construction in which the chronology might be varied or even reversed, so as to achieve a particular effect.” “*Chronotope*,” Holquist concludes, “*is the indissoluble combination of these two elements*” (1990, 113): on the one hand the represented event is laid bare chronologically, and on the other hand it is mediated and processed artistically. Or as Vice puts it, *fabula* and *syuzhet*, or story and plot, “are one,” the latter being the artistic rearrangement of the former, from which the latter is constructed (214). To read Stephen’s notion of history in this light, his speculation

about history as both *nacheinander* and *nebeneinander* in the “Proteus” episode echoes the chronotope’s two elements. History is a compound of *nacheinander* and *nebeneinander*: the sequence of historical events happen one after another in “[a] very short space of time” and, rearranged by the author, emerge side by side in “very short times of space” (*U* 3.11-12). What Stephen does on 16 June 1904, it could be said, is incorporate the brute chronology of events *and* mediate between them, in an attempt to achieve the effect he desires. The entry into the sphere of meanings of history, as Bakhtin emphasizes, is “accomplished only through the gates of the chronotope” (*DI* 258). To acquire a better understanding of historical discourse and to establish an acceptable relation to history, it is necessary for Stephen to conjure up the chronotopes of the past and dialogize them in his own time-space, through a combination of *fabula* and *syuzhet*, for the construction of a divergent version of history.

The art of “Nestor,” as both the Gilbert and Linati Schemata indicate, is history. The issue of history constantly dominates the episode: it begins with Stephen’s history class in which he questions students about Pyrrhus and his campaigns against the Romans, and continues with his meditation on the actuality of historical narrative and his conversation—history being the main topic—with the schoolmaster, Deasy. Not only does history prevail in “Nestor,” but it also, though implicitly, dominates the previous episode, “Telemachus,” and carries over into the following “Proteus.” When Stephen converses with Buck Mulligan in the Martello Tower and contemplates alone on Sandymount Strand, what lingers in his mind is still the issue of history: whether in the form of recollections of May Dedalus or philosophical texts and historical events in Ireland. It is not surprising that many critics have interpreted the “Nestor” episode in terms of history. Trevor L. Williams, for example, discusses “Nestor” from the Marxist point of view by construing the economic relationship between Deasy and Stephen as an echo of Marx’s critique of feudalism (148), in which “hegemony work[ing] by consent” (Haines, Mulligan, Conmee, and Deasy) exploits “counterhegemony” (Stephen and Bloom), while the latter attempts to undermine the power of the former (xiv). James Fairhall reads “Nestor” as Joyce’s reaction to World War I: Joyce represents images of the bloody and ferocious War in the episode and

creates the character Deasy to personify the mentality of militarism and the ineffectual father figure (169). Garry M. Leonard presents in “Nestor” a Lacanian interpretation of the fictive construction of personal and national histories (“His[§]tory” and “History,” in Leonard’s words), and traces Stephen’s struggle with the actuality of historical narrative and the conflict between the two histories (170-83). Robert Spoo’s metahistorical discussion shows “how dominant notions of history are both figured and resisted in the Joycean text” (9): he construes “Nestor” and “Proteus” as conflicts between history and art, and offers an intertextual reading of the two episodes by exploring Laforgue, Pater, Vico, Yeats, and Ferrero’s influence on Joyce’s text.

These readings undoubtedly shed light on the Joycean text, well-known for its confusion and complication, but there seems to be something missing from each reading. Williams points out the conflict between hegemony and counterhegemony, yet does not say exactly how the counterhegemonic Stephen copes with the hegemonic Deasy. Leonard remarks on Stephen’s ambivalent and confusing attitude toward history, but fails to specify how Stephen breaks away from the labyrinth of ambivalence. Among these critics, Spoo is the only one who brilliantly notes the relationship between “Nestor” and “Proteus,” and yet he passes over numerous recurrences in Stephen’s interior dialogue in the “Proteus” episode. Enda Duffy registers these recurrences, and states that throughout “Proteus” Stephen “quotes most of the memorable phrases and motifs of the two earlier episodes” (28); however, Duffy considers these recurrences as only mockery, “the most pallid form of subversion” (29), and fails to interpret them from a more constructive perspective.

I will be arguing that “Proteus” could be interpreted as the influx of chronotopic encounters: Stephen assimilates historical discourses in “Telemachus” and “Nestor,” conjures them up dialogically into his time-space, and meanwhile transforms these incorporated discourses, in order to create an acceptable version of history which, instead of stifling the artist, potentially liberates him from his conflict with the nightmarish impact of the past. Spoo contends that Stephen attempts to “establish a healthy relationship to history and to forge a usable past that will inform but not deform his aesthetic sense and art” (91). To read “Proteus” in this regard, the already-

transformed discursive recurrences in the episode may be seen as Stephen's rejoinder to received views of history invoked from other chronotopes, as well as an avenue to his mature historical/artistic creation. Notwithstanding his refusal to answer the call of hegemony ("Call: no answer" [U 3.278]), Stephen nevertheless answers through the form of chronotopic encounter in his mind: he prefers to respond to incorporated concepts of history mentally in his own time-space, entering into dialogue with them and transforming them into his own, rather than accepting them blindly or defying them openly. If "Nestor" and "Telemachus" could be regarded as the call or question posed by established concepts of history, "Proteus" might be viewed as Stephen's answer to them. A Bakhtinian dialogue is taking place between Stephen's interlocutors and himself, between history and art, between the past and the present, between "old wisdom" (U 2.376) and revolutionary spirit, between received concepts and mediating mind, and, in Bakhtinian terms, between authoritative discourse and internally persuasive discourse. When the experience of chronotopic encounters is organized systematically and artistically—or when discourses incorporated at random are turned into an artistic combination of *fabula* and *syuzhet*—a form of interpretation, which is both a work of art and a chapter of history, is created, as manifested in "The Parable of the Plums" and the Shakespeare theory.

Playing the role of counselor-like Nestor in the episode of his namesake, Garrett Deasy is the central figure with whom Stephen enters into a dialogue, both literally and metaphysically. Their conversation occupies most of the episode, while in the following episode the schoolmaster's discourses recur in Stephen's mind as he recalls them chronotopically. Trevor L. Williams maintains that history in "Nestor" is a terrain of struggle for interpretation, which, once won, becomes fixed and puts thought to sleep (146). It is true that two voices—Deasy's and Stephen's—struggle for centrality, but the victory of one voice does not necessarily "put thought to sleep." Bakhtin indicates the openness of interpretation: "There is neither a first nor a last word and there are no limits to the dialogic context" (SG 170). If Deasy represents hegemony, as Williams claims, Stephen as counterhegemony could always challenge Deasy's fixed interpretation and undermine his authority, as the authoritative

discourse could always be transformed into innerly persuasive discourse. Rather than fixing them, Stephen's dialogical meditation upon history and chronotopic response to Deasy's discourses widen the scope of historical discourses and interpretations.

Critics have noted that Deasy represents the stasis of history, that is, dead and unprofitable historical dogma. Suzette A. Henke equates him with "historical determinism" (40). Spoo also relates him to the embodiment of "personal and historical stagnation" (94). In his colloquy with Deasy, Stephen associates the schoolmaster with "old wisdom" (*U* 2.376), whose discourses abound in such clichés as "To learn one must be humble. But life is the great teacher" (*U* 2.406-7).

Throughout their conversation, Deasy repeatedly refers to historical events for support, though most of them are historical nonsense: the pride of the English (*U* 2.243), the Orange lodges' activities (*U* 2.270-72), and the fallacy that Ireland never allowed the immigration of the Jews (*U* 2.442). These inaccurate historical materials signify on the one hand Deasy's ignorance and impotence as a counselor and father figure, but on the other hand the arbitrary nature of history: as authority, Deasy can misquote and misinterpret historical materials to strengthen the authoritativeness of his discourses and thus his power. It is this stifling arbitrariness that irritates Stephen, who is anxious to wake from the haunting nightmare induced by the dead history Deasy imposes on him. Deasy's espousal of dead history—or "estranged past," in Bakhtin's words—denotes the suspension of time, or, to borrow from Spoo, "personal and historical stagnation": time stops proceeding forward. In Deasy's study, Stephen responds to the schoolmaster's advice mentally: "The same room and hour. The same wisdom: and I the same. Three times now. Three nooses round me here" (*U* 2.233-34). The phrase "the same" is repeated three times, suggesting the stasis of time/history which suffocates Stephen. Stephen, however, endeavors to escape from the stagnation of time so that he may escape from the nightmare of the arbitrariness of history. His strategy, as shown in "Proteus," is discursive assimilation and reaccentuation, or dialogically chronotopic encounters and reenactments.

Just as Bakhtin argues for a close relationship between past and present, Stephen, however unwillingly, never denies the ties to the past. "The cords of all link back,

strandentwining cable of all flesh” (*U* 3.37). Literally, Stephen means that the umbilical cords of all mankind link back to the first parents, Adam and Eve. But figuratively, he implies the unavoidable relation of the present to the past, a relation which he could never break himself off from. Therefore, when he muses that “Father and Son are consubstantial” (*U* 3.49-50), he refers both to the consubstantiality of the Trinity, and to the connection between past and present: the son always inherits something from his parents. This heritage passes from generation to generation and yet is always detectable in the son. When his “consubstantial father’s voice” (*U* 3.62) sounds in his mind, consequently, Stephen is entering into an interior dialogue and chronotopic encounter with both Simon Dedalus and the past: he appropriates and parodies his father’s discourses, transforms them into his own, and elaborates upon them into a scene of mental drama which might happen in the Goulding family, a scene common in “[h]ouses of decay” (*U* 3.105) where Stephen is mistaken for a “dun” and “has nothing to sit down on” (*U* 3.71, 94). To some extent, the mental drama could be seen as Stephen’s creation, which he constructs by assimilating discourses from the past and transforming and rearranging them in his chronotope.

To understand the difference between Deasy’s and Stephen’s attitudes toward history, Henri Bergson’s distinction between pure “memory” and “duration” may be helpful. Wyndham Lewis usefully defines Bergson’s “duration”:

“Duration” is what occurs when we completely telescope the past into the present, and make our life a fiery point “eating” like an acetylene flame into the future. “Duration” is *inside us*, not outside. “Duration” is the *succession* of our conscious states, but *all felt at once* and somehow caught in the act of generating the “new,” as “free” as Rousseau’s natural man released from conventional constraints, but with much more élan . . . It is the organization of the past into a moving and changing present, into an incessantly renewed intensive quantity . . . (1993, 411)

With the emphasis on mediation and regeneration, duration is similar to *syuzhet*, the reconstruction of incorporated material. Memory, on the other hand, is “unorganized,” a “succession of extended units” and “degraded *spatial-time*” (Lewis 1993, 411),

corresponding to *fabula*. To put it in Bakhtinian terms, if “duration” resembles the spirit of dialogism, pure memory shows the inclination for monologism, which could turn into dialogic through artistic rearrangement. As a ventriloquist of authoritative discourses—of Christian faith, of anti-Semitism, of misogyny—Deasy indulges in historical discourses from memory without organizing or renewing them, leaving them as decayed and monologic. Stephen, however, negotiates between memory and duration: he absorbs these discourses chronologically and reworks them chronotopically, and in so doing enlivens the dead discourses and releases them from the prison of pure memory. Spoo has it that Stephen’s absorption and repetition of Deasy’s discourses as a parallel text within his interior dialogue demonstrates that “historical discourse is always already the product of prior textualizations, that its power as cultural memory represses its constructedness, the discursive masks it must don in order to project an image of originality and univocity” (97). The historical power of cultural memory may repress the constructedness of historical discourse, but the discourse’s scope is widened as a result of the artist’s reworking, which makes possible innovation and originality.

By reaccentuating and organizing Deasy’s discourses, Stephen renews the decayed discourses and in the meantime presents a different version of historical reading. For Deasy, all Irishmen are sons of the ancient kings of Ireland: “We are all Irish, all kings’ sons” (*U* 2.279-80). When the phrase “all kings’ sons” recurs in Stephen’s interior dialogue in “Proteus,” it acquires a double-meaning distinct from the original: “The Bruce’s brother, Thomas Fitzgerald, silken knight, Perkin Warbeck . . . All kings’ sons. Paradise of pretenders then and now” (*U* 3.313-17). As he repeats the phrase, Stephen refers it not solely to those pretenders who, coveting the throne, claim to be the heir to it, but also to the Irish colonized, who, as subjects of English colonialism, are indeed all the English kings’ sons. Religiously conservative and dogmatic, Deasy maintains that “All human history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God” (*U* 2.380-81). Yet for Stephen, a rebel against religion, the great goal humans move toward is death, which no one can resist: “Dogskull, dogsniff, eyes on the ground, moves to one great goal” (*U* 3.350-51). Being “just,” one of



Deasy's "big words," is taken for granted by the schoolmaster: "We are a generous people but we must also be just" (*U* 2.262-64). But Stephen does not believe in the existence of justice when he recalls his exile in Paris: "Yes, used to carry punched tickets to prove an alibi if they arrested you for murder somewhere. Justice" (*U* 3.179-80). Violence ("murder") abounds in history, at all times and in all spaces, and justice is absent rather than granted. As the colonized, the Irish have no control over justice, and are thus unable to be just even if they want to. This may explain why Stephen replies to Deasy that he "fear[s] those big words . . . which make us so unhappy" (*U* 2.264): he recognizes that justice does not belong to the colonized Irish, who, after all, are not justly treated by the imperial ruler. For Deasy the Orangeman, a Fenian refers to a rebel like Stephen (*U* 2.272); yet when the Fenian enters chronotopically into Stephen's speculation in "Proteus," it refers to the persecuted exile, Kevin Egan, whom Stephen associates himself with: as "[s]purned lover" (*U* 3.245) neglected and betrayed by the homeland. By dialogizing and parodying Deasy's discourses in his own time-space, Stephen gives his own interpretation of history and simultaneously renews decayed historical discourse.

Not only do Deasy's discourses signify historical stagnation, but his collections also suggest the stasis of history. In Deasy's study, Stephen notices that "snug in their spooncase of purple plush, faded, the twelve apostles having preached to all the gentiles: world without end" (*U* 2.202-4). Whatever great tasks they had accomplished, the twelve apostles have faded out from the stage of life and stepped into a world of stillness. "Faded," they enter the coffin of history and are shut in there, becoming mere icons decorating an old fogey's room where stale smoky air permeates. Also among Deasy's collections are the Stuart coins, "base treasure of a bog: and ever shall be" (*U* 2.201-2). Minted out of inferior metals in 1689 by James II, these coins no longer circulated as a currency in Deasy's day. They become marks of the past, static, having no further life. The discourse "and ever shall be" serves not merely to parody the *Gloria Patri*, but, more importantly, to emphasize the static state of the coins, which have lost their function as a currency. The phrases "world without end" and "ever shall be" recur in "Proteus" after Stephen's experiment on the authenticity of

“Ineluctable modality of the visible”: “See now. There all the time without you: and ever shall be, world without end” (*U* 3.1, 27-28). The pronoun “you” in the context may refer to the philosophers whose notions of cognition Stephen is pondering and questioning, indicative of the unreliability of their notions. But with the recurrences in mind, we may argue that “you” refers to the apostles, the coins and their coiner, and Deasy: swallowed by time, the apostles and their religion, as well as the coins and the sovereignty that minted them, are trivial and insignificant, and so are Deasy and his historical discourse. And yet the pronoun may also refer to Stephen himself, who, dubious about philosophers’ notions of cognition and impatient with Deasy’s historical dogmatism, is essentially excluded from their “history” and from the possibility of salvation owing to his refusal to embrace that version of history. This historical exclusion accounts for Stephen’s intention to reaccentuate another version of history which would turn exclusion into inclusion and stagnation into potential. By reworking stale historical discourses, Stephen implicitly mocks religion and sovereignty, as well as the representative and proponent of both, Deasy, and at the same time insinuates the domineering power of Deasy’s dogmatic version of history.

Deasy also collects shells, a metamorphosis of coins: “whelks and money cowries and leopard shells: and this, whorled as an emir’s turban, and this, the scallop of saint James. An old pilgrim’s hoard, *dead* treasure, *hollow* shells” (*U* 2.213-16, emphases added). As remnants of the shellfish, whose outer covering remains after the decay of the organism, shells are inevitably related to death, and therefore act as static marks of history. But Stephen also connects them with beauty and power: for, according to Don Gifford, shells symbolize “the beauty, goodness, and wisdom of God” in heraldry and “sovereignty and the power of the gods” as a material providing the Greeks with royal purple dye (34). Gifford’s explanation is convincing, and yet in the context shells function as symbols of power also because they were used as currency in ancient times. This explains why Stephen associates them with the money he receives from Deasy, “A lump in my pocket: symbols soiled by greed and misery” (*U* 2.227-28). Money is equivalent to power, not simply because money brings power, and vice versa, but because only the sovereignty in power can mint coins. As he gives

Stephen money, Deasy in effect stands for power itself, eagerly teaching his subject a lesson about what money is: “Money is power” (*U* 2.237). A preacher of the value of money, Deasy personifies greed, which he, ironically, attributes to the Jewish merchants whom he resents.

In “Laocoon,” William Blake expresses his negative attitude toward money, an attitude similar to Stephen’s association of money with a soiled symbol: “Where any view of Money exists, Art cannot be carried on, but War only”; “Christianity is Art & not Money. Money is its Curse” (776-77). He identifies money with institutions and hence with power: “The True Christian Charity not dependent on Money (the life’s blood of Poor Families), that is, on Caesar or Empire or Natural Religion: Money, which is The Great Satan or Reason, the Root of Good & Evil In The Accusation of Sin” (776). For Blake, imperial and religious institutions engender coercion, misery, and corruption, and, above all, act as the modes of “Empire against Art” (777), which impel Blake, in his imagination, to fight against the institutions. Stephen is not unlike Blake in this regard, for he, too, suffers from the oppression and exploitation by three masters: the English, the Roman, and the Irish. With his pro-English stand, his Christian belief, and his status as an Irish schoolmaster, Deasy represents all three masters in miniature, who in reality takes advantage of Stephen by commanding him to have his letter printed on the press: “I *want* that to be printed and read” (*U* 2.338, emphasis added).

As objects and an image, shells recur in Stephen’s meditation on the strand in “Proteus.” When crushing “wrack and shells” (*U* 3.10-11), Stephen is simultaneously crushing remnants of history—an act suggesting his renunciation of Deasy and his dead, estranged history. In fact, shells undergo metamorphoses in this protean episode. When he treads on sands and shells, Stephen has in mind the concept of shells as money, which he naturally associates with the headmaster: “Wild sea money. Dominie Deasy kens them a” (*U* 3.19-20). By affiliating Deasy with money, Stephen implies once again the schoolmaster’s alignment with power, authority, and the utilitarianism popular in Victorian England, all of which he desires to “crush” or destroy. Later on, “wild sea money” metamorphoses into “human shells” as Stephen surveys the present

scene on the shore and associates it chronotopically with an imaginary scene out of the historical past: “Ringsend: wigwams of brown steersmen and master mariners. Human shells” (*U* 3.156-57). Again, shells are connected with relics of human beings, which once existed but entered history only as the dead—echoing Stephen’s concept of death as the one great goal of human life. When Stephen compares his bad teeth to shells, likewise, he registers the fragility of human life and that he, like all other human beings, will step into history and become relic, lifeless and decayed, a mere “human shell.” He thus attempts to outlive decay by renewing decayed historical discourse. Shells, then, are transformed into a language which “tide and wind have silted here” and is “[h]eavy of the past” (*U* 3.288-91). Despite his ambivalent attitude toward the historical past, Stephen acknowledges his relation to the past and that sands or shells, as historical relics, signify a language recording history, or, more exactly, a dead language recording a dead history. What he strives to do is to renew the dead language—by bringing it into a chronotopic encounter with and reenactment within present circumstances—giving it life potential and relieving himself of its nightmarish pressure: he declines to drown himself in the “shellcocoacoloured” (*U* 3.327) tide of history.

Stephen’s association of shells with language recording history echoes the Victorian philologist Richard Chenevix Trench’s view that language, as the “connecting link between the present and the remotest past,” “stretches back and offers itself for our investigation . . . itself a far more ancient monument and document than any writing which it contains” (45). By “analyzing” the language, Trench “recreate[s] for himself the history of the people speaking that language” and “come[s] to appreciate the divers elements out of which that people was composed” (46). Stephen, however, is unlikely to espouse Trench’s philology, though he may agree with his interest in etymological history. Aware of the paralyzing force of language as ideology, Stephen prefers to reaccentuate and dialogize that language rather than analyze it: for the analysis of a dead language—the tracing of its origin and evolution—does not enliven it but enslaves the analyst to a dead history. Furthermore, Trench’s discourse reflects the Victorian trend of utilitarianism as evinced in *Deasy*: he likens words to

“pieces of money which in the ordinary intercourse of life are passing through our hands,” and regards them as “a currency intellectual and spiritual of no meaner worth,” with which “we have to transact so much of the higher business of our lives” (65). Stephen’s connection of shells with money and language may be ascribed to Trench, or, more exactly, to the Victorian trend in general.<sup>3</sup> But instead of accepting Trench’s philology and the Victorian trend, Stephen prefers to dialogize them chronotopically and create his own philology: a philology of protean discourses rather than linear linguistic history.

When the image of shells recurs again at the near end of “Proteus,” it experiences another metamorphosis: “My cockle hat and staff and hismy sandal shoon” (*U* 3.487-88). Assimilating Ophelia’s discourse, Stephen turns his Latin quarter hat into a cockle hat, his ashplant into a staff, and the shoes he wears into sandal shoon belonging to both Mulligan and himself. As Gifford notes, the cockle hat and the staff are conventional metaphors for the “lover as pilgrim” (65). To extend Gifford’s explanation, we may suggest that Stephen embodies an artist/historian as pilgrim, seeking in his interior dialogue with Shakespeare a way to renew stale discourses, so as to avoid drowning in the tide of dead and estranged discourse, and to reject Deasy’s utilitarian view of Shakespeare as “an Englishman” who “made money” and “knew what money was” (*U* 2.242-43). Mark Osteen’s interpretation of “Proteus” as a depiction of Stephen’s “attempts to *defeat* both repetition and flux” (60, emphasis added) may be somewhat controversial, but the following comment is appropriate enough: “Conceiving of language as the detritus of history, Stephen seeks to turn this flotsam into treasure and thereby discover the *logos* beneath transformations” (64).

As clichés and dead language saturate Deasy’s historical discourses, his historical views are likewise conventional and conservative, representing the orthodox views of his day. For Deasy, history means a linear Christian chronicle, which progresses toward the manifestation of God. Dubious about Christianity, Stephen disagrees with Deasy’s simplification of the progress of human history into one single effect

---

<sup>3</sup> In fact, Joyce himself is known to have been interested in and familiar with Trench’s work. See J. C. C. Mays, Introduction to *Poems and Exiles*, p. xxvii.

determined by one single will. He replies to Deasy that God is a shout in the street (*U* 2.386): God is not the absolute will and ultimate power, but the manifestation one experiences in common daily life. Spoo comments that a war of words is waged in “Nestor,” in which Stephen responds with parodic hostility to Deasy’s Protestant reading of history (106). Indeed, Stephen responds to Deasy and subverts his reading by means of parody, but he attains the aim of subversion both in external and interior dialogue. For Stephen, history is cyclical rather than linear: it does not move on a predetermined route toward a predetermined destination; instead, circulating memory recurs in the form of chronotopic interlocution with the individual mind. Numerous recurrences in “Proteus” demonstrate Stephen’s view of history as cyclical, and this also explains his act of destroying time and space in the “Circe” episode: he attempts to escape from the nightmarish recurrence of haunting history.

Deasy’s historical view is also anti-Semitic—a Christian tradition lasting for centuries: “They sinned against the light . . . And you can see the darkness in their eyes. And that is why they were wanderers on the earth to this day” (*U* 2.361-63). He imagines that “difficulties,” “intrigues,” and “backstairs influence” have been surrounding him, which he attributes to the Jews (*U* 2.343-44). Above all, he believes that the Jews are destroying the British Empire—a fact worrying him, in spite of his position as a subject of English colonialism:

England is in the hands of the jews. In all the highest places: her finance, her press. And they are the signs of a nation’s decay. Wherever they gather they eat up the nation’s vital strength. I have seen it coming these years. As sure as we are standing here the jew merchants are already at their work of destruction. Old England is dying. (*U* 2.346-51)

Stephen refutes Deasy by suggesting the nature of a merchant: “A merchant . . . is one who buys cheap and sells dear, jew or gentile, is he not?” (*U* 2.359-60), which Deasy the anti-Semite repudiates. In Stephen’s interior dialogue in “Proteus,” the Jew appears again, and is associated with Kevin Egan: “They have forgotten Kevin Egan, not he them. Remembering thee, O Sion” (*U* 3.263-64). Relating the Irish exile to the wandering Jew, Stephen connects the fates of the Irish and the Jews together, and

meanwhile challenges Deasy's anti-Semitism. More importantly, Stephen not only correlates Kevin Egan with the Jew, he is himself a Jew in his dream: "That man led me, spoke. I was not afraid. The melon he had he held against my face. Smiled: creamfruit smell. That was the rule, said. In. Come. Red carpet spread. You will see who" (*U* 3.367-69). According to Gifford, Stephen's dream involves the Hebraic tradition ("rule") that the firstfruits of the land were to be brought to the holy place of God's choice and there presented to the priest (61). In other words, Stephen becomes a Hebrew priest in the dream, with Bloom acting as the mentor or guardian offering him the melon/Molly/moly, the key to his establishment of a profitable relation to history. Despite being unaware of his correlation with Bloom, Stephen transforms Deasy's sinner against the light into himself, an Irish and Hebrew priest who intends to write a modern version of novelized epic of the two peoples—a task whose accomplishment relies on his encounter and union with Bloom and Molly.

Another feature characterizing Deasy is his misogyny: he attributes the fall of mankind, nations, and historical personages to women's intrinsic unfaithfulness:

A woman brought sin into the world. For a woman who was no better than she should be, Helen, the runaway wife of Menelaus, ten years the Greeks made war on Troy. A faithless wife first brought the strangers to our shore here, MacMurrough's wife and her leman, O'Rourke, prince of Breffni. A woman too brought Parnell low. (*U* 2.390-94)

When the sinful woman recurs in "Proteus," she is the lifegiver Heva, or Eve, the "[s]pouse and helpmate of Adam Kadmon" (*U* 3.41). Stephen contemplates the ancestress of mankind: "She had no navel. Gaze. Belly without blemish, bulging big, a buckler of taut vellum, no, whiteheaped corn, orient and immortal, standing from everlasting to everlasting. Womb of sin" (*U* 3.41-44). The discourse "womb of sin" echoes Deasy's assertion that Eve brought sin to the world. But whereas Deasy's discourse reveals his misogyny, Stephen's expresses the idea of woman's womb as a symbol of productivity giving birth to life. Furthermore, Stephen emphasizes woman's status as man's partner ("spouse" and "helpmate"). When he glances at the couple of cocklepickers on the shore, he associates them with the image of Adam and Eve

expelled from the Garden of Eden: “With woman steps she followed: the ruffian and his strolling mort” (*U* 3.372-73); “Across the sands of all the world, followed by the sun’s flaming sword, to the west, trekking to evening lands. She trudges, schlepps, trains, drags, trascines her load” (*U* 3.391-93). In this way, Stephen reworks Deasy’s discourse and revises the accusation of women as unfaithful and as the cause of downfall and destruction. The image of woman, in effect, inspires Stephen’s artistic creation: it is when he muses upon the tide within woman that he acquires inspiration for his vampire poem. Though only a “souped-up” version of one of Douglas Hyde’s translated verses (Gifford 62), the vampire poem, as Christine Froula observes, could be seen as “a tiny, parodic prophecy of *Ulysses*’ greater poetry and the symbolic process that underlies [Stephen’s] theory of masculine art and philosophy” (91).<sup>4</sup> As inspiration, or instrument, to his art, female figures will recur again to contribute to his more mature artistic works in “Aeolus” and “Scylla and Charybdis,” that is, “The Parable of the Plums” and the Shakespeare theory. For the Stephen of “Proteus,” women bring not sin to the world, but productivity and inspiration to him. He may manipulate images of women as an instrument, but at least not as inferior beings. By transforming women’s roles and images in his own chronotope, Stephen rejects Deasy’s hostile and misogynous view of women, typical of patriarchal ideology, though not until his encounter with Bloom and Molly will he, potentially, be able to turn woman from instrument into soulmate.

As his position in the school indicates, Deasy is the master, who ventriloquizes the English ruler’s voice and oppresses Stephen with authoritative discourse,<sup>5</sup> which embodies “authority as such, or the authoritativeness of tradition, of generally acknowledged truths, of the official line and other similar authorities” (*DI* 344). More exactly, Deasy has internalized the ruler’s discourses and has become a West Briton. When he claims that he, like Stephen, has “rebel blood” in him (*U* 2.279), he betrays his internalization of the colonizer’s view of the Irish as rebellious by nature.

---

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed discussion of the vampire poem in relation to Stephen’s artistic development, see Froula, pp. 96-105.

<sup>5</sup> Osteen expresses the same idea in *The Economy of Ulysses*, p. 55.



Therefore, he refuses the intervention of a second voice, as the imperial ruler denies the colonized their own voice: “There can be no two opinions on the matter” (*U* 2.322-23)—a statement suggesting his emphasis on absolutism and monologism. Whilst Stephen lacks “rule” in class, Deasy “restore[s] order” (*U* 2.29, 191-92), displaying his superiority as the master and authority. Stephen does feel a sense of subservience when confronting Deasy, yet he is by no means “a helpless victim of Mr Deasy’s history” as E. L. Epstein puts it (23). On the contrary, he dialogizes and parodies Deasy in his own time-space, and in so doing reaccentuates Deasy’s historical discourses and undermines his historical views. In his denial of a different opinion on one matter, Deasy shows an inclination to dominate, whilst Stephen wants to be equal with other people: “You will not be master of others or their slave” (*U* 3.295-96). Deasy likes to “break a lance” (*U* 2.425) with Stephen—a discourse implying his militarism, but Stephen is conscious of the danger of corporal violence: “Shoot him to bloody bits with a bang shotgun, bits man spattered walls all brass buttons. Bits all khrrrrklak in place clack back. Not hurt? O, that’s all right. Shake hands” (*U* 3.187-90). This violent scene may be parodic, yet it evinces the cruelty of corporal force: whether he desires it or not, Stephen is inevitably drawn to violence, as innocent people are ineluctably involved in war, and it is impossible to be “not hurt” and “all right” once implicated in violence. Stephen registers this, and thus responds to Deasy’s militarism by mentally playing out the parodic violent scene, which implicitly reveals his opposition to violence. This attitude toward non-violence significantly echoes Bloom’s proclamation of peace in “Cyclops” and Molly’s resentment of war in “Penelope,” recalling Joyce’s own non-violent stand in “Force,” written when he was sixteen.<sup>6</sup> On pacifist grounds, Stephen, in his chronotopic encounter with Deasy in “Proteus,” parodies the war image in “Nestor,” and at the same time ridicules Deasy’s martial ideology and imperial militarism. Interestingly, the pictures of “vanished horses” (*U* 2.300) on the walls of Deasy’s study transmute into verse, “*Won’t you come to Sandymount, / Madeline the mare?*” (*U* 3.21-22), and

---

<sup>6</sup> For details, see *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*, pp. 17-24.

the blank end of Deasy's letter serves Stephen to write down his artistic creation, the vampire poem. In this respect, Stephen is hardly Deasy's victim as Epstein claims: he turns his sense of subservience into the impulse to create by means of dialogic assimilation and reaccentuation.

Haunted by oppressive imperial history exemplified by Deasy, Stephen is also obsessed with racial history, which he connects with personal memory, particularly the death of his mother. In "The Telemachiad," the biological parent is frequently affiliated with the geographical mother. When he views the sea from the Martello Tower in "Telemachus," Buck Mulligan alludes to Swinburne's "The Triumph of Time," in which the sea is compared to a great sweet mother. But Stephen prefers to link the "snotgreen sea" to the green bile his mother vomits: "The ring of bay and skyline held a dull green mass of liquid. A bowl of white china had stood beside her deathbed holding the green sluggish bile which she had torn up from her rotting liver by fits of loud groaning vomiting" (*U* 1.107-10). Later on, the dark green bay lying beneath him is once again likened to his mother's vomit: "a bowl of bitter waters" (*U* 1.249). This discursive and ideological connection of the consanguineous mother with the geographical mother has been a great source of Stephen's nightmare, a double-bind which he is struggling to break through in order to write a chapter of Irish history with a different ending.

In Stephen's mind, May Goulding Dedalus embodies long-term Irish suffering ascribed to her exploitation and oppression by all her masters, the English ruler, the Catholic Church, and her husband. As Stephen recalls, poverty and misery enshroud the dying woman awaiting her "beastly" death in the "wretched bed" (*U* 1.198, 252): "Ghostly light" shines on her "tortured face," her "hoarse loud breath rattling in horror" (*U* 1.274-75). Thanks to the lack of sanitation and cleanliness in body, clothes, and environment, infestation with lice was prevalent among the Irish poor. As a consequence, May Dedalus has to "squash lice from the children's shirts" all the time, her "shapely fingernails reddened by the blood" of the insects (*U* 1.268-69). In Stephen's dream, her thin "body within its loose graveclothes" is "wasted" (*U* 1.270-

71) because she has dedicated all her life to supporting her family in the poverty-stricken colony.

Notwithstanding all her sufferings, May Dedalus tortures her son by binding him to her faith: “Her glazing eyes, staring out of death, to shake and bend my soul. . . . Her eyes on me to strike me down” (*U* 1.273-76). She wants him to abide by her will, to submit to what *she* thinks is good and right. This attempt to keep Stephen in bondage makes May Dedalus a representative of the oppressive mother/Mother, “the old sow that eats her farrow” (*P* 203), her shackles restraining the artistic soul from flight, turning Daedalus into Icarus “trembling at his soul’s cry” (*U* 1.282). When Stephen screams in his mind, “No, mother! Let me be and let me live” (*U* 1.279), he is appealing to his biological mother as well as geographical mother, for both have flung nets at him to hold him back from flight. To read the mother-son relationship in this light, it is not surprising that Stephen terms himself “[a] server of a servant” (*U* 1.312): Erin did serve the British Empire—“[t]he seas’ ruler” (*U* 1.574)—and the holy Roman Catholic Church.

When the importunate ghost of the mother recurs in “Nestor,” she is transformed into the “*poor soul*” going to heaven in Stephen’s riddle (*U* 2.106). According to Gifford, the riddle is a revised version from P. W. Joyce’s *English*, and the answer to the original riddle is: “The fox burying his *mother* under a holly tree” (33). In his answer, however, Stephen turns “mother” into “grandmother”: “The fox burying his grandmother under a hollybush” (*U* 2.115)—a gesture indicating his sense of evasive guilt derived from his refusal to yield to the mother’s death wish. When he speculates about the mystery of maternal love, the riddle and the fox slip into his chronotope again: “A poor soul gone to heaven: and on a heath beneath winking stars a fox, red reek of rapine in his fur, with merciless bright eyes scraped in the earth, listened, scraped up the earth, listened, scraped and scraped” (*U* 2.147-50). However hard Stephen tries to evade his sense of guilt over his mother’s death, he fails to convince himself of his innocence. He holds himself responsible for May Dedalus’s miserable death because he denies her faith, in spite of his refutation of Mulligan’s accusation that he kills his own mother. In the answer to the riddle, the fox simply buries his

mother/grandmother. But when the fox enters Stephen's chronotopic domain, he is endowed with negative characteristics—"red reek of rapine in his fur" and "merciless bright eyes"—denoting his sinister character. To put it another way, Stephen bestows negative characteristics upon the fox as he assimilates the discourse from the original riddle and increasingly identifies with the animal. He betrays his sense of guilt in his interior dialogue.

Stephen's ambivalent and complicated attitude toward the mother reveals his dilemma over *amor matris*. When he meditates on the merciless fox scraping in the earth, he is instructing Cyril Sargent in arithmetic. The pale student reminds him of his younger self: "Like him was I, these sloping shoulders, this gracelessness. My childhood bends besides me" (*U* 2.168-69). However graceless the son is, he is embraced by his mother's love, the "only true thing in life": "Yet someone had loved him, borne him in her arms and in her heart. But for her the race of the world would have trampled him underfoot, a squashed boneless snail. She had loved his weak watery blood drained from her own" (*U* 2.140-43). In spite of her plight, the mother does her best to nourish the son: "With her weak blood and wheysour milk she had fed him and hid from sight of others his swaddlingbands" (*U* 2.166-67). It is this oppressive yet undeniable maternal love that casts Stephen on the horns of a dilemma: he cannot deny her affection, yet he is unwilling to accept it. Stephen admits that she protects him from being crushed by the hostile world. As he recalls, he relies on "mother's money order" to support himself during his exile in Paris (*U* 3.185). But to obey her is to embrace the suffering, stifling, and haunting history of Ireland which demands the son's loyalty. Unable to deny, yet unwilling to accept *amor matris*, Stephen identifies with the merciless fox who kills and buries his own mother/grandmother<sup>7</sup> and suffers from the torture of his conscience.

When the fox recurs in "Proteus," he is transfigured into the dog Stephen glimpses on the shore: "Their dog ambled about a bank of dwindling sand, trotting, sniffing on all sides. Looking for something lost in a past life" (*U* 3.332-33). The

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. "Circe": "Burying his grandmother. Probably he killed her" (*U* 15.3610-11).

“something” the dog has lost turns out to be his grandmother: “His hindpaws then scattered the sand: then his forepaws dabbled and delved. Something he buried there, his grandmother” (*U* 3.359-61). The dog is presumably a projection of Stephen himself, who in “Telemachus” is called “dogsboddy” by Mulligan (*U* 1.112). The animal then metamorphoses into “a pard, a panther, got in spousebreach, vulturing the dead” (*U* 3.363-64). The panther recalls Haines’s panther dream in “Telemachus,” where he is said to have been “raving and moaning to himself” all night “about shooting a black panther” (*U* 1.61-62). Whether in “Telemachus” or in “Proteus,” the panther is associated with Stephen, not merely because Stephen is the victim nearly shot by Haines, but also because the panther metamorphoses from the dog, whom Stephen affiliates himself with. Nevertheless, the panther could also refer to Bloom, in terms of his frequent association with the dark color<sup>8</sup> and his involvement in spousebreach. Stephen’s recall of the panther brings him into line with Bloom, though without his awareness: both are victims under a martial colonial system, exploited and oppressed by the ruler. Also importantly, the recurrence of the panther in “Proteus” turns from a passively hunted beast into an actively hunting animal, signifying Stephen’s response to the ruler: he refuses to be a passively persecuted victim. And yet Stephen is still troubled by the ghost of the mother. He realizes that to escape from the haunting impact of *amor matris*, he should just bury the past and stop “vulturing the dead,” which, however, is not what he has in mind. By delving into the past—by having chronotopic encounter with the past—Stephen intends to enter into dialogue with it: he prefers vulturing the dead to burying the past, confronting his nightmare to escaping from it. This may explain why memories and image of the mother recur constantly in “The Telemachiad” and in several later episodes: Stephen wants to dialogize her so as to rethink the ties between them and to release himself from the nightmarish pressure of her oppressive love.

As Stephen continues his contemplation on the strand, his thought turns to the drowned man off Maiden’s rock, whose image chronotopically overlaps with May

---

<sup>8</sup> For example, Bloom is associated with the black horse, Throwaway, and is referred to as “the gentleman in black” with “dark eyes” (*U* 13.349, 415) in “Nausicaa.”

Dedalus's image: "A drowning man. His human eyes scream to me out of horror of his death. I ... With him together down .... I could not save her. Waters: bitter death: lost" (*U* 3.328-30). Stephen has intended to save his mother—to rescue May Dedalus from the drowning tides of convention and conservatism flooding Ireland, and to liberate Erin from her history of long-term misery. But he realizes that it is beyond his power: he would drown himself altogether in the tides, sunk "*beneath the watery floor*" (*U* 2.66) like Lycidas. As Stephen believes, the whole of Ireland is drowning owing to general paralysis. When he sees his sister Dilly buying a French primer in "The Wandering Rocks," a scene of drowning occurs in his mind, "She is drowning. Agenbite. Save her. Agenbite. All against us. She will drown me with her, eyes and hair. Lank coils of seaweed hair around me, my heart, my soul. Salt green death" (*U* 10.875-77). The pronoun "she" in the context refers to Dilly. But if we bear in mind the recurring image of the drowning, the pronoun may also refer to May Dedalus and thus to Mother Ireland. Stephen, however, yearns for survival: "No, mother! Let me be and let me live" (*U* 1.279). By entering into chronotopic encounters and interior dialogue with the mother, Stephen tries to inform her of his inability to save her from the flood and misery paralyzing Ireland—if to save her means to obey her—to beg her understanding and forgiveness, and ultimately to wake from the nightmare of history she imposes on him and to reestablish an acceptable relationship with her.

In fact, the image of the mother changes in the course of Stephen's interior dialogue: she becomes less and less reproachful. In "Telemachus," the description of the nightmare in which she shows up to blame her son occurs twice:

Silently, in a dream she had come to him after her death, her wasted body within its loose brown graveclothes giving off an odour of wax and rosewood, her breath, that had bent upon him, mute, *reproachful*, a faint odour of wetted ashes" (*U* 1.102-5, emphasis added).

When the passage recurs a few pages later, the breath bending upon Stephen is no longer "reproachful," but, noticeably, "with mute secret words" (*U* 1.272), as if the mother was about to relate something to the son. It may be argued that to release himself from pain and guilt, Stephen deliberately eliminates the word "reproachful"—

as if in so doing he could also eliminate his mother's reproach—and fills in the blank with words that suggest the mother's intention to communicate and to be reconciled with him. As the passage recurs again in "Nestor," what is left is only the sensation: "an odour of rosewood and wetted ashes" (*U* 2.145-6); the mother's image becomes vague as a result of Stephen's lessening self-reproach when he persuades himself that what is gone is gone. In "Proteus," the mother's image is reduced to "a ghostwoman with ashes on her breath" (*U* 3.46-7)—the tone has changed dramatically. In this way, the reworking of discourses—or the confrontation of chronotopes—serves as a strategy for reinterpreting past events. Stephen refuses to succumb to the ghost of the past and to conventions embodied by his mother. By means of assimilation and reaccentuation, he strives to blur the image of the mother, in expectation of reducing his pain and guilt, and breaking through the shackles she imposes upon him. Dialogizing and reconstructing incorporated discourses in his time-space, he also dialogizes and reshapes his inner self, and, to a certain degree, manages to regain his inner peace, however superficial and provisional it may be. To put it more precisely, Stephen at this stage suppresses his dilemma over *amor matris* rather than overcoming it; he may strive to resist May Dedalus's oppressive love, but has yet to construct another version of history distinct from hers. It is not surprising that when Stephen delivers the Shakespeare theory in the library, his mother crosses his mind once again: he associates the scene of Ann Hathaway tending Shakespeare on his deathbed with the image of his "Mother's deathbed" where the person who "brought [him] into this world lies" (*U* 9.216-22). Not until the "Circe" episode, in which the mother "sending out an ashen breath" (*U* 15.4217) appears again, does Stephen gesticulatively refuse her calling ("*Non serviam!*" [*U* 15.4228]), and not until his encounter with Molly, a new model for postcolonial Ireland, does he potentially free himself from May Dedalus's haunting ghost and reestablish a constructive relationship with history.

May Dedalus is not the only personification of Mother Ireland, however; the milkwoman in "Telemachus" also embodies Erin to Stephen's mind. But while May Dedalus reifies the suffering yet oppressive mother figure of Ireland, the milkwoman represents another image of Irish womanhood: subservient and flattering, yet toilworn

and abject. Stephen reads the woman as a symbol of Ireland: “Silk of the kine and poor old woman”—both phrases known as traditional epithets for Erin (“names given her in old times” [*U* 1.403-4]). The image of Ireland as an old woman played a significant part in the work of Irish cultural nationalists, who rooted their research for material in folklore, which Joyce grew increasingly impatient with. In “The Soul of Ireland,” a review of Lady Gregory’s *Poets and Dreamers*, Joyce expresses his impatience with folkloric presentation of Ireland: “In her new book she has left legends and heroic youth far behind, and has explored in a land almost fabulous in its sorrow and senility. Half of her book is an account of old men and old women in the West of Ireland” (*CW* 103). For Joyce, to recount Irish “legends and heroic youth,” that is, the glorious past, does not profit the present predicament: it only imprisons the revivalists within the ivory tower of the romantic past separated from present reality. But to explore a land fabulous in sorrow and senility is even worse, for it is a land without vitality, a land of despair and death. Joyce’s review continues:

The story-tellers are old, and their imagination is not the imagination of childhood. The story-teller preserves the strange machinery of fairyland, but his mind is feeble and sleepy. He begins one story and wanders from it into another story, and none of the stories has any satisfying imaginative wholeness. (*CW* 103)

The lack of vitality leads to the lack of imagination, and the want of organizing imagination results in the want of imaginative wholeness. Lady Gregory’s book tires Joyce not only because of its atmosphere of parochialism and mythologization of Irish peasants in the west of Ireland, but, more importantly, because of its lack of vitality, imagination, and wholeness—elements essential to productive artistic creation and historical construction—and, above all, its separation from contemporary reality. It is a book of dreamers, who live in an unrealistic fairyland detached from real historical time and whose dreams are not to be realized. Lady Gregory’s book represents the public discourse of cultural nationalism prominent in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Ireland: “This book, like so many other books of our time, is in part picturesque and in part an indirect or direct utterance of the central belief of Ireland”—“a belief in the



*incurable* ignobility of the forces that have overcome her” (*CW* 105, emphasis added). Owing to the incurability of present predicament, cultural nationalists retreat to a dreamland characterized by the stagnation of historical time. The invented presence of folkloric chronotopes in the past, as Anna Matzov points out, is “the ensuring factor for them to happen again in the future” (212). The past may be recalled, but cannot be retrieved. Instead of retrieving the heroic past and regenerating a golden age, cultural nationalists run the risk of imprisoning themselves in an ivory tower of the estranged past. Their central belief and historical time are so lacking in any prospect of future creativity that Joyce, as well as Stephen, rebukes the whole Celtic Twilight.

As a key cultural nationalist text representing Ireland in the image of an old woman, W. B. Yeats’s *Cathleen Ni Houlihan* is typical and representative of the text which, in Joyce’s opinion, twists and degrades the soul of Ireland. Yeats’s Irish symbol, Cathleen the Old Woman, appears young, queenly, and beautiful to the true patriots who love her and are willing to die for her. Joyce’s milkwoman, on the other hand, remains old, ugly, and abject throughout: she emerges as a counterpoise to Yeats’s old woman, a realistic image set against Yeats’s idealized symbol. From this point, it seems reasonable to state that Stephen incorporates the often-used discourse, reaccentuates the decayed image, and responds to Yeats and his nationalistic version of history in his own chronotope.

Whereas Yeats’s Irish symbol has her own name, Cathleen, Joyce’s does not. Never given a name, she is simply called by the narrator “the milkwoman”—an appellation indicating her job as a server—or addressed variously as “you” or “ma’am” by Stephen, Mulligan, and Haines. Without a name, she does not have her own identity—just as colonized Ireland is deprived of her own autonomy. As an incarnation of Mother Ireland, the milkwoman is supposed to nourish her own children or true patriots, according to Yeats. Due to this very lack of an identity, nonetheless, Joyce’s old woman feeds Stephen the Irish bard, Haines the “conqueror,” and Mulligan the “gay betrayer” alike (*U* 1.405), and is hence degenerated into a “wandering crone” and “common cuckquean” (*U* 1.404-5) serving the English invader and the Irish betrayer. And yet she is willing to serve and flatter them. On hearing that

Mulligan is a medical student, she expresses her admiration, “Look at that now” (*U* 1.417), and pays no attention to Stephen the artist who stands aside, notwithstanding Mulligan’s derision of her to please Haines: “The islanders . . . speak frequently of the collector of prepuces” (*U* 1.393-94). Inevitably, Stephen listens to her words “in scornful silence”: “She bows her old head to a voice that speaks to her loudly, her bonesetter, her medicineman: me she slights” (*U* 1.418-19). Stephen’s comment insinuates the milkwoman’s utilitarian inclination and servile awe. In spite of her ignorance of the Irish language, furthermore, she tries to flatter Haines by echoing his view of Irish after knowing his nationality: “Sure we ought to [speak Irish in Ireland] . . . and I’m ashamed I don’t speak the language myself. I’m told it’s a grand language by them that knows” (*U* 1.433-34). Symbolic of Mother Ireland, the milkwoman fails to recognize her own language and bard but endeavors to please the conqueror and betrayer responsible for her plight. The irony is clear.

As Stephen presumes, the milkwoman acts as “a messenger from the secret morning” (*U* 1.405-6). She may enter the Martello Tower to “serve or to upbraid”—like May Dedalus serving her son with her wheysour milk and upbraiding him for rebellion—“whether he could not tell”; and yet he “scorned to beg her favour” (*U* 1.406-7). To put it in other words, Stephen refuses the message she brings him, a message instructing him to love and honor her as revivalists do, which, however, is against his will. By merging the abject, flattering, and servile milkwoman with Mother Ireland, Stephen undermines the beautiful and unrealistic construction of the racial image, simultaneously “demythologiz[ing] the discourse of Irish nationalism”—to borrow Theresa O’Connor’s phrase (100)—and rejecting the idealized and escapist version of history presented by Yeats and other revivalists. He may fail to deny maternal love, and yet he is unwilling to love such an unlovable mother, let alone die for her.

The milk provided by the milkwoman, May Dedalus, or Mother Ireland in general constitutes, in a very literal sense, the inheritance of racial history, or, in Herbert Spencer’s term, “organic memory” (Otis 221). Laura Otis usefully surveys the theory of organic memory popular in the nineteenth century. According to Otis, the

theory “proposed that memory and heredity were essentially the same and that one inherited memories from ancestors along with their physical features” (2). Moreover,

The theory of organic memory placed the past *in* the individual, *in* the body, *in* the nervous system; it pulled memory from the domain of the metaphysical into the domain of the physical with the intention of making it *knowable*. Through analogy, it equated memory with heredity, arguing that just as people remembered some of their own experiences consciously, they remembered their racial and ancestral experiences unconsciously, through their instincts. (3)

In short, the organic memory theory locates history in the body, “aligning memory with heredity and individual development with racial development” (5). The milk, in this regard, is a medium of inheritance: the mother/Mother feeds her children on milk to imbue them with racial memory. When Stephen relates himself to a changeling with protean existences of metempsychosis in “Proteus,” he may be alluding to the irresistible organic memory inherited from his ancestors in his reference to the umbilical cords that “all link back” (*U* 3.37). Joyce’s manipulation of the human body as the structure of *Ulysses*—“the epic of the body” (Budgen 312)—may also be considered an echo of the organic memory theory. As Frank Budgen declares, Joyce was in reality familiar with the theory:

In his later years in Dublin Joyce lived in that philosophy which maintains that on the borders of our individual memory lies the memory of our race, that outside the frontiers of the individual mind lies the universal mind, and that with the ‘open Sesame’ of symbols (words or things) the individual mind may be made a partaker of that vaster racial experience. (310)

Significantly, the theory “must be viewed in the context of nineteenth-century European desires for national identity and epistemological unity, both of which were to be achieved by focusing on history and development” (Otis 4). The revivalists’ inclination to probe the idealized past of Erin may be read in this light. As Otis points out, “the organic memory theory expressed *a desire to know the past* by scrutinizing its manifestations in the present”; if the individual inherits memories from the

ancestors, “a feeling of continuity, even of immortality, could be achieved,” and identity, whether personal or national, could be determined (x-xi, emphases added). As they explore and idealize the remote past, revivalists aim to search for the roots of Irish culture, and thereby to endow Erin with an identity. Stephen, however, declines to indulge himself in digging up and glorifying the remote past beyond retrieval. Concentrating on present reality—“the now, the here” (*U* 9.89)—he prefers to examine the impact of the past upon the present and conjure up the chronotope of the past into his own time-space, so as to allow the present to unload the historical burden, rather than scrutinize the present for the purpose of knowing the past.

If Deasy represents decayed, imperial history and May Dedalus and the milkwoman embody oppressive, imposed racial history, Haines may be regarded as the combination of the two. As an Englishman, Haines’s affiliation with imperialism and colonialism seems inevitable. Stephen calls him the “conqueror” and “seas’ ruler” (*U* 1.405, 574), indicating the Englishman’s involvement in conquering and ruling Ireland. His occupation of the Martello Tower, where Stephen pays the rent, is also suggestive enough. Like Deasy, Haines intends to exploit or make use of Stephen: “I intend to make a collection of your sayings if you will let me” (*U* 1.480). When Stephen asks if he will be paid for it, Haines gives a vague answer: “I don’t know, I’m sure” (*U* 1.493), implying the conqueror’s inclination to take advantage of the subject. Haines’s anti-Semitic discourse—“Of course I’m a Britisher . . . and I feel as one. I don’t want to see my country fall into the hands of German jews either. That’s our national problem, I’m afraid, just now” (*U* 1.666-68)—foreshadows Deasy’s assertion that the Jew merchants are ruining England. Unwilling to see England fall into the hands of Jew merchants, ironically, Haines attributes to history the fact that Ireland fell into the hands of the English: “It seems history is to blame” (*U* 1.649). History, in this sense, becomes an excuse responsible for Irish suffering, whereas the English ruler bears no responsibility. Haines’s discourse reveals the evasive mentality of the conqueror who ascribes the wrong he has done to impersonal history. Stephen, however, would rather attribute the wrong to personal operations, or, like Blake, argue that “all historical developments are produced by mental operations—that all effects

have spiritual causes” (Lincoln 1994, 78). When Haines’s discourse recurs in “Circe,” the evasion is turned into mimicry, for Stephen manipulates the discourse to ridicule the two privates, that is, the representatives of imperial power: “You are my guests. Uninvited. By virtue of the fifth of George and seventh of Edward. History to blame. Fabled by mothers of memory” (*U* 15.4370-72). Those uninvited guests, or strangers in the house, work in the colony as executioners of imperial power by virtue of King Edward VII and his heir George V. Yet neither the kings nor the executioners are responsible for the colonial situation: the blame is laid on fabled history. In response to this colonial mentality, Stephen assimilates and recirculates Haines’s discourse chronotopically, and mocks the colonizer and his evasive and irresponsible attitude toward colonial history.

On the other hand, Haines’s eagerness to participate in Irish revival—his advocacy of Gaelic, research on folklore, reading of nostalgic poetry—aligns him with the camp of cultural nationalism. In “Scylla and Charybdis,” the librarian Mr. Best refers to Haines’s enthusiasm for Irish mythology and Douglas Hyde: “I was showing him Jubainville’s book. He’s quite enthusiastic, don’t you know, about Hyde’s *Lovesongs of Connacht*. I couldn’t bring him in to hear the discussion. He’s gone to Gill’s to buy it” (*U* 9.93-95). As this passage indicates, Haines prefers Hyde’s nostalgic poetry to Stephen’s live discussion of Shakespeare—a fact insinuating his preference for estranged past over living present, as well as his Orientalism which characterizes revivalist literature and imperial mentality alike.<sup>9</sup>

Rejecting both decayed, imperial history represented by Deasy and imposed yet oppressive racial history embodied by May Dedalus and the milkwoman, Stephen endeavors to construct another version of history acceptable to himself, which, to some extent, would rely on his chronotopic encounter and interior dialogue with Blake. As Stanislaus Joyce notes, in early youth, the gods of his elder brother were Blake and Dante (53). In his lecture on Blake delivered early in March 1912, Joyce shows his consistent admiration for the poet and philosopher, who, like Joyce himself, “belonged

---

<sup>9</sup> For the underlying Orientalism or “imperial exoticism” as displayed in revivalist literature, see Vincent Sherry, p. 7.

to the literary-revolutionary school" (*CW* 215). Joyce shares many of the ideas basic to Blake's political poetry: "freedom, justice, economic equality, and non-competitive fraternal love and co-operation" (Fuller 1988, 53). When Stephen questions Cochrane on Pyrrhus in class, the student's unsatisfactory answer reminds him of Blake's definition of history, "Fabled by the daughters of memory" (*U* 2.7). Moments later, in Stephen's contemplations in "Nestor" and "Proteus," Blakean allusions recur continually. To read the two episodes with Blakean history in mind, we may assert that Stephen enters chronotopically into a dialogue with his forebear. He assimilates Blake's discourses, reaccentuates them, transforms them into his own in his chronotope, and thus constructs an individual philosophy distinct from Blake's, in order to escape the trap of historical dialectic.

Like Stephen, Blake also thinks of history—especially contemporary history—as a nightmare saturated with war, tyranny, and oppression. As David V. Erdman remarks, Blake sees his age as "one of increasingly prodigious war and uncertain peace" and refuses to "join the current madness" (vii, 374). As "a poet of social vision," nevertheless, Blake does not attempt to escape from history; he records it instead, for "the prophet as a *recorder* of history must continue to follow the course of events" (Erdman vii, 398). Blake's heavy involvement with social events and political debates of his age is well-known. But he not only participates in them; he transcribes them: the American Revolution, the French Revolution, and many other events are incorporated into his prophetic poetry. His vision of history, however, is remote from contemporary historians' "ostensibly impartial analyses of historical progress"; it is rather "a sequence of sudden revelations and grotesque transformations, full of sound and fury" (Lincoln 1994, 83). Despite the distinction between Blake's and the Enlightenment historians' treatment of history, Blake incorporates ideas from such "reasoning historians" as Hume, Gibbon, and Voltaire and transforms them to serve his purpose. Andrew Lincoln observes that Blake's account of the growth and collapse of commercial civilization could be derived from these historians' ideas, which, however, are "transformed by the distinctive perspective of his myth" (1994, 74, 78). In so doing, Blake attempts to engage with and contain their analyses—"to wrest the

discourse of history from the grasp of those whose vision was confined to the fallen world, and who made historical change appear dependent on impersonal processes” (Lincoln 1994, 83). To put it in Bakhtinian words, Blake dialogizes the Enlightenment historians, assimilates their discourses, transforms them into his own in his chronotope, and in the meantime reveals his attitude toward them. Stephen’s dialogue with various personages, in this sense, resembles Blake’s with his contemporaries.

An apocalyptic poet, Blake is highly influenced by the Scripture. In his study of Blake’s *Vala, or The Four Zoas*, Lincoln points out that for Blake the Bible plays the guide to the universal patterns of human history (1995, 11). The Bible records the history of Christianity, which is itself myth—an immense and intricate myth of creation, growth, decay, and fall of life. Under such an influence, Blake’s approach to history “ties the myth to a particular historical time-scale”: he superimposes the two thousand years of history since the advent of Christ onto an archetypal pattern, introducing Biblical names which align the myth explicitly with one version of history (Lincoln 1995, 26). This method “produces history in an archetypal form that can illuminate widely different periods of historical time” (Lincoln 1995, 285). Archetypal in essence, Blake’s history is rather universal than particular: it incorporates and harmonizes different approaches to history, suggesting “the fundamental identity of different cultures” in its universalizing perspective (Lincoln 1995, 1). In spite of his preference for universal history, Blake does not ignore his homeland: he attempts to place world history within a specifically British framework. As Lincoln comments, Blake “reconcil[es] the British framework with the Christian one, and approach[es] the universal through the national” (1995, 27). Joyce admires Blake, and shows the Blakean inheritance in his work: he bases his Irish-Hebrew epic upon Greek myth, reconciles the two, and in so doing approaches the world through Ireland, the “heart” to the universe (Ellmann 1982, 505).

Sharing partly the Christian historians’ assumption, Blake believes that the function of history is to clarify the relationship between humanity and divinity, that human life is a condition of spiritual exile, and that the fallen history of humankind will terminate in a universal resurrection through revolution (Lincoln 1995, 10, 22).

The spirit of revolution is embodied by Orc, who burns and purges “the Old World and the New to overthrow tyranny and patriarchy in church and state, art, religion, and philosophy” (Linda M. Lewis 111). In the spirit of hatred and destruction, however, Orc merely creates a void; it takes Los, “the divine inspiration of poetic art . . . loving man beyond all measure,” to initiate resurrection (Linda M. Lewis 112). Nevertheless, as Linda M. Lewis suggests, political revolutions could “come full circle, the rebel evolving into the tyrant.” As a result, the revolutionary spirit makes cyclical appearances in the world (137, 114). History for Blake is accordingly cyclical, not a single, linear sequence of causes and effects moving toward the manifestation of God. Stephen’s inclination to defeat tyranny and his cyclical view of history resemble Blake’s in this regard.

What is more, Blake reconstructs allegories of the Scripture in the light of secular discourse set within a British framework, and in so doing exposes the insufficiency of both discourses. Take *The Book of Urizen* for example: it rewrites Genesis in a satirical form that undermines at the same time the idea of the sacred text and the concepts of science and progress (Lincoln 1995, 1, 14). The reason Blake creates his own mythology is to renew decayed discourse. Linda M. Lewis makes this clear:

Traditional figures from Greek and Latin sources have become solidified . . . and are themselves the basis for tyranny, for they restrict rather than expand potential meanings. . . . For Blake, revolutionary art requires a newly created—or drastically revised—mythology. (124)

The motives underlying Joyce’s rewriting of Homeric story and Stephen’s constructing of history are not unlike Blake’s: all three artists endeavor to create the new out of a drastic revision and expansion of the potential meanings of past discourses.

Stephen shares many aspects of Blake’s philosophy of history, but he does not embrace all of them. Like Joyce, Stephen “never accept[s] the Blakean or any other ready-made symbols,” though he “steep[s] himself in Blake” (Budgen 310). Rather, he enters chronotopically into an interior dialogue with Blake in “Nestor” and “Proteus,” where he speculates about and revises the forerunner’s views of history. According to



Blake, history, like literature, is a fabulous construction: “‘History’ is not a record of ‘what happened,’ but rather a narrative of selected ‘actualities’ arranged in a fictional construct that masquerades as ‘Truth’” (Leonard 170). The difference between the two sciences lies in the assumption that history—“Fable” or “Allegory” in Blakean terms—is an “inferior kind of Poetry,” for it is not “surrounded by the daughters of Inspiration” like poetry—“Vision” or “Imagination”—is. Nevertheless, “Fable or Allegory is seldom without some Vision” (Blake 604). Blake admits that the boundaries between the two categories are not clear-cut: history is constructed by the human mind and is thus as fictive as poetry, though less visionary and imaginative. Such a belief leads Blake to question the actuality and credibility of history as recorded in historical texts, and to assert history to be fabulous and allegorical. But Stephen is not convinced of Blake’s assertion of the fictive nature of history: “And yet it was in some way if not as memory fabled it” (*U* 2.7-8). For Stephen, to equate history with fable seems fabulous in itself. Pyrrhus and his campaigns against the Romans are facts, unable “to be thought away” (*U* 2.49). As Blake declares, history is “Form’d by the daughters of Memory” (Blake 604). The way and process of its formation may be subject to the ideology of the historian, but memory itself contains at least partly real events. Stephen goes beyond Blake’s dismissal of the credibility of history by implying that history may be fabled by the daughters of memory, “nevertheless *something* happened,” and “there is the actual” (Leonard 179, 174). Blake’s “phrase . . . of impatience” (*U* 2.8) appears excessive to Stephen, which he, like his creator Joyce, may regard as “splendid error” (Ellmann 1972, 15).

Stephen may refute Blake’s assertion of the fictive nature of history, but he appreciates Blake’s methodology of incorporating history into poetry. He questions students about historical events in history class, but then turns the class from history to literature by asking students to recite Milton’s “Lycidas.” The distinction between history and poetry is blurred consequently. “Lycidas,” in fact, is both history and poetry: the death of Edward King is a historical fact, but Milton’s pastoral elegy is

poetry.<sup>10</sup> Milton incorporates the event, transforms historical element into poetic work, and thereby combines the two categories. Asking students to recite “Lycidas” in a history class, Stephen implicitly rejects the traditional assumption of the inferiority of history prevalent since the Renaissance and suggests the equality, or at least a very minor distinction, between the two categories. For him, history can be poetry, so long as the factual element is colored—transformed but not twisted—by the poet’s imagination, or, in Blake’s words, “surrounded by the daughters of Inspiration.” Stephen’s argument about Shakespeare’s creation of *King Lear* in “Scylla and Charybdis” essentially echoes Blake’s methodology: “Why is the underplot of *King Lear* in which Edmund figures lifted out of Sidney’s *Arcadia* and spatchcocked on to a Celtic legend older than history?” (U 9.990-92) To put it more precisely, Shakespeare combines the story of King Lear’s pre-Christian reign as he finds it in Holinshed’s *Chronicles* with the story appropriated from Sir Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia*, which describes the fall of a duke deceived into repudiating his honest son in favor of the villainous son who reduces him to misery and blindness. In so doing, Stephen’s argument goes, Shakespeare knits the historical and poetic materials together, meanwhile weaving his own personal experience into the sources (U 9.997-1002) and creating an artistic work which subtly reflects his personal history. History and poetry, as a result, are fused tightly in the Shakespearean play, which incorporates elements from both categories yet excels both sources in artistic achievement.

Stephen adopts Blake’s methodology, and recounts in “Proteus” an imagined scene from the Irish past, which contains both historical and poetic elements:

Galleys of the Lochlanns ran here to beach, in quest of prey, their  
 bloodbeaked prows riding low on a molten pewter surf. Dane vikings, torcs  
 of tomahawks aglitter on their breasts when Malachi wore the collar of gold.  
 A school of turlehide whales stranded in hot noon, spouting, hobbling in the  
 shallows. Then from the starving cagework city a horde of jerkined dwarfs,  
 my people, with flayers’ knives, running, scaling, hacking in green blubbery

---

<sup>10</sup> For the relation between history and elegy, see Peter M. Sacks, *The English Elegy*.

whalemeat. Famine, plague and slaughters. Their blood is in me, their lusts my waves. I moved among them on the frozen Liffey, that I, a changeling, among the spluttering resin fires. I spoke to no-one: none to me. (*U* 3.300-9)

Scandinavian invasions, the great famine in 1331 in which starved Dubliners killed whales to feed themselves, and the frozen Liffey on which Irish people amused themselves in 1338—all these events did happen and are hence historical materials. But Stephen recounts them in an artistic way, and thus combines history and poetry. This narrative could be seen as Stephen's reaccentuation of history out of chronotopic encounters, distinct from the idealized and nostalgic history delineated by revivalists in its realistic account.

Also noteworthy in this passage is Stephen's attitude toward the history he inherits. He acknowledges that violence and suffering abound in Irish history, which he, being an Irishman, shares involuntarily. Saturated in the philosophy of organic memory prevailing in the nineteenth century, Stephen accepts the idea of the existence and inheritance of popular race memory. After all, he is fed with the milk of Mother Ireland, and the blood of his barbarous ancestors flows in his body. Notwithstanding this, he deliberately detaches himself from that history and his countrymen, the "jerkined dwarfs," unwilling to involve himself in their violence and suffering: he participates in, yet is detached from, that history. But however he tries to detach himself from racial history, organic memory passes from his ancestors to him, enabling him to conjure up other chronotopes and experience the protean existences of metempsychosis. Budgen argues that the people or shades Stephen encounters are "all parts of himself" (310). As he shares organic memory with his ancestors, Stephen goes through various chronotopes—Irish shore in the eighth century, the mouth of the Dodder in 1331, the Liffey in 1338—to witness, imaginatively, historical events. The personages he meets are all parts of himself because he shares their blood—their memory—which allows him to metamorphose into other consubstantial identities, i.e., his alter egos.

A history lesson begins the "Nestor" episode, a history of battles, violence, and blood. While Stephen muses upon Blake's definition of history as fable, he has also in

mind the cruel images of war-governed history. Consequently, the history textbook becomes a “gorescarred book” (*U* 2.12-13) to him. When Cochrane answers his question about Pyrrhus, Stephen pictures the battle mentally: “From a hill above a corpsestrewn plain a general speaking to his officers, leaned upon his spear. Any general to any officers. They lend ear” (*U* 2.16-17)—as though he had entered the chronotope of Rome in the third century B.C. to witness the scene. Stephen might be deriving the image from Blake’s “King Edward the Third” in *Poetical Sketches*: “Our fathers, sweating, lean on their spears, and view / The mighty dead: giant bodies streaming blood, / Dread visages frowning in silent death!” (32) But Stephen assimilates these discourses and turns them into his own. In Blake’s poem, leaning on the spears and viewing the dead are the ancestors of the King’s warriors, “Sons of Trojan Brutus” (31); in Stephen’s transformed version, however, it is Pyrrhus who leans upon the spear speaking to his subordinates on a hill strewn with the dead. What is more, Stephen adds the words “Any general to any officers” to the Blakean allusion, insinuating the universality of war-saturated history. Whether in Rome or in Britain, violent wars compose history.

This history of war could be applied to ordinary human life. When he stands on the porch and watches Sargent hurry toward the playground where students are playing hockey, Stephen notices that “sharp voices were in strife” on “the scrappy field” (*U* 2.184-85). In Deasy’s study, Stephen hears shouts from the playground again, and he contemplates:

Again: a goal. I am among them, among their battling bodies in a medley,  
the joust of life. . . . Jousts. Time shocked rebounds, shock by shock. Jousts,  
slush and uproar of battles, the frozen deathspew of the slain, a shout of  
spearspikes baited with men’s bloodied guts. (*U* 2.314-18)

The Blakean allusion is transformed into Pyrrhus’s battle against the Romans and then into a hockey game and a joust of life. But however transformed, the brutality of war remains unchanged, as evinced in Stephen’s parody of Deasy’s militarism discussed previously, and Stephen is enslaved to incessantly rebounding shocked time, unable to break away from the prison. Being a changeling wandering in times and spaces,

Stephen fails to escape from the bonds of organic memory or the pressure of racial history. It seems only the destruction of time and space could possibly set him free, recalling Blake's insistence on destruction as the moment of transformation leading to eternity: "I hear the ruin of all space, shattered glass and toppling masonry, and time one livid final flame. What's left us then?" (*U* 2.9-10) This image recurs in "Proteus," where Stephen associates it with the rescue of the Fenians Richard Burke and Kevin Egan: "a flame of vengeance hurl them upward in the fog. Shattered glass and toppling masonry" (*U* 3.248-49). The Blakean allusion, after serving Blake the first master, is transformed once again into a double-voiced discourse to serve Stephen the second master, to borrow Bakhtin's terminology (*DI* 324). As an exiled Fenian, or a "wild goose" (*U* 3.164), Kevin Egan is inevitably associated with war. The cigarettes he rolls, in Stephen's retrospection, metamorphose into gunpowder, whose "blue fuse burns deadly between [Egan's] hands and burns clear" (*U* 3.216-17, 239). The prevalence and universality of war is demonstrated once again. At any time, in any space, the inhuman war never stops its violation, which both Stephen and Blake are at odds with. As Joyce declares in his lecture on Blake concerning his response to massacres in Paris after the Revolution: "His spiritual rebellion against the powers of this world was not made of the kind of gunpowder, soluble in water, to which we are more or less accustomed" (*CW* 215). However fascinated by the French Revolution, Blake rejected it once the regenerative spirit deteriorated into pointless violence. He believes in the weapon of the mind, imagination, which Stephen also advocates. This belief in imagination forms a spiritual affinity between the uncompromising young artist and the rebellious elder poet.

While Stephen shares Blake's conception of "the conquest of tyranny by imagination," that "the authorities, religious and secular, must be defeated in spiritual rather than corporeal warfare" (Ellmann 1982, 370-71), he is impatient with Blake's move from temporal history to eternal reality (Johnson 776). Blake sings "of the ideal world, of truth, the intellect and the divinity of the imagination" (*CW* 220), and asserts that the corrupt temporal world would be destroyed by apocalyptic fire—"the red flames of Orc" (Blake 201)—and subsequently be supplanted by eternal truth

(Johnson 776), though that eternity is likely to turn to chaos again. For Stephen, however, what is important is not remote and unrealistic eternity. If the Blakean “livid final flame” consumes the temporal world, “What’s left us then?” Stephen asks (*U* 2.10). Like Joyce, Stephen appreciates Blake’s daring in claiming “the all-importance of the imagination” and staking “his long life on its affirmation” (Stanislaus Joyce 113), but what seems excessive to Stephen is Blake’s turning away from temporal reality to embrace eternal truth. Transmuting the Blakean verses “The road of excess leads to the palace of wisdom” and “No bird soars too high, if he soars with his own wings” (Blake 150, 151) into “thud of Blake’s wings of excess” (*U* 2.8-9), Stephen implies that Blake flies too far into the beyond of imagination, that is, the realm of supernatural fantasy, and that the excess leads finally not to wisdom but to “a thud against the unyielding hardness of reality”— for Stephen the reality of Dublin and of all human history (Gleckner 147-48). As Robert F. Gleckner points out, Blake’s “road of excess,” to Stephen’s mind, eventually leads not to the “palace of wisdom,” but to “a blinding of the sight to the grubby realities of this world, to an ‘idealism’ so absolute” that there is no room for everyman and everywoman like Bloom and Molly. As a consequence, “Blake’s prophetic poetry, however myth-filled and conceptually attractive, [is] not a comfortable resting place for the Stephen-Joyce of *Ulysses*” (158-59). Absolute in nature, Blakean eternity becomes in the end an inferno of tyranny rather than a land of liberty.

Partly in response to Blake, Stephen makes an experiment in “Proteus” by closing his eyes to test if he is “walking into eternity along Sandymount strand” (*U* 3.18-19). The result is predictable. When he opens his eyes, he sees a “world without end” (*U* 3.27-28), not the world of eternal truth, but the colorful world of temporal reality, which is what Stephen decides to espouse. As he insists in “Circe”: “I didn’t want it to die. Damn death. Long live life!” (*U* 15.4474) Blake did incorporate reality into his poetry, but in his search for eternity, “Blake killed the dragon of experience and natural wisdom, and, by minimizing space and time and denying the existence of memory and the senses, he tried to paint his works on the void of the divine bosom” (*CW* 222). For Joyce and Stephen, “the dragon of experience” and memory provide

material for the artist's creation, and the senses serve the artist to minutely appreciate and vividly portray the sensual world. As he kills and denies these essential elements for artistic creation, Blake bases his works on the void rather than on reality, and thus creates in his works an inhuman and monoglot world—"the void of the divine bosom." Budgen contrasts Blake's art with Joyce's:

Blake tells us of the forces that made the world. They are creative elements for ever forging and building, groaning and howling. Whatever they are, they are not human. His material is a loud, monotonous recitative. A whole population of elemental beings appears in *Vala* or *Jerusalem*, but they all talk with the same voice. Joyce deals with elemental shapes rather than elemental forces. Things are. . . . And Joyce's material has all the grace of an opera with its balance of orchestra, aria and recitative, different male and female voices and chorus. (311-12)

In brief, Blake constructs an inhuman world of monoglossia, full of sound and fury yet detached from humanity and reality, whereas Joyce creates a human world of heteroglossia, where everyman and everywoman dwell and divergent voices coexist.

As Ellmann points out, Joyce's work is "history fabled": for he recomposes what he remembers (1982, 364). What Stephen does in "Proteus" is similar. A spectator and speculator, he observes the sensual world and associates his observations with memories, and reworks and transforms them in his chronotope. Blake may ground his work on fabled history and imagination, but his repudiation of the senses essentially separates him from the colorful world of temporal reality. As Budgen observes, both Joyce and Blake "have a passion for locality"; the difference lies in the fact that "we do get a vision of the actual pleasant places when we read Joyce, and of the people who inhabit them, whereas the place names in Blake are abstractions only" (311). Rejecting the senses, Blake regards the material world as a mere shadow of eternity. Through the senses, Stephen recognizes that the vegetable world is not a shadow of eternity: it is reality itself. In contrast to Blake's praise of eternal truth and painting of his work "on the *void* of the divine bosom," Stephen prefers to accept and embrace the material existence of the world and its cycles of birth and death; he chooses to "[h]old

to the now, the here" (*U* 9.89)—a manifestation of Bakhtinian spirit. In "Scylla and Charybdis," Stephen enters once again into a chronotopic encounter with Blake and parodies the elder poet, and in so doing repudiates his search for eternity:

Space: what you damn well have to see. Through spaces smaller than red globules of man's blood they [Neoplatonic Theosophists] creepycrawl after Blake's buttocks into eternity of which this vegetable world is but a shadow. Hold to the now, the here, through which all future plunges to the past. (*U* 9.86-89)

What is important for Stephen, accordingly, is the immediate environment of contemporary reality, the here and now, which is the chronotope connecting the past with the future, and therefore the time-space one has to scrutinize and embrace.

In dialogue with Blake, Stephen is in the process of constructing his own philosophy of history. He accepts the forebear's concept of history as universal and cyclical, and favors the idea of creating the new out of a drastic revision and expansion of the potential meanings of past discourses. Like Blake, who "thought of himself as a prophetic bard with a harp that could prostrate tyranny and overthrow armies—or, more simply, as an honest man uttering his opinion of public matters" (Erdman viii), Stephen also intends to respond to public discourse and defeat tyranny mentally. But he disagrees with Blake's claim as to the fabulous nature of history and denies the eschatological model based on the search for eternity. Eschatology, Bakhtin argues, "always sees the segment of a future separating the present from the end as lacking value." Losing its "significance and interest," this separating segment of time "is merely an unnecessary continuation of an indefinitely prolonged present" (*DI* 148). Eschatologists slight the present and place hope in the future, but this future is in fact "emptied out" (*DI* 148), a futureless future in essence. Budgen compares Blake's eschatological/mythological history with Joyce's concrete history:

Blake invents a whole mythology with which to explain his world. Joyce shows the world (he does not explain it) in the world's own terms, its own living shapes. He takes history as present. It is now, in front of us. That



which lay *nacheinander* in time he translates, in the manner of a weaver of tapestries, into the *nebeneinander* before our eyes. (312)

Indeed, Blake incorporates contemporary events into his prophetic poetry, but as a poet having “all the fury of conviction of a religious revivalist” who “wants his readers to do something, to believe something, to worship something” (Budgen 312), he turns the immediate environment of contemporary reality into a specialized form of evangelical mythology. To put it more precisely, he sublimates his sources, transporting the present into the past and even into the future, where genuine dialogism and heteroglossia are unlikely to take place. In this respect, Blake is not too far removed from Irish revivalists, as the mentality of escapism characterizes both. Blake did reject imperial domination, as revivalists aimed at colonial resistance, but the histories they construct are both closed books with a predetermined ending, having no life potential for regeneration or the initiation of an alternative future. Stephen, on the other hand, strives to connect the past with the present, or, more exactly, to bring history down to earth—to the chronotopic reality of here and now—Dublin on 16 June 1904. This explains why the Shakespeare theory is delivered in the library, a storage for books with closed endings: Stephen must confront the dead discourses and enliven them through dialogic reaccentuation, in order to write a different history book with an open ending.

In the “Aeolus” episode, Stephen makes concrete his philosophy of history and creates a short but mature piece of historical/artistic work: “The Parable of the Plums.” Spoo has presented a convincingly minute and comprehensive reading of the Parable by viewing it as the product of Stephen’s discursive assimilation and aesthetic imagination (128). He also delineates in great detail how Stephen transforms incorporated discourses: the old women on the strand metamorphose into the Dublin vestals, Deasy’s adulteresses into Nelson the adulterer, misogyny into an implicit criticism of imperialism, etc (129). What one could add here is that Stephen, like Joyce, translates what lies *nacheinander* in time—chronological dots in memory—into the *nebeneinander*—a picture mediated by the author depicting the general paralysis of Dublin—before the eyes of his audience. On hearing Stephen’s depiction

of the two vestals, Professor MacHugh responds, “Vestal virgins. I can see them” (*U* 7.952-53), implying the vividness and concreteness of Stephen’s picture—in contrast to Blake’s abstract representations. Set in contemporary Dublin, Stephen’s Parable, or in Spoo’s words, “countervision of Irish history” (127), also differs from Blake’s eschatological vision of history in its emphasis on the chronotopic here and now and the actuality of turn-of-the-twentieth-century Dublin. The Parable is essentially an anti-parable, or in Bakhtin’s favorite term, a “novelized” parable, which, instead of focusing on “sowing the good seed and preaching the kingdom of heaven” as Biblical parables do (Suvin 59), presents two impoverished old women in a colonized land where seeds (“plumstones” [*U* 7.1027]) are spit out at random and the kingdom of heaven turns into a paralyzed colony under the dominion of imperial power. The omniscient and omnipotent God becomes “onehanded adulterer” (*U* 7.1018) laid bare for ridicule in spite of his dominating power. In this way, Stephen creates a new kind of parable—a new genre indeed—distinct from the traditional one, undermining the sacredness of Christianity, challenging the authority of imperial domination, and specifying the predicament of Irish reality at the same time. Like Blake, Stephen also calls his Parable a “vision” (*U* 7.917), which combines poetry and history and is “closer to reality than anything he has produced hitherto.” Its value lies in the fact that it “sacrifice[s] neither aesthetic vision nor historical reality” (Spoo 134). As Darko Suvin points out, the parable as a fictional form between metaphor and short story embodies the chronotopic development of metaphor, which may lead to the extension of narrative form from the parable to the short story and then to the novel (57-62). To borrow Suvin’s pattern but replace metaphor with epiphany, we may argue that Stephen brings epiphanies into chronotopic encounters and thereby constructs a mature form of narrative. Constituted out of *fabula* and *syuzhet*, or shaped in the manner of the *nacheinander* and the *nebeneinander*, the parodic Parable stands for Stephen’s first mature historical/artistic work, which consists of historical material, personal experience, and artistic reaccentuation. Simultaneously a work of art and a short page of Irish paralytic history, the Parable brings Stephen’s chronotopic encounters into a compendium and climax, enabling him to create even more mature

works such as the short stories collected in *Dubliners* and ultimately masterpieces like *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*.

A similar methodology of incorporation of chronotopic encounters is adopted again in Stephen's Shakespeare theory, another manifestation of his aesthetics of historicity stressing the interaction between temporal reality and historical/artistic creation, though broader in scope and more complicated in ideology. As a lecture delivered consciously within the context of Irish revivalism, whose version of history is analogous to a closed book, Stephen's theory emphasizes not only the all-importance of here and now (*U* 9.89), that is, the immediate environment of contemporary history, culture, and phenomena—an element neglected by revivalists—but also the crucial role of the historian/artist as mediator transforming assimilated discourses dialogically. Shakespeare's works, Stephen declares, result from the poet's incorporation of historical material ("jewbaiting," "witchroasting," the "lost armada," etc. [*U* 9.748-60]) and the personal experience of sexual defeat: "All events brought grist to his mill" (*U* 9.748). Interestingly, this principle also applies to Stephen's own theory, which is itself the result of dialogic incorporation and reaccentuation. To give an example, the view of Shakespeare as a "cornjobber and moneylender" (*U* 9.743) recalls Deasy's point of Shakespeare as a great moneymaker who "knew what money was" (*U* 2.242) in "Nestor."<sup>11</sup> Stephen comments mentally upon his own methodology: "Local colour. Work in all you know. Make them accomplices" (*U* 9.158). This comment properly summarizes Stephen's artistic credo: to write about what one is familiar with by processing what one incorporates. The pronoun "them" may refer to the audience listening to Stephen's argument in the library, but it may also refer to the incorporated materials which Stephen works into his theory: they become "accomplices" in his act of historical/artistic creation. Whatever attitude Stephen has toward his own theory, he is pleased with his methodology: "I think you're getting on

---

<sup>11</sup> Also, the image of "bloodboltered shambles" (*U* 9.133-34) in *Hamlet* recalls the cruel images of war-governed history in "Nestor"; the argument as to Ann Hathaway's unfaithfulness echoes Deasy's misogynous point of view; and the discourse "Christfox" (*U* 9.337) is a recurrence, though transformed, of the fox in Stephen's riddle. In *Paperspace: Style as Ideology in Joyce's Ulysses*, Patrick McGee also points out that Stephen's argument about Antisthenes comes from Professor McHugh in "Aeolus." For details, see McGee, p.63.

very nicely. Just mix up a mixture of theologicophilological" (*U* 9.761-62). As Patrick McGee observes, it is characteristic of Stephen to make "every random fact serve his purpose" in his discussion of Shakespeare (1988, 63). This characteristic significantly echoes Bakhtinian assimilation which stresses the reaccentuation of internalized discourses—recalling the Joycean motif of metempsychosis.

History, for Joyce, could be understood as a form of metempsychosis based on organic memory, personal yet simultaneously cultural. The historian/artist plays the agent or subject initiating the metempsychosis of incorporated historical materials by reworking them into the text; meanwhile, the historian/artist also plays the object undergoing the process of metamorphosis, transformed into various personae to inaugurate chronotopic encounters, which are linked up by organic memory, as demonstrated in Stephen's imaginative witnessing of the Irish past in "Proteus." In his Shakespeare theory, Stephen implicitly elaborates on this concept:

As we, or mother Dana, weave and unweave our bodies . . . from day to day, their molecules shuttled to and fro, so does the artist weave and unweave his image. And as the mole on my right breast is where it was when I was born, though all my body has been woven of new stuff time after time, so through the ghost of the unquiet father the image of the unliving son looks forth. In the intense instant of imagination, when the mind, Shelley says, is a fading coal, that which I was is that which I am and that which in possibility I may come to be. So in the future, the sister of the past, I may see myself as I sit here now but by reflection from that which then I shall be. (*U* 9.376-85)

In spite of its allusiveness and obscurity, this passage conveys two issues underlying Stephen's theory: heredity and self-representation. The image-form as the signified, Stephen postulates, changes with the flow of time and the shift of space, but the signifier, the image-memory located within the body, remains unchanged. When the historian/artist weaves and unweaves his image, he inevitably encounters questions as to how he should handle the inherited "mole"—sign of organic memory which is "the last to go" (*U* 9.391)—and present the inheritable self-image.

In "Tradition and the Individual Talent," a manifesto of modernism published in 1919, T. S. Eliot also deals with these issues. Eliot indicates that tradition, as a form of heredity, involves the "historical sense," which again involves a perception of "the pastness of the past" and of "its presence," compelling the author to write "not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order." This historical sense makes the writer traditional and "conscious of his place in time, of his own contemporaneity" (23). To put it more precisely, Eliot emphasizes the interaction between past heritage and present existence: the past is readjusted and reinterpreted by the present, and the present is influenced and directed by the past. This incessant interaction, or "conformity between the old and the new" (24), renders the written work both "timeless" and "temporal" (23), and since it resides in European literature and within it the national, the work is both universal and local. The writer's task, then, is to "develop or procure the consciousness of the past" throughout his career (25), his mind being "a receptacle for seizing and storing up numberless feelings, phrases, images," waiting to be united "to form a new compound" (27). The poet, in other words, functions as "a particular medium" in which "impressions and experiences" enter and "combine in peculiar and unexpected ways" to make a new formation (28). What is fundamental in the process of storage and combination—or Bakhtinian assimilation and reaccentuation—is to remain impersonal. Eliot stresses the importance of depersonalization in self-representation: "The progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality" (26).

T. S. Eliot's concept of tradition as the signifier whose signifieds vary in different chronotopes is interestingly Bakhtinian; the argument concerning the historical sense, which is both timeless and temporal, also recalls Bakhtin's idea of the great time—as well as Bergson's "duration"—within which the present enters into a dialogic relationship with the past and the future, and all meanings encounter subsequent developments. Joyce, in all probability, would acquiesce in Eliot's attitude toward tradition as hereditary property in need of constant chronotopic renewal, and in his

emphasis on the writer's role as a skilled processor with technical excellence. But it is unlikely that Joyce would agree with the insistence on depersonalization, which basically contradicts his own aesthetics. As commonly acknowledged, Joyce's works are to some extent personal, derived partly from private experiences and emotions. In a similar way, Stephen's interpretation of Shakespeare focuses on the personal—it is essentially a psychobiographical reading exploring the correspondence between the playwright's life and works, or as Scott W. Klein has it, “an extrapolated biography and psychology bound together by fiction” (1993, 440). Klein's comment significantly points to a crucial element in Stephen's construction of the Shakespeare theory: it may be a combination of biographical events and psychological analysis, but they are fictionalized or transformed in Stephen the historian/artist's receptacle of mind to serve his purpose. What concerns Joyce, to put it another way, is not “a continual extinction of personality,” but the transformation of it. Joyce would probably modify Eliot's statement this way: “The progress of an artist is a continual self-regeneration, a continual transformation of personality.” To read *Portrait*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake* in this light, these texts are both personal and impersonal/universal: the process of transformation makes the works not simply an account of personal experience, but a chapter of cultural/racial history, for what happens to the individual—the author or characters—is happening to the people as a whole owing to the heredity of organic memory. Joyce's texts, so to speak, are the result of the metempsychosis of incorporated material, personal and cultural, transformed by the historian/artist as he shuttles to and fro the molecules underneath which the inherited mole lies. Rather than “a continual surrender of himself,” similarly, what Stephen cares about is what the historian/artist incorporates and how he metamorphoses the incorporated material, or, in Stephen's own words, how the artist weaves and unweaves the inherited image which connects him *nacheinander* with the past and the future, and *nebeneinander* with the immediate environment of contemporary reality in general.

As Stephen's theory goes, Shakespeare incorporates into his works the motif of adultery—as an ancient and recurrent theme and as a personal experience—combines the incorporated material to form a new compound, and meanwhile metamorphoses

himself into his characters and encounters them as alter ego personae of the past and the future in the created chronotopes which constitute his artistic works. In so doing, Shakespeare achieves the effect of depersonalization, understood not as sacrifice of personal experiences and emotions, but as transformation and transcendence of them in chronotopic encounters taking place in his plays: "He has *hidden* his own name, a fair name, William, in the plays" (*U* 9.921-22, emphasis added). The play *Hamlet* is thus both private and public, temporal and timeless; it has entered the Bakhtinian great time, and records a personal history of cuckoldry and a racial memory of betrayal ruled by sexual domination, the personal neatly and tightly woven and unwoven into the universal. Significantly, the image of weaving/unweaving recurs in "Penelope," foreshadowing Stephen's metaphysical union with Molly through writing at the end of the day, and implying that Molly might be the answer Stephen is looking for: a new mother figure distinct from the oppressive May Dedalus and the subservient milkwoman.

To a certain degree, Stephen's conception of the historian/artist as the agent who initiates the metempsychosis of incorporated personal and historical material and encounters his alter ego personae chronotopically in the process of historical/artistic creation recalls Yeats's doctrine of the mask, interpreted by Harold Bloom as "desire taken up into the mind" or "the mind's attempt to find what will suffice" (331). Unlike T. S. Eliot, Yeats regards poetry as the product of the poet's "phantasmagoria" of his personal life, particularly the "tragedy" of his life (Yeats 1961, 509); it is the result of self-dialogue, "the quarrel with ourselves" sung "amid our uncertainty" (Yeats 1959, 331), recounting the poet's "flight from his entire horoscope" and "his blind struggle in the network of the stars" (1959, 328). Suffering or disappointment in life helps the poet to find or make his mask, that is, his "other self," "anti-self," or "antithetical self" (1959, 331), whose significance lies in the metaphysical function of renewing the old self-image that is suffering:

I think all happiness depends on the energy to assume the mask of some other life, on a re-birth as something not one's self, something created in a moment and perpetually renewed . . . If we cannot imagine ourselves as

different from what we are, and try to assume that second self, we cannot impose a discipline upon ourselves though we may accept one from others. (1959, 334)

The mask, therefore, is “the Ought or that which should be,” “the Will or what Is of our anti-self, our opposite cone” (Bloom 332). As the projection of unsatisfied desire, the mask serves as the medium for the hidden desire as ghost to embody itself: “Because the ghost is simple, the man heterogeneous and confused, they are but knit together when the man has found a mask whose lineaments permit the expression of all the man most lacks, and it may be dreads, and of that only” (Yeats 1959, 335). However dreadful the lineaments of the mask are, it allows for the unity of one’s selves, or the self and anti-self: “All possible unity is from the Mask,” which, as “a ‘form created by passion to unite us to ourselves,’” “leads the poet to at least the possibility of his fuller self” (Bloom 332, 183).<sup>12</sup> Unfulfilled passions, in other words, turn into vision as a result of phantasmagoria and then project onto the mask. To create an artistic work, the poet must find and make his mask out of the tragedy of his personal life: he “must go from desire to weariness and so to desire again, and live but for the moment when vision comes to our weariness like terrible lightning, in the humility of the brutes” (Yeats 1959, 340). This is not unlike Stephen’s idea of historical/artistic creation as chronotopic encounter with alter ego personae. Because of its very potential for renewal, the principle of the mask helps the poet deal with the inevitable influence of tradition—which for Yeats is both blessing and curse—by swerving away from it: “There is a shadow of type on type, for in all great poetical styles there is saint or hero, but when it is all over Dante can return to his chambering and Shakespeare to his ‘pottle-pot.’ They sought no impossible perfection but when they handled paper or parchment” (1959, 333). To put it in a nutshell, the mask makes self-representation possible; it enables the poet to encounter his anti-self and confront tradition, potentially leading to the construction of an artistic work. Accordingly, when

---

<sup>12</sup> To a certain extent, Yeats’s doctrine of the mask is similar to the concept of the “double” theorized by Robert Rogers, who argues that writers reveal their instinctive or repressed selves in their works. See Norris, pp. 173-74.



the historian/artist weaves and unweaves his image, he metaphysically assumes the mask as anti-self and then throws it off—a never-ending process necessary for historical/artistic creation.

In all respects, Stephen grounds his Shakespeare theory on the playwright's psychobiographical analysis: he construes *Hamlet* as fundamentally a personal domestic tragedy dominated by sexual betrayal and jealousy. Such a psychobiographical reading of Shakespeare resembles, to a certain degree, Ernest Jones's psychoanalytic study of *Hamlet*, whose original 1910 version on Hamlet and Oedipus Joyce possessed in his library (Kimball 162). As a psychoanalysis of Hamlet the character, Jones's study focuses on the inevitable heredity of the Oedipus complex based on sexual domination. This analysis crosses over from the character to the playwright when Jones deciphers the correspondence between Shakespeare's life and work, maintaining that Shakespeare exploits incorporated material to express personal feelings such as sexual defeat and bereavement. Jones concludes his argument:

There is thus reason to believe that the new life which Shakespeare poured into the old story was the outcome of inspirations that took their origin in the deepest and darkest regions of his mind. He responded to the peculiar appeal of the story by projecting into it his profoundest thoughts and emotions in a way that has ever since wrung wonder from all who have heard or read the tragedy. It is only fitting that the greatest work of the world-poet should have had to do with the deepest problem and the intensest conflict that have occupied the mind of man since the beginning of time—the revolt of youth and of the impulse to love against the restraint imposed by the jealous eld. (98)

Despite his concentration on *Hamlet* as a domestic tragedy dominated by the Oedipus complex, Jones implicitly pinpoints that the Oedipus complex is more than personal and domestic: it is cultural and universal, “the deepest problem and the intensest conflict that have occupied the mind of man since the beginning of time.”

Innovative and influential it may be, yet Jones's study is within the limits of the psychosexual—an assumed common limitation of Freudian psychoanalysis.

Nevertheless, psychoanalysis, or psychology in general, could go beyond the psychosexual scope to enter the field of psychopolitics, as Jones does when he asserts the universality of the Oedipal conflict, which is both domestic and cultural. In his study of the interaction between psychology, politics, and society in England during 1869 and 1939, Nicolas Rose points out that “the formation of the modern psychological enterprise” is based on psychological studies of individuals, which are “connected up with other social, political and theoretical events” (1985, 3, 10). In fact, many psychologists have noted that individual psychology could shed light upon our understanding of social and political operation. Betty Glad, for example, suggests the possibility of reading political psychology in terms of psychobiography:

Not only is [psychobiography] likely to provide a deep and systematic study of personality; it also permits a holistic approach to the personality and politics field and the building of political generalizations. Through it, insights can be gained into such phenomena as . . . political attitudes and perceptions, and patterns of behavior in panic and crisis situations. (321)<sup>13</sup>

Notwithstanding its concentration on the psychosexual, Stephen’s Shakespeare theory is in effect psychopolitically oriented: it criticizes the myth of the construction of patriarchal history. In this respect, Stephen goes beyond the limits of psychosexual analysis illustrated by Jones, and crosses over to the analysis of a sexuo-racial matrix. As Froula remarks, Stephen’s critique of “the Shakespeare canon” turns from the personal to the cultural, deciphering the discriminatory sexual dialectic shown “not only in Shakespeare’s works but in male cultural creativity more generally” (107). Stephen’s reading of Shakespeare is consequently both a personal autobiography and a “cultural autobiography” (108), connected together by masculine constructions of sexual racialism.

Many critics have registered the covert political implication in Stephen’s delineation of the theory. L. H. Platt reads “Scylla and Charybdis” in the context of the

---

<sup>13</sup> For similar arguments, see also Jon Elster, *Political Psychology*; Jeanne N. Knutson, “Personality in the Study of Politics”; Albert Somit and Steven A. Peterson, “Biological Correlates of Political Behavior”; and Geoffrey Cocks, “Contributions of Psychohistory to Understanding Politics.”

Irish revival, and regards the theory as a challenge to the high culture of revivalism (1992, 745). McGee observes that Stephen criticizes and undermines “the univocity of the patriarchal discourse” on which the Shakespeare theory feeds (1988, 68). In the light of “the sexual and racial metaphysical formula of transcendence,” Laura Doyle investigates Stephen’s questioning and parody of the sexually discriminatory myth of patriarchy that “transcends” feminized body into masculine art (166). Froula also interprets the episode in terms of psychoanalysis, noting that “Stephen’s theory dramatizes and supplements his culture’s essentialist construction of sexual difference as female womb/male ‘void’ by diagnosing, fetishizing, and self-ironically cultivating a psychohistorical wound of sexual betrayal to turn to artistic gain” (110).

The Shakespeare theory, indeed, could be construed as Stephen’s attempt to deconstruct the law of the father, as he defies Deasy’s view of history earlier in “Nestor.” When John Eglinton alludes to the myth of transcendence that exalts the fictive Ann Hathaway to the literary world and casts the actual Ann into historical oblivion, Stephen “retort[s]” (*U* 9.217) by offering biographical details of Ann so as to argue for her actual existence in history. From the Shakespeare-Ann Hathaway formula, Stephen deduces the tyranny of the patriarchal law that silences, if not usurps, the voice of the Other: “[H]e left her and gained the world of men. But his boywomen are the women of a boy. Their life, thought, speech are lent them by males” (*U* 9.254-55). Whatever Ann Hathaway is like, she is deemed adulterous and condemned to die, “for literature at least, before she was born” (*U* 9.216); a shadowy or even non-existence, she lives in/for masculine artistic creativity, not in/for historical actuality. To put it another way, under the disguise of artistic transcendence, the tyrannical law of the father marginalizes the Other, the feminized body of creativity imagined by masculine culture to be the key to the future. This transcendence ensures the fatherhood of offspring as created artistic work, and thus represses the fear of cuckoldry. The father as lawgiver, in this respect, is possessive and domineering by nature; characterization such as this betrays a sense of insecurity:

Whether these be sins or virtues old Nobodaddy will tell us at doomsday  
leet. But a man who holds so tightly to what he calls his rights over what he

calls his debts will hold tightly also to what he calls his rights over her whom he calls his wife. No sir smile neighbour shall covet his ox or his wife or his manservant or his maidservant or his jackass. (*U* 9.787-91)

Like *Nobodaddy*, Blake's "Father of Jealousy" or god of wrath and hellfire, the patriarchal father sticks to his possession, acting as the ruler in the disposition and manipulation of his subjects and objects. This possessiveness leads to the inevitable antagonism between father and son, "sundered" by a "steadfast" "bodily shame" (*U* 9.850). This antagonism, Stephen argues, results not solely from the "legal fiction" (*U* 9.844) of paternity as founded upon "incertitude" and "unlikelihood" (*U* 9.842), in contrast to *amor matris*, "the only true thing in life" (*U* 9.843), but also from the likely competition for power between the two men: "The son unborn mars beauty: born, he brings pain, divides affection, increases care. He is a new male: his growth is his father's decline, his youth his father's envy, his friend his father's enemy" (*U* 9.854-57). Not merely is the son's friend the father's enemy: the son himself *is* the father's enemy, who potentially threatens the throne of the father manifested as the King or the Church. This Oedipal conflict only dissolves within the myth of artistic transcendence, when the poet becomes "the father of all his race," the "all in all" (*U* 9.868-69, 1018-19).

To read Stephen's interpretation of Shakespeare in this light, the play *Hamlet* could be construed as a psychopolitical analysis of Irish history:<sup>14</sup> Parnell, as well as other martyred patriots like Wolfe Tone and Robert Emmet, is the murdered father, whose ghost, in unrest, keeps haunting the inactive son; the British Empire is the usurping new father, the tyrannical king whom the usurped stepson seeks to dethrone; Mother Ireland is the sinful queen who plays the willing guilty party in the adultery plot; and the Irish in general are the distracted Hamlets, endeavoring to revenge the murdered father, subvert the usurping uncle, and save the adulterous mother from infamy. In a subtle sense, Stephen's Shakespeare theory is the synthesis of Jones's approach of psychosexual analysis and Yeats's doctrine of the mask. While Jones

---

<sup>14</sup> For a psychopolitical reading of *Hamlet*, see Francis Barker, *The Culture of Violence*.

emphasizes that the predominance of the psychosexual drive determines and controls one's personality and gives it no free play, Yeats suggests the possibility of revealing and representing one's antithetical self by assuming the mask, in order to act out a different play with different personalities, plots, or endings. Stephen, however, synthesizes Jones and Yeats: wearing the mask of Shakespeare, he strives to work up a scenario of Ireland, based on psychosexual dominance and conflict, but acted out differently. In this new play as a chapter of Irish history, a new triangle is sought to replace the vicious Oedipal triangle of domineering patriarch, adulterous mother, and subversive descendant.

But as I mentioned earlier, Stephen dissolves the father-son conflict by parodically making the father and son into one: as an androgynous angel fathering his own offspring. The key to the sexuo-political triangle, in other words, is self-sufficient androgyny, understood not as a self capable of accepting the other, but as a Nietzschean solipsist who does not need the other. Or as Froula puts it, this "French triangle" (U 9.1065) shields the artist from both heteroerotic and homoerotic love, as shown in *Exiles*, so that the male artist could detach himself from the actual world of everyday reality and concentrate his attention on the fictive world of artistic creation (112-14). The triangle, in this regard, acts as a perfect excuse or medium for the self-centered artist, who could avoid actual contact with people and hide himself within the self-sufficient ivory tower of artist creation. Far from being constructive, this triangle is sinister and self-destructive, and its result, the Nietzschean solipsist or androgynous angel, could be as vicious and dangerous. As Nietzsche insists, only the great man with strong personality who has "lived through something greater and nobler than others" and "is building up the future has a right to judge the past" and write history, whereas the "weaklings" of the masses, the embodiment of "*impotentia*" in want of "self-mastery," are obliged to be ruled, incapable of participating in the writing of history (56, 46):

One giant calls to the other across the waste spaces of time, and the high spirit-talk goes on, undisturbed by the *wanton noisy dwarfs who creep among them*. The task of history is to be the mediator between these, and

even to give the motive and power to produce the great man. *The aim of mankind can lie ultimately only in its highest examples.* (81, emphases added)

In spite of his emphases on nonconformity and “immediate contact with life” (92), Nietzsche’s insistence on the great man as the sole creator of history deepens the gap and thus worsens the antagonism between Self and Other. The creator is considered the only essential element in history, and the Other as insignificant and unnecessary, in need of being “extinguished” (44). This argument easily turns into racism of all kinds, producing autocratic figures such as imperialists and fascists who, as self-styled great men, claim to have the exclusive right to create history and thereby justify their deed of extinguishing the “wanton noisy dwarfs” as conglomerate Other. Stephen is not unaware of the danger of Nietzschean solipsism or self-sufficient androgyny: “Nine lives are taken off for his father’s one. Our father who art in purgatory. Khaki Hamlets don’t hesitate to shoot. The bloodboltered shambles in act five is a forecast of the concentration camp sung by Mr Swinburne” (*U* 9.132-35). Rather than dissolving conflicts, the androgynous angel generates discriminatory racism and colonialism, which engender unjust coercion and inhuman slaughter. Joyce’s opposition to the idea of a pure Ireland may stem from the same reasoning: the insistence on self-sufficiency proves to be both naïve and destructive, leading to the formation of a new father imposing upon the ruled subjects another law which immutably stresses the differences between binary oppositions. By relating the wholesale killing in *Hamlet* to the wholesale killing in modern warfare—the Boer War in particular—Stephen not only pinpoints the dangerous outcome of solipsism, which, in the past and in the present, produces cold-blooded, self-centered Hamlets caught in the trap of Cyclopean ideology, but also condemns the coercion and injustice of the patriarchal law that, while producing solipsistic Hamlets, involves the innocent such as Ophelia in its “bloodboltered shambles,” its modern manifestation being the concentration camp built up during the Boer War, “established by the British under Kitchener for the retention of Boer civilians, including women and children,” and “widely regarded as cruel and inhuman” (Gifford 202). The juxtaposition of two chronotopically different

killings once again illustrates the heredity of organic memory manifested in historical events, operated by androgynous angels of Nietzschean solipsists in the name of the law of the father. It is noteworthy that in associating the slaughter in *Hamlet* with the colonial Boer War, Stephen unknowingly anticipates his spiritual union with Molly, who in “Penelope” also recalls and criticizes the Boer War.

Skeptical about the law of the father, Stephen does “mean to fly in the face of the tradition of three centuries” (*U* 9.214) which casts great men as lawgivers, women as willful adulteresses serving to spur masculine creativity, and youngsters as potential threats to the law. But as Doyle points out, Stephen’s attitude toward the myth of artistic transcendence is ambivalent; he internalizes yet questions it, parodies but is trapped in it: “His parodic pose fixes him, in fact, within that world. We should remember that Stephen fabricates this entire deconstruction of Shakespeare, Christianity, and gendered racialism to win a hearing inside, not outside, his culture—among the intellectuals of Dublin” (173). Although he attempts to dethrone the father, to fly in the face of patriarchal tradition, Stephen, like Icarus, falls into the sea of patriarchal mythologies that have incorporated him: his own theory backfires on him as he aims to overthrow the patriarch. In effect, his manipulation of Ann Hathaway, artistically fictionalized rather than biographically credible to serve his purpose of deconstruction, makes him unwittingly compliant with the world of masculine fantasy: Ann Hathaway is not a historical figure, but a prototype or stereotype, a necessary evil for the construction of his theory.<sup>15</sup> This parodic casting of Ann Hathaway as willful adulteress subtly betrays, once again, Stephen’s repressed and irreconcilable fear of the mother, whose imposing love, for him, is as tyrannical as the law of the father. Despite his endeavor to negotiate with the ghost of the mother, Stephen fails to reestablish an acceptable relationship with ambivalent *amor matris*, which has troubled him since “Telemachus.” He admits that under the law of the father *amor matris* is usually ignored or even trampled upon: “His mother’s prostrate body the fiery Columbanus in holy zeal bestrode” (*U* 2.143-44). But on the other hand, this

---

<sup>15</sup> For the necessity of sacrificing the historical Ann Hathaway for artistic creation, see also McGee, *Paperspace*, pp. 51-52.

willful love, as exemplified by Columbanus's mother, aims to keep the son's body and will under control, and thus signifies the other domineering tyrant, the counterpart to the father. As Stephen surmises in "Nestor" when he perceives his younger self-image in Sargent: "Secrets, silent, stony sit in the dark palaces of both our hearts: secrets weary of their tyranny: tyrants, willing to be dethroned" (*U* 2.170-72). In the context, "our hearts" refer to Stephen's and Sargent's, in which unknown secrets are stored, but the phrase may also refer to the mother's and the son's hearts, implying the close, near-tyrannical, relationship between them: the mother takes advantage of the secrets of mysterious *amor matris* to tie down the son and make him incapable of flight. Stephen acknowledges the inevitability of *amor matris*, but he is conscious of its ambivalent nature and thus seeks to dethrone the tyrant of this secret love. When he constructs the Shakespeare theory—which aims to dethrone the father—he is simultaneously rejecting the mother: "The eyes [of the mother] that wish me well. *But do not know me*" (*U* 9.827, emphases added). Deconstructing the law of the father and in the meantime denying the love of the mother, Stephen is inevitably trapped between Scylla and Charybdis, between "[t]he devil and the deep sea" (*U* 9.139-40).

As Spoo indicates, Joyce "processes the past" in *Ulysses*, which offers its own "mediation of history" in its exploration of the impact of the past upon the present world (4). In a similar way, Stephen also processes the past in his attempt to construct a chapter of Irish history by means of *fabula* and *syuzhet*. Whilst Deasy sticks to the past, Stephen tries to incorporate it dialogically into the present chronotope, so as to figure out a way of surviving in the present predicament under the past's nightmarish impact. As he descends to, or rather conjures up, the hell of the chronotopic past, Stephen is aware that history as a nightmare "would drain the blood of the living for a useless sacrifice to the dead" (Budgen 310). However "invasive," "insidious," and "oppressive" (Spoo 101) history may be, he endeavors to establish a less harmful relation to it and therefore to create his own version of history, more comprehensive and open-minded, less violent and sinister. The performance of this task is based upon his dialogue with Blake, with whom Stephen shares the view of history as universal and cyclical and the belief in the creation of the new out of a drastic revision and



expansion of the potential meanings of past discourses. Stephen appreciates Blake's methodology but rejects his eschatology, and registers that what he has to grasp is the immediate environment of contemporary culture and phenomena, not a remote past beyond retrieval or a distant future beyond control. In this respect, dialogue serves more to negotiate and create than to destroy and subvert, allowing Stephen to realize his desire of bursting through stifling historical discourses. Michael H. Begnal maintains that Stephen piles up dry facts "in the dusty corridors of his mind," and in so doing becomes "an intellectual voyeur," peeping at the learning of the past and degrading the heroic tradition of his native land (213). Begnal's statement is problematic and misleading. Instead of piling up dry facts, Stephen assimilates and reworks them in his chronotope, giving new life potential to decayed historical discourse, as shown in "The Parable of the Plums." Despite all his attempts, however, Stephen fails to establish a really acceptable relationship with history: he is caught up in the myth of patriarchal history grounded on sexual domination, as demonstrated in the Shakespeare theory. The mask he wears, after all, is forged in/by patriarchal tradition, which he has internalized, notwithstanding his attempt to undermine it. If history is the condition of identity (Druff 303), and Stephen "wants a name that will situate his identity beyond the law of the father and the great mother" (McGee 1988, 50), we may argue that he is trying to construct a history dominated neither by imperial Father nor by great sweet Mother, and meanwhile to represent a self-image which will be a modification of the inevitable impact of hereditary organic memory. For lack of a proper Nestor, however, Stephen is dangerously trapped in between. In this regard, the union with Bloom and Molly is essential to him: he needs a non-patriarchal father to lead him out of the Nietzschean world of solipsism, teaching him the essence of unselfish and unstifling love and guiding him toward genuine contact with the world of actuality and sensuality; he also needs a non-traditional mother to redefine *amor matris*, showing him an example of non-possessive, non-dominating, and non-reproachful mother who allows him to fly at his will.

In "Theses on the Philosophy of History," Walter Benjamin describes the angel of history he saw in a painting:

A Klee painting named “Angelus Novus” shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. This storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress.

(1992, 249)

Stephen, before his encounter with Bloom and Molly, is not unlike this angel, caught up between the catastrophic past and predictable future—predictable so long as the Irish fail to dethrone the tyrannical father whose law has long engendered the catastrophe, and to rethink the ambivalent *amor matris* which has kept them from flight. This may explain why the angel’s back is turned toward the future: because it is not a future of redemption, but a future of continuing catastrophe. Exiled from Paradise, or the Kingdom of the Father as Lawgiver, the angel tries to restore what has been destroyed, just as Stephen struggles to stay in his motherland in an attempt to awaken the paralyzed public governed by the father’s law, an attempt only involving himself in that general paralysis. Not until his encounter with Bloom and Molly is Stephen able to “move away” from the trap of the law/love. If, as Benjamin suggests, only the *flâneur* can seize the flitting image of the past and receive the message or meaning of history (Arendt 18-19), Bloom the wanderer is such a *flâneur*, a non-intimidating new father figure who, along with his non-conventional wife, will help Stephen the fixed angel move of his own accord and inspire him to the construction of a new chapter of Irish history. Bloom and Molly, indeed, are the new couple needed in Stephen’s new Paradise, who, together with Stephen, will enact a new paradigm of the “French triangle,” acting out in the time-space of contemporary Ireland the hereditary

Oedipal condition passing from the chronotopic past, with a different plot and ending—and this will be the chronotope which will liberate Stephen, and the history he would like to construct.

## CHAPTER TWO

### The Private, the Public, and the Subject: Bloom's Construction of the Architectonic Self

As a Jew living in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Dublin—a colonial city shot through with anti-Semitism—Leopold Bloom finds it difficult to establish an identity and make himself at home in the city. In the funeral procession of the “Hades” episode, Bloom is ignored and belittled by other mourners.<sup>1</sup> In the *Telegraph* office of “Aeolus,” he receives a cold shoulder from the foreman Nannetti (*U* 7.187-90) and becomes the object of derision for his fellow Dubliners (*U* 7.444-52, 988-94). In Barney Kiernan’s pub in the “Cyclops” episode, he is set up as the target of racial discrimination and hatred, and is nearly attacked physically by the furious Citizen (*U* 12.1843-51). To vindicate his subjectivity in the hostile environment and make the menacing city his home, then, becomes a mission for Bloom on 16 June 1904.

The conflict between individual subjectivity and social contexts has been a recurrent issue in modernism and has attracted much critical attention. In 1903, one year before Bloom’s famous wandering, Georg Simmel remarked on the predicament of the individual against the collectivization of social forces:

The deepest problems of modern life flow from the attempt of the individual to maintain the independence and individuality of his existence against the sovereign powers of society, against the weight of the historical heritage and the external culture and technique of life. (51)

To resist “being levelled, swallowed up in the social-technological mechanism” (52) is never easy, for metropolitan life tends to paralyze individuals, moving them into “a sphere of mental activity which is *least sensitive* and which is *furthest removed from the depths of the personality*” (53, emphases added). On the other hand, the “[p]unctuality, calculability, and exactness” required by modern metropolitan life also

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, Bloom’s account of the story about Reuben J. Dodd and his son is interrupted continually by Simon Dedalus and “thwarted” “rudely” (*U* 6.277) by the comparatively friendly Martin Cunningham. Also, at the end of the episode, he is treated with indifference by John Henry Menton as though he did not exist (*U* 6.1016-19).

incline to exclude “those irrational, instinctive, sovereign human traits and impulses which originally seek to determine the form of life from within instead of receiving it from the outside in a general, schematically precise form” (54). As a consequence, the predominance of “the objective spirit over the subjective” (58) characterizes modern culture, a characteristic which endangers the integrity and independence of individual subjectivity. To respond to this crisis of modernity, extreme individualism paradoxically emerges: individualization is “produced” and “over-exaggerated merely to be brought into the awareness even of the individual himself” (59). Simmel’s attitude toward individualism is neither positive, as that of many modernist writers, nor negative, as with collective ideologies, but neutral: “it is our task not to complain or to condone but only to understand,” since individualists “transcend” metropolitan collectivism and integrate their inner forces (60).

Joyce’s contemporary, Virginia Woolf, also finds it a thorny issue to solve the dilemmas of choice between social collectivism and individual freedom, “between the devil and the deep blue sea” (261). To lean toward social collectivism runs the risk of losing individuality; to embrace individual freedom, on the other hand, sets the subject at odds with social centripetal forces. What is essential is not to choose between the dilemmas, but to achieve a balance between the thorny options, as Woolf suggests in *Three Guineas*:

Find out new ways of approaching “the public”; single it out into separate people instead of massing it into one monster, feeble in mind. And then reflect—since you have enough to live on, you have a room, not necessarily “cosy” or “handsome” but still silent, private; a room . . . safe from publicity and its poison. (297)

Notwithstanding Woolf’s association of the public with a monster, she indicates the inevitability of contact with the poisonous monster; nevertheless, she pinpoints the necessity of maintaining privacy of some kind in order to protect oneself from being swallowed up by the public. Albeit Woolf addresses the “daughters of educated men” (261), the principle as suggested in this passage may apply to Bloom’s attempt to make himself a habitable home in Dublin: wandering in the colonial metropolis,

Bloom strives to figure out a way which allows him to approach the public *and* maintain the private, a zone somehow liminal between social centripetal forces and individual centrifugal forces.

A few critics have dealt with the issue of Bloom's subjectivity. In *James Joyce, Ulysses, and the Construction of Jewish Identity*, Neil R. Davison argues that Bloom, in the course of his eighteen-hour wandering in Dublin, constructs his Jewish identity by means of recollecting memories of his father and assimilating and reaccentuating discursive stereotypes of the Jew, which he must confront "to achieve a balanced psychological autonomy" (11). In *The Modernist Self in Twentieth-Century English Literature*, Dennis Brown defines Bloom's selfhood as "pluralist, heterogeneous and discontinuous" (1-2). Davison's exploration of the ways Bloom shapes his Jewish identity is convincing, but he pays more attention to the method Joyce creates his Jewish hero than the procedure the hero challenges social collectivism and constructs his own subjectivity. The claim as to Bloom's "pluralist, heterogeneous and discontinuous" self—broadly speaking, modernist selfhood—is without controversy, but Brown fails to detail how that selfhood is formed and in what way Bloom distinguishes himself from other "pluralist, heterogeneous and discontinuous" modernist subjects like Stephen and Molly, or, in a subtle sense, the Citizen and Gerty.

What I would like to investigate in this chapter is how Bloom establishes his self in a hostile city which threatens to devour the subjectivity of a supposed Other and to collectivize the voice of the individual, and how the individual, in confronting the threat, avoids the lure and trap of the other camp, the extremity of individualism driven by the unconscious. I would regard Bloom as the balance between the mouthpiece of public discourse, embodied by the Citizen and Gerty, and the representative of Nietzschean solipsism, exemplified by the Stephen before his encounter with Bloom and Molly, or at least the Stephen of *A Portrait*. To examine the methodology and process of Bloom's self-construction, it would be helpful to survey Bakhtin's concept of "architectonics."

In her preface to the French edition of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Julia Kristeva states that Bakhtin lacks a theory of the subject, a statement not entirely

correct. In spite of his failure to theorize specifically about the individual subject, Bakhtin does not ignore the issue altogether. During the early philosophical period of his career, when problems of ethics and aesthetics were his major concern, Bakhtin paid a great deal of attention to the issue of the subject, particularly the construction of human subjectivity, which Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist term “architectonics”: “the activity of forming connections between disparate materials” (84). Literally, architectonics is related to structuring, or as Holquist declares in his Introduction to *Art and Answerability*, is “concerned with questions of building, of the way something is put together” (x). Metaphorically, however, it is associated with the building of the self, representing the “structuring force that organizes communicative relations—whether between self and self, self and other, different selves, or self and the world” (Clark and Holquist 84). With its focus on the structuring of parts, architectonics is essentially a Self-Other relationship:

In order to vivify my own outward image and make it part of a concretely viewable whole, the entire architectonic of the world of my imagining must be radically restructured by introducing a totally new factor into it. This new factor that restructures the architectonic consists in my outward image being affirmed and founded in emotional and volitional terms *out* of the other and *for* the other human being. (AA 30)

The other, accordingly, functions as a “transparent screen” (AA 31), whose unique “excess of seeing” (AA 22) complements the self’s visual insufficiency resulting from his/her inevitable lack of seeing, and thus enables the self to achieve a tentative wholeness—which is the aim of architectonics. The architectonic self that structures parts, in this sense, subtly corresponds to what Nikolas Rose calls the modern assembled self, constituted out of the assembling of divergent forces interacting between the private and the public.<sup>2</sup>

For Bakhtin, the concept of architectonics refers not merely to the way “relations between living subjects get ordered into categories of ‘I’ and ‘another’”; it consists of

---

<sup>2</sup> For details, see Rose, “Assembling the Modern Self,” pp. 224-48.

a second level of meaning: how “authors forge the kind of tentative wholeness we call a text out of the relation they articulate with their heroes” (Holquist 1990, x). “An author,” Bakhtin explains, “is the uniquely active form giving energy” (AA 8), in a “productive” and “constructive” relation to the hero (AA 5). By means of articulation with the hero, the author reorganizes heteroglot voices, energizes the hero, produces a literary work, and in the meantime examines his/her relationship with the hero *as well as* the connection between self and other. Architectonics therefore denotes a double meaning of structuring: the individual’s constructing of a self and the author’s creating of a text. It is a relation of dialogue, between self and other, and between the author and the hero, resulting in the formation of a text, literary and subjective. To read *Ulysses* in this light, the corpus overtly conveys this double structuring: Joyce’s composing of his novel and Bloom’s fashioning of his self take place at the same time. As authors of their selves, both Joyce and Bloom create their own texts by means of dialogue with an other. The subject of Bakhtin’s architectonics, in this respect, is fundamentally a dialogic self (Holquist 1990, xxvi), whose essence lies in its openendedness and communicability—or its answerability.

The concept of architectonics—the building of the self—may find its counterpart in the literary genre popular in the nineteenth century, the *Bildungsroman*. Literally the novel of education, the *Bildungsroman* stresses the mental development of the hero. As a thinker trying to answer questions concerning “the nature of human consciousness under particular cultural and historical conditions” (Holquist 1986, xiv), Bakhtin takes great interest in the genre on account of its focus on “the image of *man in the process of becoming*” (SG 19), an image in which “a dynamic unity” is found (SG 21). To put it more precisely, the hero of the *Bildungsroman* undergoes the process of self-construction, and is always in a dialogic relationship with the outer world, his image mutable and developing. Becoming, indeed, never comes to an end, but is rather an openended and ongoing process. What is noteworthy with regard to this process is that Bakhtin links individual development to historical emergence:

He emerges *along with the world* and he reflects the historical emergence of the world itself. He is no longer within an epoch, but on the border between



two epochs, at the transition point from one to the other. This transition is accomplished in him and through him. He is forced to become a new, unprecedented type of human being. (SG 23)

What Bakhtin emphasizes here is not simply the affinity between self-construction and sociohistorical contexts, but the important role of the hero in the process of historical becoming: he acts as the pioneer in the period of transition, potentially leading the world to a new epoch. Such a pioneering hero resembles Bloom to some degree. A middle-man on the borders of races and genders, Bloom innovates at the sociohistorical transition point from colonial Erin to nationalist Ireland, from the dominance of patriarchal society to the emergence of women's liberation, setting the examples of a new citizen subject and a new womanly man.

From this point, we may argue that the subjectivity Bloom endeavors to constitute is an architectonic self, a self in the process of assimilating, dialogizing, and structuring, for the purpose of achieving in chaotic eras a tentative wholeness which is also a habitable home. As the journey of Odysseus aims at homecoming and self-affirmation, Bloom's eighteen-hour wandering is also a life journey, which leads to the creation and redefinition of a modern postcolonial subject position reflecting the emergence of postcolonial Ireland. Clark and Holquist suggest that quests enable individuals to construct their selves: "The way in which I create myself is by means of a quest: I go out to the other in order to come back with a self" (78). However old-fashioned this metaphor may be, it applies well to Bloom's journey of self-affirmation and self-construction: he goes out to confront the heterogeneous world in order to come back with an openended, all-inclusive self.

In the course of the self-constructing journey, empathy and return play indispensable and decisive roles:

I must empathize or project myself into this other human being, see his world axiologically from within him as *he* sees this world; I must put myself in his place and then, after returning to my own place, "fill in" his horizon through that excess of seeing which opens out from this, my own, place outside him. I must enframe him, create a consummating environment for

him out of this excess of my own seeing, knowing, desiring, and feeling.

(AA 25)

Empathy, in other words, enables the self to see the world from another angle, to perceive things differently and openmindedly, and to eschew the danger of provincialism. Bloom possesses this quality,<sup>3</sup> and can thus “[s]ee ourselves as others see us” (*U* 13.1058)—a quality the Cyclopean Citizen lacks. But what is important is not only the power of empathy: “in any event my projection of myself into him must be followed by a *return* into myself, a *return* to my own place outside the suffering person” (AA 26). If the self identifies entirely with the other and fails to return, he/she becomes a selfless object, always a projection of others and lacking a habitable destination/home—like the selfless Gerty, a mere sounding board for public discourse. Empathy *and* return, Bakhtin emphasizes, initiate aesthetic activities, which include self-construction:

Aesthetic activity proper actually begins at the point when we *return* into ourselves, when we *return* to our own place outside the suffering person, and start to form and consummate the material we derived from projecting ourselves into the other and experiencing him from within himself. (AA 26)

As the construction of the architectonic self begins at the point when the self returns to his/her own habitat from the other, the importance of the self-structuring journey lies not in its end—there is no teleological end as such—but rather in its process. Clark and Holquist remark on this process: “I ‘live into’ an other’s consciousness; I see the world through that other’s eyes. But I must never completely meld with that version of things, for the more successfully I do so, the more I will fall prey to the limitations of the other’s horizon” (78). What is noticeable in this passage is not solely Bakhtin’s emphasis on empathy and return or the pivotal role of the other or outsideness in self-construction. The ongoing, never-ending process of empathy and return also suggests the subject position Bakhtin favors: one that negotiates between the private and the public, the personal and the social. It is a position of great

---

<sup>3</sup> In his discussion of Bloom as a womanly man, Joseph Allen Boone also points out Bloom’s quality of empathy. See Boone, p. 72.

flexibility and freedom, not fixed at either pole. A subject living utterly in his/her consciousness possesses only the private self, which, existing idealistically, may turn into solipsistic existence, regardless of the law and the collective. The Nietzschean Stephen in *A Portrait* serves as an example. His friend MacCann calls him “antisocial being, *wrapped up in yourself*” (P 177, emphases added)—implying Stephen’s individualistic tendency. In the famous manifesto for freedom, Stephen announces his refusal to serve the public and his embracing of individual liberty:

*I will not serve* that in which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland or my church: and I will try to express myself in some mode of life or art *as freely as I can* and as wholly as I can, using for my defence the only arms I allow myself to use—silence, exile, and cunning. (P 246-47, emphases added)

An antisocial solipsist wrapped up in himself is unlikely to be able to forge the uncreated conscience of his people. The Stephen of *Ulysses* recognizes this, and thus insinuates the danger of solipsism in his Shakespeare theory. But if the subject “lives into” an other’s consciousness and merges completely with it, the private/personal self no longer exists: what is left is simply the public/social self. Such a subject becomes a spokesperson for the collective voice, as numerous Dubliners in *Ulysses* assume this role. Bloom, however, mediates between the two selves. While absorbing the consciousness of the public, he manages to maintain his private self, trying not to surrender to the trap of being incorporated into the social, whereas other Dubliners, such as the nameless Citizen and Gerty, embrace the public and discard the private. On the other hand, Bloom tries not to resort entirely to the realm of the private: after short-term lingering in his imagination and hallucination, he always returns to the present world of social reality—a world dominated not by the private but by the public consciousness. He empathizes, yet he also returns. Distinguishing himself from other Dubliners in this respect, Bloom embodies a new subject position of which Joyce approves: an in-between position hovering between the two extremes of personal and social, or more precisely, a third existence resulting from the negotiation of the extremes yet going beyond the binary opposition. In Bakhtinian terminology, Bloom

acts as an “answerable author,” who seeks to “accomplish the task of translating [him]self from inner language into the language of outward expressedness and of weaving . . . [him]self . . . into the . . . fabric of life as a human being among other human beings” (AA 31-32)—i.e., an author negotiating between personal memory and social consciousness, the two woven together as a new texture/text.

Comprising both the private and the public selves, the modern subject, as Toril Moi points out, is produced by the “highly complex network of conflicting structures,” which “encompass not only unconscious sexual desires, fears and phobias, but also a host of conflicting material, social, political and ideological factors” (10). To construct the architectonic self, the modern subject must mediate between the two selves, bringing them into a dialogic relation and conversing with both of them. In a modern metropolis like colonial Dublin, however, the public self, as manifested in the city as collective whole, often proves to be a threat to the private. In the form of various sounds and voices, the collective whole threatens to diminish, if not invade, the private territory of the individual. Bloom has been under this threat during his wandering in Dublin. As Steven Connor observes:

The urban consciousness of Joyce’s *Ulysses* . . . is predominantly a vocal-auditory consciousness; the city of Dublin is very imperfectly and intermittently seen in *Ulysses*, being experienced rather as an agitated polyphony of travelling sounds and voices, in which the seemingly private “interior monologues” of Leopold Bloom, Stephen Dedalus and others are subject to every kind of auditory interference, including songs, jingles, sayings and non-human sounds. (1997, 210)

Indeed, this polyphony of travelling sounds and voices of the city penetrates throughout the novel. But among the twelve episodes of “The Wanderings of Ulysses,” “Sirens” serves as the best paradigm in representing these various forms of auditory interference. With music as its art and *fuga per canone* as its technique, “Sirens” is saturated with sounds and voices generated by the city, which attempt to collectivize Bloom’s private self—to enforce the themes “love and war” upon him. On the other hand, the desires, fears, and phobias of Bloom’s unconscious tempt him to

deviate from the call of the collective self and walk his own way. As the themes of love and war extend to and dominate respectively the following episodes “Nausicaa” and “Cyclops”—in which public discourses prevail as well—I will treat the three episodes as a whole, and examine how Bloom constructs his architectonic self out of the auditory interference of the city-as-collective-self and of the allurements of the private unconscious self, assimilating, dialogizing, and balancing the two selves for the emergence of postcolonial compound subjectivity.

As the Joycean text focuses on Bloom’s wandering in Dublin, and the “Sirens,” “Cyclops,” and “Nausicaa” episodes are all set in public areas, it may be helpful to investigate the relationship between the subject and the social space. In his insightful study, *The Body and the City*, Steve Pile explores the spatial impact on the subject. He suggests that the sense of self involves the sense of space, that “violations of space” might be “personally felt” as “violations of the self,” for “a hard, high, fixed, impermeable boundary” exists “on a space which is both urban and bodily” (6), and that, as a result, “the transgression of borders” might probably provoke “border disputes,” or even “shock,” “fear,” and “fury” (5). Space, in this context, contains a double implication: each individual in the city is allocated an urban *and* a bodily space, the boundaries of which are not allowed to be transgressed. The issue of space is consequently inseparable from the problem of Self and Other: spatial transgression provokes “shock,” “fear” and “fury” because the individual feels a violation of both urban and bodily spaces by the other. Referring to David Sibley, who considers space “an integral part of the outsider problem,”<sup>4</sup> Pile comments that the “construction, maintenance and policing of spatial boundaries” closely “relates to the ways in which people develop boundaries between self and other” (89). Spatial boundaries therefore serve to distinguish the self from the other, setting the two apart. To get a better understanding of the shock, fear, and fury engendered by the transgression of borders—as illustrated in the “Cyclops” episode, in which Bloom plays the role of an intruding outsider—and to examine how an individual constructs a habitable home on

---

<sup>4</sup> Sibley states that “The way in which space is organised affects the perception of the ‘other,’ either as foreign and threatening or as simply different” (1992, 116, quoted in Pile 89).

the alterity of self and other, it would be useful to draw up “a map of the self in place, an integration of the spaces of the body, the space of the self and the other, and the mediating environments of the home, the locality and the world beyond” (Sibley 1995, 125, quoted in Pile 89-90).

Home, as Sibley indicates, is the mediating environment where the space of the self integrates with the space of the other. In this sense, any space in which one is free from the policing of spatial boundaries is, metaphysically at least, home. Bloom finds it difficult to make himself at home in Dublin because, in the eyes of other Dubliners, he is “so foreign from the others” (*U* 13.1210). Bloom’s foreignness presumably results from his Jewish lineage—long considered an unwelcome Other in anti-Semitic ideologies—which excludes him from the “specific *territorialisations* of desire, the body, geographic space, and the social order” such as the city (Pile 203).

Territorializing social order, the city demands the loyalty of its citizens, which implies the necessity of certain disciplines, or unification and collectivization of individual wills. If one refuses to participate in that territorialization, he/she finds him/herself labeled as an other expelled from the city, incapable of finding a habitable home in the urban space. As territorializations of desire, nostalgia, sentiment, and heroism, the Ormond bar and Barney Kiernan’s pub tend either to involve Bloom in the collectivity or to dismiss him as a strange and threatening other. It seems only an open space beyond the direct control of urban territorialization such as Sandymount Strand may allow Bloom to enjoy his bodily/geographical space to some extent, and it thus becomes a tentatively habitable home for the self-constructor.

In spite of the territorializing inclination of the city, the individual body is not necessarily a powerless victim under the manipulation of the urban space. Bodies, in one way or another, may be active: “Bodies are made within particular constellations of object relations—the family, the army, the state . . . the nation, and so on. These are not, however, passive bodies which simply have a space and are a space; they also make space” (Pile 209). Notwithstanding his expulsion from urban territorializations, Bloom, in the act of wandering, endeavors to make space in the city. The space he attempts to make may be regarded as a “third space,” which, according to Pile, refers

to any “negative” space lying “beyond the structure of significance” (183). Third spaces, in other words, are located on the border of dualisms. Nevertheless,

third spaces do not simply lie beyond dualisms, they call into question the constitution of dualisms; third spaces are not simply gaps between axes of power (such as race, class, gender, sexuality), *they are also created out of the interactions between different power relations*, different desires and different fears; third spaces are also inflected in geographical space—in the body and in the city. (Pile 183, emphases added)

Bloom occupies and makes a third space because he wanders through the alterity of these dualisms, belonging and yielding to neither camp. John S. Rickard puts it reasonably: Bloom is “literally ‘singled out’ in the text, allowed to remain free from the kinds of defective mnemotechnic that other Dubliners are prone to” (78). As Joyce is aware of “his status as a split subject” constituted by opposed discourses such as British imperialism and Irish nationalism (Rickard 16), Bloom has a similar awareness. Instead of being a passive subject constructed by either discourse, Bloom actively incorporates and dialogizes discursive oppositions, trying to make a third space and construct an architectonic self out of the interactions of diverse power relations in the city.

The efforts to mediate between dualistic discourses and make a third space in the city relate Bloom to the figure of the *flâneur*. K. Tester interprets this figure:

The *flâneur* is the secret spectator of the spectacle of the spaces and places of the city. Consequently, *flâneurie* [sic] can . . . be understood as the activity of the sovereign spectator going about the city in order to find the things which will occupy his gaze and thus complete his otherwise incomplete identity; satisfy his otherwise dissatisfied existence; replace the sense of bereavement with a sense of life. (6-7, quoted in Pile 230).

The *flâneur*, accordingly, is both an observer and an observed. Though seemingly the object of the city’s gaze, he represents the panorama of the city through his eyes; his view, Duffy points out, “provides an equalizing gaze upon an heterogeneous group of people, activities, and spectacles” (62). Just as Bloom wanders ceaselessly in Dublin,

the *flâneur* is never a static subject, but rather a mobile subject always on the move (Duffy 54). Such a mobile subject position determines the role of the *flâneur* as the spectator of the city, who occupies a third space situated in a marginal location. Pile notes that the marginal location “inside *and* outside power relations” gives the *flâneur* “access to the streets, to the crowds, to the erotic underground of city life”; he is “a masquerade, which acts out its constitutive ambivalence to others, through a play of absences and presences, in the site of others” (231). Bloom’s presences in and absences from the Ormond hotel and Barney Kiernan’s pub—the sites of other Dubliners who consider Bloom an other—align him with the role of a *flâneur*, who, “treat[ing] the objects of the city with a somewhat detached attitude,” is endowed with the ability to “transform faces and things so that for him they have only that meaning which he attributes to them” (Tester 6-7, quoted in Pile 230). Acting as an author who creates his own text of the city in order to make space in it, Bloom the Dublin *flâneur* assimilates and reaccentuates urban discourses, yet refuses to immerse himself in various territorializations of the city by the very means of ceaseless *flânerie*.

In *The Subaltern Ulysses*, Duffy reads the novel as “an early twentieth-century flaneur-novel, because of its manifest aim to characterize a city and because Bloom seems the very personification of the most characteristic modern persona, the man of the crowd” (62). Duffy regards Bloom’s *flânerie* as “aggressive, emancipatory, and the blueprint for a potential version of new postcolonial subjectivity,” and claims that “the enlivened, reborn flaneur in Joyce’s text is formed out of a model for the representation of the urban subject” (63). Duffy’s argument is convincing, but his focus falls mainly on the relationship between the modernist *flâneur* and such postcolonial contexts as commodity culture and the colonial gaze. I would agree with Duffy in his view that Bloom represents a new citizen subject in the postcolonial urban space, but will focus rather on the method and process of his space-making and self-construction.

An urban space like the city of Dublin, as Connor observes, is subjected to auditory interference (1997, 210). Among these different kinds of auditory interference, music may be one of the most influential. In Ireland, music has



traditionally borne a double function: it is both personal and political, associated with sexual and national longings simultaneously. A music-lover, Joyce incorporates music into all his major works. In "The Dead," songs arouse Gretta's reminiscences of Michael Furey and inspire Gabriel's epiphany, which leads him to reexamine his relationship with his wife and his native land. In *A Portrait*, Simon Dedalus's music used to be a source of comfort and peace, which "drove off all the mists of the night's ill humour from Stephen's brain" (P 88). In the corpus of *Ulysses*, musical allusions populate all the eighteen episodes. Zack Bowen suggests "the absolute necessity of music per se to an understanding of Joyce's textual strategies, the characters' minds, and the thematic patterns of his books" (1995, 2). This is especially true with regard to "Sirens," the episode of music.

The Gilbert and Linati Schemata indicate that the technique of "Sirens" is *fuga per canonem*, "fugue according to rule." "A fugue," Margaret Rogers explains, "is a polyphonic musical composition of one or more themes repeated or imitated by successive voices sounding against each other, creating a single harmonic texture in a continuous interweaving of voices" (15). To read the "Sirens" episode in this light, we may assume that the barmaids and the bar-frequenters, as the embodiments of public discourses, sing the fugue of the city-as-collective-self successively to achieve the effect of "a single harmonic texture," in which the voice of the other is either silenced or collectivized. While being one of the eight parts of the fugue,<sup>5</sup> Bloom incorporates these public discourses on the one hand and tries to reaccentuate them with private memory on the other, and in so doing sings his own fugue and makes space for himself in the city. The architectonic self Bloom endeavors to construct, therefore, may also be termed a fugal self, which entails the assimilation and transformation of public discourses by the individual, who not only repeats and imitates these discourses, but, more importantly, reaccentuates them to serve his/her needs, so as to create another "single harmonic texture in a continuous interweaving of voices" distinct from that of the city.

---

<sup>5</sup> Rogers enumerates the eight parts: "Miss Douce, Miss Kennedy, Dedalus, Bloom, Molly, Dollard, Lenehan and Boylan" (15).

To a certain extent, the repeated themes and recurring voices of the fugue recall Richard Wagner's use of the leitmotif in his opera: "the brief phrase that, repeated and varied, comes to represent the character, object, idea, or emotion in connection with which it sounds" (Martin 150). An admirer of Wagner, Joyce is familiar with the composer and his work. As Timothy Martin observes, Wagner's work acts as "a *source* of musical material for literary use," among which the leitmotif is the most prominent (150). Essentially "representational," leitmotifs "evoke particular characters, symbols, and themes," and "[offer] thematic continuity, [link] one context with another and [underline] relationships between characters and ideas" (Martin 151). Martin notes that Joyce consciously adopts Wagner's leitmotifs in his work: even the use of interior monologue in the novel shows traces of Wagnerian influence (153-54). In general, repeating literary and musical allusions (to *Hamlet*, *Martha*, etc.), recurring characters (Boylan, the blind stripling, and so on), phrases that become attached to particular characters ("bronze by gold" to the barmaids, "jingle" to Boylan, "met him pike hoses" to Molly, etc.), and major themes (construction of a self, search for a father, definition of a national identity, and so forth): all these characteristics resemble leitmotifs (Martin 154). But it is inadequate to regard all recurring elements—whether phrases, characters, or themes—as leitmotifs. Martin's definition of the literary leitmotif sounds more precise and appropriate for my argument concerning Bloom's construction of the architectonic/fugal self:

a brief, distinctive phrase which, through repetition and variation in appropriate contexts, establishes its meaning, acquires intrinsic importance . . . accumulates in thematic and emotional significance, and draws together the contexts in which it appears. (154)

According to this definition, we may argue that love and war are the most dominant leitmotifs in "Sirens," which, sung repeatedly and variously by the barmaids and barflies, function as a hypnotizing power to incorporate Bloom into the fugue of the city-as-collective-self.

In his interpretation of the overture of "Sirens," Heath Lees offers a notable explanation of the fugue:

The word *fuga* literally means “flight,” and its coining in medieval music reflected the appearance of one voice in pursuit of another or “chasing” it . . . The musical theme of chase is singularly appropriate for the “Sirens” episode since it is his pursuit of Boylan that has led Bloom to the Ormond Hotel, and the episode’s narrative concern is with Bloom’s flight from the ephemeral attractions of the barmaids and from the temptation to easy refuge offered by the boozy crowd’s cheap sentimentality. (45)

Lees’s explanation of the fugue as flight and chase is persuasive: Bloom does pursue Boylan to the Ormond Hotel. Nevertheless, he is also chased and tempted by Sirens in the bar—as embodied by tempting songs disseminating the leitmotifs of love and war—and thus has to escape from them. Moreover, the “cheap sentimentality” is not an “easy refuge” but rather a deadly trap, which, with music as its disguise, tempts the “boozy crowd” to group hypnotism through the entrancement of the fugue of the city.

In a semi-closed urban space like the Ormond bar—analogous to the city in miniature—people are easily hypnotized by certain atmospheres and indulged in songs of specific leitmotifs appointed by the composer of the fugue, the city-as-collective-self. Jack W. Weaver remarks that music helps Joyce’s characters to discover a place in, and come to terms with, the universe (6). In spite of the apparent controversy of Weaver’s remark regarding the constructive power of music, Joyce’s characters do try to make a habitable home in the colonial city; and yet they must resist the trap and threat of music before they achieve the aim, otherwise they might suffer the same fate as so many sailors in *The Odyssey*: “led to [their] death on the rocky shore of [the Sirens’] isle” by their “sweet meadow lolling” (Gifford 290). Similar to the sailors, the barflies in the Ormond Hotel are charmed by the spell of music and fall prey to the hypnotizing collective voice, discarding their private self for the public.

In actuality, Joyce is conscious of the spell of music: he declares that the purpose of the *fuga per canonem* technique of “Sirens” is to “describe the seductions of music beyond which Ulysses travels” (SL 242). By “the seductions of music,” Rickard comments, Joyce means “the power of music to carry and intensify sentiment and sentimentality, including nostalgic longings” (79). Sirens, in this sense, refer both to

the barmaids who allure men into the bar with alcohol, and to the barflies who sing beautifully of the past, of lost love, and of the martyred Croppy Boy (Rickard 79). Sebastian Knowles contends that all songs played in the Ormond bar contain seduction imagery (451), and that a Siren possesses three essential characteristics in *Ulysses*: “presence in Bloom’s imagination as a seductive force [such as Martha Clifford], description recalling the tropes of the original Greek myth, and connection with Molly Bloom” (449-50). A fourth characteristic may be added to Knowles’s list: the collectivizing voice of the city, which tries to tempt Bloom into traps of nostalgic longings of love and war as sung successively by the Dubliners. While Homer’s Sirens are literally fatally attractive, Joyce’s Sirens lead their victims to “stasis, binding, and paralysis” (Rickard 79)—in other words, a discarding of the individual self for the collective, the silencing of the personal fugue by the city’s, and the absorption of private space by the urban.

Sung repeatedly and variously by Dubliners, the thematic leitmotifs of love and war dominate “Sirens” and run respectively through almost every song in the episode. Significantly, the thematic leitmotifs of love and war have been anticipated by the cavalcade of the lord lieutenant of Ireland, which passes by the Ormond bar and forms the background to the “Sirens” episode. An imperial ruler, the viceroy, along with his lady “on [the] way to inaugurate the Mirus bazaar in aid of funds for Mercer’s hospital” (*U* 10.1268-69), preludes the leitmotifs to the episode, and at the same time spreads the message all over the urban space by means of cavalcade. Like catalysts, these songs act on Bloom’s consciousness and unconscious, continually reminding him of his dubious existence as an outsider inside Dublin community and his precarious relationship with Molly, attempting to put him in tune with the city’s fugue. Some of the love songs, noticeably, are simultaneously war songs: the air “Love and War” serves as an example. In effect, the combination of sexual longing and patriotic feeling characterizes many of the Irish songs in the nineteenth century. In these songs, not only is the loved female transformed into a symbol of Ireland, but gender roles and citizen subject positions are also allocated. The songs of Thomas Moore typify this trend.

In “Drink to Her,” an air in *Irish Melodies*, the narrator sings of an anonymous “her,” a beautiful girl who “long / Hath wak’d the poet’s sigh” and “gave to song / What gold could never buy” (262). It is conventional to align a woman with the Muse—to compare a beloved beauty to the invaluable source of poetic inspiration. What is noteworthy in this poem is that the woman is depicted as a passive object waiting to be acted on: “Oh! woman’s heart was made / For minstrel hands alone; / By other fingers play’d, / It yields not half the tone” (262). Woman in this passage is likened to a musical instrument, presumably a harp, which only the poet can and knows how to play; she is analogous to an inanimate object under the manipulation of the male and has no autonomy of her own. Since the harp is a traditional emblem of Ireland, the objectified beautiful girl of the song thus embodies Erin, passive and helpless, in need of minstrel hands to play tunes on her. The minstrel, on the other hand, does not merely take the responsibility of tuning the harp; he is also a “warrior-bard,” obliged to go to war, stand in “the ranks of death,” and tear chords of the harp asunder when he falls, so as to prevent her from “sound[ing] in slavery” (“The Minstrel-Boy,” 318). In short, woman as sung in Moore’s songs is a lifeless object incarnated into Erin, lost in slavery, and waiting to sound with the minstrel’s help. While woman plays the role of a passive object in need of male manipulation, protection, and salvation, man is destined to become a minstrel boy, a warrior-bard going to war for his Beauty/Harp—these are the only citizen subject positions assigned to the male and female as shown in Moore’s songs. Such polarization of gender roles and citizen subject positions—man as warrior going to war, and woman as objectified emblem of Ireland manipulated by man and as the lost land waiting to be recovered—evinces a state of paralysis: neither man nor woman is given a chance to choose their role, for all roles are predetermined and assigned by the collective self.

In “’Tis the Last Rose of Summer,” a song occurring in the “Sirens” episode, paralyzed sexual and social identity is illustrated once again. Traditionally, the rose symbolizes love, but in this song it is transformed into a symbol of all the goodness of summertime—the glory of Ireland—on the decline. Seemingly deploring the passing

of summer, the narrator in fact announces his love to the last rose of summer which turns out to be Erin:

So soon may *I* follow,  
 When friendships decay,  
 And from Love's shining circle  
 The gems drop away.  
 When true hearts lie wither'd,  
 And fond ones are flown,  
 Oh! who would inhabit  
 This bleak world alone? (Moore 315)

If we read it as a conventional love song, we may assume that the narrator loses his love, who now lies "scentless and dead" with her "mates of the garden" (Moore 314), a loss which drives the heartbroken lover to decline to "inhabit / This bleak world alone." But the capital "Love" implies that it is patriotic love rather than romantic affection, and hence the solitary blooming rose refers to the personified Erin on the verge of decay. As a true lover—a true patriot and warrior-bard—the narrator announces his willingness to follow her to the field of war where her companions—her followers—lie, whatever measures he has to adopt before entering the garden of passing summer/past glory. Decayed friendships, dropped gems, withered true hearts, and flown fond ones, in this light, allude to the narrator's fellow warriors, who have lost their lives in the battle for their Love, Erin.

Whilst "'Tis the Last Rose of Summer" may seem only implicitly patriotic, the mingling of romantic love and political yearning is explicit in "When He, Who Adores Thee," especially in the second stanza:

With thee were the dreams of my earliest love;  
 Every thought of my reason was thine;  
 In my last humble prayer to the Spirit above,  
 Thy name shall be mingled with mine.  
 Oh! blest are the lovers and friends who shall live  
 The days of thy glory to see;

But the next dearest blessing that Heaven can give

Is the pride of thus dying for thee. (Moore 228)

The first half of the stanza describes the narrator's profound affection toward his beloved; it sounds like a love song, pure and simple. But when we proceed to the second half of the stanza, we find that the loved one turns out to be the Loved One, Erin, whose freedom and glory her lovers—the Irish patriots—are willing to fight and die for. In this way, the love for a female merges with the love for the homeland; the female turns into Erin, the only beloved of the Irish patriots waiting to be released from her bondage and to recover her past glory. Paralyzed gender roles and citizen subject positions are demonstrated once again. As a matter of fact, similar songs abound in *Irish Melodies*: “Remember Thee,” “The Legacy,” “She Is Far from the Land,” and many others all speak for this paralysis. Songs in *Irish Melodies*, in a nutshell, are characterized by the crossing of romantic love and patriotic affection. Erin is likened to an enchanting yet imprisoned female, who needs true lovers to sacrifice themselves for her liberty. In this sense, Erin represents another seductive Siren, who, in the name of patriotic love, leads her followers to the field of war and ultimately to death; her songs signify the calling of the collective self, which requires each individual voice to sing harmonically under her direction, or rather under the direction of the collectivizing voice.

Curiously, however, these Siren songs sing of defeat rather than liberty. In songs like “The Harp that Once Through Tara's Halls” and “The Minstrel-Boy,” both occurring in the “Sirens” episode, the appeal to force and Irish freedom is typical and apparent: it is important that “some heart indignant breaks” to wake up Erin the harp so that she may give throbs to “show that still she lives” (229), for her “songs were made for the pure and free” and “shall never sound in slavery” (318). Despite their calling for Irish freedom, both songs describe depression and collapse: the harp “breaks at night” to tell the “tale of ruin” (229), and the Minstrel-Boy is found in “the ranks of death” immediately after going to war (318). What is depicted in both songs is not hope and liberty, but frustration and death. Significantly, in “The Origin of the Harp,” Moore relates the “soft Harp” to “a Siren of old” who “so long hath been

known / To mingle love's language with sorrow's sad tone" (281-82). What is remarkable about this song is not simply the fact that woman is connected with the weeping Siren transformed into the Harp, but also the fact that the Siren songs of the Irish Harp combine the leitmotifs of love and war as defeat, intensifying the atmosphere of grief and failure and driving her listeners to further states of paralysis without their knowledge. As a consequence, it is doubtful whether the sexualized love songs singing of defeat will lead the Minstrel-Boys to save Erin from slavery *or* intensify the state of bondage.

In the advertisement to the first and second numbers of *Irish Melodies*, Moore points out the affinity between music and politics in native Irish music: "how much [music and politics] are connected . . . appears too plainly in the tone of *sorrow* and *depression* which characterizes most of our early Songs" (113, emphases added). Irish music, indeed, is anything but solely a means of expressing erotic feelings: political yearnings often merge with erotic feelings to make the song both private and public—or even more political than erotic. Moore goes on to note the role music plays in Irish history:

It has been often remarked, and still oftener felt, that in our music is found the truest of all comments upon our history. *The tone of defiance, succeeded by the languor of despondency*,—a burst of turbulence dying away into softness,—the sorrows of one moment lost in the levity of the next,—and all that *romantic mixture of mirth and sadness*, which is naturally produced by the efforts of a lively temperament to shake off, or forget, the wrongs which lie upon it. Such are the features of our history and character, which we find strongly and faithfully reflected in our music; and there are even many airs, which it is difficult to listen to, without recalling some period or event to which their expression seems applicable. (118-19, emphases added)

To put it another way, music embodies the public discourse circulating in history and impelling the listener to identify with the ideology or doctrine promoted by that discourse. When singing or listening to these songs, an ordinary Irishman is supposed to feel sorrow and depression, to experience empathy with the "expression" in the



songs, and to be transformed into a Minstrel-Boy willingly going to war. The danger is that a return to the self fails to follow the empathy, and the Irishman is hence trapped in the frame of the empathetic state, being nothing but a battling and martyred Minstrel-Boy forever. Moore admits that “too great warmth of . . . political sentiment . . . occur[s] in the course of these pages [of *Irish Melodies*]” (129), and that he has chosen these airs with “touches of political feeling” and “tones of national complaint” “as a vehicle of dangerous politics,—as fair and precious vessels . . . from which the wine of error might be administered” (128-29). In other words, Moore proposes that his songs act as stimulus to his countrymen’s sentimental *and* patriotic feelings, in order to achieve the political purpose of Irish freedom. But instead of stimulating martial nationalism, too much sentiment drowns the Irishmen in the sea of profitless nostalgia. The languor of despondency succeeds in silencing the tone of defiance.

As a twenty-year-old young poet, Joyce was once attracted by the sentimental songs of Moore, as he was fascinated by the sentimental poetry of James Clarence Mangan. But as a mature artist, he perceives the danger and limitation of such songs and poems. In his lecture on Mangan, Joyce asserts that, in his most famous poems, Mangan “sings hymns of praise to his country’s *fallen glory*” with “a profound sense of *sorrow and bitterness*” (*CW* 183, 185, emphases added). Although “Mangan wrote without a native literary tradition” (*CW* 182), his work is thematically typical of Irish poetry: “All his poetry records injustice and tribulation, and the aspiration of one who is moved to great deeds and rending cries when he sees again in his mind the hour of his grief. This is the theme of a large part of Irish poetry” (*CW* 184). As Mason and Ellmann remark, Joyce considers Mangan “a great symbolic figure, whose verse enshrines the griefs and aspirations and limitations of his people” (175). In this respect, Mangan differs little from Moore: both poets sing of Irish past glory, of romantic and nationalistic aspirations, of profound nostalgic sentiment, and, above all, of the “great traditions” of their people, that is, “[l]ove of grief, despair, [and] high-sounding threats” (*CW* 186). Their songs serve as a medium for the stimulation of people’s sense of patriotism, transforming ordinary Irishmen into Minstrel-Boys, in spite of the

pathetic irony: the predetermined defeat awaiting in the field of war. In Mangan, as well as in Moore, “an *hysterical nationalism* receives its final justification” (*CW* 186, emphases added). In characterizing Mangan’s work as “hysterical nationalism,” Joyce pinpoints the pathetic irony in the poetry of his predecessor.

As they sing and listen to songs of “hysterical nationalism” but ignore the irony, the Irishmen in the Ormond bar become the sounding board for public discourses, each participating enthusiastically in and absorbed invariably by the city’s fugue. One song after another, the barflies sing of love and war, saturated in the charm of music and lost in the vortex of the collective self. They yield to the seductions of music, and are no longer a gang of disappointed boozers and pleasure seekers struck down by the pressures of colonial life and abject reality, but rather passionate lovers, courageous warriors, and indignant Minstrel-Boys, sharing in the romantic sentiment, political yearning, heroic deeds, and profound sorrow. Colonial Ireland turns into glorious Erin, who is waiting for her true lovers to relieve her of her bonds, to fight and sacrifice themselves for her unattainable freedom, and to revive her past grandeur and glory. In an ironic sense, these depressed Irishmen hear in the songs not only national grief and sentiment, but also dubious hope and dignity. The freedom of Erin may seem beyond their reach in reality, but in songs they can at least express their longing and participate in the long-term indignation, so as to achieve the effect of catharsis. In their collective hallucination, Irish freedom seems attainable so long as they sing of the Minstrel-Boy going to battle for Erin. Temporarily, the singers and listeners indulge themselves in the charm of music, lost in the expectation of possible glory and hopeful liberty and the atmosphere of collective hypnotism, transformed by the fugue of the city into stereotypically hysterical and sentimental Irish male nationalists. And yet they welcome the atmosphere of collective hypnotism, and are willing to surrender themselves to the temptations of the collective self which exalts erotic longing to hysterical nationalism, and to ignore the discarded personal self altogether.

As a Jew, the oppressed of the oppressed, Bloom becomes a victim in the field of power struggles hidden in and disguised as emotional stimulation: the oppressed Irishmen transfer their predicament to the inferior, and in so doing obtain a sense of

superiority, however superficial and transient it may be. According to this reasoning, if the Irish are cuckolded by the English, they could victimize the inferior Jews in compensation for their loss; if the self-centered English establish their subjectivity by inventing and oppressing an Other, the Irish can obtain a self by duplicating the colonial pattern. This explains why Blazes Boylan is a “conquering hero” (*U* 11.340), and the song “See, the Conquering Hero Comes” one of his leitmotifs: he conquers the wife of the Jewish other and thus excels and surpasses the cuckolded colonial subject, turning the Irish from the conquered into the conqueror, from the Other into the Self. Boylan, in this regard, is a product of collective expectation, vain and pompous, a reincarnation of the English conqueror but *not* the English ruler. In spite of the Irishmen’s unawareness of Bloom’s presence in the Ormond dining room until his departure, the shadowy Bloom is identified with a cuckolded image throughout the episode.<sup>6</sup> He embodies an enemy other deserving to be humiliated, an abject and inferior foreigner who ought to be defeated. The term “stranger in the house” may originally refer to the English foreigner colonizing Ireland, whom the Irishmen desire to conquer. But far from being a counterpart to the English foreigner, the Irishmen direct their hatred to the other foreigner less powerful than the English and themselves, the Jew, so that they may reestablish their self-esteem, however dubious it is. Self and Other, as well as gender roles, are as a consequence further polarized under the colonial system.

In “Counterparts,” the underdog Farrington transfers his anger, humiliation, and depression derived from the west Briton and the English to an inferior in social hierarchy, his son, Tom. By duplicating and imposing these sufferings on the inferior, Farrington reasserts his manhood, and turns from the persecuted into the persecutor, no longer an underdog at the bottom of social hierarchy. In a similar mentality, the Irish barflies shift their indignation from the English to the Jew, and seek revenge on the inferior foreigner. Bloom inevitably becomes the victim of victims, the target of

---

<sup>6</sup> The leitmotif of seduction is prominent in the episode, e.g., the Minuet of *Don Giovanni* (*U* 11.965) and the “jingle” and “tap” sounds. Bloom, as set against the auditory interference of the seduction leitmotif, is undoubtedly cast in the role of the cuckold.

the Irishmen's vengeance, destined to be resented and cuckolded. In the eyes of these Dubliners, consequently, the wife of the cuckold is nothing more than a sexual object with rusty buccinator muscle (*U* 11.512), capable of being verbally teased and abused: "Mrs Marion Bloom has left off clothes of all descriptions" (*U* 11.496-97). In brief, if the oppressed Irish suffer from grief, depression, and despair through colonial injustice, Bloom the double scapegoat should suffer doubly from colonial marginalization and victimization, identifying with the cuckolded Other—this is the underlying assumption of the ethnocentric, victimizing, oppressed Irishmen on Bloom's reaction to the tempting Siren songs.

Bloom's response, however, differs from the Irishmen's assumption. Apart from "Goodbye, Sweetheart, Goodbye," a musical accompaniment played on the piano by Simon Dedalus, "Love and War" is the first song Bloom hears from the Ormond bar sung by a Dubliner, Ben Dollard. When Simon Dedalus asks Dollard to sing the song, a comment following the request is made: "God be with old times" (*U* 11.459). This comment explicitly discloses the stimulation of nostalgia by the song and implicitly reveals the seductive power of music. Bowen argues that the song "encompasses the major themes of Bloom's love life and of the political situation in Ireland, with its messianic motifs, and so on" (1984, 494). "Love and War," indeed, contains and summarizes the major leitmotifs of the episode—sexual longing and patriotic sentiment—fusing the two in a single melody. Bloom's "ardent soul" is "absorbed" by love, for he thinks only of Molly and "not of the morrow," and the song as a whole speaks for the martial attitude of the war-absorbed, ardent-souled Irishmen toward their native land: "By cannon's rattle, rous'd to battle, / Soldiers banish sorrow" (quoted in Bowen 1975, 170-71). Unable to change the personal and political predicaments of present reality, these boozers as followers of Bacchus decide to model themselves on the lover and the soldier:

Let's blend love's wounds with battle's scars, ...

And call in Bacchus all divine, ...

To cure both pains with rosy wine,

To cure both pains with rosy, rosy wine.

And thus, beneath his social sway,

We'll sing and laugh the hours away. . . (quoted in Bowen 1975, 171)

What is notable in these lines is not solely the combination of the personal and the political, of sexual longing and martial patriotism; they also indicate the singers' indulgence in wine and song after suffering from "love's wounds" and "battle's scars." Singing parts in the city's fugue and identifying with the lover and the soldier, these Irish boozers decide to "cure both pains with rosy wine" and "sing and laugh the hours away" beneath Bacchus's "social sway." They adopt the policy of escapism, avoid present reality, and embrace nostalgic sentiment and Bacchic merriment. The song, in this respect, is hardly as "messianic" as Bowen claims.

When Bacchus holds the Irishmen "beneath his social sway," Bloom stands outside that atmosphere. "In liver gravy Bloom mash[es] mashed potatoes" (*U* 11.553), recalling an anecdote of the singer Ben Dollard and associating it with Molly. Whereas the Irishmen identify with the lover and the soldier, blend love with war, and indulge themselves in wine, music, and laughter, Bloom declines the invitation of these temptations: he refuses to be swallowed up by the city's collective voice, but would rather be an observer and outsider. His method of resistance at this stage is simple and direct. Bloom directs his thought away from the song itself, and makes comments on the musician playing the piano: "Wonder who's playing. Nice touch. Must be Cowley. Musical. Knows whatever note you play. Bad breath he has, poor chap" (*U* 11.560-61). In this way, Bloom evades the temptation of the city's collective voice, which threatens to incorporate him into its fugue and convert him into a hysterico-nostalgic Bacchic lover and soldier, as it has done to other Dubliners.

It may seem easy for Bloom to turn away from the seduction of nostalgic and Bacchic "Love and War"; it is by no means easy, however, to keep himself detached from the more militant and emotional "Croppy Boy," a song, according to Bowen, "about particularly Irish matters, betrayal, religion, sentimentality, and war" (1975, 195). As Bowen points out, the Irishmen's preference of "The Croppy Boy" over "*Qui sdegno*," a song "of peace and the banishment of strife," is suggestive enough (1975, 194-95): they prefer their "native Doric" (*U* 11.991) of indignation, heroism, and

martyrdom to an Italian song singing that “only love can bind human beings together” (Gifford 306), a song Bloom would probably prefer. In calling the song “[o]ur native Doric,” Tom Kernan pinpoints that “The Croppy Boy” belongs to the Irish and represents their voice. It is a song of public mentality and collective feeling, and thus a representative of public discourse.

As a song representative of the public self, “The Croppy Boy” succeeds in stirring the Irishmen’s patriotic sentiment and immersing the singer and listeners in the “thrill they itch for” (*U* 11.1083). Not only does the singer Ben Dollard turn into the Croppy Boy (“Dollard the croppy cried” [*U* 11.1074]), but the listeners also identify with the persecuted and sacrificed hero, becoming the “[g]eneral chorus” (*U* 11.1144) of the song. To put it more precisely, the Irishmen are transformed by the fugue of the city into reincarnations of the fearless and dauntless Croppy Boy, a heroic personification deceived by a false father figure, who is in reality a yeoman captain disguised as a priest and presumably an Irish betrayer or an English colonizer, into meaningless death before performing any heroic deeds—though, undeniably, dying for Erin is heroic enough in itself to the Irish patriots’ mind. Ironically, none of the boozers has ever experienced genuine physical persecution like the Croppy Boy experiences. It is true that as the colonized, the Irish suffer from exploitation and oppression, and yet from the evidence of 16 June 1904, these barflies undergo unjust persecution only imaginatively, or at most ideologically, in songs and in their collective hallucination. It is Bloom, the doubly marginalized scapegoat, who actually suffers and is suffering from ethnophobic persecution that day, belittled and ridiculed wherever he goes.

Bloom is aware of the seductive danger of the song. In the course of Ben Dollard’s performance, Bloom tries three times to leave the Ormond Hotel. As the Dubliners “begged in one” (*U* 11.993) for singing “The Croppy Boy,” Bloom decides for the first time to depart: “I’ll go” (*U* 11.994), he tells himself. In the middle of the song when Dollard the Croppy claims that he loves his “country above the king” (quoted in Gifford 293), Bloom tells himself again that he should leave: “Time to be shoving. Looked enough” (*U* 11.1073). At the near end of the song, when the yeoman

captain announces that all traitors will be hanged, Bloom tells himself to go once again: "Get out before the end" (*U* 11.1122). Nevertheless, the song tempts Bloom to stay with its Siren charm: "But wait. But hear" (*U* 11.1005). Despite his seeming refusal to listen to the song, Bloom fails to reject its Siren seduction and as a result hears the song in its entirety.

While the Irishmen are totally incorporated into the city's fugue, melting into the circumstances of the song, Bloom endeavors to remain objective, to be an outsider making comments. His comment first falls on the singer, Ben Dollard, one of the numerous Irish on the decline: "Other comedown. Big ships' chandler's business he did once . . . Now in the Iveagh home. Cubicle number so and so" (*U* 11.1012-15). Bloom attributes the singer's decline to his indulgence in alcohol: "Number one Bass did that for him" (*U* 11.1015). As the song proceeds to the false priest's servant bidding the Croppy Boy welcome, Bloom connects the false father figure to society at large, which, as Bowen remarks, "betrays people like Ben and reduces them to poverty" (1975, 196): "Ruin them. Wreck their lives. Then build them cubicles to end their days in. Hushaby. Lullaby. Die, dog. Little dog, die" (*U* 11.1018-19). In this way, Bloom turns the "holy father" (quoted in Gifford 293) into patriarchal society in general, which paralyzes and destroys its people rather than serving or saving them. Particularly, Bloom may attribute the role of the false father figure to male Dubliners, for he is under the unjust treatment and victimization imposed by those false conquerors, disparaged and humiliated all the time. By assimilating and reworking lines from "The Croppy Boy," Bloom turns away from the invitation of the city's collective voice. His reaccentuation of the song and his social criticism on the false priest can thus be seen as his resistance to the city's fugue and, in a subtle sense, his attempt to construct an architectonic/fugal self as distinct from the collective self of the urban fugue.

As the song proceeds, Bloom's associations turn more and more personal. While the Irishmen style themselves as Croppy Boys, Bloom, hearing the line "I alone am left of my name and race" (quoted in Gifford 293), identifies with the Croppy Boy as well: "I too. Last of my race" (*U* 11.1066). He might have previously related the false

priest to patriarchal society at large, but now he associates himself with an inadequate father responsible for the lack of an offspring: "Well, my fault perhaps. No son. Rudy. Too late now" (*U* 11.1066-67). When the line "I bear no grudge against living thing" (quoted in Gifford 293) is sung, Bloom continues the Croppy Boy's speech by declaring the meaninglessness of hatred: "Hate. Love. Those are names. Rudy. Soon I am old" (*U* 11.1069). This passage does not merely indicate Bloom's pacifist inclination; more importantly, it suggests his capability to resist being absorbed into the collective self by personalizing public discourses and rewriting the fugal text: he himself becomes the persecuted Croppy Boy, who bears no hatred to Boylan the conqueror and Irish society disguised as a false father figure. Written by a new Croppy Boy, this revised text differs from the original one advocated by other grudging, war-embracing Croppy Boys in the Ormond bar. To a certain extent, Bloom the wandering Jew is not unlike the wild goose Kevin Egan: both are exiled wanderers persecuted by false father figures, Bloom by the Irish and Egan by the English. In this respect, Bloom is ironically even more *Irish* and *patriotic* than those self-styled Irish patriots: at least he experiences persecution and homelessness, and tries to propose a new concept of home where persecution ceases to exist.

The song as a collective voice may try to incorporate all the citizens into its fugue, whether Bloom or other Irishmen. Bloom distinguishes himself from the others and succeeds in refusing the incorporation because he can always reaccentuate and personalize public discourses. Patriotism and martyrdom for him are names, bearing no substantial significance. The combination of Robert Emmet's last words with Bloom's breaking wind speaks clearly for the modern Croppy Boy's attitude toward militant and chauvinistic nationalism. Therefore, although he is compelled to participate in the fugue of the city, he sings his own fugue alongside the city's voice, however difficult it is to resist the collectivizing voice and to have his own voice heard. When he says "Glad I avoided" (*U* 11.1145), he refers not only to his success in avoiding "a swill to wash it down" (*U* 11.1144-45), but, implicitly at least, also to his being able to escape the incorporation into the collective self.



In spite of the fact that songs are not verbally sung in "Cyclops," the leitmotif of war proceeds to dominate the episode. Allusions to patriotic songs by Moore, Mangan, and others abound in speeches by the Citizen and the nameless I-narrator and in parodic insertions; in these speeches xenophobic hostility to *the foreigner* is illustrated and revealed to the full. The episode, as Davison puts it, "portrays the novel's ugliest face of aggressive nationalism" (1995, 257). Bloom may seem a shadowy existence in "Sirens," unnoticed or treated indifferently as a foreign cuckold bearing the double pain of sexual and national defeat, and at the same time considered a subject obliged to be incorporated into the collective self. In "Cyclops," however, the call of the collective self becomes more urgent and intensive. The Dubliners in Barney Kiernan's internalize patriotic songs like "The Croppy Boy," championing chauvinism and anti-Semitism, while Bloom's shadowy existence turns solid: he encounters the hostile incorporating force in the pub, face to face with the challenge of the centripetal power, and in so doing announces his resistance to the collective force of absorption. By resisting urban territorialization as taking place in Barney Kiernan's, Bloom makes space for his self, not a shadowy existence any longer.

As in "Sirens," Moore's patriotic and sentimental songs are important intertexts in "Cyclops." Five songs allusive to Moore occur in the context: "Erin, the Tear and the Smile in thine Eyes," "She Is Far From the Land," "Where Is the Slave," "The Meeting of the Waters," and "Let Erin Remember the Days of Old," all collected in *Irish Melodies*. Contained in the parody of the Irish legend exalting the Citizen to a legendary hero, the allusion "a tear and a smile" (*U* 12.161-62) from "Erin, the Tear and the Smile in thine Eyes" reinforces the sorrow and misery of the Irish hero rather than aligning him with a heroic figure. If we adopt Bowen's argument that the song raises the Citizen to the height of making him the personification of Ireland (1975, 213), the allusion is even more ironic. Helpless and weeping, Erin "never shall cease" her "silent tear" and "increase" her "languid smile" until her "various tints unite" (Moore 226). And yet it is doubtful how the tearful Erin may unite her various tints, since her personification or transformation—the reincarnated heroic figure, the Citizen—is saturated in sorrowful tears.

If the song “Erin, the Tear and the Smile in thine Eyes” reinforces general paralysis among Erin’s followers, “She Is Far From the Land” unknowingly brings them into ridicule. Composing the song as a “commemoration” of Sara Curran’s “suffering” (Bowen 1975, 216), Moore attempts to represent the despairing sentiment of Robert Emmet’s fiancée after the hero’s martyrdom: “her heart in his grave is lying” (Moore 297). Once again, the female is associated with Erin, who the patriot loves and dies for: “He had liv’d for his love, for his country he died, / They were all that to life had entwin’d him; / Nor soon shall the tears of his country be dried, / Nor long will his love stay behind him” (297). Like other songs by Moore, “She Is Far From the Land” is also characterized by the sense of sorrow and despair; key words like “love,” “die,” “weep,” “Minstrel,” “breaking heart,” “glorious morrow,” and “island of sorrow” fill the song, suggesting once again the polarization of gender roles—female as weeping Siren/Erin in despair and male as minstrel-warrior sacrificing his life for her. What is ironic and remarkable is that three and a half pages of parody depicting the execution of Robert Emmet follow the musical allusion to the faithful and despairing Sara Curran, who in the parody accepts the marriage proposal of “a handsome young Oxford [graduate’s]” “on the spot” (*U* 12,658-59, 662). Notwithstanding the fact that Sara Curran married Henry Sturgeon, who graduated from Royal Military Academy, not Oxford, three years after, not “on the spot” of, Robert Emmet’s execution, the irony is still sharp and clear. The Irish female is far from being as faithful as she is supposed to be: instead of laying her heart in her hero’s grave, she betrays him easily and immediately when the Englishman presents to her his “visiting card, bankbook and genealogical tree” (*U* 12.660). Accidentally or intentionally, the parody seems to question the stereotyped image of an ideal Irish female in Moore’s song, sentimental and idealistic, yet paralytic and unrealistic—indeed, a predecessor of Gerty MacDowell.

Another Moore’s song occurs in the Citizen’s aggressively chauvinistic assertion, “The friends we love are by our side and the foes we hate before us” (*U* 12.523-24). The line comes from “Where Is the Slave” (Moore 344-45), a song of endless sorrow and predetermined defeat once again. As Bowen comments, the reference emphasizes

“not only the antagonistic temper of the citizen, but also his reliance on the stock quotations and changeless clichés which represent a great segment of the inflexible attitude of Irishmen like him” (1975, 217). In quoting the line, the Citizen reveals his status as a sounding board for the city’s fugue, echoing only the public voice which traps and paralyzes its subjects. He is incorporated into the collective self, and transformed without his knowledge into “the slave so lowly, / Condemn’d to chains unholy” (Moore 344). Interestingly, the reference appears right before the parody of Robert Emmet’s execution and Sara Curran’s acceptance of the Oxford graduate’s marriage proposal. This arrangement seems to ridicule the impossibility and farcicality of narrow-minded nationalism with its simultaneously absurd and unreasonable dualism as asserted by the Citizen.

The rest of Moore’s songs referred to in the episode, “Let Erin Remember the Days of Old” and “The Meeting of the Waters,” differ little from songs mentioned previously: both sing of Erin’s beauty—whether her beautiful landscapes or her past glory—and expect the coming of a peaceful and prosperous future. Other musical allusions in “Cyclops” such as “A Nation Once Again” (*U* 12.891, 917), “The Fair Hills of Eiré” (*U* 12.1264), “God Save Ireland” (*U* 12.1579), and “Come Back to Erin” (*U* 12.1828) all function as public discourses like Moore’s songs, and propagate the ideology of the collective self: that Erin *was* glorious and beautiful and is now waiting for the true patriots—destined to step onto ruin and defeat—to save her from bondage. In “Sirens” as well as in “Cyclops,” the collective voice successfully holds other Dubliners under its control, and tends to encroach upon the private domain of Bloom’s personal self. As the dominant figure in “Cyclops,” the Citizen embodies the foremost sounding board for the public voice, speaking for and possessing solely the collective self, advocating extreme chauvinism on the one hand and announcing xenophobic anti-Semitism on the other. Bloom, the unwelcome stranger, becomes the target of his attack.

In her examination of turn-of-the-twentieth-century anti-Semitism in Ireland, Marilyn Reizbaum points out the phenomenon of “the Irish need for a sense of oppression” (71), which, in a nutshell, refers to the need of a scapegoat on whom one

could vent one's anger, resentment, and dejection, as I discussed earlier. The Jew thus becomes the target for "the inversion of values that one undertakes in order to defend one's position" (Reizbaum 71). As an international phenomenon at the turn of the twentieth century, anti-Semitism is deeply related to another international phenomenon: anti-imperialism. "[T]he era's anti-imperialistic propaganda," Davison remarks, "often preceded Jewish conspiracy theories" (1995, 251). By aligning anti-imperialism with anti-Semitism, one can easily bully an inferior stranger, which may help and lead to the challenge of the other stranger, superior and powerful, more difficult to overcome—this accounts for the Dubliners' hostile attitude to Bloom, who serves as a springboard for them to overcome the imperial stranger at the end.

A mouthpiece for the public voice, the Citizen expresses his resentment of the English as well as the Jews. Gifford identifies the Citizen as Michael Cusack, founder of the Gaelic Athletic Association, who styled himself "Citizen Cusack," opposing Englishness and proposing Irishness (316). But Davison suggests that Joyce draws on the attitude of both Arthur Griffith and Michael Cusack to create the Citizen, for Griffith offers his countrymen "a lesson in the inherent treachery of *Jews and other strangers*" to achieve the purpose of Irish independence (1995, 251-53, emphases added).<sup>7</sup> It is not surprisingly that as a combination of Cusack and Griffith, the Citizen proposes absolute Celticism and martialism, denounces anything un-Irish, including European civilization, and detests both the English and Jewish strangers. When he taunts strangers with being bugs which fill Ireland (*U* 12.1141-42), he is therefore making a glancing double reference both to the English invader who domineers over the Irish and to the Jewish foreigner whom *he* is intimidating. Significantly, rumor—in essence a form of public discourse—has it that Bloom "gave the ideas for Sinn Fein to Griffith to put in his paper all kinds of jerrymandering" (*U* 12.1574-75) and "drew up all the plans according to the Hungarian system" (*U* 12.1636).<sup>8</sup> A rumor it may be, yet

---

<sup>7</sup> For the details of Griffith's attitude toward the Jew in relation to the independence movement, see Davison, "'Cyclops,' Sinn Fein, and 'the Jew,'" pp. 245-57.

<sup>8</sup> As Gifford notes, Sinn Fein derived the idea of "nonviolent subversion of English institutions" from "a similar, and successful, Hungarian resistance to Austrian dominion in the latter half of the nineteenth century." The barflies believe the rumor "because Bloom has a Hungarian background and 'because Griffith was persistently rumored to have a Jewish adviser-ghostwriter.'" See p. 366. In his introductory

it indicates the predicament of the Jew in early twentieth-century Ireland: in spite of all his efforts at and services to Irish freedom and his ambivalent role as a ghostwriter composing a national text, the Jew is always an Other, a foreigner and scapegoat, destined to stand in the margin of the margins, and to suffer from sexual/political humiliation and exploitation by his intimidated but bullying master.

As a part of public discourses, the anti-Semitism of the Irishmen in Barney Kiernan's is stereotypical: all Jews are Shylock-like, rebellious, un-manly. It is uncertain what exactly happens between Moses Herzog and Michael E. Geraghty. But Geraghty, a Jew, is called by the I-narrator "a bloody big foxy thief" (*U* 12.13) who "lifted any God's quantity of tea and sugar" (*U* 12.15) from Herzog and refuses to pay for his purchase: "I'm hanging on to his taw now for the past fortnight and I can't get a penny out of him" (*U* 12.20-22). Reuben J. Dodd, a Jewish moneylender and another target for xenophobic hatred, is related to the conventional image of the usurious Jew, who, addressed variously as "a dirty jew" (*U* 8.1159), a "gombeen man" (*U* 10.890), and "Judas Iscariot" (*U* 11.438-39), is expected by his malicious fellow Dubliners to "clap" himself "in the dock" (*U* 12.1100). This explains why Bridgeman, Patrick Dignam's debtor, is called by Joe Hynes "old Shylock" (*U* 12.765), although it is uncertain whether he is a Jew or not: it seems just as natural a cliché to associate a moneylender with Shylock, Shakespeare's infamous Jew. A factor leading up to the Citizen's physical attack on Bloom is also related to the issue of money: the Citizen believes that Bloom wins in the Gold Cup horse race, but is too stingy to tell other people and stand them a drink. The I-narrator's comment on Bloom may represent public opinion about the miserliness of the Jew: "Courthouse my eye and your pockets hanging down with gold and silver. Mean bloody scut. Stand us a drink itself. Devil a

---

book on *Ulysses*, Vincent Sherry draws an important parallel between Bloom's background and the Hungarian resurrection, and underscores the significance of the parallel: "Born in 1866 to a Hungarian father and Irish mother, Bloom enters life as a kind of dual national. In the same year Hungary initiated its rebirth as a nation, but with two allegiances: following the Austro-Prussian war (which began on 15-16 June 1866), it declared its independence from Austria, but it also accepted the Austrian emperor as a constitutional monarch. The Hungarian plan was put forward as a practical model for Ireland's relation to England by Arthur Griffith, in 1904, in *The Resurrection of Hungary*, and the contemporary oral culture of *Ulysses* takes cognizance of that. . . . To the fever of single-version nationalism currently raging across Europe the Hungarian plan offers an antidote, encouraging a more pluralist outlook—a capacity and tolerance for doubleness." See p. 12.

sweet fear! There's a Jew for you! All for number one. Cute as a shithouse rat" (*U* 12.1759-61). As a Jew, Bloom cannot be seen or heard except as the stereotypical image of Shylock. His thrift and temperance are interpreted by the Dublin community as miserliness, and his giving money to help the Dignams is twisted into "[d]efrauding widows and orphans" (*U* 12.1622). Critics tend to ascribe Bloom's isolation from Irish patriarchal society partly to his unfamiliarity with Irish pub culture. But even if he adopts the culture, it is unlikely that he will be accepted.

In addition to miserliness, the Jew, as Dubliners believe, is inseparable from his rebellious inclination. John Wyse protests, "why can't a Jew love his country like the next fellow?" And J. J. O'Molloy replies, "Why not? . . . when he's quite sure which country it is" (*U* 12.1628-30). The dialogue demonstrates Davison's observation of the supposed Jewish subversiveness: "During the *fin-de-siècle*, 'the Jew' had become a 'race' without a territory, a subversive to any but his own supposed 'nation'" (1995, 249). The Jew, in this light, represents a wandering people possessing a subversive force ready to threaten and rebel against the nation he stays in. Considered a subversive force to all nations, the Jew is always cast in the role of the outsider wherever he stays.

Such a subversive and floating subject position conduces to another stereotypical characteristic of the Jew: nationally, religiously, and sexually, he is something in-between. Ned Lambert's question about Bloom discloses the issue of the Jew's uncertain identity: "Is he a Jew or a gentile or a holy Roman or a swaddler or what the hell is he? . . . Or who is he?" (*U* 12.1631-32). In reply to the question, J. J. O'Molloy says, "Who is Junius?" (*U* 12.1633). By likening Bloom to Junius, the pseudonym of an unknown mysterious author (Gifford 367), J. J. O'Molloy points out the mysterious, uncertain identity of the Jew. This floating identity, due to its shadowy existence and uncertainty, is in a sense no identity at all, eliminated from patriarchal society by the fugal collectivity. As a consequence, Bloom becomes a "half and half" (*U* 12.1052-53), a fellow "neither fish nor flesh" (*U* 12.1055-56)—or neither man nor woman—as the Citizen claims, and a "mixed [middling]" (*U* 12.1658-59), as the I-narrator announces. Such a mixed middling, curiously, is rather feminine: "Lying up in the hotel Pisser

was telling me once a month with headache like a totty with her courses" (*U* 12.1659-50); or as the dialogue between the Citizen and Joe Hynes indicates, "Do you call that a man? . . . I wonder did he ever put it out of sight" (*U* 12.1654-55). The Jewish male, therefore, becomes a feminized Other with a floating, uncertain identity wandering in the third space of the city, castrated and marginalized by Irish patriarchal society.

The Dubliners' feminization of Bloom echoes, to a considerable extent, the English imperial feminization of the Irish male. To put it more precisely, the intimidated Dubliners reproduce the colonial pattern of feminization and impose it on the inferior Other, the Jewish male. The pattern of feminization has long been a colonial strategy rationalizing imperial colonization: that the colonized are feminine and helpless and thus need ruling and protection. The traditional image of Ireland—the poor old woman—speaks for the weakness, impotence, and decadence of the Irish people in need of governing and guardianship. In *On the Study of Celtic Literature*, Matthew Arnold explicitly points out the femininity of Celtic nature: characterized by their sentimentality, which conduces to their failures in music, poetry, business, and politics, the Celtic people have "something feminine" in them, "undisciplinable, anarchical, and turbulent by nature" (347).<sup>9</sup> Arnold may intend to praise the "spiritual power" of the Celtic people, which he regards as the complement to the Saxon's "material power" (298). And yet his argument reinforces the Irishmen's incapability of self-government, suggesting the necessity of their "accepting a subsidiary position for themselves" vis-à-vis the masculine English (Cairns and Richards 49).

As the colonizer assumes, the Irishmen are feminine by nature, lacking in discipline and order, hence personifying disturbance to patriarchal society and undeserving of home-rule. So far as the English ruler is concerned, the Irishmen possess "deviant" masculinities and represent "a tacit challenge" to both conventional male subjectivity and the whole of the world (Silverman 1); they embody, to a certain degree, what Kaja Silverman calls "marginal male subjectivities": those which "absent themselves from the line of paternal succession" and "in one way or another occupy

---

<sup>9</sup> For a detailed survey of Arnold's treatment of Celtic femininity, see David Cairns and Shaun Richards, *Writing Ireland*, pp. 42-57; and Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland*, pp. 29-32.

the domain of femininity . . . saying 'no' to power" (389). As they proclaim extreme Celticism, the Citizen and other nationalists do say no to imperial power.

Paradoxically, however, they themselves internalize and become the power they want to overcome by reproducing the pattern of feminization and imposing it on Bloom. In so doing, they duplicate the "disenfranchisement and subordination" (Silverman 389) which they are suffering from and intend to eliminate. Instead of the "phallic divestiture" (Silverman 389) they are supposed to symbolize, these chauvinistic Dubliners exemplify phallic reincarnation. They turn themselves into, as it were, false marginal male subjects by embracing the value of the masculine world acclaimed by the English imperium.

In this regard, Bloom becomes the only person possessing genuine marginal male subjectivity: he accepts both the femininity and masculinity in him. The acceptance of marginal male subjectivity in effect grounds the construction of an architectonic self: for only acceptance can open the door to dialogue and incorporate the opposites. Willing to accept differences—or otherness—and to enter into dialogue, Bloom is able to avoid the danger of extremism, whether extremes of femininity and masculinity, or private self and public self. While the Citizen embraces absolute Celticism, maintaining that the English possess syphilization rather than civilization, which they stole from the Irish, and have no music, art, and literature "worthy of the name" (*U* 12.1197-201), Bloom speaks for "moderation" and admits the Englishmen's civilization (*U* 12.1195-96). Cosmopolitan in temperament, Bloom registers the limit of the Citizen's absolutism, which is analogous to monologism: "Some people . . . can see the mote in others' eyes but they can't see the beam in their own" (*U* 12.1237-38). A cliché this may be, yet Bloom's critique reveals the significance of parallax, or, in Bakhtinian terminology, the excess of seeing of the other: an interlocutory other is needed and should be admitted if one wants to see his/her entire self and obtain a tentative wholeness. Able and willing to accept differences, Bloom acknowledges that he belongs to both the Irish and the Jewish people. His definition of a nation as "the same people living in the same place" (*U* 12.1422-23) may sound loose and nonsensical; nevertheless, it is not altogether senseless and ridiculous. If the Citizen



could accept Bloom's definition of a nation, he would have accepted Bloom as his countryman, and would not have been obsessed with anti-Semitism and xenophobia, announcing that "*Sinn fein ambain!* The friends we love are by our side and the foes we hate before us" (*U* 12.523-24) and that "We'll put force against force" (*U* 12.1364). But the Citizen draws a fixed borderline between Self and Other, and polarizes gender roles and personal characteristics: martial forces belong to the male, and effeminate love belongs to the female, easy and simple. Bloom, on the other hand, declines the polarization of self/other, masculine/feminine, and love/hate. He reveals his awareness of the danger of force-embracing racism: "Persecution . . . all the history of the world is full of it. Perpetuating national hatred among nations" (*U* 12.1417-18), and advocates love, "the opposite of hatred," as "really life" "for men and women" (*U* 12.1485, 1481-83). Bloom's objection to violence and advocacy of love separates him from the mainstream of masculine value and aligns him with the feminine, according to patriarchal ideology. Marginalized he may be, yet Bloom accepts his marginal male subjectivity, and in so doing initiates the construction of an architectonic self—a subjectivity comprising both feminine and masculine characteristics, an identity which is both Irish and Jewish, a self negotiating between the private and the public. In the course of dialogic assimilation and reaccentuation, Bloom gradually develops and shapes his self, less partial and provincial, and more comprehensive and complete—though the process of self-construction, according to Bakhtin, never comes to a teleological end and completion. Bloom's ability to resist the trap of the collectivizing power of the urban fugue as public self, to accept femininity and masculinity in his subjectivity, and to construct an all-inclusive architectonic self derives from his capacity to incorporate and dialogize heteroglot voices. His making of a third space in Barney Kiernan's—a site of territorialization of collective desire and social order—also results from the capacity to reaccentuate social discourses and transgress boundaries between races, genders, and self/other.

If masculine voices dominate "Cyclops," an episode of men and war, a feminine voice heralding love and femininity prevails over "Nausicaa," or at least the first half of the episode. As mentioned previously, the leitmotif of love predominates "Sirens"

and runs through “Nausicaa.” But before examining the herald of love, Gerty, it would be helpful to survey the sentimental love songs in “Sirens.” As with some of Moore’s war songs, in which the woman is portrayed as a tempting Siren and *femme fatale*, many of the love songs in the episode also involve the issue of gender.

When Bloom follows Boylan to the Ormond Hotel, Simon Dedalus is playing “Goodbye, Sweetheart, Goodbye” on the piano. The song, as Bowen indicates, starts with Boylan’s entrance into and concludes with his exit from the bar, and is thus the leitmotif of Boylan the conquering hero (1975, 166). Nevertheless, Bloom hears some of the music and registers the topic of seduction implicit in the “voiceless song” (*U* 11.321). The song may be played in a spirit of “comic irony” by “the friendly natives in the Ormond bidding goodbye to assignation-bound Boylan,” (Bowen 1975, 166), but it also demonstrates the spell woman places on man: “I could not leave thee though I said / Goodbye, sweetheart, goodbye” (quoted in Bowen 1975, 165). Despite the “bliss” she bestows upon him, the “sweetheart” represents basically a temptress figure entrancing man with her charm. Equating woman with the seductive Siren, “Goodbye, Sweetheart, Goodbye” on the one hand echoes Bloom’s mental state and foreshadows the ways he will be haunted by Molly in the rest of the episode, and on the other hand exemplifies the penetrating power of music which generates a unitary voice within patriarchal society, one that inscribes woman as a seductive Siren. As a member of that patriarchal society, Bloom inevitably falls prey to the voice, which incessantly reminds him of Molly and the approaching act of adultery, however hard he tries to resist the charm of his sweetheart and to take his mind off the forthcoming adulterous event.

Another song relating woman to the Siren image is “Tutto è sciolto” (“All Is Lost”), a tenor air from the opera *La Sonnambula*, whistled by Richie Goulding to Bloom in the Ormond dining room. Though it is originally an Italian song, its sentimentality and melancholy are perfect for the male Dubliners, who probably identify with the pathetic hero Elvino. Sung by Elvino lamenting the faithlessness of his fiancée Amina, the aria expresses the “deepest despair” (Bowen 1975, 175) felt by the heart-broken hero upon the loss of his beloved. Although Amina is wrongly

accused, she is associated in the song with an enchanting Siren who deprives her lover of all hope and joy and abandons him to deepest despair: “All is lost now, / By all hope and joy am I forsaken, / Nevermore can love awaken / Past enchantment, no, nevermore” (quoted in Bowen 1975, 175). And yet, however Siren-like she may be, the heroine of Vincenzo Bellini’s opera proves to be faithful and innocent and reunites with her lover in the end. In patriarchal society, indeed, woman may be seductive, but she should not be *fatale*: she is the weaker and inferior after all. The opera fascinates the Irishmen not merely because its happy ending accords with the expectation of the fugal city; more importantly, the ending reflects the longing of the Irishmen’s wish-fulfillment: the regain of the lost love, Erin. But Bloom seems to have a different interpretation of the song: he would rather read it personally. To a large extent, the song reiterates and reflects Bloom’s unhappy position and frame of mind, for he applies the plot of the opera to his own situation (Bowen 1975, 176-77): he becomes the melancholy Elvino and Molly the heartbreaking Amina. Consciously or unconsciously, Bloom internalizes the public discourse that aligns woman with the tempting Siren, but he goes a step further by interpreting Amina’s accidental sleepwalking into the room of another man as intentional: “She longed to go. That’s why. Woman. As easy stop the sea. Yes: all is lost” (*U* 11.640-41)—as Molly’s adultery with Boylan is voluntary. Public love songs, whether Irish or not, tend to identify woman with a temptress, who for the Irishmen often turns out to be Erin dreaming of a happy ending. For Bloom, however, all women ultimately relate to Molly, the unique and fleshly Siren (Bowen 1984, 495). Notwithstanding his internalization of public discourses, therefore, Bloom does not simply absorb them like a sponge or reflect them like a sounding board. Rather, he tries to maintain his voice in an environment abounding with public discourses by personalizing them.

Interestingly, despite the analogue between Elvino’s despair and Bloom’s distress, Bloom the “unconquered hero” (*U* 11.342) assigns the role of Elvino to Goulding instead of himself: “Face of the all is lost. Rollicking Richie once” (*U* 11.646-47). This gesture indicates to a certain degree Bloom’s attempt to detach himself from the despairing Elvino figure, though he does find similarities between his and the opera

hero's depressing situation and mental state: "A beautiful air . . . I know it well" (*U* 11.642). Implicitly, Bloom seems to be conscious of the danger of extreme individualism—being lost in despair, in Elvino's case—and thus tries not to over-personalize the opera as social discourse. We may regard Bloom's intention to be detached from Elvino as an endeavor not to be drowned in the unconscious fears and desires of the individualistically private self—the fear to become miserable Elvino and the desire to be reunited with virtuous Amina—though on the other hand he also seeks not to be incorporated into the fugue of the city, as revealed in his reaccentuation of assimilated public discourses.

Similar to "Tutto è sciolto," "M'appari" also has the leitmotif of lost love. A tenor aria from Friedrich von Flotow's light opera *Martha*, the song is sung by the desperate hero Lionel in lament of his loss of Martha, another Siren figure seducing and forsaking the hero, who falls into the profoundest grief and despondency as a consequence. Although the opera ends happily with the marriage between the hero and heroine, the Siren image of woman is nonetheless obvious in this song: "Each graceful look, each word so cheering / Charm'd my eye and won my heart. / . . . / All on Earth I then could wish for / Was near her to live and die" (quoted in Bowen 1975, 178-79). Whereas Homer's Sirens lead the sailors to literal death with their enchanting voice, Flotow's Siren tempts her victim toward mental death—the loss of reason—by means of her "form endearing."

Like "Tutto è sciolto," "M'appari" also insinuates itself into Bloom's innermost being as a public voice, warning him of woman as temptress, charming yet cruel and dangerous. But while Bloom strives to keep himself detached in the previous song, he is much more involved in "M'appari": he comments on each line Simon/Lionel sings, and makes associations of the song with his own life—most of the associations, unsurprisingly, relate to Molly, Bloom's ultimate Siren. By associating the public discourse of the music with his own personal experience—and not vice versa—Bloom tries to avoid being swallowed up by the social self, refusing to participate in the city's fugal song of the Siren woman as Erin. Molly may embody a temptress like Amina and Martha. And yet Bloom's memories of her make her an individual subject, unique

and special: she is Bloom's Siren, not Elvino's, Lionel's, or any other person's. Bloom wanders between personal experiences and public discourses, and undergoes the endless process of empathy and return. His associations of Molly in the context of public discourses and his critiques of public assumptions based on memories of Molly may be seen as an attempt to mediate between the personal and the social selves—and to initiate the construction of his architectonic/fugal self.

The song "M'appari" begins with Lionel's recollection of his first encounter with Martha, whose "*form endearing*" (U 11.665) drives his sorrow away. The third-person narrator notes the power of music over the listeners: "Braintipped, cheek touched with flame, they listened feeling that flow endearing flow over skin limbs human heart soul spine" (U 11.668-69); "Good, good to hear: sorrow from them each seemed to from both depart when first they heard" (U 11.677-78). Bowen comments that the music, beautiful in its commiseration, raises Bloom from his lost-love depression (1975, 180). This is a controversial argument. The music in fact reminds Bloom continually of his present despairing condition rather than "lift[ing] momentarily the pall of sorrow which hangs over" him (Bowen 1975, 180). Admittedly, music acts as a powerful public discourse because it propagandizes social doctrines without the listener's knowledge. It flows over "skin limbs human heart soul spine" of individuals and touches "their still ears with words, still hearts of their each his remembered lives" (U 11.669, 676-77) to achieve the purpose of collectivization. By means of its insinuating charm, music penetrates the consciousness—and even the unconscious—of individuals, who, if failing to question or diagnose its ideological context, fall prey to its collectivizing temptation. In this way, the "voice of Lionel" as public discourse charms and collectivizes its victims: "It sang again to Richie Poldy Lydia Lidwell also sang to Pat open mouth ear waiting to wait. How first he saw that form endearing, how sorrow seemed to part, how look, form, word charmed him Gould Lidwell, won Pat Bloom's heart" (U 11.717-20). At the end of the song, the hero (Lionel), the singer (Simon), and the listener (Leopold) are leveled to one single collective identity: "Siopold" (U 11.752). The song, in short, touches Bloom's memories and threatens to incorporate him into its single harmonic texture—in this case, the sharing in Lionel's

joy, despair, and achievement of desire—but Bloom declines the incorporation; he prefers to be an outsider, assimilating, reaccentuating, and dialogizing it.

Notwithstanding this, the song intensifies his fear and despair instead of driving his sorrow away: he associates the song with “Love’s Old Sweet Song,” a Molly leitmotif, and falls into obsession with the adulterous act.

As Bowen has it, no matter how hard Bloom tries to think of something else, his thoughts inevitably return to Molly and Boylan (1975, 181). This is especially true as evidenced by Bloom’s stream of consciousness when he hears the line “*Full of hope and all delighted*” (*U* 11.685): he begins to elaborate on the word “delight,” the delight of being a tenor (“Tenors get women by the score” [*U* 11.686]) and the delight Boylan, a tenor, may experience in his meeting with Molly. Bloom pictures the scene of the meeting: “Jing. Stop. Knock. Last look at mirror always before she answers the door. The hall. There? How do you? I do well. There? What? Or? Phial of cachous, kissing comfits, in her satchel. Yes? Hands felt for the opulent” (*U* 11.689-92). When the line “*But alas, ’twas idle dreaming*” (*U* 11.694) is sung, Bloom, aroused and unable to repress thoughts of Molly and Boylan, turns the sensual aspects of the music into the act of love the couple are carrying out (Bowen 1975, 182): “Tenderness it welled: slow, swelling, full it throbbed. That’s the chat. Ha, give! Take! Throb, a throb, a pulsing proud erect” (*U* 11.701-2). In other words, Bloom can always transform assimilated discourses into personal experience, and avoid the fate of being absorbed into the single harmonic texture of the city-as-collective-self. On the other hand, he seeks not to fall into the trap of the extreme of private self, whose conscious and unconscious desires and fears may lead the subject to antisocial individualism or tempt the individual into a loss of “self,” as demonstrated in the case of Lionel. To escape the trap, Bloom always returns to present reality after a period of lingering in memories—as he always returns from his empathy with collective self—and tries hard to direct his thoughts to something else, and not to identify with the deserted/cuckold: before the imagination of Molly and Boylan’s sexual intercourse, he makes comments on Simon Dedalus’s “[g]lorious tone” (*U* 11.695) and intemperance, and after the imagination, he speculates about the spell of music (*U* 11.703). Empathy and return,

Bakhtin stresses, initiate self-construction (*AA* 26). Capable of empathy and return, of wandering between personal memories and public discourses, Bloom is thus able to escape the double trap of extremes, brings them into dialogue, and constructs an architectonic self out of the negotiation of the two.

Especially noticeable in this long passage of Bloom's reaccentuation is that he seems to perceive the power hidden in music which disturbs his mind: "Words? Music? No: it's what's behind" (*U* 11.703). Bowen explains that Bloom's awareness "indicates his appreciation of the symbolism and irony underlying the song and furnishes additional evidence that he sees some of his own dilemma in the music" (1975, 182). To put it another way, Bloom registers the enticing power of music, which demands the identification of the individual with its set of public prejudices. In Bakhtinian terms, the enticing power represents a form of centripetal force, the demand for the unification of voices. But in spite of his awareness of this power, Bloom cannot sever his ties from the centripetal force hidden within the public discourse of music. All he can do is dialogize the centripetal force with individual centrifugal force: to sing a new part in the city's fugue, one that is "[sung] dumb" (*U* 11.776) and comprises notes from both public voice and his personal tone. In this way, Bloom's fugue is heard along with the city's fugue in the rest of "M'appari": Molly's "[y]ellow, black lace" (*U* 11.725-26) comes after Martha's "*graceful look*" (*U* 11.724); Molly's "Spanishy eyes" (*U* 11.732-33) follows Lionel's "[c]harmed . . . eye" (*U* 11.729); and the call of Lionel on the lost Martha echoes Bloom's call on his lost Molly. The name "Siopold" (*U* 11.752) may suggest the temporary fusion of Simon, Lionel, and Leopold, for Lionel's grief and despair do pass on to Bloom. And yet the fusion does not denote Bloom's identification with the public voice; rather, it signifies Bloom's creation of his own fugue out of the dialogue between the city's fugue and his personal memories—both personal memories and public discourses provide his fugue with material. It is by no means easy to resist the collectivization of the public self and the call of personal fears and desires. To construct an architectonic self, however, Bloom has to negotiate between them, turning the struggling process into

creative force or material, as he undergoes numerous empathies and returns in “Sirens.”

“M’appari,” as Fritz Senn suggests, “anticipates events and emotions in ‘Nausicaa’” (298). The leitmotif of love and the Siren image of woman recur in the episode, as the leitmotif of war and the Croppy Boy figure reappear in “Cyclops.” As Gerty recalls, “With all his faults she loved him still when he [Gerty’s father] sang *Tell me, Mary, how to woo thee* or *My love and cottage near Rochelle* . . . [or] *The moon hath raised*” (U 13.311-15). All the songs Gerty’s father sings, Bowen declares, are romantic and sentimental songs, references to which are “calculated to reinforce the sentimental bent of the girl’s thoughts” (1975, 227). Exposing herself to the atmosphere of popular love songs, Gerty inevitably falls prey to the sentimentality explicit in the songs. As shown in her free indirect discourse, she has internalized the rhetoric of the love songs and echoes them: “With All Her Faults I Love Her Still” is in fact another sentimental love song, though slightly altered here. What is of significance in these songs, however, is not solely their sentimentality and paralyzing influence upon Gerty; the way they represent women is also noteworthy. In “With All Her Faults I Love Her Still,” as well as in the other songs, woman is endowed with the image of a temptress as she is in the love songs in “Sirens”: “With all her faults I love her still, / And even though the world should scorn; / No love like hers my heart can thrill, / Although she’s made that heart forlorn!” (quoted in Bowen 1975, 227). Once again, the love song as public discourse connects woman with the seductive Siren with irresistible charms. The love sung in this song is simply another Amina or Martha, and the lover another Elvino or Lionel who recounts the Siren’s temptation. Although Gerty is frequently associated with the Virgin,<sup>10</sup> she nevertheless symbolizes another temptress figure with “a charm few could resist” (U 13.106-7), seducing and preying upon admirers.

---

<sup>10</sup> The juxtaposition of the mass in the Church of Mary, Star of the Sea, and the portrayal of Gerty relates the girl to the Virgin. Phrases such as “ivorylike purity” (U 13.88), “queenly *hauteur*” (U 13.97), and “rosebloom” (U 13.120), attributed to Mary originally, also connect Gerty with the Virgin Mary. See Gifford, pp. 385-86; Bowen 1975, p. 228.



Not only does the Siren image of woman recur in the love songs and the heroine of “Nausicaa,” but nostalgic songs by Moore also reappear in the episode, or more precisely, in Gerty’s discourse: “How moving the scene there in the gathering twilight, the last glimpse of Erin, the touching chime of those evening bells . . .” (*U* 13.624-25). “The last glimpse of Erin” and “those evening bells” allude to Moore’s “Tho’ the Last Glimpse of Erin With Sorrow I See” and “Those Evening Bells” in *Irish Melodies* (Bowen, 1975, 228-29; Gifford 392-93). Sentimental and melancholy in tone, patriotic and nostalgic in spirit, both songs typify Moore’s lyrics in their personification of Ireland as a tempting female waiting for her bards to set her free. These Moore allusions reveal the fugal city’s control over Gerty, who internalizes and ventriloquizes the conventions of public discourse; they also, as Bowen points out, reinforce the identification of Gerty and Ireland (1975, 228-29): the girl is connected with enchanting Erin, personifying the eternal and geographical female sung in numerous songs by Moore, Mangan, and the like.

In this light, Gerty represents the combination of Siren and Erin, the first incarnation of the female in flesh and blood in the Joycean text, no longer a shadowy existence on the margins of patriarchal society like Josie Powell Breen, Martha Clifford, and the barmaids in the Ormond bar. She embodies, in a word, the double female image of temptress and Ireland as sung in the “Sirens” episode. This incarnation of Siren and Erin, in Vicki Mahaffey’s words, “represents the Irish feminine ideal” that patriarchal society demands (161): an angel in the house and an object of the male gaze. Gerty acquiesces in these public expectations: she is a “sterling good daughter . . . just like a second mother in the house, *a ministering angel* too with a little heart worth its weight in gold,” and “as fair a *specimen* of winsome Irish girlhood as *one could wish to see*” (*U* 13.325-26, 80-81, emphases added).<sup>11</sup> Her accordance with public expectations, however, only turns her into an object of male desire produced by such public discourses as pulp fictions, fashion magazines,

---

<sup>11</sup> For a detailed survey of the role of women in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Ireland, see Diane Stubbings, *Anglo-Irish Modernism and the Maternal*.

advertising, and clichés.<sup>12</sup> All these discourses, saturated with social—or more accurately, masculine—expectations, imply what a feminine ideal should be: “selfless and bodiless, gendered but sexless” (Jackson 76).

Selfless, Gerty is “a cultural commodity, a product of social notions” of what a woman should be (Johnson 900), dedicated to the pursuit of fashion in agreement with patriarchal demands and endeavoring to play the role of an ideal female: an obedient daughter, a loving ministering wife, and a devoted mother.

Bodiless, she is seen through her clothing: her “neat blouse of electric blue selftinted by dolly dyes,” her “navy threequarter skirt cut to the stride,” the “coquettish little love of a hat of wideleaved nigger straw,” and the shoes which are “the newest thing in footwear . . . with patent toecaps and just one smart buckle over her higharched instep” (*U* 13.150, 154-55, 156, 164-69). Even though a picture of Gerty is given, it is given in segments: we see Gerty’s “figure,” “face,” “mouth,” “hands,” “instep,” “eyes,” “lashes,” “brows,” and “hair” (*U* 13.83-117), but never see Gerty as a whole person with a whole body.

Gendered, Gerty is “a womanly woman not like other flighty girls unfeminine” (*U* 13.435-36), an angel of “womanly [wisdom]” in the house with “sweet girlish shyness” (*U* 13.223, 121), willing to become a “dear little wifey” taking care of her “beau ideal”—a “manly man”—with “creature comforts” (*U* 13.241, 209, 210, 222).

Sexless, Gerty denies her sexual desire in spite of the fact that she does feel it; or as Tony E. Jackson puts it, “the images of woman in Irish patriarchal culture work to deny this animal desire to Gerty’s consciousness” (75). Sex, then, becomes something existing but unspeakable, or in Barbara Leckie’s words, a “discourse of censorship” (65), censored by the fugal city. Apparently Gerty knows about sex: “she revealed all her graceful beautifully shaped legs” to Bloom, seeming to “hear the panting of his heart, his hoarse breathing, because *she knew too about the passion of men like that, hotblooded*” (*U* 13.698-701, emphases added). And yet she avoids naming it and even rejects it altogether, for “[f]rom everything in the least indelicate her finebred nature

---

<sup>12</sup> For a detailed list of public discourses which produce Gerty and their examples, see Jeri Johnson, p. 900.

instinctively recoiled" (*U* 13.660-61). Thus, she imagines that she and Bloom, "the only man in all the world for her," "would be just good friends like a big brother and sister *without all that other*" (*U* 13.672, 665-66, emphases added). When sex is considered "indelicate," physical needs become forbidden, unnamable, and repressed: "that place" (*U* 13.332) replaces "the toilet," "went there for a certain purpose" (*U* 13.340) substitutes for "went to the toilet," and a word like "beeoteetom" (*U* 13.263) is a taboo for Gerty, for "she'd be ashamed of her life to say" "an unladylike thing like that out loud" (*U* 13.265-66).

Selfless and bodiless, gendered yet sexless, self-censoring Gerty turns out to be an object of male fantasy, "constructed by and through" a discourse emerging "as a veritable code of femininity" (Johnson 900). Jeri Johnson refers to Joyce's remark on the episode that the sexual encounter "all took place in Bloom's imagination," and argues that "Gerty is *Bloom's* 'Projected Mirage'" and "fantasy," for her discourse is "perceived from the standpoint of the masculine observer" (900). It is somewhat unconvincing to regard Gerty as *Bloom's* fantasy. Gerty indeed embodies a Siren figure and satisfies Bloom's sexual desire, and Bloom does play the observer when Gerty is "on show" (*U* 13.775-76). The "namby-pamby jammy marmalady drawersy" (Johnson 899) style of Gerty's discourse, however, is unlikely to be perceived from the standpoint of Bloom, who is sensual, scientific, observant, and realistic, perceiving Gerty as she really is rather than fantasizing her. More accurately, Gerty represents a *public fantasy*, a mirage projecting masculine imagination, a product fulfilling the expectation of patriarchal society. She is an idealized feminine image, but not ideal in herself—after all, she is selfless.

As a public fantasy, Gerty proves to be the female counterpart to the martial Citizen, who in the parody of the Irish legend in "Cyclops" is described as a "broadshouldered deepchested stronglimbed frankeyed redhaired freelyfreckled shaggybearded widemouthed largenosed longheaded deepvoiced barekneed brawnyhanded hairylegged ruddyfaced sinewyarmed hero" (*U* 12.152-55), in striking contrast to Gerty's extreme femininity, though both are bodiless and gendered. One feminine, the other masculine, they are, in Jackson's words, "Joyce's imaginary Irish

couple,” “the gendered mirror-images privileged by the culture that Joyce is examining” (74). The Citizen and Gerty, indeed, represent stereotypical Irish maleness and femaleness (Jackson 63), the incarnation of the Croppy Boy and Siren-Erin. They reify the polarization of gender roles and self-other relationship. As a product constructed by, not an agent constructing, social discourses, Gerty possesses only a public identity like her male counterpart, and plays the role allocated by the fugal city. As a result, Gerty can be nothing but a pathetic dreamer who saturates herself in the current of commercial culture and the atmosphere of romantic and sentimental love, and assumes the role of Siren-Erin, the object of the male gaze and public fantasy. When the tremendous gap between assumption and reality is revealed, however, Gerty is discovered as puppet rather than an ideal, symptomatic of the colonized Erin who is miserable rather than glorious. Mahaffey comments that the exposure of Gerty’s “pathetic limitations”—which is done by Bloom in his interior dialogue—reduces a probably “real, potentially complex woman [to] a lonely caricature and common cliché” (161). Harsh Mahaffey’s comment may sound, yet it pinpoints Gerty’s deplorable status as a public fantasy, simply reflecting the collective assumption of what a woman is or should be, and falling victim to that fantasy. Gerty may have “luxurious notions for herself” (O’Brien 115), as Erin has grandiose dreams, but her luxurious notions end in self-deception: she can not face the reality of her lameness, her possible spinsterhood, and the likely domestic violence in her family—these, of course, are not supposed to appear in an idealized, romanticized, and fantasized world. If the Citizen indulges himself in chauvinistically nationalistic dreams approved by the fugal city, Gerty imbues herself in the tide of dominant patriarchal ideology and public culture, passively and helplessly. In this respect, the victimized, femininity-personified Gerty is really “the mate” to the victimizing, “generic male” of the “Cyclops” episode (Jackson 72): both figures live up to the assumption of public self, lacking the ability to examine it and construct a dialogically fugal identity.

Joyce’s imaginary Irish couple embody the polarization of genders and self-other relationship. They may “appear as complementary kinds of subjectivities” (Jackson 63), but such subjectivities make them objects rather than subjects: both the Citizen

and Gerty become the spokespersons for their society and culture, the instruments of verbal-ideological collectivization, or even the personifications of Ireland. While the Citizen makes propaganda for martial nationalism and assumes the role of a modern Croppy Boy, a heroic bard willing to die for Ireland, Gerty speaks for romantic love and commercial culture, playing the incarnated Siren-Erin in accordance with the public expectation of an ideal female. Echoing the fugue of the city, both figures internalize the public voice but fail to dialogize it, and hence fail to construct an intermediary architectonic self: they have only a public identity and lack a private one. So extremely polarized are they that this couple are unable to enter into dialogue with each other. Such polarization of femininity and masculinity results in the isolation of the sexes, which, in Joyce's words, is in fact a state of paralysis—as Mr. Duffy recognizes at the end of "A Painful Case," "he had been outcast from life's feast" (*D* 117) and imprisoned in a paralytic state owing to his rejection of Mrs. Sinico's feminine affection. To break through the paralysis of stereotyped gender polarization, a new Irish couple sticking to neither extreme of gendered fantasy is needed. Bloom and Molly, a new womanly man and a new manly woman, exemplify this new couple, possessing both femininity and masculinity and capable of balancing private and public selves.

As the balance between the "complementary kinds of subjectivities" of Gerty and the Citizen, Bloom nevertheless internalizes patriarchal values to a certain degree, regarding Gerty as a sexual object to vent his desire on: "Hot little devil all the same" (*U* 13.776), "Anyhow I got the best of that" (*U* 13.785-86), "Did me good all the same. . . . For this relief much thanks" (*U* 13.939-40). Similar to Martha, whose trick leads to Lionel's loss of reason, Gerty also drives Bloom to a state of loss: "Drained all the manhood out of me, little wretch" (*U* 13.1101-2). What is evinced in these utterances is Bloom's absorption of the public assumption which connects woman with a Siren-like temptress. He also fails to escape the trap of gender stereotypes that consider male and female as binary opposites. As a result of the internalization of stereotypes, Bloom agrees that women are cultural commodities for men's pleasure ("Dressed up to the nines for somebody. Fashion part of their charm" [*U* 13.804]), that

they like to compete with each other for men's gaze ("That's what they enjoy. Taking a man from another woman" [*U* 13.874-75]), that they tend to play the role of an angel in the house ("Of course they understand birds, animals, babies. In their line"; "Nature. Washing child, washing corpse" [*U* 13.903-4, 955-56]). Joseph Allen Boone convincingly points out Bloom's internalization of his society's "fixed ideas concerning the active-passive nature" of male-female relationship (74), that "the majority of Joyce's male characters are obsessed by shows of power, force, virility, and sheer brawn," while "the women believe themselves to be passive, receptive, and intuitive creatures who complement their 'feminine' virtue with a forgiving indulgence of 'masculine' bravado" (69). It is also clear that "Bloom must struggle to establish a sense of selfhood and sexual identity" within the "bifurcated context" of stereotyped gender roles (69). But it would be an overstatement to assert that "Bloom attempts to repress the 'feminine' within himself" (74).

Bloom may echo stereotypical discourses concerning the bifurcation of gender roles, but he never denies his femininity, let alone "represses" it. Unconsciously at least, he accepts his feminine temperament and mediates between the binary opposition of masculinity and femininity. He is androgynous, as Boone indicates (67), understood not as a Nietzschean androgynous angel of self-sufficiency, but as a bisexual being capable of incorporating differences, and he is willing to be androgynous. But it is Gerty who inspires Bloom, leading him to the revelation of his hermaphroditism, as it is the Citizen that stimulates Bloom to question and reaccentuate the masculine discourse of Irish society, to assert his Jewish and Irish identities, and to advocate love as against force.

Gerty, as McGee suggests, is "finalized and imprisoned" by the supposedly feminine discourse that speaks her, but Bloom is not (1987, 314). We may argue that Bloom's unfinalizability results from his willingness to dialogize. Unlike Gerty, whose discourse is "constantly determined by the need to displace or domesticate taboo subject matter," Bloom shows in his discourse an inclination to examine taboo (Law 232), or, in Bakhtinian terminology, to transform authoritative discourse into internally persuasive discourse. As Jules David Law observes, Bloom is fascinated by

the act of transgression (232), whether that of sexual boundaries or self-other polarization. The examination of taboo and the act of transgression in effect signify forms of dialogue, and echo Bakhtin's emphasis on "the need to exceed boundaries" (Holquist 1986, xix). Taking Gerty as a medium, or in Bakhtinian terms, in answer to Gerty as ideologue of stereotyped Irish womanhood, Bloom reveals his femininity and reaccentuates the stale feminine discourse that speaks for Erin, and, by doing so, shapes an architectonic self capable both of receiving and of questioning and answering.

Gerty styles herself, or is styled, the "specimen of winsome Irish girlhood" (*U* 13.81), obliged to be the selfless and bodiless object of the male gaze and the gendered yet sexless angel in the house. Bloom, however, turns the stereotyped image of woman into a sensual and bodily subject, challenging taboo and transgressing the borderline of gendered discourses. As a consequence of his discursive reaccentuation, the conventional images of the Virgin/mother, little wifey, and sterling good daughter embodied by Gerty are transformed into images that are, potentially at least, unconventional, personal, and subversive.

Far from being "Refuge of sinners. Comfortress of the afflicted" (*U* 13.442), Bloom's version of the mother is "sad," laborious, and realistic:

Sad however because it lasts only a few years till they settle down to potwalloping and papa's pants will soon fit Willy and fuller's earth for the baby when they hold him out to do ah ah. No soft job. . . Nature. Washing child, washing corpse. Dignam. Children's hands always round them. Coconut skulls, monkeys, not even closed at first, sour milk in their swaddles and tainted curds. Oughtn't to have given that child an empty teat to suck. Fill it up with wind. Mrs Beaufoy, Purefoy. Must call to the hospital.  
(*U* 13.952-60)

Gerty's image of the Virgin/mother with "an infinite store of mercy" giving Bloom "a sweet forgiving smile, a smile that verged on *tears*" (*U* 13.748, 764-65, emphasis added) is transformed into a "sad" picture of a laboring mother. Gerty's hands that "were of finely veined alabaster with tapering fingers and as white as lemonjuice" (*U*

13.89-90) turn into children's hands round the mother. The milk with which Gerty bathes her feet, as rumor has it (*U* 13.91-92), becomes the "sour milk" in babies' swaddles. And the picture of the sad, laboring mother is consummated by Mrs. Purefoy suffering from the torture of hard labor. Bloom undoubtedly internalizes such patriarchal values as the ascription of washing children and corpses as woman's work, and yet he unveils the hyperbolic sentimentality and hypocrisy of Gerty's image of the Virgin/mother as well as the queenly image of Erin.

From the mother image, Bloom turns to the figure of the wife. Assigned the role of the angel in the house, Gerty "would make the great sacrifice. Her every effort would be to share his thoughts. Dearer than the whole world would she be to him and gild his days with happiness" (*U* 13.653-55). After Bloom's reworking, a realistic portrait of the Irish family replaces the romantic atmosphere of Gerty's fantasy: "Husband rolling in drunk, stink of pub off him like a polecat. Have that in your nose in the dark, whiff of stale boose. Then ask in the morning: was I drunk last night?" (*U* 13.964-66); and the little wifey is metamorphosed into a homely woman:

Wife locked up at home, skeleton in the cupboard. Allow me to introduce my. Then they trot you out some kind of a nondescript, wouldn't know what to call her. Always see a fellow's weak point in his wife. Still there's destiny in it, falling in love. Have their own secrets between them. Chaps that would go to the dogs if some woman didn't take them in hand. (*U* 13.970-75)

Bloom's viewpoint of the husband-wife relationship basically echoes Gerty's: both characters agree on the affinity between husband and wife and on man's reliance upon woman's care. Whereas Gerty's discourse implies the necessary selflessness of woman after marriage ("sacrifice"), Bloom's reveals an equal relationship between the sexes, or even the superiority of woman over man (woman takes man "in hand"). The wife in Bloom's realistic version does not gild the days of her husband with happiness; rather, they mutually brand each other with the partner's "weak point." Noticeably, Bloom's associations are always related to his unique Siren, Molly. His thoughts inevitably turn to his own spouse when he reaccentuates the image of wife: "Chickens come home to roost. They stick by one another like glue. Maybe the women's fault



also. That's where Molly can knock spots off them" (*U* 13.966-68). For Bloom, Molly beats off all the other women as the ideal wife in spite of her act of adultery.

In Bloom's interior dialogue, moreover, thinking about Molly almost invariably occasions thinking about Milly, or to phrase it differently, mother always summons daughter: "Handed down from father to, mother to daughter, I mean. Bred in the bone" (*U* 13.917-18). Gerty's discourse describes her as a "sterling good daughter" like "a second mother in the house": "when her mother had those raging splitting headaches who was it rubbed the menthol cone on her forehead but Gerty . . . Everyone thought the world of her for her gentle ways" (*U* 13.325-31). Bloom's version of the daughter, on the other hand, emphasizes her cleverness:

Milly for example drying her handkerchief on the mirror to save the ironing. . . . And when I sent her for Molly's Paisley shawl to Prescott's . . . carrying home the change in her stocking! Clever little minx. I never told her. Neat way she carries parcels too. Attract men, small thing like that. (*U* 13.918-23)

Milly's cleverness replaces Gerty's gentleness, and the "sterling good daughter" is transformed into a "little minx," indicative of Bloom's revision of the conventional daughter image: unlike Gerty, who is confined "in the house," the outgoing Milly enjoys more space outside the house, transgresses the borderline of bodily/geographical space allocated by the gender-polarized city, and is thus somewhat androgynous—or at least not traditionally feminine.

Curiously, the role of daughter often mixes with the role of wife: "Milly delighted with Molly's new blouse. At first. Put them all on to take them all off. Molly. Why I bought her the violet garters" (*U* 13.798-800); "Sometimes Molly and Milly [have their periods] together" (*U* 13.785). The associations of their breasts also connect Molly and Milly together: "Fifteen she [Molly] told me. But her breasts were developed" (*U* 13.890); "Her [Milly's] first stays I remember. Made me laugh to see. Little paps to begin with" (*U* 13.1199-200). It is a controversial argument whether or

not Bloom has incestuous affection for Milly,<sup>13</sup> but it is certain that Bloom transfigures Gerty into Molly and Milly and merges them together. As Jackson notes, the female discourse of “Nausicaa” shows Gerty as the mother, wife, and daughter (78). Yet the images of her three roles are transformed as a result of Bloom’s discursive reaccentuation.

What is more, Bloom crosses his own sense of self with the mother and wife images, and becomes a real womanly man. When he thinks about woman’s periods, Bloom admits his capacity of empathy, that he can “feel” the uncomfortableness as well: “Molly often told me *feel* things a ton weight. . . . *Feel it myself too*” (*U* 13.823-24, emphases added). While he maintains that it is woman’s nature to “understand” and take care of children (*U* 13.903-4, 955-56), he glosses over the fact that he understands and takes care of Milly, too:

And the women, fear of God in their faces. Milly, no sign of funk. Her blue scarf loose, laughing. Don’t know what death is at that age. And then their stomachs clean. But being lost they fear. When we hid behind the tree at Crumlin. I didn’t want to. Mamma! Mamma! Babes in the wood. Frightening them with masks too. . . . Poor kids! Only troubles wildfire and nettlerash. Calomel purge I got her for that. After getting better asleep with Molly. Very same teeth she has. (*U* 13.1187-95)

What is noteworthy in this passage is not merely Milly’s association with Molly, the Virgin, and Gerty—for blue is the color of both Mary and Gerty (*U* 13.179-80). More importantly, Bloom betrays his *maternal* love for his daughter, unconsciously transfiguring himself into a motherly father by empathizing with the role of the mother.

Reaccentuating public feminine discourse with his personal memory, and transforming Gerty the “specimen” into his own wife and daughter, Bloom meanwhile reinterprets and redefines “love,” which for the Citizen signifies effeminacy and for Gerty sentimentality. For Bloom, however, love means something more. What is

---

<sup>13</sup> For Bloom’s incestuous inclination, see Jane Ford, “Why Is Milly in Mullingar?” pp. 436-49.

revealed in his interior dialogue is his affectionate love for his daughter, wife, and the world. Bloom's paternal/maternal affection for Milly, as mentioned previously, is obvious: "Her growing pains at night, calling, wakening me. Frightened she was when her nature came on her first. Poor child!" (*U* 13.1201-3) Remarkably, Milly "calls" and "wakens" her father instead of her mother when she needs comfort and help, a gesture reflecting her reliance on Bloom and his care of her. For Molly, Bloom cherishes a profound matrimonial love, as demonstrated in the large portion she occupies in his thoughts on 16 June 1904. Because of that profound love—in contrast to Gerty's romantic but superficial love for Reggy Wylie—Bloom tolerates and accepts Molly's adultery, which has haunted him for the whole day: "And she can do the other. Did too" (*U* 13.1275). Extending his parental and matrimonial love, Bloom shows sympathy for all the Dubliners: he sympathizes with Mina Purefoy for her hard labor, pities Gerty for her lameness ("Sad about her lame" [*U* 13.1094]), and forgives the Citizen even though he attacks him ("Perhaps not to hurt he meant" [*U* 13.1220]). Love, as a consequence of Bloom's reaccentuation, turns from sentimental romance into thoughtful caring and profound affection. For Bloom, to love is to incorporate and accept heteroglot differences, to give freedom and space to the beloved, and not to draw a fixed borderline between assumed binary opposition such as Self and Other. In this respect, Bloom's concept of love may be defined as "genuine incorporation of heteroglossia," which echoes Bakhtin's interpretation of love:

It is only love (as an active approach to another human being) that unites an inner life (a *subiectum*'s own object-directedness in living his life) as experienced from outside with the value of the body as experienced from outside and, in so doing, constitutes a unitary and unique human being as an aesthetic phenomenon. (*AA* 82-83)

When Bloom asks Molly why she accepted his marriage proposal, she replies: "Because you were so foreign from the others" (*U* 13.1209-10). In the eyes of the self-centered Dubliners, Bloom is indeed a foreign outsider, the Other. The position of outsidership, however, is necessary for self-construction. Bakhtin makes this clear:

[T]he author must take up a position outside himself, must experience himself on a plane that is different from the one on which we actually experience our own life. Only if this condition is fulfilled can he complete himself to the point of forming a whole by supplying those values which are transgredient to life as lived from within oneself and thus can consummate that life. (AA 15)

As an outsider, Bloom may seem impotent and incomplete. Nevertheless, only an “unconsummated” and “axiologically yet-to-be” subject is “capable of living and acting” (AA 13) and allowed the space for consummation. But in practice no one is consummated, and the subject always needs the other to help him/her achieve a tentative wholeness. Bloom knows this, and can hence empathize with and return from the other, yet other Dubliners do not and cannot. For Molly, we might assume, Bloom’s “foreignness” results from his inclination to dialogize and accept different voices rather than from his Jewishness. Capable of incorporating different voices, Bloom is willing to admit his femininity and able to resist the interpellation of the public self that promotes the polarization of Self-Other and gender roles. Boone has it that Bloom’s “unmasculine” attitude is “ultimately saving” to him (73). As a womanly man possessing marginal male subjectivity and wandering like a *flâneur* in the third space of the city, Bloom differs from other manly men such as the Citizen and womanly women like Gerty on account of his willingness and ability to reaccentuate assimilated public discourses, to accept the excess of seeing of other people, and to refuse the urban territorializations of desires and social order. This ability also helps him resist the trap of extreme individualism, which threatens to drown him in personal fears and desires and to detach him from social reality. Alone on Sandymount Strand in the second half of “Nausicaa,” Bloom risks indulging himself in the fear of being a cuckold and the desire of being with Molly, especially when the Siren songs persistently insinuate his cuckoldry and his thoughts invariably turn to Molly. Eager to participate in communal life, however, Bloom always returns from the private sphere to contemporary reality, as he always associates public discourse with personal memory. Putting his personal memory into dialogue with public discourse, negotiating

between the private self and the social, and transgressing the boundaries between races, genders, and Self-Other, Bloom initiates the construction of his architectonic/fugal self, which comprises both yet is bound by neither extreme. His interior dialogue, indeed, incorporates such binary oppositions as private and public, masculinity and femininity, and, above all, Self and Other. As Bakhtin argues, “actions of contemplation”—i.e., interior dialogue—“unify and order” the “other as a given” (*AA* 24). Bloom’s dialogic assimilation makes him a new citizen subject and a new womanly man consisting of both Self and Other, which are “reciprocal” (Holquist 1990, xxvii), not oppositional. If Bloom represents a self-constructed persona, who unifies and orders the other as a given in interior dialogue, other Dubliners embody socially constructed figures, possessing only a public identity and simply echoing public discourses like a sounding board, whilst Stephen exemplifies a solipsist figure, anti-social and forever criticizing and resisting. In spite of the dominant power of colonial/nationalistic absolutism and monologism, Bloom the new citizen subject opts for neither collectivization nor solipsism, and heralds the coming of a new age, when hybridity characterizes postcolonial subjectivity, and heteroglossia typifies a postcolonial nation in the act of becoming. To phrase it differently, in his dialogic constitution of an architectonic self, which balances collectivism with egoism, Bloom blueprints a potential and constructive version of new postcolonial subjectivity for the postcolonial nation under development, in the hope of transforming the antagonism of binary opposition into creative force of some kind for the construction of a new nation.

McGee interprets Bloom’s writing on the shore at the end of “Nausicaa” as an attempt to “fill the ‘I’ with an identity” (1987, 315). Indeed, Bloom is trying to obtain a habitable space and make himself at home in patriarchal Irish society. The lack of “room” (*U* 13.1265) for him to finish his writing is suggestive enough: he is deprived of his space by the fugal city. But the unfinished writing (“I. AM. A” [*U* 13.1258-64]) may also imply his unfinalized subjectivity, always incomplete and ready to assimilate different voices—and this is the essence of the Bakhtinian architectonic self. Urban territorialization of social order, however, absorbs the space Bloom is making: the

collective voice assaults Bloom with the cuckoo chant, making him a cuckolded Other once again. At the very end of the episode, therefore, Gerty's gendered feminine discourse replaces Bloom's interior dialogue, implying the will of the domineering and possessive collective self to allocate the outsider an incompetent identity as the cuckolded Other. Curiously enough, the stick Bloom uses as a pen to write on the shore "fell in silted sand, stuck" (*U* 13.1270) when he flings it away. Stick in the mud, a phrase referring to adherence to convention and stereotype, may suggest the phallic image and hence the domination of patriarchal power over the shore. But it is Bloom, the new citizen subject and womanly man, who flings the stick in the mud. We may thus read the act as Bloom's mockery of urban territorialization executed by social collectivity which imposes the identity of the cuckolded Other upon him, an identity which is socially given, stabilized, and stereotyped, incapable of architectonic dialogue. Despite the fact that the public voice encroaches upon Bloom's interior dialogue, his act of mockery—whether consciously or not—makes him an interlocutor to, if not a questioner of, the imposing fugal city as collectivity. The act of flinging the stick, in this light, might also be read as Bloom's challenge to urban territorialization and his attempt to make space out of it, initiating the construction of an architectonic self. Notwithstanding this, the achievement of the habitable home he endeavors to make depends on Molly's answerability, which, politically and culturally implicated, countersigns Bloom's proposal of love and freedom, and affirms his role as liberator and reformer, not as cuckold and outcast.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Dialogic Answers and the Grotesque Body:

### Molly's Bisexual Writing of the Nation

As the character having the last word of *Ulysses*, Molly Bloom plays a pivotal and necessary part in the performance on 16 June 1904. The "Penelope" episode, according to Joyce, "is the clou of the book," "being written through [Molly's] thoughts and body Poldy being then asleep" (*SL* 285, 274). Joyce leaves the last word to Molly and assigns her the *clou* of the novel because, as Daniel R. Schwarz suggests, the presentation of her perspective is essential in terms of the novel's thematic significance:

For Molly is the necessary ingredient . . . necessary for [Joyce] to complete the novel that is at once the story of how he moved beyond the limitations of his younger self, represented by Stephen; the anatomy of modern Ireland with its unlikely Jewish hero, Bloom; the discovery of the essential patterns which unite the major epochs of European civilization; and the epic of the body, epitomized by Molly. (258)

To put it in Bakhtinian words, Molly acts as an answerable author, who responds to the solipsistic Stephen's dilemma over father's law and mother's love, to the sociocultural outsider Bloom's attempt to construct a habitable home in hostile Dublin, to the imperial patterns of domination and subjection characteristic of European civilization, and to the asceticism and misogyny of Christian tradition that exalts the spiritual and debases the physical. In this respect, Molly is complementary to Stephen and Bloom, her answerability completing the triologue of *Ulysses* which is simultaneously the novelized epic of the body, of the Irish and the Jews, and of the postcolonial nation in the act of becoming.

Notwithstanding the fact that Molly's voice is not heard until the last episode, she is present in other Dubliners' conversations and, more importantly, continually vocal in Bloom's consciousness or interior dialogue. If we regard Bloom's fellow Dubliners, with whom he converses during his *flânerie*, as the immediate addressee of his

utterance, “whose responsive understanding the author of the speech work seeks and surpasses” (SG 126), we may think of Molly as Bloom’s superaddressee, the ever-present yet invisible third party in dialogue. As Bakhtin indicates, a speaker shapes an utterance not only according to the immediate addressee whom s/he is speaking to, but also according to a particular image on which the belief that s/he will be understood is based. Bakhtin comments on this concept:

But in addition to this addressee (the second party), the author of the utterance, with a greater or lesser awareness, presupposes a higher *superaddressee* (third), whose absolutely just responsive understanding is presumed, either in some metaphysical distance or in distant historical time (the loophole addressee). In various ages and with various understandings of the world, this superaddressee and his ideally true responsive understanding assume various ideological expressions (God, absolute truth, the court of dispassionate human conscience, the people, the court of history, science, and so forth). (SG 126)

Morson and Emerson argue that in a positive sense the superaddressee “embodies a principle of hope” (135). Simplistic it may sound, yet the argument is not altogether unconvincing: metaphysically at least, the superaddressee represents some kind of support, if not hope, to the speaker, as illustrated in the list of the superaddressee’s ideological expressions. According to this interpretation, if the Citizen relies on the backing of the collective self as his superaddressee, advocating binary antagonism and chauvinistic nationalism, the key to Bloom’s establishment of a habitable home rests on Molly’s responsive understanding, without which Bloom is cast as an underdog in a “terrible” hell of “*lack of response*” (SG 127).

An instance may explain the invisible presence of the superaddressee. In response to the public discourse of the Dubliners in the Ormond bar, Bloom addresses himself mentally to the singers of love and war, seeking and surpassing, though failing to obtain, their responsive understanding of the seductive peril of the collective voice which needs to be processed and reaccentuated. When he assimilates and responds to the very last line of “M’appari” (“Come to me!”), his reworked utterance is directed to



both the immediate addressee Simon Dedalus/Lionel, the singer/hero representing public discourse, *and* the invisible higher superaddressee, Molly: "Come. Well sung. All clapped. She ought to. Come. To me, to him, to her, you too, me, us" (*U* 11.754-55). Bloom agrees with the singer that Martha, the heroine of the song, "ought to" come to Lionel. And yet, since Bloom identifies with Simon/Lionel temporarily, the utterance "She ought to. Come. To me" is also addressed to his ultimate Siren: he is appealing to Molly circumlocutorily that she ought to come to him. To put it in other words, in addressing himself to the Dubliners, Bloom is at the same time speaking to Molly, the invisible yet ever-present third party in the dialogue, whose responsive understanding Bloom presumes and desires. Bakhtin makes this clear: "Each dialogue takes place as if against the background of the responsive understanding of an invisibly present third party who stands above all the participants in the dialogue" (*SG* 126). When the public self embodies this third party in other Dubliners' utterances, Molly represents Bloom's superaddressee, the receiving of her affirmative understanding being his ultimate aim.

As an invisibly silent presence in the dialogue shaping the utterance, the superaddressee is "a constitutive aspect of the whole utterance, who, under deeper analysis, can be revealed in it" (*SG* 126-27). This aspect of the superaddressee comes from the nature of the utterance, as well as that of the human being, which "always wants to be *heard*, always seeks responsive understanding, and does not stop at *immediate* understanding but presses on further and further (indefinitely)" (*SG* 127). The presupposition of the superaddressee, therefore, presumes that the utterance will be "heard, understood, responded to, and again to respond to the response, and so forth *ad infinitum*" (*SG* 127). However significant in relation to the construction of the utterance, the superaddressee is nevertheless silent in the dialogue, just as Stephen's superaddressee, May Dedalus, is simply a voiceless woman under the male gaze. This may explain why Joyce leaves the last word of the novel to Molly: for to be presented *only* as Bloom's superaddressee reduces her to another ghostly presence. To turn from a silent presence into a voiced person, Molly should participate in the dialogue and have her voice heard rather than being merely implicit in the speech of the other

participants. She may act as Bloom's superaddressee, and yet she has to become the addresser so that she can answer to the responsive understanding he presumes and desires.

In an often-quoted letter to Budgen, Joyce remarks on Molly's role: "The last word (human, all too human) is left to Penelope. This is the indispensable countersign to Bloom's passport to eternity" (*SL* 278). Critics often interpret this remark as Joyce's insistence on the significance of Molly's affirmation of Bloom, which bestows upon him his final and spiritual triumph over other chauvinistic Dubliners. But as the "indispensable countersign," Molly's word functions essentially as an excess of seeing complementary to Bloom's inevitable lack of seeing. By excess of seeing, Bakhtin means the "concrete, actually experienced horizons" (*AA* 22) as seen by one person but not by the other. Each person has his/her excess of seeing as well as the lack of seeing: I cannot see my own head, face, back, or the world behind me, which are only accessible to the other person's excess of seeing. To make the vision whole, the two excesses must be put together. As Holquist declares:

By adding the surplus [or excess] that has been "given" to you to the surplus that has been "given" to me I can build up an image that includes the whole of me and the room, including those things I cannot physically see: in other words, I am able to "conceive" or construct a whole out of the different situations we are in together. (1990, 36-37)

Complementing Bloom's horizon with her own, Molly countersigns Bloom's passport to eternity and spiritual victory by seeing what he fails to see in himself and by himself, speaks what he leaves unsaid, and fills in the "loophole" (*PDP* 233) in his word and consciousness. This is the reason why Molly's word represents the *clou* of the book: it is indeed an indispensable element to making the novel a tentative whole, in theme and in perspective. It is in this respect that Molly plays the requisite role of Bloom's dialogic other, the ultimate and necessary interlocutor in rejoinder to Bloom.

As Bloom's superaddressee and the excess of seeing complementary to his lack of seeing, Molly is a counterpart to, not a subordinate of, the modern Ulysses. Equal to him as an individual, she can thus affirm Bloom the new citizen subject and

womanly man. In the course of her interlocutory affirmation of Bloom, Molly unknowingly provides the Irish people with a new concept which enlightens the construction of a new nation and a new form of nationalism. Traditionally regarded as either Mother Earth nurturing lives in the universe, or a whore with immensely libidinous desire, or a commonplace—i.e., conventionally irrational—woman contradicting herself all the time, Molly appears apolitical, or at least indifferent to turn-of-the-twentieth-century Irish politics, though she is not unaware of its impact on her.<sup>1</sup> Unlike Maud Gonne or Mrs. Riordan, Molly shows no interest in political or nationalist movements. It thus seems improbable that she is related to any form of nationalism. But as Nolan points out, Joyce redistributes elements of feminine stereotypes among his female figures in a manner determined by both “culturally specific notions of femininity” and “particular historical conditions,” and these female figures therefore “bear a function of protest and resistance, both in relation to patriarchy and to colonialism” (169). As the female having the crucial last word of *Ulysses*, consequently, Molly embodies what Bakhtin calls an *ideologue* who protests against and resists patriarchal and colonial domination. Her interior dialogue in “Penelope,” as Carol Shloss puts it, “can act as [an index] of the external political situation of women in Dublin in 1904” (105). Shloss’s argument concerning Molly’s strategies of resistance is insightful and persuasive.<sup>2</sup> But apart from passive resistance, Molly also engages herself in active construction: indeed, she is simultaneously an unweaver and a weaver. How she ideologically constructs an Irish nation in her rambling thoughts and reflections thus becomes the pivot of this chapter. I would suggest that as the reincarnated milkwoman, an image representative of Ireland, Molly seeks and obtains the maximum freedom she is allowed in the colonized land. By obtaining personal freedom, which potentially leads to national liberation, Molly proposes the strategy Ireland should adopt in nationalist campaigns: dialogue.

Dialogue, as generally admitted, is the principal concept in Bakhtin’s theories, animating and dominating all his writings. For this reason the Bakhtinian thought in

---

<sup>1</sup> For Molly’s awareness of political impact, see Shloss, “Molly’s Resistance to the Union,” p. 106.

<sup>2</sup> For details, see Shloss, pp. 105-18.

general is termed “dialogism,” a term, according to Holquist, never used by the theorist himself (1990, 15). Typically, Bakhtin never gives a precise definition of dialogue, though he does distinguish between three kinds of dialogue: external dialogue, internal dialogue, and great dialogue (*PDP* 265). External dialogue refers to the literal conversation between two persons, “expressed compositionally in the text” and “inseparably connected with internal dialogue” (*PDP* 265). Internal dialogue, also called micro-dialogue, is in effect the technique of interior monologue employed in stream-of-consciousness novels. Closely related to assimilation and reaccentuation of discourses, this type of dialogue implies that a person responds to other people’s utterances in his/her own consciousness—a process more dialogic than monologic because the utterance itself is dialogic, filled with the overtones of its users. Both external dialogue and internal dialogue, Bakhtin emphasizes, “are just as inseparably connected with the great dialogue of the novel as a whole that encompasses them” (*PDP* 265). Great dialogue, in other words, refers to the novel as a whole, consisting of literal external dialogue between characters and unvoiced internal dialogue in characters’ consciousnesses. Molly’s “interior monologue” in “Penelope,” in this light, belongs to internal dialogue, affiliated with the great dialogue of *Ulysses* as a textual whole.

Whichever type it is, dialogue differs from monologue in its presupposition of an addressee and response, whereas monologue as speech is “addressed to no one and does not presuppose a response” (*SG* 117). The dialogic relation, accordingly, is one between utterance and response, or question and answer:

*Question and answer are not logical relations (categories); they cannot be placed in one consciousness (unified and closed in itself); any response gives rise to a new question. Question and answer presuppose mutual outsideness. If an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, it falls out of the dialogue and enters systemic cognition, which is essentially impersonal. (SG 168)*

Thus, dialogue indicates a series of questions and answers proceeding between two consciousnesses. If Bloom the great wanderer/wonderer represents the questioner,

Molly embodies his ultimate answerer, who responds to his inquiries in her interior dialogue. To read *Ulysses* in this light, the text exemplifies a great dialogic novel consisting of questions and answers: Bloom raises questions in his episodes, and Molly answers them in hers, while her answers engender new questions awaiting the answers of, say, Bloom, Stephen, and other Irish people.<sup>3</sup> Outside the consciousness of each other, Bloom and Molly enter into a dialogue of questions and answers: frequent recurrences in “Penelope,” which occur earlier in Bloom’s episodes, demonstrate this silent but emphatic dialogue.

The prerequisite for a dialogue, consequently, is the coexistence of at least two consciousnesses: “*I and other, I and thou*,” that is, “*I in interrelationship with other personalities*” (SG 167). Present or absent, a “dialogic *thou*” (SG 112) must occur in dialogue. Bakhtin makes it clear that “dialogicality” is “a special form of interaction among autonomous and equally signifying consciousnesses,” and that “unity” is not “an innate one-and-only,” but “a dialogic *concordance of unmerged twos or multiples*” (PDP 284, 289, underlining added). When the existence of another equal and unmerged consciousness is denied, what follows is monologism:

Monologism, at its extreme, denies the existence outside itself of another consciousness with equal rights and equal responsibilities, another *I* with equal rights (*thou*). With a monologic approach (in its extreme or pure form) *another person* remains wholly and merely an *object* of consciousness, and not another consciousness. No response is expected from it that could change everything in the world of my consciousness. Monologue is finalized and deaf to the other’s response, does not expect it and does not acknowledge in it any *decisive* force. Monologue manages without the other, and therefore to some degree materializes all reality. Monologue pretends to be the *ultimate word*. It closes down the represented world and represented persons. (PDP 292-93)

---

<sup>3</sup> For example, Molly decides to give Bloom another chance, personifies a new maternal image for Stephen, and proposes to Irish people a new form of nationalism. How they will reply to her responses remains a question to be answered.

The difference between monologism and dialogism, in short, is that the former denies the existence of another consciousness, whilst the latter admits the equal right of a dialogic *thou*.

In his explication of dialogism, Holquist specifies three composing elements of a dialogue: an utterance, a reply, and a relation between the two, the last being the most important (1990, 38). Indeed, an utterance without a reply falls into the monologic, and a reply inevitably involves the attitude of the answerer toward the subject and object of the utterance. Molly's final affirmation of Bloom shows not merely her active response to him, but, more importantly, her positive attitude toward him and his utterance. By extension, understanding, emotion, thought, and meaning are all forms of dialogue (SG 111, 113, 120, 145) since they comprise an utterance, a reply, and a relation between the two.

But the genuine essence of dialogue lies in its capacity for mutual enrichment: new potential emerges as a result of dialogic contact, whether semantically, personally, or culturally:

A meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue, which surmounts the closedness and one-sidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures. We raise new questions for a foreign culture, ones that it did not raise itself; we seek answers to our own questions in it; and the foreign culture responds to us by revealing to us its new aspects and new semantic depths. Without *one's own* questions one cannot creatively understand anything other or foreign. . . . Such a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and *open* totality, but they are mutually enriched. (SG 7)

Molly's interior dialogue suggests a new way of conceiving the nation just because imperial colonialism and chauvinistic nationalism are processed in the course of her assimilation and reaccentuation, creating a new possibility revising yet enriched by both forces. Clark and Holquist remark that as "an account of relations between people and between persons and things that cuts across religious, political, and

aesthetic boundaries,” dialogism embodies the liberating force “precisely because it insists that we are all necessarily involved in the making of meaning” (348). In “Penelope,” Molly actively makes meaning of her self and life, and thereby liberates herself—a colonial female subject—from the closedness and one-sidedness of colonial culture by entering into dialogic encounters and responses, the mutual enrichment resulting from which potentially leads to a new way of thinking through the liberation of Ireland in relation to the Other.

Despite the fact that Bakhtin fails to define the concept of dialogue systematically, we may summarize the essence of dialogue as the chronotopic encounter of consciousnesses, in which questions are raised by one and answered by the other with equal rights to speak, resulting in mutual enrichment, linguistically and ideologically. *Ulysses* can thus be read as a great dialogue consisting of external and internal dialogues, which permeate all the episodes of the book. Numerous recurring utterances pervading the novel are in fact in a dialogic relation, taking place as the responding dialogic *thou* makes contact with the addresser. Molly, the *clou* of the Joycean text, acts as Bloom’s superaddressee and excess of seeing as well as his dialogic *thou*, and “Penelope” the climactic episode of answers in response to Bloom’s, as well as Stephen’s, episodes of questions. Put together, all the episodes compose the novel as a great dialogue. But before exploring Molly’s episode of response, we should examine two explicitly dialogic episodes first, “Circe” and “Ithaca,” the one in the form of dramatic script comprising external dialogues, the other with the technique of catechism consisting of questions and answers. These episodes are dialogic in form or technique, stylistically more dialogic than the others, dramatizing or itemizing the questions Bloom desires but fails to verbally ask, though the answers sought are not confirmed until Molly offers her excess of seeing as the dialogic *thou* in “Penelope.”

The young Joyce was fascinated by Ibsen. He underlined the greatness of modern drama and believed that the genre “is closer to the eternal laws of human behaviour” that “do not change whatever the place or time” (Mason and Ellmann 8). Synonymous with “strife, evolution, movement in whatever way unfolded,” drama is “at war with

convention” and represents for Joyce “essentially a communal art and of widespread domain,” and “may help us to make our resting places with a greater insight and a greater foresight” (*CW* 41, 42, 45-46). Although Joyce reformulates later in his literary career the earlier aesthetic system that exalts drama above other genres, he remains enthusiastic about drama and makes all his novels dramatic in spirit (Ellmann 1982, 73). Written in the form of dramatic dialogue, “Circe” not only demonstrates Joyce’s persistent interest in drama, but also echoes his artistic credo suggested in “Drama and Life”: the emphasis on contemporary materials, the aversion to conventions, the attraction to Wagnerian myth, and the insistence on the universality of the laws of life (*CW* 38-46). These principles, as Ellmann points out, and as we may observe, permeate all Joyce’s novels (1982, 73). What is remarkable is that despite Joyce’s exaltation of the dramatic genre, many of his principles echo Bakhtin’s concept of the novel, especially the stresses on the here and now and new possibilities, and the refutation of canon and convention, reiterating significantly the spirit of dialogism. Dialogic in style and orientation, “Circe” represents a novelized drama, as Bakhtin may have put it;<sup>4</sup> it reflects both “the tendencies of a new world still in the making” (*DI* 7), and the process of a questioning mind in search of affirmative responses from an answerable dialogic *thou*.

As Joyce’s novelized drama of external dialogues encompassed in the great dialogue of *Ulysses*, “Circe,” apart from the initial stage direction, begins meaningfully with the interlocution between the Call and the Answer:

THE CALL

Wait, my love, and I’ll be with you.

THE ANSWER

Round behind the stable. (*U* 15.10-13)

This significant beginning reveals precisely the hallucinatory nature of “Circe” due to the unclear mental state of the protagonists and the lateness of the hour: the impersonal is thus personified. And yet it also foreshadows the dialogic nature of the

---

<sup>4</sup> Significantly and interestingly, Bakhtin takes Ibsen as an example of novelized drama in “Epic and Novel.” See *The Dialogic Imagination*, p. 5.



episode composed of incessant calls and responses, metamorphosed into different personae dialogizing each other. The interlocution between the personified Call and Answer, above all, insinuates Bloom's uppermost longing: to call for his love, Molly, and tell her that he will be with her in spite of the mental alienation dividing them, in the hope of receiving an affirmative answer from her. The seemingly random interlocution between the Call and the Answer is therefore crucial and suggestive, relevant to the episode as an externally dialogic drama and to the novel as a great dialogue.

But "Circe" is in fact externally *and* internally dialogic: hallucinations occurring in Bloom's mind and in Stephen's involve discursive recurrences from previous episodes, which, according to Bakhtin, belong to internal dialogue, since the human act, thought, and understanding are all internally dialogic in essence. Hugh Kenner states that "'Circe' is *Ulysses* transposed and rearranged" (356). The "Circe" episode, indeed, accumulates recurring discourses which Bloom and Stephen have assimilated during the day. As Molly plays Bloom's superaddressee in the other episodes, she assumes the same role in his Circean hallucination, which simultaneously enacts discursive recurrences transposed and rearranged. The difference is that apart from being his superaddressee, Molly in this episode occasionally becomes the second party, the addressee:<sup>5</sup>

A VOICE

*(sharply)* Poldy!

BLOOM

Who? *(he ducks and wards off a blow clumsily)* At your service.

*(He looks up. Besides her mirage of datepalms a handsome woman in Turkish costume stands before him. Opulent curves fill out her scarlet trousers and jacket, slashed with gold. A wide yellow cummerbund*

---

<sup>5</sup> To be precise, this is the only time Bloom addresses Molly directly as the second party in "Circe." He does not speak to her directly but plays the role of an observer in the adulterous scene where Molly presents herself the second and last time in the episode.

*girdles her. A white yashmak, violet in the night, covers her face, leaving free only her large dark eyes and raven hair.)*

BLOOM

Molly!

MARION

Welly? Mrs Marion from this out, my dear man, when you speak to me. *(satirically)* Has poor little hubby cold feet waiting so long?

BLOOM

*(shifts from foot to foot)* No, no. Not the least little bit.

*(He breathes in deep agitation, swallowing gulps of air, questions, hopes, crubeens for her supper, things to tell her, excuse, desire, spellbound. . . .)*

MARION

Nebrakada! Femininum!

*(The camel, lifting a foreleg, plucks from a tree a large mango fruit, offers it to his mistress, blinking, in his cloven hoof, then droops his head and, grunting, with uplifted neck, fumbles to kneel. Bloom stoops his back for leapfrog.)*

BLOOM

I can give you ... I mean as your business menagerer .. Mrs Marion ..... if you .....

MARION

So you notice some change? *(her hands passing slowly over her trinketed stomacher, a slow friendly mockery in her eyes)* O Poldy, Poldy, you are a poor old stick in the mud! Go and see life. See the wide world. (*U 15.293-330*)

The call “Poldy” reiterates Molly’s first call to Bloom in the morning—in fact her first utterance to him that day (*U 4.246*). “At your service” echoes Bloom’s serving Molly with her breakfast in “Calypso.” The utterance “opulent curves” repeats a phrase from *The Sweets of Sin* which Bloom reads and borrows for Molly in “The Wandering

Rocks" (*U* 10.612). Molly's "Turkish costume" echoes Bloom's dream which he recalls in "Nausicaa": "She had red slippers on. Turkish. Wore the breeches" (*U* 13.1240-41). "Mrs Marion" is resonant with the mode of address Boylan writes on the envelope of his letter to Molly (*U* 4.244-45), an ill-mannered mode of address making Bloom's "quicken[ed] heart [slow] at once" (*U* 4.244). The phrase "poor little hubby" acts as the counterpart to Gerty's utterance "dear little wifey" (*U* 13.241). "Nebrakada! Femininum!" repeats mysteriously a phrase Stephen reads in *The Eighth and Ninth Books of Moses* in "The Wandering Rocks" (*U* 10.849). The camel's offering of the mango to Molly echoes to a certain extent Stephen's dream in which he is offered a melon (*U* 3.365-69). And, mysteriously again, "a poor old stick in the mud" recalls the scene "The stick fell in silted sand, stuck" (*U* 13.1270) before the final cuckoo song in "Nausicaa." All these recurrences—since they recur in *Bloom's* hallucination—are assimilated and reaccentuated by Bloom, who transposes and rearranges them in his inner play of external dialogues between characters. But the gesture of transposition and rearrangement makes the drama of external dialogues a play of internal dialogue as well, where Bloom enters internally into interlocution with the responding dialogic *thou*.

In this passage of dialogue with Marion as the addressee and the real Molly at home as the superaddressee, Bloom reveals his desire to converse with her: he has "questions" to ask her and "things to tell her." This explains why Molly embodies herself, becoming the addressee and speaking directly to Bloom: for Bloom longs to enter into contact with her directly and to receive responses from her. If in reality they fail to dialogize each other—excepting the brief conversations before and after Bloom's wandering, which are far from being Bakhtinian dialogic—in Bloom's hallucination they enter into face-to-face dialogue. But the Circean Marion, as we may register, is constructed by Bloom's assimilated discourses, imagination, and desperate longing, hence distinct from the real Molly. This accounts for the need to have Molly as Bloom's excess of seeing as the last word of the novel, allowing her to construct instead to be constructed. Moreover, despite Bloom's desire to ask Molly questions and tell her things, he does not really speak them out; he offers to give her something

("I can give you ..."), but does not indicate what it is. Bloom himself seems unsure if he is capable of offering that important something; his dialogic *thou* thus asks him to "Go and see life. See the wide world." The line may belong to Molly, yet in effect reverberates with the tonalities of Bloom's voice: as an Irish *flâneur*, he wants to see the life and wide world of Dublin like his predecessor Odysseus, and he needs Molly to give him a reason ("excuse") for his wandering and long-term absence from home.

The question remains: what does Bloom want to ask Molly? And what does he want to offer her? Very likely, Bloom longs to ask Molly if she knows the reason for his eighteen-hour absence from home, a reason unspeakable owing to its unacceptability to other Dubliners: that he condones and accepts, though not without mental struggles, her adultery with Boylan, that he wishes to give her physical freedom, which belongs only to her and should be under her own control. This unspeakable reason is unacceptable to other Dubliners because, for them, women as objects belong to men, and are not entitled to the acquisition of freedom. From the viewpoint of patriarchal society, Molly's adulterous act only proves her wantonness and Bloom's cowardice. Bloom's fellow Dubliners would not consider the offer of freedom to women a heroic deed requiring courage and foresight, let alone relate it to the potential for the initiation of the national freedom they desperately aspire after. Freedom, for them, is the privilege of the Irish male, having nothing to do with the female or the Jew; the fact that a "free" Irish state with half of the population as the enslaved abject Other is not free at all is not taken into consideration. But Bloom recognizes this. By liberating Molly, he is simultaneously struggling for his own freedom and redefining Irish liberation, one that does not reproduce the imperial system and is not prejudiced against the Other, whether sexual or racial; and Molly, in return, is expected to respond to Bloom's gesture, which, without her responsive affirmation, signals only his cowardice and impotence in the eyes of other Dubliners. To read "Circe" in this light, the hallucinatory world can be seen as a vivid dramatization of Bloom's unconscious fears and desires, a parodic or even farcical play watched by a malicious Dublin audience. To put it another way, Bloom, debased and ridiculed in Nighttown as nightmare, is imagining how he is imagined by other

Dubliners hostile to him, a hostility he is fully aware of in his encounters with them. Like a trapped animal in a glass menagerie, he is observed and anatomized by other Dubliners, as in the scene of the medical examination, put under trial, forced to confess his innermost sins and desires, and mocked mercilessly. It may look like a carnival, but the Circean carnival is hostile. Bloom's survival relies on the magical herb moly/Molly, whose expected response helps him survive in hostile Nighttown, or Dublin in miniature.

But not until "Penelope" does Molly give Bloom the answer he needs, without which he is condemned to suffer from humiliation and frustration in Nighttown governed by the Man-hating Ogress—the sense or meaning of the episode according to the Linati Schema—represented by patriarchal society at large rather than Bella Cohen alone. The humiliation and frustration he experiences—whether in "Circe" or previous episodes—are connected with and generated by his sexual failure as a cuckold and political failure as a victimized Jew. His hallucinations in the episode, as well as his questions to Molly and the answers he expects, are thus twofold in essence: they are both personal/physical and national/political. I would like to divide Bloom's questions/hallucinations into these two categories and analyze each—a necessary task because these questions, contained in hallucinations, are deeply related to and inevitably influence Molly's response in "Penelope."

Politically marginalized, Bloom longs to break through the boundaries set between races by means of love rather than reproducing the colonial system of domination and subjection, as the chauvinistic Citizen and his ilk do. Since his ideals are rejected in reality, he endeavors to speak them out loud and put them into practice in the hallucinatory world, in which he becomes "the world's greatest reformer" (*U* 15.1459), crowned as the "undoubted emperor-president and king-chairman, the most serene and potent and very puissant ruler of [the] realm" of "the new Bloomusalem in the Nova Hibernia of the future" (*U* 15.1471-72, 1544-45). Granted a chance to make "a stump speech" (*U* 15.1353), Bloom announces his "programme" on public life ("better run a tramline, I say, from the cattlemarket to the river" [*U* 15.1367-68], echoing his proposition in "Hades" [*U* 6.400-402]), his stand on socialist anti-

capitalism and anti-mechanism (“Machines is their cry, their chimera, their panacea . . . produced by a horde of capitalistic lusts upon our prostituted labour. The poor man starves . . .” [*U* 15.1391-95]), and, above all, his ideas of universalism:

I stand for the reform of municipal morals and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for all. Union of all, jew, moslem and gentile. Three acres and a cow for all children of nature. Saloon motor hearses. Compulsory manual labour for all. All parks open to the public day and night. Electric dishscrubbers. Tuberculosis, lunacy, war and mendicancy must now cease. General amnesty, weekly carnival with masked licence, bonuses for all, esperanto the universal language with universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical impostors. Free money, free rent, free love and a free lay church in a free lay state. (*U* 15.1685-93)

These ideas, as Cheryl Herr points out, are Utopian and socialistic in nature (171), resulting from Bloom’s internal dialogue: the idea of new worlds for all races and religions echoes Bloom’s definition of a nation in “Cyclops” (*U* 12.1422-23); the phrase “three acres and a cow” is a “rallying cry for Irish land reform” in the nineteenth century (Gifford 479); the idea of motor hearses repeats Bloom’s proposition in “Hades” (*U* 6.405-8); the emphasis on manual labor reminds us of his keenness on Sandow’s exercise in “Calypso” (*U* 4.234) and of the discussion about the relationship between sports and the development of a people in a parody in “Cyclops” (*U* 12,897-901); the proclamation of the use of electric dishscrubbers and the end to tuberculosis, lunacy, and mendicancy echoes his sympathy for human beings—female in particular—in “Lestrygonians” (*U* 8.718, 392, 309-14, 28-29); the announcement of a termination to war, general amnesty, and universal brotherhood, and the critique of chauvinistic patriotism reflect his preference for peace and love over war and hatred, corresponding to the appeal to national freedom expressed in “Cyclops”; the emphases on free currency, exemption from rent, and bonuses for all citizens reveal his interest in economic problems, which should take precedence over the language problem, not vice versa as those “debating societies” claim (*U* 8.465-67);

and, finally, the advocacy of a free lay church and state reiterates his critical attitude toward the Catholic theology and clergy in “Lestrygonians” (*U* 8.31-40).

Most of these ideas are impractical and unlikely to be accepted by Dubliners, and some of them sound like an announcement that serves Bloom’s personal interest and desire—a weekly carnival and free love, for example, demonstrate his fascination for carnivalesque fantasy, which he is enacting. And yet, to a considerable degree, these ideas do reflect Bloom’s proposal of sexual liberation and political credos which emphasize sympathy for the poor, the all-importance of economic problems, and, above all, the necessity of undermining boundaries between religious, racial, and cultural differences: as he goes on to suggest in the slogan, “Mixed races and mixed marriage” (*U* 15.1699), and in his subsequent remark, “All insanity. Patriotism, sorrow for the dead, music, future of the race.” (*U* 15.1964-65). Critical of chauvinism and aware of the collectivizing power of music, Bloom focuses on the living and registers the invalidity of the empty talk of barflies concerning the Irish future, which would simply be an extension of the paralytic status quo, if monologism keeps dominating the political stage. Not surprisingly, Bloom sees patriotism, sorrow for the dead, music, and future of the race as indexes of insanity.

Utopian and impractical, Bloom’s political creeds are made to sound parodic: not only do they occasionally contradict each other—e.g., a state with “compulsory” manual labor is not really “free”—but the speaker himself seems to lack confidence in his own speech and senses its impracticability, for it is followed by a hostile and parodic remark from a fellow Dubliner (“Free fox in a free henroost” [*U* 15.1695]) and a yawn from another (*U* 15.1697). In spite of his coronation in the hallucinatory world, Bloom faces and senses hostility in it as well as in the real world. His attempts to be a new religious and political leader reforming the old regime and transcending conflicting differences are thus rejected and ridiculed—both by his hostile fellow Dubliners and by himself. Expressing his political ideals and imagining their subsequent rebuttal, Bloom does not merely “[project] the culture’s Utopian fantasies and [exhibit] its ideological insufficiencies” (Herr 173); he also pinpoints the culture’s inability to accept differences. The socialized and secularized Bloomusalem proves to

be a personal ideal, a fantastic Utopia too radical and unreal to be welcomed and accepted by Irish society at large, apt only to be ridiculed

But what really clinches Bloom's downfall is his transgression of sexual boundaries: instead of a parodic remark or a meaningful yawn, he confronts direct protest after his suggestion of mixed marriage, Lenehan's proposal of mixed bathing, which Bloom probably agrees with, and the parade of the statues of naked goddesses (*U* 1699-1710).

FATHER FARLEY

He is an episcopalian, an agnostic, an anythingarian seeking to overthrow our holy faith.

MRS RIORDAN

*(tears up her will)* I'm disappointed in you! You bad man! (*U* 15.1711-15)

"Successor" (*U* 15.1513) to Parnell, Bloom retraces the uncrowned king's failure because of his proclamation of sexual freedom. As in the case of Parnell's downfall, the nationalist leader suffered the abrupt collapse of both his political career and the promise of Home Rule after the exposure of his ten-year liaison with Katherine O'Shea, which led to the split among Irish nationalists and terminated the seeming unity and accord in Irish politics. One of the most crucial factors in the ruin of Parnell's career, Joyce believes, was the attitude of the Irish Roman Catholic Church: when the divorce trial brought by Captain William O'Shea was over and the split had taken place, Church leaders denounced the political chieftain. William J. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, was one of the Church leaders who fervently declared against Parnell's leadership:

... if the Irish leader would not, or could not, give a public assurance that his honour was still unsullied, the party that takes him or retains him as its leader can no longer count on the support of the bishops of Ireland. In speaking as I have spoken, I confine myself almost exclusively to the moral aspect of the case. (quoted in Lyons 1960, 116)

Archbishop Walsh's statement evinces not simply the interference of religion in politics, but the intolerance of religion to sexual transgression: a political leader



involved in a sexual scandal is immoral and hence inapt for leadership, however competent he is for the job.<sup>6</sup>

Like Parnell, Bloom becomes the target of a violent attack by the Church and its supporters when his inclination to sexual liberation is revealed. Father Farley, representative of the Church and the first person to protest against Bloom's leadership, declares that Bloom threatens the holy Catholic faith, while mentioning nothing about his political credos. An ardent Parnellite and devout Catholic before the Parnell-O'Shea scandal, Mrs. Riordan chooses to follow the Church and turn away from Parnell in *A Portrait*. As the young Stephen recalls, "Dante had ripped the green velvet back off the brush that was for Parnell one day with her scissors and had told him that Parnell was a bad man" (*P* 16). The pronoun "you" in Mrs. Riordan's hostile remark in "Circe" thus refers to both Parnell and Bloom: "bad" because they transgress "public morality" preached "from the altar" (*P* 31).

But the Irish Catholic Church is not the only religious contributor to Parnell's downfall; the English Protestant Church also "entered the list to finish him off" (*CW* 227). For example, the Reverend Hugh Price Hughes, a Methodist minister, "publicly denounced Parnell as 'the most infamous adulterer of the century,'" claiming that "if the Irish people deliberately accepted such a man as their leader they were morally unfit for self-government" (Lyons 1960, 80). Similarly, the American evangelist and revivalist, Alexander J. Dowie, condemns Bloom for his "debauchery" and summarizes his crime as unchristian, followed by a violent curse from the mob:

ALEXANDER J DOWIE

*(violently)* Fellowchristians and antiBloomites, the man called Bloom is from the roots of hell, a disgrace to christian men. A fiendish libertine from his earliest years this stinking goat of Mendes gave precocious signs of infantile debauchery, recalling the cities of the plain, with a dissolute granddam. This vile hypocrite, bronzed with infamy, is the white bull

---

<sup>6</sup> For the relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and Parnell's downfall, see also Emmet Larkin, *The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland and the Fall of Parnell, 1888-1891*; and C. J. Woods, "Parnell and the Catholic Church."

mentioned in the Apocalypse. A worshipper of the Scarlet Woman, intrigue is the very breath of his nostrils. The stake faggots and the caldron of boiling oil are for him. Caliban!

#### THE MOB

Lynch him! Roast him! He's as bad as Parnell was. Mr Fox! (*U* 15.1752-62)

While the Catholic Church condemns Bloom for being an "episcopalian," the Protestant Church accuses him of worshipping the Scarlet Woman, an "opprobrious Protestant term for the Roman Catholic church" (Gifford 480). Religious antagonism is fully evidenced here. Bloom has witnessed such antagonism, and therefore strives to build "a free lay church in a free lay state" in order to transform conflicts into union. His ideal, as we have seen, is denied and mocked by both the Catholic and the Protestant Church, and his merging of sexual with social politics leads to his political collapse: he can be nothing but a defeated reformer "as bad as Parnell," deserving to be lynched and roasted.

As the successor to Parnell, whose sexual life ruined his political career, Bloom is aware of Irishmen's hostility to "deviant" sexuality, which, for them, is immoral and thus should be kept away from national politics. In spite of this knowledge, Bloom asks for sexual freedom, endeavoring to combine it with national liberation, for if sexual tolerance had been granted, Parnell would not have been driven to his downfall and Ireland might have obtained freedom in 1904. But while Parnell kept his liaison with Mrs O'Shea a secret and detached his sexual life from the Home Rule appeal, Bloom tries to connect sexuality with politics and make sexual freedom a part of national liberation, as his statement "Mixed races and mixed marriage" (*U* 15.1699) indicates. The question we have to ask, then, is how Bloom conceives sexual freedom, and how it is related to political liberation.

Bloom's concept of sexual freedom may be summarized as androgynous and triangular. Critics have pointed out Bloom's androgynous inclination; in the previous chapter, I explored his status as a womanly man, who is an all-inclusive figure rather than a self-sufficient solipsist, distinct from Stephen's Shakespearean androgynous angel. In the hallucinatory world of Nighttown, Bloom's androgynous inclination is

dramatized maliciously and put on display: he is transfigured into a womanly man and then a manly woman before public eyes. When he faces the crisis of political downfall, Bloom tries to resort to sexuality to solve the crisis—suggestive enough, though definitely a wrong move: “I call on my old friend, Dr Malachi Mulligan, sex specialist, to give medical testimony on my behalf” (*U* 15.1772-73). The medical testimony shows that Bloom is “bisexually abnormal” (*U* 15.1775-76), according to Dr. Mulligan, and “a finished example of the new womanly man . . . about to have a baby” (*U* 15.1798-810), according to Dr. Dixon. Bloom then gives birth to eight eminent male yellow and white children—a gesture fulfilling his wish to have a son—and is subsequently associated with the Messiah ben Joseph, ben David, and Christ, performing parodic miracles (*U* 15.1834-51). But the womanly man is metamorphosed into a manly woman when he confronts the masculine matriarch, Bella Cohen: “Exuberant female. Enormously I desiderate your domination” (*U* 15.2777). “Unmanned” by Bello (*U* 15.2965), Bloom changes his gender into a “girly” (*U* 15.2884) with male sexual organs (*U* 15.2945), or rather an androgynous subject with characteristics of both sexes: “*charming soubrette with dauby cheeks, mustard hair and large male hands and nose, leering mouth*” (*U* 15.2985-86). To read Bloom’s androgyny positively, we may argue that Bloom, whether as womanly man or as manly woman, transgresses the borderline of gender identities, actively participating in the position of the Other and experiencing the processes of empathy and return. He thus discloses the insufficiencies of both patriarchal and matriarchal societies: by turning patriarchy into matriarchy, Bloom exposes the tyranny of the latter, which simply reproduces the cruelty, discrimination, and injustice characteristic of the former. A form of herteroglossia indeed, the androgynous merging of differences—whether sexual, political, religious, or linguistic—is refused in both patriarchal and matriarchal societies on account of its tendency to transgress boundaries, which seriously undermines the absolutism embraced by both societies. As a result of the transgression, Bloom is tortured in both camps, charged as “Belial! Laemlein of Istria, the false Messiah! Abulafia!” in one (*U* 15.1907) and sentenced to burial in the “shrubbery jakes” and suffocation in the “cesspool” in the other (*U*

15.3204-13). The positive aspect of androgyny is reduced to an arbitrary and ridiculous combination of male and female characteristics on the hostile Circean stage, Bloom's capacity to empathize distorted into his willing victimization by patriarchy.

The androgynous freedom is significantly related to the other concept of Bloomian sexual liberation, i.e., triangulation, which also threatens the domination and stability of patriarchal society. Bloom's interest in the triangular sexual relationship is obvious in the Circean hallucinatory world: the policy of mixed marriage in Bloomusalem, which he proposes to Mrs. Breen earlier ("I only meant a square party, a mixed marriage mingling of our different little conjugials" [U 15.433-34]), serves as an extension of the principle. In the sexual trial where Bloom is accused by Mary Driscoll and the noble ladies, Mrs. Bellingham states that Bloom urges her "to defile the marriage bed, to commit adultery at the earliest possible opportunity" (U 15.1054-56); and the Honourable Mrs. Mervyn Talboys claims that Bloom sends her a picture, which "represents a partially nude senorita, frail and lovely (his wife, as he solemnly assured [her], taken by him from nature), practising illicit intercourse with a muscular torero, evidently a blackguard," and that he urges her "to do likewise, to misbehave, to sin with officers of the garrison" (U 15.1067-70). Not only does Bloom search for his own physical pleasure, but he intends to bring it to Molly: "In five public conveniences he wrote pencilled messages offering his nuptial partner to all strongmembered males" (U 15.3034-35), as the Sins of the Past declare. Accordingly, Bloom has long wanted to offer Molly to other men, or rather the other way around: he wants to bring in another man to compensate for Rudy's death. As Bello tells Bloom: "As a paying guest or a kept man? Too late. You have made your secondbest bed and others must lie in it. Your epitaph is written. You are down and out and don't you forget it, old bean" (U 15.3198-200). The phrase "secondbest bed," recalling Stephen's Shakespeare theory and hence connecting Bloom to both figures, indicates another triangular relationship: that between Shakespeare, Ann Hathaway, and her adulterer. "Your epitaph is written" echoes Robert Emmet's last words which Bloom glimpses in Lionel Marks's antique saleshop at the end of "Sirens," suggesting that Ireland/Molly has achieved liberation. In other words, Bloom has invited another

man to the matrimonial bed for Molly, which he actively devises. When it really happens, however, Bloom is afraid—and is *supposed* to be afraid—to be “down and out” in the triangular relationship, a relationship unacceptable to patriarchal marriage. Therefore, in the fantasy of the adulterous scene between Marion and Boylan, Bloom is debased to a cuckolded “flunkey” (*U* 15.3760), receiving mockery from both the adulterer and adulteress (*U* 15.3763-89). His generous gesture of offering Molly freedom misunderstood, he is regarded and ridiculed by the tyrannical patriarch/matriarch as a mere impotent coward.

In spite of his unconscious fear and the malicious derision, Bloom’s inclination to take a third party into the matrimonial bed bears a significant function: he wants to devise a new form of family unit the new Irish state may require, one as distinct from the patriarchal family unit in which the unfaithful wife is dismissed as wanton, the cuckolded husband as impotent, and the intruder as transgressing and unwelcome. Bloom’s, or Joyce’s, interest in sexual liberation and the new family unit is closely related to the emergence of sexual radicalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when the rise of “a more militant feminism,” opposed both politically and culturally to “every aspect of patriarchal hegemony,” made “a profound impact on the socialist movement” (Rowbotham and Weeks 19-20). Among the socialist theorists that paid attention to female issues, such as the suppression of female sexuality, were Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis, who worked “very much within existing concepts of gender roles” to “humanise rather than revolutionise social relations” (Rowbotham and Weeks 23). Even though their efforts were not successful, they “touched on many vital connections” and raised significant questions: “[t]he political implications of women’s control over their bodies; the separation of sexual pleasure from procreation; the significance of homosexual love, of free unions, of changed ways of life and the relationship of all these to the labour and socialist movements” (Rowbotham and Weeks 23). Many of these questions drew Joyce’s attention, for, as Richard Brown tells us, Joyce possessed Havelock Ellis’s *The New Spirit* in his Trieste library (29).

One of the “pioneer sexual enlighteners of the twentieth century,” Havelock Ellis regards sexuality as “a powerful force which suffuse[s] and enhance[s] the whole of life” (Rowbotham and Weeks 182, 166). This idea is underscored in *The New Spirit*: “It must be among our chief ethical rules to see that we build the lofty structures of human society on the sure and simple foundations of man’s organism” (9, quoted in Rowbotham and Weeks 147). This may partly explain why Bloom takes so much interest in sexuality and why Joyce composes *Ulysses* as an epic of the body and of the Irish and the Jewish people: for human society is based on the human organism, the body. Richard Brown has explored similarities between Ellis’s and Joyce’s works and viewpoints, and has suggested the sexual pioneer’s likely influence on the literary innovator (83-84, 136-39). I would only add that Bloom’s attitude toward sexuality strikingly resembles Ellis’s “‘liberal’ ideology of sex”: “a greater toleration of sexual variations; a desire to relax the rigid moral code; and an emphasis on the ‘joy of sex’” (Rowbotham and Weeks 180). Also noticeably, Ellis introduced Ibsen to the English audience, and agreed with the Norwegian playwright’s belief that “the only revolution now possible [is] the ‘revolution of the human spirit’” (Rowbotham and Weeks 147), a belief Joyce undoubtedly shares and endeavors to put into practice.

To a certain degree, sexual radicalism as theorized by Ellis subverts the “mythology” of patriarchal marriage and family. As Tony Tanner notes, “marriage is *the* central subject for the bourgeois novel,” or rather the “mythology” in bourgeois society (15). Traditionally, the family was seen as “the essential unit that held society together,” and marriage the “most important mediation procedure that attempts to harmonize the natural, the familial, the social, and even the transcendental” (369, 16). Bill Overton also remarks that conservative thinkers in the nineteenth century believed that “the strength of the restored monarchy depended on ‘the authority of the husband, the subordination of the wife, and the dependency of the children’” (13)—in contrast to Bloom’s family. But with marriage as the medium, the family also bears the economic and supervisory functions that restrain female sexuality: “The basic principle of [the bourgeois] marriage is to keep everything in the family. This means control of money and property, but also, because these are transmitted through women,

of female sexuality" (Overton 21). Consequently, the bourgeois home confines and has to confine "unoccupied women" and "unoccupied language," since women are property and transmit property, and have no control over "linguistic realities," which, along with "sexual realities" and "economic realities," are "to be excluded from the home" and the female (Tanner 100). In Tanner's words, marriage acts as a "contract" (6), an enforceable agreement between parties that demonstrates the display of power, which falls on the side of the lawgiver, the father/husband. As Tanner points out, however, "contracts *create* transgressions," and adultery exemplifies this connubial and familial transgression (11). Fascinated by the idea of liberation, Bloom and Joyce are undoubtedly such transgressors of the marriage contract, the former inviting a third party into the marital bond, the latter renouncing it until the late period of his life;<sup>7</sup> for them "the old contracts no longer have any force at all" (Tanner 15).

In his examination of Joyce's relation to the issue of sexuality, Richard Brown registers the "modern" characteristics of Joycean texts as connected with attitudes to marriage, to the scientific attention to sexuality, to non-procreative priorities in sex, and to women at large (10). Like his younger persona Stephen, who repudiates the "nets" of "nationality, language, religion" (*P* 203), Joyce also rejects all the institutionalized bonds, inclusive of the marriage contract. His relationship with Nora reflects his refusal to accept the matrimonial bond, an act, according to Brown, "echoing the larger shift from divine to humanistic authority" and "from Catholicism to sexual liberalism" (16). But Joyce's rejection of marriage signifies not solely his rebellion against the divine authority of Catholicism; it also indicates his dissatisfaction with the conjunction of the sexual and the economic in marriage, a conjunction that compares the wife to the prostitute (Brown 30-31), echoing George Bernard Shaw's argument in *Mrs. Warren's Profession*. As a result of the conjunction, female sexuality is debased to prostitution, losing its autonomy and becoming merely the vehicle for the transmission of property.

---

<sup>7</sup> It is well-known that Joyce entered into the marriage contract with Nora at the age of forty-nine mainly in order to avoid legal problems with his inheritance. For details, see Ellmann, *James Joyce*, pp. 610-46.

Interested in—or rather interested in rethinking—the issue of marriage and sexuality, Joyce centers his major works on the marital situation and the family: “The Dead,” *Exiles*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake* all deal with the issue. Adultery, in particular, attracts much of Joyce’s attention. Critics have investigated the implications of adultery in nineteenth-century novels.<sup>8</sup> Overton, for example, bases his examination of “the double standard of sexual morality” long entrenched in Western culture on the exploration of female adultery (1). For Joyce, however, the significance of the adulterous act lies in its potential for transgression; in Tanner’s words, it is “an act of transgression that threatens the family” (4). If marriage acts as a contract, adultery is “an attempt to establish an extracontractual contract, or indeed an anticontract” threatening “‘the continuation of the Species,’ ‘the distinction of Families,’ and ‘the security of the Marriage Bed’” (Tanner 6). From the viewpoint of patriarchy, the act of adultery “introduces a bad multiplicity within the requisite unities of social roles” (Tanner 13) and subverts the stability of established social units. And yet from the viewpoint of a social/sexual reformer like Joyce or Bloom, the “bad multiplicity” resulting from the anticontract is necessary for the liberation and construction of a new Irish state: it suggests a new form of family unit incorporating the intrusive outsider and liberating female sexuality, a new unit distinct from that of the coercive patriarchal family and anticipating the heteroglossia that would constitute a nation. As Tanner puts it, adultery is “a leap into limitlessness, with the result that the whole ambiguous problematics of limits are brought into the open” (376). Such limitlessness or openness enables the new nation to incorporate and accept its heteroglot components and undermine boundaries of all sorts.

In patriarchal society and marriage, however, the triangular relationship of the adulterous unit is sinful and unacceptable. Bloom’s gesture of offering Molly her sexual freedom is not justified as a courageous and insightful deed, but misunderstood as an act of cowardice and impotence. In the eyes of his fellow Dubliners, Bloom represents nothing more than a cuckold and a failure, or in Alison Sinclair’s phrase,

---

<sup>8</sup> See Tanner, pp. 11-18; Overton, pp. 1-23; and Alison Sinclair, pp. 1-29.



“the counter-exemplum of patriarchal culture”: the man who has failed in relation to a woman (27). The cuckold as failure, as Sinclair has it, conveys a message in accord with patriarchal norms: women are the sources of both life and unruliness, hence creatures to be controlled; men who fail to keep women safely in a position of subservience should be held up to public ridicule because their carelessness endangers the public (58). In this way, the cuckold as sexual failure and public danger is presented to the censoring eyes of the public, suffering from malicious derision and censorious critique, as when Bloom witnesses the adulterous scene between Boylan and Marion on the Circean stage, where he is allocated the role of a “flunkey” with “antlered head” (*U* 15.3760, 3764), a pervert satisfying his sexual desire by peeping at the adulterous couple’s intercourse, callously mocked and punished before the Dublin audience.

Significantly, the cuckold represents not only a sexual failure deserving public contempt: he functions as a scapegoat as well. Expounding on Mary Douglas’s concept of the joke, Sinclair declares that a joke “expresses the potential for instability” and is expressed “in a situation where there is some stability.” A joke, therefore, involves “the fine balance between subversion and the maintenance of order” (55-56). In applying to cuckoldry the concept of the joke as both subversive and stabilizing, Sinclair argues that a great number of transgressions are permitted in the literary imagination, if not in reality, as the literary presentation of the cuckold makes it “safe to engage in the risky venture of celebrating infidelity” (53), a venture *both breaking and retaining* patriarchal norms. To phrase it differently, the cuckold as scapegoat enables the public to take part in the “cultural ‘celebration’ of infidelity,” and provides the “counter-example” to the sexually and socially “successful man”; he embodies “a fissure in the presentation of hegemonic masculinity in the patriarchal society that produces him,” allowing “the possibility of failure to be glimpsed” (Sinclair 53, 56). As a failure and scapegoat, the cuckold thus deserves contempt and punishment, for cuckoldry implies the shattering of two boundaries simultaneously: the spatial boundary between the public and the private, and the gender boundary

between men and women,<sup>9</sup> both set by patriarchal society in the form of marriage and family bonds.

Rebellious against bondage of all forms, Joyce rejects the marriage contract and proclaims free love. Richard Brown has noted Joyce's interest in "free-love unions" (29)—a proclamation Bloom announces as a policy in Bloomusalem (*U* 15.1693). In an attempt to "replace romantic mystifications with biological certainties," Joyce, as Brown comments, represents love as more than "sexual passion" (34). Love, according to Joyce's notes for *Exiles*, is "understood as the desire of good for another" (*E* 343), or in Richard's words, "To wish her well" (*E* 190). The longing to possess, which the adulterer Robert believes to be "nature's law," is not genuine love for the cuckolded Richard, who announces to Robert that "I am afraid that that longing to possess a woman is not love" (*E* 190). Like Bloom, Richard proposes to offer his wife Bertha freedom: "You forget that I have allowed you complete liberty—and allow you it still"; "Bertha, believe me, dear! It is not jealousy. You have complete liberty to do as you wish—you and he" (*E* 175). However ambiguous Richard's concept of woman and sexual freedom is, the free-love morality in the play recurs in Bloom's attitude toward Molly and sexuality in *Ulysses*, where Bloom, in spite of his sexual liberalism, experiences "an irreconcilable conflict between a passion for absolute possession and a categorical imperative of absolute freedom," understood by Budgen as "the Joycean conception of sexual love" (314).

As Brown observes, interestingly, love as presented in Joyce's works is not "a kind of union" but "a kind of separation of individuals" (34). This observation is partly true: for throughout the novel Bloom and Molly "have been given separate emotional and sexual lives," which are "in excess of romantic or marital exclusiveness" (Brown 34). Despite their bodily separation, however, Bloom and Molly do share a kind of spiritual union—however mysterious it is—which enables the separated couple to enter into an interior dialogic relationship, to question and answer each other in separate chronotopes: identical events occurring in both persons'

---

<sup>9</sup> For details of these two boundaries, see Sinclair, p. 57.

streams of consciousness in different times and places at the same day demonstrate their affinity and mysterious dialogue. On the other hand, the bodily separation of individuals is necessary, for it is fundamental to the validation of the Bakhtinian excess of seeing. Bloom and Molly's "separate emotional and sexual lives," in this respect, can be seen as an essential and inevitable element for their final spiritual union, providing for each other the excess of seeing that leads to the chronotopic encounter of their interior dialogue. Brown states that love, understood as "the recognition of the inadequacy of the matrimonial formulation" in sexual relationships and as "the presentation of individuals as fundamentally separate from each other," "runs through the understanding of relationships in all [Joyce's] works, whether those relationships be formalized by marriage or not" (35). Moral individuality, indeed, is essential to the liberation of modern sexuality (Brown 36). Bloom's capacity to offer his wife sexual freedom is based on the recognition that Molly is a separate being whose actions should be decided and controlled only by herself. Like Bertha, Molly has to be a free and active agent in any adulterous act, as Richard's speech to his wife implies (Brown 35).

Proclaiming free love and interested in triangular relationships, Bloom not only passively tolerates but actively accepts Molly's adultery. He himself, after all, is involved in extramarital relationships as well. As a consequence of his willingness to liberate Molly's sexuality, Bloom brings in Stephen as "another chap in the case" (*U* 16.1385), in the hope that the gesture may compensate for Rudy's death, bring the two men, or father and son, into spiritual union, and suggest a new form of family unit different from the patriarchal family unit. By inviting a third party into the family, Bloom rethinks and rewrites the story of the Parnell scandal: he is not the jealous husband ruining the uncrowned king's career and the promise of Irish freedom, but rather a sexual liberal and Wildean ideal husband, tolerating and welcoming the liberation of female sexuality. Or more precisely: he represents a revised combination of Parnell and Captain O'Shea, a reincarnation of sexual and political reformer. Bloom's gesture, contradictory to patriarchal misogyny, also refutes Deasy's misogynous statement that attributes historical downfalls, including that of Parnell, to

unruly female sexuality (*U* 2.389-96). In the malicious Nighttown of “Circe” where hostile public voices encroach upon Bloom’s imaginative territory, Bloom’s generous and insightful gesture is debased to an act of cuckoldry, his ideas of free love such as sexual liberation and polygamy (*U* 15.1156) rejected, he himself brought to trial for his sexual transgression. The positive answer of understanding he desires to receive from Molly is replaced by a negative answer of hostile ridicule from the publicly constructed Marion, who in Nighttown is presented as a libidinous whore like Kitty, simultaneously the prostitute in Cohen’s and the English mistress that brought Parnell down. It seems that only when he leaves Nighttown can he escape the hostile hallucinatory world, and only when he approaches home/Molly may he receive the answer he yearns for. But before receiving Molly’s answers, Bloom is trapped in the catechism of mechanical questions and answers in “Ithaca,” which, essentially impersonal, “falls out of the dialogue and enters systemic cognition” (*SG* 168).

Like the Circean hallucinatory world, the Ithacan catechistic territory is essentially hostile—hostile because Bloom, as well as Stephen, is deprived of his voice once again, this time by the mechanical catechism of science, in spite of the setting at 7 Eccles Street, Bloom’s desired “home.” As the art of the episode, science dominates the catechistic form and impersonalizes the emotions and sentiments intrinsic to the episode of homecoming and reunion. Insightful critiques have shed light on the parodic catechistic scientism of “Ithaca.” Andrew Gibson makes the point that Irish science was “an English and Anglo-Irish preserve” and “a specific kind of training for the mind” (158, 155), and investigates Joyce’s parodic mimicry, which aims to textually pervert and defile imperial science, in order to ideologically resist and subvert the empire (133-74). Duffy regards the catechistic narrative as “the account of a police investigation with model answers,” and suggests Bloom’s threatened position as the interpellated subjectivity under the “massive regime of surveillance of the colonial state” (181). In the light of Bakhtinian concepts, Robert Hampson asserts that “Joyce’s appropriation of the catechistical method introduces dialogism into the catechism’s monologic simulacrum of dialogue, and works to subvert the catechism’s claim to authority and complete knowledge” (230); in other

words, parodic double-voiced discourse enables Joyce to turn the essentially monologic catechistic form—despite being composed of questions and answers—into dialogue. These readings sum up the catechistic scientism of “Ithaca” as oppressive, interrogative, and monologic, though its authority is subverted and its discourse is transformed into dialogism as a result of parody. Scientific discourse of this kind, as many critics have registered, is dehumanizingly impersonal,<sup>10</sup> but questions as to why scientism proves to be so oppressive to a scientific man like Bloom and exactly how it oppresses him remain unanswered. In fact, scientism as the narrative discourse of “Ithaca” displays hostility to Bloom as a living entity and threatens his existence because it invades privacy (e.g., the content of his drawers), digs out memory (e.g., details of Rudolph Bloom’s suicide), and, in David Trotter’s words, attempts to represent the “virtual Bloom” at the expense of the “actual Bloom” (93). For the convenience of discussion, I will lay aside the parodic element and focus on the examination of the hostility of the Ithacan scientific discourse toward Bloom.

As a man with a scientific temperament, Bloom shows his interest in science throughout his day of wandering. Walking in the sunshine and wearing black in “Calypso,” he meditates on the relation between the color black and the heat: “Black conducts, reflects, (refracts is it?), the heat” (*U* 4.79-80). When he recalls a picture showing a man “in the dead sea floating on his back, reading a book with a parasol open” in “Lotus-Eaters,” Bloom speculates about weight, which he concludes as “the force of gravity of the earth” (*U* 5.38-46). In “Hades,” in the carriage to the cemetery, Bloom wonders if the corpse bleeds when cut by a nail, since the “circulation stops,” and later defines a corpse as “meat gone bad” and cheese as “Corpse of milk” (*U* 6.432-34, 981-82). In “Cyclops,” he tries to explain to the barflies the hanged man’s erection as “only a natural phenomenon,” a gesture then derided by the I-narrator and parodied by the third-person parodist (*U* 12.464-78). Bloom is indeed scientific in temperament. From the instances given above, however, we can figure out the kind of science which interests him: science related to human life and factual knowledge. As

---

<sup>10</sup> See Gibson, p. 3; Karen Lawrence, *The Odyssey of Style in Ulysses*, p. 182; David Fuller, *James Joyce’s Ulysses*, p. 81; and Schwarz, p. 241.

the Ithacan narrative indicates, Bloom's scientific tendency is "towards applied, rather than towards pure, science" (*U* 17.561-62). The following passage may summarize and demonstrate the essence of Bloomian science:

They could: and watch it all the way down, swallow a pin sometimes come out of the ribs years after, tour round the body changing biliary duct spleen squirting liver gastric juice coils of intestines like pipes. But the poor buffer would have to stand all the time with his insides entrails on show. Science. (*U* 8.1046-50)

Accordingly, the science that fascinates Bloom tends toward applied science, which is always factual knowledge and in connection with human bodies. The scientific narrative of "Ithaca," however, tends toward pure science, notwithstanding its statement of Bloom's tendency towards applied science. A simple question like "Did [the water] flow?" (*U* 17.163), put when Bloom turns on the faucet, is followed by a lengthy explanation half a page long tracing the water back to its reservoir and including irrelevant information about water-supply problems (*U* 17.164-83). The question concerning the qualities of water which Bloom admires elicits another tedious page-long response saturated with abstruse jargon (*U* 17.183-228). The respondent may intend to be scientifically precise in answering the question with regard to Bloom's and Stephen's ages, but ends in giving complicated calculations and confusing figures which are, in human terms at least, meaningless (*U* 17.446-61). Scientific discourse of this sort demonstrates not precision and practicality, but pomposity, redundancy, digression, and confusion, a pure display of abstruse jargon and impractical knowledge, an interference with understanding, and an irrelevance to human life. *This* is pure science, theoretical, mechanical, and inhuman, in contrast to the humanistic Bloomian applied science, and its danger lies in its inclination toward systematization and mechanization, inadequate in its response to complex human actions and emotions.

According to the Ithacan scientific narrative, Bloom and Stephen represent respectively the scientific and the artistic temperament (*U* 17.559-60). Despite Bloom's fascination with science, this distinction is arbitrary: Bloom in fact possesses

both temperaments. It is true that Bloom, not such an intellectual as Stephen, is not as artistic as his surrogate son. But he is not inartistic: like Stephen, he is interested in literary creation. When he reads Philip Beaufoy's *Matcham's Masterstroke* in "Calypso," Bloom speculates that he may "manage a sketch" likewise by appropriating Molly's discourses: he attempts to "invent" a story with triviality of daily life as content and Molly as co-author (*U* 4.518-20). In "Lestrygonians," recollections of "the odd things people pick up for food" remind him of "[i]dea for a poison mystery" (*U* 8.856, 871). On hearing the piano in "Sirens," Bloom registers that it has been tuned (*U* 11.650), revealing his familiarity with music. In "The Wandering Rocks," Lenehan comments on Bloom's artistic temperament, a positive comment Bloom rarely receives from his fellow Dubliners: "He's a cultured allroundman, Bloom is . . . He's not one of your common or garden . . . you know . . . There's a touch of the artist about old Bloom" (*U* 10-581-83). Bloom's art, as we may assume, resides in real life, just as his science is grounded on actual daily life. These instances lay bare the arbitrariness of the mechanical distinction, which eliminates the artistic disposition from Bloom's temperament.

This arbitrariness is disclosed even more pronouncedly if we look at the way the scientific discourse narrates a sequence of events involving complex human actions and emotions. From his seeing Stephen off to his glimpsing at himself in the mirror, Bloom's actions include hitting his temple against the walnut sideboard, noticing the rearrangement of furniture indicative of Boylan's earlier presence, feeling the onset of "sensations," lighting a fire, and glancing at the wedding gifts on the mantelpiece (*U* 17.1274-347). This sequence of actions inevitably contains powerful surges of emotions, for Bloom must have been reminded of Molly's adultery and their precarious marriage. Not only are emotions ignored—predictable, indeed—but the sequence of actions is cut mechanically into ten frigid questions and answers. The first question and answer concerns Bloom's hitting his head against the sideboard, which is described scientifically as follows:

The right temporal lobe of the hollow sphere of his cranium came into contact with a solid timber angle where, an infinitesimal but sensible

fraction of a second later, a painful sensation was located in consequence of antecedent sensations transmitted and registered. (*U* 17.1275-78)

Once again, jargon abounds in the scientific explanation, whereas the painful sensation is reduced by the narrative to the minimum. Following the explanation are four questions and answers related to the rearrangement of furniture: “Describe the alterations effected in the disposition of the articles of furniture,” “Describe [the two chairs],” “What significances attached to these two chairs?” “What occupied the position originally occupied by the sideboard?” (*U* 17.1279-80, 1291, 1299, 1302) Objects completely replace human subjects. It is as though the room were being monitored, and we were reading a detailed transcription from the monitor, which perceives and transcribes individual objects—and only objects—into a scientific report. The following question seems to return to human subjects: “With what sensations did Bloom contemplate in rotation these objects?” (*U* 17.1311); its answer, however, fails to interpret the working of Bloom’s real sensations engendered by the implication of adultery, but gives a series of descriptions of his movements and gestures instead (*U* 17.1312-19). The next two questions and answers also concern movements: the first Bloom’s movement as he lights a fire, the second the movement of the fire—scientific descriptions once again. The last two questions and answers return anew to objects: “What homothetic objects, other than the candlestick, stood on the mantelpiece?” and “What interchanges of looks took place between these three objects and Bloom?” (*U* 17.1333-34, 1340-41). The last question sounds human in context, but its answer is dehumanizing:

In the mirror of the giltbordered pierglass the undecorated back of the dwarf tree regarded the upright back of the embalmed owl. Before the mirror the matrimonial gift of Alderman John Hooper with a clear melancholy wise bright motionless compassionate gaze regarded Bloom while Bloom with obscure tranquil profound motionless compassionated gaze regarded the matrimonial gift of Luke and Caroline Doyle. (*U* 17.1342-47)

What is involved in these interchanges of gazes are by no means merely literal exchanges of reflections. These wedding gifts certainly awaken Bloom’s memories of



the past: he and Molly's courtship, their wedding, their matrimonial life, etc. The respondent does state that Bloom gives the dwarf tree a "compassionated gaze," but we never, and never will, know what compassion lies behind the gaze. Scientific discourse, in other words, mechanizes human beings. The sequence of intricate human actions and emotions is systematized into ten questions and answers, five of them centering on descriptions of objects, three on outward actions, and two on inadequate interpretation of "sensations." As Karen Lawrence points out, the Ithacan narrative tells "too much and not enough": "despite the exhaustiveness of the interrogation process, fundamental questions remain unanswered, both for the characters and for the reader" (184, 199). Instead of clarifying complications and adding meaning to the narrative, scientific discourse of this kind "actually robs us of meaning" (Platt 1996, 105).

Scientific discourse robs "Ithaca" of meaning because, as many modernists believed, along with modern technology, science tends to control and dominate human beings. In his critical reading of Charles Baudelaire, Benjamin argues that in modern and capitalist society, "technology has subjected the human sensorium to a complex kind of training" (1983, 132). Benjamin directs his attention to this training—or the process of paralysis, in Joycean terminology—and refers to Marx's discussion of the relation between workers and machines: "In working with machines, workers learn to coordinate their own 'movements to the uniform and unceasing motion of an automaton'; as a result, 'it is not the workman that employs the instruments of labour, but the instruments of labour that employ the workman' (132-33). The work of the worker at the machine is therefore "devoid of substance" (135). To illustrate the control of mechanism over human beings as portrayed in artistic work, Benjamin takes one of Alois Senefelder's lithographs as an example, which represents five figures, each "dominated by an emotion," in a gambling club. Benjamin comments that "the figures presented show us how the mechanism to which the participants in a game of chance entrust themselves seizes them body and soul, so that even in their private sphere, and no matter how agitated they may be, they are capable only of a reflex action" (135). Similarly, mechanism dominates the Ithacan narrative. However

human the episode may be, the human is dehumanized by science and technology, its protagonist's private sphere invaded, his agitated emotions suppressed. Bloom may differ from those paralyzed workers in his unwillingness to be incorporated into the mechanical training, as his curiosity serves as a defense to the collectivization engendered by mechanism. Under the domination of scientific technology, nevertheless, he is in as perilous a situation as the workers described by Marx, at least so in "Ithaca."

Benjamin is not the only modernist intellectual to register the fact of machines' control over human beings as reflected in artistic work; Wyndham Lewis, Joyce's contemporary, also notes this threatening crisis. In spite of his famous misreading of *Ulysses*,<sup>11</sup> Lewis's critique of mechanism echoes Joyce's attitude toward mechanical science as demonstrated in "Ithaca." As Christopher Innes observes, in contrast to his earlier futuristic praise of machines, "Lewis denounced modern technology and its reflection in modernist art as *a tool of oppression*" after his exposure to the mechanical slaughter of the First World War (134, emphases added). In *The Caliph's Design*, Lewis meditates upon this oppression as reflected in modern architecture. For him, sky-scrapers are cubes and tall boxes, confining people within and stupefying people without (1986, 46, 31), and modern technology subjects human beings to the danger of "becom[ing] overpowered by our creation, and becom[ing] as mechanical as a tremendous insect world, all our awakened reason entirely disappeared" (76). This epitomizes what happens in "Ithaca": human beings are manipulated by the mechanical technique of scientific catechism as narrative discourse. It is true that the Ithacan scientific narrative provides us with abundant information; and yet it would be wrong to maintain that "Ithaca" informs us of so many "facts and details" about Bloom that "we see him as a fully fleshed character as much as ever" (Sicari 279). Bloom in "Ithaca," in effect, is anything but a "fully fleshed character"—under the domination of mechanical scientism, no one can be a fully fleshed figure.

---

<sup>11</sup> For details, see, for example, Scott W. Klein, *The Fictions of James Joyce and Wyndham Lewis*, pp. 1-23.

What is worse, the hostile scientific discourse twists a person's image in the name of science by providing unreliable information. The list of Molly's lovers, as recent critics have registered, proves to be fictional. The Bloom represented by the discourse is therefore the "virtual Bloom" rather than the "actual Bloom," a constructed figure rather than a fully fleshed person. According to the virtual version, Bloom is a cuckold, a stereotypical Jew, a male chauvinist, and a walking embodiment of colonialism. To equate Bloom with a cuckold, the Ithacan narrative addresses Molly as Marion (*U* 17.1178), a name recalling Boylan's ill-mannered mode of address to Molly in "Calypso" and the publicly constructed Marion in "Circe"; implies that Milly might be fathered by Mulvey (*U* 17.868-70); suggests Bloom's willing cuckoldry (*U* 17.2126-31); and gives an unreliable long list of Molly's lovers (*U* 17.2133-42). As a stereotypical Jew, Bloom is depicted as an androgynous creature with "firm full masculine feminine passive active hand" (*U* 17.289-90), and an impotent husband incapable of intercourse after Rudy's death (*U* 17.2274-92); his Jewish origin is accentuated, for the change of name from Virag to Bloom is mentioned repeatedly (*U* 17.534, 1637, 1869-72, 1873); he himself is mystified, as his actions are juxtaposed with Jewish ceremonies (*U* 17.1021-31, 2042-58). He is also a male chauvinist, considering Molly ignorant (*U* 17.674-702) and women in general as inferior (*U* 17.1411). Furthermore, he represents a walking embodiment of colonialism, as his "ambitions" are similar to that of an enlightened retired colonial official (*U* 17.1497-633).<sup>12</sup> This version of Bloom is the virtual Bloom. What is vicious is that scientific discourse attempts to represent the virtual Bloom as the actual: the actual is in danger of being replaced by the virtual. As a consequence, the reason Bloom invites Stephen home remains a mystery; the actual Bloom's intention—to form a triangular family—is never articulated, or, at most, is reduced to insufficiently explained mutual "advantages" of "security of domicile and seclusion of study" for the guest, "rejuvenation of intelligence, vicarious satisfaction" for the host, and "disintegration of obsession, acquisition of correct Italian pronunciation" for the

---

<sup>12</sup> For the argument that Bloom's interest and ideas tend to be colonial, see Duffy, p. 182.

hostess (*U* 17.937-39). In spite of being an episode of homecoming and reunion, “Ithaca” hardly touches on the family issue that obsesses Bloom—an issue science seems unable or disinclined to deal with, or even deliberately to suppress.

The advantages described, presumably, are only one of the reasons—and the most superficial one—Bloom takes Stephen home. In their several brief encounters during the day, Bloom has been aware of Stephen’s precarious existence as an artist in colonial Ireland and has endeavored to give him a helping hand. It is uncertain if Bloom knows his importance to Stephen, as it is unlikely that Alfred H. Hunter, a model for Bloom, knew the significance of his friendly deed to Joyce’s life and art.<sup>13</sup> As Schwarz remarks, nevertheless, Bloom for Stephen embodies “the paradigm for the social values” which he must learn: a new father figure who possesses both an “affection for family or acquaintances” and the “prospect of passionate love” which Stephen lacks, and who may lead him out of the “danger of fleeing from himself into an uncomfortable exile of aestheticism and narcissism and turning his back on the potentially socially and morally mature artistic self” (247). If Bloom plays the new father figure who leads Stephen to artistic maturity, Molly, the new mother figure, may inspire Stephen’s mature artistic creation, as Nora liberated Joyce from Irish paralysis—dissimilar to the conventional, oppressive May Dedalus. For Bloom, Stephen is not only a substitute for Rudy, a vicarious son, but a vicarious lover for Molly to replace the brutal and imperial Boylan, playing the go-between between Bloom and Molly. If we reverse the triangular pattern of *Exiles*, in which triangular relationships “bring men surrogately into sexual contact” through the female body (Fuller 1992, 91), we may argue that Bloom intends to direct the spiritual union between him and Stephen into another union, both spiritual and physical, between Stephen and Molly, in anticipation of his surrogate, or even hopeful, contacts with his long-alienated wife. For Molly, she promisingly regains a long-lost son and obtains an intellectual as lover, reunites with her husband through the vicarious son/lover, and in so doing unites the father and son in her body as homeland. Such a triangular family,

---

<sup>13</sup> For details, see Ellmann, *James Joyce*, pp. 161-62.

based on free love and open relationship, revises and redeems the Oedipus complex as well as the bourgeois nuclear family: harmony replaces antagonism, and liberation supplants oppression.

Bloom may be the proposer of the Stephen-Bloom-Molly triangular family, but he is not the only person interested in the proposal. Despite Stephen's refusal to stay with the Blooms, "counterproposals" anticipating their reunion are "alternately advanced, accepted, modified, declined, restated in other terms, reaccepted, ratified, reconfirmed" (*U* 17.960-61) between the two men, though we never know exactly *how* they make these counterproposals:

To inaugurate a prearranged course of Italian instruction, place the residence of the instructed. To inaugurate a course of vocal instruction, place the residence of the instructress. To inaugurate a series of static, semistatic and peripatetic intellectual dialogues, places the residence of both speakers (if both speakers were resident in the same place) . . . (*U* 17.962-72)

Accepting Bloom's suggestion that he teach Molly Italian and learn vocal music from her in return, Stephen indirectly responds to the proposal of the triangular family: his agreement to have further "intellectual dialogues" with Bloom indicates his tacit consent to the unspoken—and unspeakable—proposal. Implicitly at least, Stephen is entering into a Bakhtinian dialogue with Bloom, whose attitude toward women, for instance, probably influences the young man: when he responds to Bloom's idea of two smartly dressed girls reading in a showcart, Stephen's earlier bitterness about women, evinced in his vampire poem and "The Parable of the Plums," is no longer manifest (*U* 17.611-17). Mutual enrichment resulting from dialogue, in other words, is taking place between the two men: Stephen's intellectuality enlightens Bloom, while Bloom's humanity inspires Stephen. Early in "Eumaeus," in fact, the bond between Stephen, Bloom, and Molly has been established when Bloom shows Molly's photo to Stephen (*U* 16.1425-26), who considers her "handsome" (*U* 16.1479). Stephen's willingness to follow Bloom home also implies his awareness of Bloom's intention and foreshadows his approval of the proposal.

This arrangement of the triangular family is undoubtedly revolutionary, not simply in the familial sense but also in the political and cultural senses. In the familial sense, the triangular family modifies the traditional patriarchal family and the dominant nuclear family, both characterized by the hierarchy of power relations. In Bloom's triangular family unit, there is no such hierarchy; the power center does not exist. In the political sense, this family comprises a cuckolded Jew, an Irish intellectual, and a semi-illiterate female, all disfranchised from the Irish political arena. This unit subtly recalls Bloom's definition of the nation. If "[a] nation is the same people living in the same place" (*U* 12.1422-23), Bloom, Stephen, and Molly all have the right to participate in the construction of the Irish nation. And yet the fact is that they are politically marginalized. In the cultural sense, if Bloom embodies Hebrew culture, Molly may arguably represent Irish culture and Stephen Greek culture. Whether Hebrew, Irish, or Greek, all are oppressed by the empire and exiled from Irish society.<sup>14</sup> In spite of their advocacy of "Irish culture," cultural nationalists in effect narrow down Irish culture, making it a reproduction of the insular and oppressive imperial culture. The idea of the triangular family is therefore radically revolutionary, not only subverting familial hierarchy, but calling for political and cultural inclusiveness, which is nevertheless denied in nationalist campaigns by the Irish Cyclopes. By proposing the triangular family unit, Joyce insinuates the omnipresent censorship in Irish society: revolutionary figures like Joyce the artist and Bloom the unconventional social reformer are destined to suffer from censorship, as Bloom is censored by imperial science in "Ithaca," incapable of speaking himself out loud.

Science or modern technology in "Ithaca," in short, shows an inclination to mechanize human beings. Bloom is spied upon and investigated by the censor of science; the sequence of his actions is arbitrarily systematized, his emotions mechanically suppressed, his image maliciously twisted, and his proposal deliberately

---

<sup>14</sup> The oppression of Hebrew and Irish cultures is obvious and needless further explanation. The oppression of Greek culture may seem less pronounced, but if we keep in mind the trial of Oscar Wilde for practice of "Greek love," taking place nine years before Bloom's wandering, the oppression is explicit.

ignored. If science for Joyce represents “just one of the possible orders of understanding rather than . . . the ultimate form of truth statement” (Bell 12), this order of understanding as demonstrated in “Ithaca” proves to be inadequate, or even obstructive, to the task of interpreting the complex workings of the human mind. But this does not mean that Joyce is anti-scientific: the portrait of his protagonist as a scientific man reveals his non-hostile attitude toward science. What is important is that humans have to humanize science, as Bloom turns pure science into applied science, not the other way around. In a speech about modern mechanism, Wyndham Lewis emphasizes the great consequence of “creat[ing] a human life *outside* the machine” to accomplish “the task of framing the new society” (1969, 275). By “*outside* the machine,” Lewis does not mean to destroy machines altogether, but means to refuse the domination of machines over human life. In other words, humans should employ machines, not be employed by machines. Only in so doing can human beings create a new and more humane society, different from the mechanical, systematized, and oppressive Ithacan world. In this respect, the issue of “art in a machine age,” as well as the issue of “man in a machine age,” is “far more a political problem than a mechanical problem” (Lewis 1969, 273), especially when science is dominated by the colonizer and used as a medium for censorship.

At the end of “Ithaca,” poetic style encroaches upon scientific discourse. Trevor L. Williams reads the poetic passages as the resistance of the oppressed Irish to the imperial power manifested in scientism (160-61). The blurring of stylistic boundaries may be interpreted as an attempt to humanize science, foregrounding “Penelope” as the most human episode. Notwithstanding this, humans in “Ithaca” are still placed under the systematized control of mechanism. The questions “In what directions did listener and narrator lie?” and “In what state of rest or motion?” as well as their answers are as mechanically scientific as they can be (*U* 17.2302-10), insignificant and irrelevant with regard to the crucial interaction between Bloom and Molly at the end of the day; and the decisive question as to Molly’s attitude toward Bloom’s arrangement of the triangular family is neglected completely. Under the coercive oppression of hostile scientific discourse, Bloom is not at home even in his own house:

he is suffering from strict censorship by the empire and the Irish public. Home, Joyce seems to imply, is where one can be oneself, free from bondage of any kind. In this regard, "Ithaca" is not home for Bloom, whose journey ends only when he is united with his Penelope. The problem, then, is Molly's response to Bloom's inarticulate proposal, or more precisely, whether or not she registers Bloom's arrangement of the triangular family with Stephen.

The last three pages of "Ithaca" deal with the interaction between Bloom and Molly in bed: he stares at her buttocks, kisses them, reports to her his day, and falls asleep. Their exchange of conversation is described as "catechetical interrogation" (*U* 17.2249), a description suited to the oppressive nature of the scene under censorship. In spite of its significance, their interaction is condensed to three questions and answers (*U* 17.2250-70): his correspondence with Martha Clifford and his encounter with Gerty are exposed by the "objective" scientific report, whilst the conversation with Molly is concealed. Once again, the Blooms are experiencing the oppression of hostile scientific discourse. Although we are told that "Stephen Dedalus, professor and author," emerges as "the salient point of [Bloom's] narration" (*U* 17.2269-70), we are not informed of the content of the narration. It seems that the proposal of the triangular family is so revolutionary that the censoring scientific narrative omits it entirely. Nevertheless, Molly does receive Bloom's message of introducing Stephen into the family, a message she recalls and replies to in "Penelope."

Unconsciously at least, Molly has managed to unite the Greek, Irish, and Jewish cultures: "In disoccupied moments she had more than once covered a sheet of paper with signs and hieroglyphics which she stated were Greek and Irish and Hebrew characters" (*U* 17.676-78). This gesture, however, is reported by the Ithacan hostile discourse as an instance of "deficient mental development" (*U* 17.674), its significant implication disregarded. Not until "Penelope" does Molly acquire her own voice, turn from Bloom's superaddressee into the addresser and respondent, and reveal her excess of seeing to the addressees by answering questions left unanswered in "Ithaca." As the transcription of Molly's interior dialogue, "Penelope" is the most human and bodily episode, in striking contrast to the scientific and mechanical "Ithaca," which, in



Kiberd's words, serves as "a preparation for [the] restoration of the human voice of Molly Bloom" (355). Not only is human voice restored, as human rule finally replaces machine rule, but a real "home" is found in "Penelope," where Bloom and Stephen are united in Molly's body, and both a triangular family and a new Irish state are, potentially at least, under formation.

Joyce himself declares that "Penelope" was "written through [Molly's] thoughts and body Poldy being then asleep" (SL 274). And yet the question as to this body being fleshly or earthly—whether Molly embodies human or earth—has long engendered critical controversy. This controversy might stem partly from Joyce's ambivalent explanatory letters, respectively to Frank Budgen and Harriet Shaw Weaver. In a letter to Budgen, Joyce maintains that Penelope's last word is "human, all too human," "the indispensable countersign to Bloom's passport to eternity" (SL 278). In a letter to Miss Weaver, however, he "rejected the usual interpretation of her as a human apparition—that aspect being better represented by Calypso, Nausicaa and Circe, to say nothing of the pseudo Homeric figures," and tried in "conception and technique" to "depict the earth which is prehuman and presumably posthuman" (SL 289). Despite Joyce's inconsistent explanations, Molly in effect possesses both qualities: the Gilbert Schema lists the organ of the episode as "Flesh" and the symbol as "Earth," indicating her role as the conglomeration of the two. In another letter to Budgen, Molly's double role is implicitly conveyed:

["Penelope"] turns like the huge earth ball slowly surely and evenly round and round spinning, its four cardinal points being the female breasts, arse, womb and cunt expressed by the words *because, bottom* (in all sense bottom button, bottom of the class, bottom of the sea, bottom of his heart), *woman, yes*. Though probably more obscene than any preceding episode it seems to me to be perfectly sane full amoral fertilisable untrustworthy engaging shrewd limited prudent indifferent *Weib. Ich bin der [sic] Fleisch der stets bejaht*. (SL 285)

This excerpt accentuates the sexual body of the female, which is simultaneously fleshly and earthly. A reading sticking to either side seems therefore insufficient: a

realistic reading, like Elaine Unkeless's, reduces Molly to a conventional woman with "conventional notions of the way a woman acts and thinks" (quoted in Scott 161), ignoring the ways her voice also stages incorporation and regeneration as a way through to a potential reconstruction of the nation; whereas a mythic reading rejects her realistic aspect as a vivid and fleshly woman reflecting in bed upon her marginalized existence in the colony, turning her into an inhuman archetypal goddess. Admittedly, Molly is an ambiguous figure characterized by contradictions, as evidenced by the inconsistency of her interior dialogue. To get a better understanding of Molly as the *clou* of Joyce's modern epic, both her qualities—as fleshly woman and as earth goddess—should be taken into account. As Bonnie Kime Scott suggests, Molly should be allowed the full scope of the ambiguity and contradictory nature detected in her, and be regarded as the "conglomerate spokeswoman, a middle ground" between the extremes of realistic individual and archetypal goddess (161-62). Molly, indeed, is both realistic and symbolic, the writing within her body both a text of personal history and a text of national manifestation for/of the uncreated new Ireland.

Fascinated by the body, Molly, in Schwarz's words, embodies "the principle of sexuality" (264): her thoughts are generally related to the body, both male and female, and are easily turned to sexuality:

I suppose thats what a woman is supposed to be there for or He wouldnt have made us the way He did so attractive to men then if he wants to kiss my bottom Ill drag open my drawers and bulge it right out in his face as large as life he can stick his tongue 7 miles up my hole as hes there my brown part. (*U* 18.1518-22)

This passage echoes Bakhtin's discussion of grotesque realism in Rabelais's work, well-known for its celebration of the body which eats, drinks, digests, defecates, and copulates in exaggerated and bizarre ways. As a book elaborating on concepts of the body, Bakhtin's *Rabelais and His World* is "a study of the semantics of the body, the different meanings of the body's limbs, apertures, and functions" (Clark and Holquist 299). Naturally, the "material bodily principle" (*RW* 18) plays a predominant role in

Bakhtin's analysis of Rabelais, a principle that fits in well with Joyce's epic of the body.<sup>15</sup> Shloss points out that Molly is concerned with "a sense of being that is firmly rooted in the body" (107). This attitude fully echoes Rabelais's. Interestingly, Molly, as well as Bloom, knows about Rabelais: "cant be true a thing like that like some of those books he brings me the works of Master Francois Somebody supposed to be a priest about a child born out of her ear because her bumgut fell out a nice word for any priest to write" (*U* 18.487-90). In spite of her dismissal of Rabelais's text as a "pretending" that "anybody can see its not true" (*U* 18.491-92), Molly's fascination with the body is essentially Rabelaisian. If Bloom serves as an example of the grotesque celebrating the grotesque,<sup>16</sup> Molly countersigns Bloom's gesture and affirms this celebration.

In Clark and Holquist's paraphrase, Bakhtin identifies "two subtexts" in Rabelais: carnival and grotesque realism, the former a social institution, the latter a literary mode. *Rabelais and His World* is hence "a study of how the social and the literary interact" (299). Indeed, carnival and grotesque realism are deeply related to each other in Bakhtin's critique of Rabelais. But for convenience of discussion, I will direct my attention mainly to grotesque realism, since my focus falls on the body rather than the festival, and the highlight of grotesque realism is the grotesque body. Convexities and orifices—the bowels, the genital organs, the anus, the mouth, etc.—are prominent in the grotesque body, which is dominated by movements of devouring and discharging, celebrating what Julia Kristeva calls the abject. It is an unconventional body, the exaltation of which signifies an act of nonconformity. Nonconformity, in fact, typifies Rabelaisian grotesque realism and characterizes Molly as a new female figure. Her contradictions—e.g., aspiring after colonial display yet despising war, asserting her femininity yet resenting housework—may be considered an act of nonconformity: she consumes but refuses to succumb to any ready-made ideology, whether patriarchal, imperial, or commercial. As Joseph Heininger points out, both Gerty and Molly

---

<sup>15</sup> For a comparison between Rabelais and Joyce in terms of Bakhtinian concepts, see Booker, *Joyce, Bakhtin, and Literary Tradition*, pp. 45-80.

<sup>16</sup> For details of Bloom's celebration of the grotesque, see Sue Vice, *Introducing Bakhtin*, pp. 156-57.

participate in the “advertising rituals of English commodity culture,” but while Gerty is obviously defined and contained by them, Molly is not; and whilst Gerty internalizes the “inculturated attitudes of female timidity and shame,” Molly explicitly rejects them (169). Molly’s interest in the body and sexuality, above all, speaks for her nonconformity that is the essence of the grotesque body.

The grotesque body, as Bakhtin has it, is based on the principle of degradation, “the lowering of all that is high, spiritual, ideal, abstract” (*RW* 19). It is fundamentally “a transfer to the material level, to the sphere of earth and body in their indissoluble unity” (*RW* 19-20). The Bakhtinian grotesque body thus has a double implication: the physical body of the human being and the external body of the earth. Bakhtin argues for the affinity between fleshly and earthly bodies: “Degradation here means coming down to earth, the contact with earth as an element that swallows up and gives birth at the same time.” To degrade, therefore, is “to bury, to sow, and to kill simultaneously, in order to bring forth something more and better” (*RW* 21). Bloom’s speculation about the function of corpses in “Hades” echoes Bakhtinian degradation. On the other hand, to degrade also “means to concern oneself with the lower stratum of the body, the life of the belly and the reproductive organs,” and consequently “relates to acts of defecation and copulation, conception, pregnancy, and birth” (*RW* 21). The purpose of degradation is hence regeneration. To put it in a nutshell, with its ambivalent signification, degradation “has not only a destructive, negative aspect, but also a regenerating one” (*RW* 21). It is worthy of note that Bakhtin refers the material body to “the collective ancestral body of all the people” rather than “the isolated biological individual” or “the private, egotistic ‘economic man’” (*RW* 19). Bakhtin’s preference for the collective body with a “cosmic” and an “all-people’s character” (*RW* 19) is perhaps politically oriented.<sup>17</sup> It might be an overstatement to argue for Bakhtin’s hostile elimination of individuality, however. Bakhtin’s “collective ancestral body,” it should be clarified, emphasizes the communication between bodies rather than collective fusion, aiming to turn modern egoistic isolation into dialogic contact.

---

<sup>17</sup> For details, see Clark and Holquist, pp. 295-320.

Furthermore, the collective ancestral body is reminiscent of organic memory, a form of interior dialogue with the past via bodies, as discussed in the first chapter. Merged with “the people’s vivid awareness of historic immortality,” the grotesque ancestral body is “interwoven not only with the cosmic but also with the social, utopian, and historic theme, and above all with the theme of the change of epochs and the renewal of culture” (*RW* 324-25). The grotesque body, in this light, is physical, cosmic, and historical at the same time.

As Bakhtin declares, the grotesque body is open to the world and the future, and aims at regeneration. Its significance rests on the communication of bodies, or more specifically, of the physical body and the world, the interactions of which rely on bodily apertures and convexities—this explains why Rabelaisian images are exaggerated to an uncanny extent in certain bodily parts. Bakhtin elaborates on this point:

[T]he grotesque body is not separated from the rest of the world. It is not a closed, completed unit; it is unfinished, outgrows itself, transgresses its own limits. The stress is laid on those parts of the body that are open to the outside world, that is, the parts through which the world enters the body or emerges from it, or through which the body itself goes out to meet the world. This means that the emphasis is on the apertures or the convexities, or on various ramifications and offshoots: the open mouth, the genital organs, the breasts, the phallus, the potbelly, the nose. The body discloses its essence as a principle of growth which exceeds its own limits only in copulation, pregnancy, childbirth, the throes of death, eating, drinking, or defecation. This is the ever unfinished, ever creating body, the link in the chain of genetic development, or more correctly speaking, two links shown at the point where they enter into each other. (*RW* 26)

In other words, the openings and protrusions of the body function as a bridge connecting the physical body and the world—or a medium between self and other. Within bodily convexities and orifices, “the confines between bodies and between the body and the world are overcome,” and “an interchange and an interorientation” take

place (*RW* 317). In the act of eating and drinking, the world is absorbed into the body and becomes a part of the human being, whilst defecation and death return the body to earth and make it a part of the earthly body. Meanwhile, copulation engenders new life, just as defecation, birth, and death do. This is an endless cycle, forever renewing itself, “as a field which has been sown and in which new shoots are preparing to sprout” (*RW* 27). To read the abject and obscene in *Ulysses* in this light, the motif of renewal—as opposed to Joycean paralysis—dominates the text: Joyce’s new Irish couple serve to renew, ideologically at least, the status quo of paralytic Ireland that abhors the abject and obscene which is substantially related to the generation of new potential.

Significantly, the grotesque open body is intrinsically androgynous. Bakhtin does state that “woman is essentially related to the material bodily lower stratum” and “is the principle that gives birth” (*RW* 240). He affirms the female, however, in order to argue against the ascetic tradition of medieval Christianity so hostile to women (*RW* 239-41). Despite his positive attitude toward the female, Bakhtin, in his analysis of the Rabelaisian world, focuses on male figures, Gargantua and Pantagruel, both possessing generating power: Gargantua’s urine “giv[es] birth to the river Rhone and to seven hundred ships,” and Pantagruel’s produces “all the warm medicinal springs of France and Italy” (*RW* 150). Accordingly, it would be problematic to maintain that the grotesque body “is predominantly gendered as female” (Dentith 83). Open and unlimited, the creatively grotesque body is rather androgynous: the lengthy quotation above, as Sue Vice notes, lists “together male and female attributes and activities” (171). The collective ancestral body, therefore, inclines to androgyny: traits of both sexes interact in the body, ensuring the potential for contact and regeneration. As a womanly man and a manly woman, Bloom and Molly personify the open grotesque body with an inclination toward renewal and future. For this reason Molly’s affirmative response to Bloom can act as new guidance to the construction of a new Ireland.

The sexual body is not merely analogous to the earthly body; it is also correlative to the textual body. As Vice remarks, language plays a central role in grotesque

realism (176). Rabelais's work, after all, is a *written* text, in which grotesque realism is transmitted through language. This fact enables Bakhtin to literally detail the process of the word's birth from the body, as when Harlequin helps a stutterer "deliver the word" (*RW* 308-9). Aware that the body celebrated in carnival has been socially restricted, a fact signaled by restraints on speech (*RW* 109, 320), Bakhtin comments that grotesque realism, as a carnivalesque spirit, has to "enter the world of great literature" in order to achieve "growth and flowering" (*RW* 96): "with their relation to changing time and their ambivalence," grotesque images must "become the means for the artistic and ideological expression of a mighty awareness of history and of historic change" (*RW* 25). The sexual body, in other words, has to transcribe the external body into the textual body so that regeneration may be achieved. Molly's interior dialogue in "Penelope," in this respect, is a textual body conceived by the sexual body's transcription of—or dialogue with—the external body.

As Bakhtin incessantly emphasizes in *Rabelais and His World*, it is important to embrace the grotesque as a spirit, despite the decline of the carnival as a festival. Characterized by openness and nonconformity, the grotesque body serves to achieve renewal and prevent closure, physically, culturally, and textually. Simon Dentith has it that "the grotesque body may be a way of mapping not only the social and religious hierarchies of medieval and Renaissance culture, but of mapping gender hierarchies also and valuations that run through them" (84). A manifestation of dialogism, the grotesque body incorporates heteroglossia into itself and mediates between conflicts; it did so in the Renaissance, and it will probably function likewise in modern times. To apply this concept to the context of Ireland in 1904 seems appropriate. As Clark and Holquist observe, "The body is a common metaphor for the state, and xenophobic societies which are trying to control the behavior of their citizens and keep them from outside contacts often stress the idea of keeping the body pure," and "the carnival tries to overcome this sort of thing through its celebration of the bodily" (311-12). When writing about the body/state, Bakhtin probably has Stalinist Russia in mind, an oppressive state forbidding dialogue with the outside world. But this may also help to explain Joyce's negative attitude toward the concept of a pure Ireland, which would

simply turn into a reproduction of imperial oppression rather than a new state of liberation. By proposing the dialogic body of openness, Bakhtin attempts to introduce a different state, free from xenophobia and oppression, as Joyce endeavors to compose a new nation of genuine freedom by writing about the new Irish couple of hybridity. Interestingly, Bakhtin isolates three “political villains” that threatened “the cultural climate” at Rabelais’s time: the bourgeoisie, the Holy Roman Empire, and the Roman Catholic Church (Clark and Holquist 314-15). These villains coincide with Joyce’s: the paralyzed Irish bourgeoisie, the coercive British Empire, and the oppressive Roman Catholic Church. Whether Rabelais’s or Joyce’s, all these political forces reinforce a state of closure: communally, culturally, and sexually. Bakhtin thus insists that only the grotesque body, understood metaphorically as a spirit, may ideologically break through the closure and imbue it with potential for change and new life.

As we can see in “Penelope,” Molly’s thoughts and actions tend toward the grotesque: she is fascinated by sexuality and interested in bodily convexities and orifices, and she breaks wind and menstruates in the course of her interior dialogue. More importantly, she shows an inclination toward novelization: to turn the outward body, via her fleshly body, into the textual body which is “Penelope,” by assimilating the grotesque. Throughout the episode, Molly reveals a longing for textual communication: “the days like years not a letter from a living soul except the odd few I posted to myself with bits of paper in them so bored” (*U* 18.698-99); “no visitors or post ever except his cheques or some advertisement” (*U* 18.715-16); “I hope hell write me a longer letter the next time if its a thing he really likes me” (*U* 18.731-32); “Mulveys was the first . . . an admirer he signed it I nearly jumped out of my skin” (*U* 18.748-62); “I liked him when he sat down to write the thing out” (*U* 18.1172-73). Textual communication for her is associated with sexual contact: “then writing every morning a letter sometimes twice a day I liked the way he made love then he knew the way to take a woman . . . then I wrote the night he kissed my heart at Dolphins barn I couldnt describe it simply it makes you feel like nothing on earth” (*U* 18.327-31); “his mad crazy letters my Precious one everything connected with your glorious Body” (*U* 18.1176-77). Meanwhile, the written text serves as a means for bodily communication,



bridging the gap between bodies: "I lent him [a book] afterwards with Mulveys photo in it so as he see I wasnt without" (*U* 18.655-56); "he made me the present of Lord Byrons poems and the three pairs of gloves so that finished" (*U* 18.185-86). Many of the male writings Bloom brings her, Molly muses, fail to interpret woman fairly, whether Rabelais, pseudo-Aristotle, Daniel Defoe, or popular fictions like *Ruby* and *Fair Tyrants* (*U* 18.487-92, 1238-43, 657-59, 492-96): "they all write about some woman in their poetry well I suppose he wont find many like me" (*U* 18.1333-34). Molly's fascination for textuality may resemble Gerty's attraction to public romance, and she hence risks falling into the trap of male representation of the female, as Gerty has. Critical and resistant, however, Molly is capable of avoiding the romanticization as evidenced by Gerty, and of creating her own textuality.

And yet, implicitly at least, Molly finds herself under the double-bind of sexuality and textuality, which stimulates her intention to novelize the external world through her internal body by means of the grotesque. On the one hand, she is regarded as a sexual object in the male gaze of, say, Boylan and other male Dubliners, who align her with sexuality, a mere vehicle for their physical desire. On the other hand, she is aware that woman as textualized in male writing can hardly avoid the stereotypical roles of procreative mother, as in Rabelais and pseudo-Aristotle, of *femme fatale*, as in Defoe and *Fair Tyrants*, and of helpless victim, as in *Ruby*. To put it another way, Molly is torn between the double-bind of sexuality, imposed by Boylan, and textuality, imposed by Bloom—since it is Bloom who brings Molly the texts. Bloom, who fails to make contact with Molly sexually, tries to communicate with her textually. By bringing her the texts, he does not mean to impose stereotypes on her, but means to educate her, in the positive sense of the word: he attempts to convey to her the message that she, different from conventionally textualized women, has control over her own body. Undeniably, Bloom runs the risk of patronizing Molly in his attempt to educate her; but the sense of patronization is reduced to the minimum as a result of his treatment of her as an equal human subject. In spite of Bloom's intention to make contact with Molly textually, she finds the communication unsatisfactory, in terms of the inadequacy of the male texts and Bloom's insufficiency

as a communicator. As Johnson notes, Molly “casually dismiss[es] the traditional male impulse to ‘write women’ into their texts,” “pronounces Bloom’s proffered reading matter inadequate,” and suspects “men’s notions of how to write (or write *for*) women” (972). While male writings prove to be inadequate in their representations of women, the way Bloom communicates, according to Molly, is likewise unsatisfactory: “if I asked him hed say its from the Greek leave us as wise as we were” (*U* 18.241-42); “he never can explain a thing simply *the way a body can understand*” (*U* 18.566-67, emphases added).

The insufficiency of male writings and Bloom’s textual communication propels Molly to write a text of her own and with her methodology, in the style of the grotesque. Written through her body, the text merges sexuality and textuality instead of polarizing them; it is therefore a text “a body can understand.” As the carnival mediates between high and low cultures, Molly mediates between hierarchies of all kinds in her bodily text, bringing taboo into the authoritative discourse associated with the patriarchal ideology that characterizes colonialism and nationalism, as Joyce brings the low (the bodily) into the high (the epic). As Clair Wills comments: “It is only by bringing the excluded and carnivalesque into the official realm in a single text that the concept of public discourse may be altered” (132). Speaking and degrading male discourse in/via her body, Molly provides a new textual communication radically distinct from male representations, a text which is Cixousian-bisexual in nature. This bisexuality in her text helps Molly eschew the trap of male representation of the female that typifies the first half of “Nausicaa.”

An advocate of bisexual writing, Hélène Cixous links sexuality to textuality, proposes “the free play of the signifier,” and endeavors to break open “the prison-house of patriarchal language” (Moi 107). According to Cixous, human beings are inherently bisexual, a principle analogous to writing as such. Men, however, tend to reject the bisexuality in themselves on account of their fear of the Other and of castration. As a consequence, bisexual writing is “overwhelmingly likely to be *women’s writing*” (Moi 110). For Cixous, Toril Moi notes, bisexual writing “strive[s] in the direction of difference, struggle[s] to undermine the dominant phallogocentric

logic, split[s] open the closure of the binary opposition and revel[s] in the pleasures of open-ended textuality” (108). To read “Penelope” in this light, Molly’s writing is undoubtedly bisexual, challenging patriarchal ideology in its search for freedom, both sexual and textual.

Rather overtly, Molly shows a tendency toward bisexuality in her interior dialogue, despite the fact that she is regarded as the reification of female sexuality under the male gaze: “I could scout it out straight whistling like a man almost easy” (*U* 18.1141-42); “I wouldnt mind being a man and get up on a lovely woman” (*U* 18.1146-47); “I wished I was one myself for a change just to try with that thing they have swelling up on you so hard and at the same time so soft when you touch it” (*U* 18.1381-83). She is intrinsically a manly woman, the female counterpart to Bloom the womanly man. Androgynous in sexuality, Molly reveals in her writing a similar bisexual tendency through the appropriation of masculine discourse: “Ill let him know if thats what he wanted that his wife is fucked yes and damn well fucked too” (*U* 18.1510-11). Her appropriation of masculine discourse allows her to speak in a man’s voice and occupy a male subject position, though only temporarily: she is able to oscillate between supposedly opposing discourses of the masculine and the feminine, making them one in her bodily text. This gesture of bisexual writing transgresses not only gender boundaries but also bodily spaces as allocated by patriarchy, a gesture Molly has made, both physically and textually, in the men’s toilet: “a pity a couple of the Camerons werent there to see me squatting in the men’s place meadero I tried to draw a picture of it before I tore it up like a sausage or something” (*U* 18.556-58). Her drawing of the phallus may suggest her incorporation of phallogentrism, but by tearing up the drawing Molly undermines phallogentric ideology. More remarkably, she feels it “a pity” that her transgressing behavior was not seen by “a couple of the Camerons,” the soldiers representative of canonical patriarchy and martial colonialism, who are “always trying to show it to you . . . as if it was 1 of the 7 wonders of the world” (*U* 18.549-52). Sexually, culturally, and textually, in short, Molly seeks to break open the prison-house of patriarchal ideology; her oscillation between poles of ideology speaks for her resistance to the domination of any authority. But she is more than an ever-

oscillating skeptical figure passively and incessantly denying and criticizing. In fact, Molly transcends the skeptical oscillation and achieves real Bakhtinian dialogue by revising masculine discourse and redefining phallogocentric ideology:

my uncle John has a thing long I heard those cornerboys saying passing the corner of Marrowbone lane my aunt Mary has a thing hairy because it was dark and they knew a girl was passing it didnt make me blush why should it either *its only nature* and he puts his thing long into my aunt Marys hairy etcetera and turns out to be you *put the handle in a sweepingbrush*. (*U* 18.1383-88, emphases added)

Incorporation of and resistance to phallogocentrism are transcended by a deeper understanding of sexuality as “only nature.” This transcendence empowers Molly to liberate herself—potentially—from the confines of patriarchy. Her bisexual writing, which reaccentuates and transcends binary oppositions, can thus be read as her attempt to achieve sexual/textual freedom.

In the course of reading male texts and writing her bisexual text, Molly assimilates and reaccentuates authoritative discourses and turns them into her own internally persuasive discourse; and while weaving and unweaving her textile/text, she gradually affirms Bloom and rejects Boylan. The adultery, in this respect, plays a crucial part in her writing: it is in fact the catalyst which motivates her writing. As an act of sexual transgression, adultery allows Molly to make contact with Boylan sexually, which enables her to meditate on what Boylan symbolizes and what she yearns for: she aspires after both sexual and textual communication. While Boylan satisfies her sexually, he fails textually. Through the process of her dialogic contemplation—a process of struggle between Boylan and Bloom—Molly finally registers Bloom’s offer of freedom and apprehends the intention of his proposal of the triangular family. With the trigger of the adultery, she reconsiders her relationship with Bloom and “write[s] the answer in bed” (*U* 18.739-40). The bed in the context occupies a double position because it was purchased in Gibraltar and removed to Ireland, and thus functions as the connection between the two colonies. Writing her meditative answer in the suggestive bed with Bloom sleeping beside her, Molly does

not merely assimilate and reaccentuate; through assimilation and reaccentuation, she also comprehends the significance of Bloom as her true counterpart, and hence enters, or suggests the possibility of entering, into literally genuine dialogue with Bloom. As she remarks at the near end of the episode: "Ill just give him one more chance" (*U* 18.1497-98). The indication of the chance she will give Bloom both implies her registration of the sexual freedom he offers her, and signifies her final affirmation of the kind of freedom Bloom stands for and her willingness to be reunited with him.

Clark and Holquist have it that Bakhtin's "examination of Rabelaisian license is a dialogic meditation on freedom" (298). This observation is applicable to Molly's exploration of bodily license and Joyce's survey of Molly's sexual/textual license. Implicit in her interior dialogue is a sense of confinement: from clothes (*U* 18.251-52, 513-14), in the house (*U* 18.996), and in Gibraltar (*U* 18.913-15). In the course of writing her text, Molly, unconsciously at least, speculates about new forms of family and nation which will turn restraint into liberation, achieved through an open, dialogic, and grotesque body manifested in both sexuality and textuality. Bakhtin repeatedly stresses the "creative, constructive" nature of the body as "the most nearly perfect form of the organization of matter" and "the key to all matter" (*RW* 366). If "all features of carnival serve to bring people together in a community" (Clark and Holquist 302), the community, in the context of *Ulysses*, refers to Molly's grotesque body as collective ancestral communication. This body is ambivalent: both affirmative and resistant. Affirmative, Molly's body incorporates divergent voices from the outside world, which are given equal status and are heard without partiality. Resistant, it brings down the high and official, challenges authority, and rejects the closure of binary oppositions. Such a feature of ambivalence displays Molly's body as creative and regenerative, not only because dialogic assimilation itself, as a result of the process of incorporation and reaccentuation, signifies creation and regeneration, but also because, due to its openendedness, the bisexual body is capable of constructively accepting differences and turning passive resistance into active creation, as demonstrated in Molly's redefinition of "uncle Johns long thing and aunt Marys hairy thing." Ewa Ziarek explores the relation between the female body and modern

technology, and remarks that the oppositions between technology and organicism, between the public and the private, suggest “a promise that the organic female body might be a site of resistance to the mechanization of public life” (265). In her body as sexuality and textuality, Molly, like Bloom, resists the collectivization of public discourse, but it is rather a bisexually grotesque body than an organic female body—the latter would simply fall into the binary trap that Molly endeavors to undermine. It requires a bisexually grotesque body, capable of affirmation, rejection, and construction, to break open and mediate between the closures of binary oppositions. As “the key to all matter,” Molly’s body dialogically assimilates divergent ideologies, high and low, official and unofficial, positive and negative; it both passively resists and actively constructs, composing a text which, prospectively, leads up to sexual/cultural liberation. This also explains why Joyce makes Molly the *clou* of the book: she is the agent for Joyce’s new nationalism, her searching for sexual/textual freedom leading ultimately to potential for national/cultural liberation.

The reason Molly represents the agent who promisingly provides Ireland with the potential for liberation may be attributed to her special status as both inside and outside, a status initiating the excess of seeing essential to the rethinking of colonial relationships and the construction of a postcolonial new nation. Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism is particularly useful here on account of its emphases on “the hybrid element in colonial discourse” and the role of the Other in self-construction, helping one to analyze “the complexities of a colonized psyche” captured “in that median category between the inside/outside, between competing belief systems” (Bazargan 128). As the dialogue between Self and Other forms the basis for the construction of the self, dialogic assimilation likewise grounds, ideologically, the construction of the new nation. Molly is especially apt for this role because she is placed in an “ambiguous third zone,” one that “vacillates between the inside and the outside” (Bazargan 122). In her discussion of Molly’s relation to colonialism, Susan Bazargan elaborates on Molly’s ambiguous inside/outside position:

The identity of the colonized, then, in its barest outlines, is shaped by dualistic forces engendering a divided existence. Molly’s case is made even

more complicated by the fact that she has lived both in Gibraltar . . . and in Ireland, and has thus internalized structures of thought and discourse associated with both the colonizer and the colonized. Reflecting such spatial dislocations and discrepancies is Molly's splintered, internally dialogic language. (121)

As the daughter of a British officer in Gibraltar, Molly inevitably absorbs "the dogmas of authority" (Shaffer 146) or Bakhtinian authoritative discourse, and reveals in her interior dialogue a colonial aspiration: "if they saw a real officers funeral thatd be something reversed arms muffled drums the poor horse walking behind in black" (*U* 18.1262-64). In association with the empire, Molly is proud of being a British "soldiers daughter" (*U* 18.881-82) and of witnessing imperial display in Gibraltar. In Ireland, however, Molly's position changes from the sub-oppressor to the oppressed, from the colonizer to the colonized, and from the superior to the inferior. This double position as both inside and outside colonial power allows Molly to acquire an excess of seeing from both sides. To author the self, Bakhtin insists, one needs to assimilate and reaccentuate language as given, or authoritative discourse, for the creation of one's own innerly persuasive discourse. To construct the new Irish nation, similarly, one has to assimilate and reaccentuate dominant ideology for the formulation of new ideology, not to eliminate it altogether, as Molly turns the obscenity of sexual intercourse—from the patriarchal point of view—into something as natural as "you put the handle in a sweepingbrush" (*U* 18.1388). In a subject position comprising both colonizer and colonized, Molly can thus sway between the inside and the outside, see through both sides, and write a nation incorporative and comprehensive in nature. Also, her indeterminate rather than Celtic blood, as Schwarz suggests, "makes her, for Joyce, an appropriate image for the Ireland that he imagines would be based on internationalist principles and would acknowledge the variety of the Irish people" (264). This image justifies Molly's role as the *clou* of the book writing the new postcolonial nation within/through her body.

Significantly, Molly's capacity to provide the excess of seeing lies not solely in her ambiguous position inside/outside colonial manipulation; her status as doubly

marginalized female in the colony also bequeaths to her the advantage of seeing through the hypocrisy of politics dominated by patriarchal ideology. As Shloss notes, “history has generally bestowed [the political-cultural double alienation] upon women under colonial rule, where gender has established yet another mode of dispossession from the political and cultural arena” (112). To put it another way, the female colonized fall victim to the double marginalization, destined to encounter oppression and exploitation by the ruler and by the male colonized, as witness “Counterparts,” where Ada Farrington suffers intimidation from the colonial system and from her bullied/bullying husband. Unconventional and resistant, Molly differs from Ada Farrington, who, a paralytic escapist, resorts to the church for comfort.

Notwithstanding this, they share identical double marginalization which places them at the very bottom of the social hierarchy, with perhaps only children under them. This position, however, allows Molly to stand both inside and outside patriarchal society, since she lives in it *and* is excluded from it, and to acquire the advantage of the excess of seeing. It is true that all the female colonized occupy the same double position, but Molly distinguishes herself from the other willingly submissive, oppressed, and paralyzed women in her refusal to succumb to authority: “but were to be always chained up theyre not going to be chaining me up no” (*U* 18.1390-91). Without this awareness of resistance, the status of double marginalization would provide the female colonized with nothing. Moreover, Molly’s Gibraltar experience also makes her different from Ada Farrington and the like, for she, as the daughter of a British officer, a sub-oppressor, had witnessed imperial manipulation of power in the colony, and is thus better informed about colonial ideology. As a consequence, she can see through the fact that as a marginalized Jew, Bloom is unlikely to be incorporated into the political arena of Irish nationalism—a reproduction of British imperialism and patriarchal ideology—in spite of his enthusiasm: “all the Doyles said he was going to stand for a member of Parliament O wasnt I the born fool to believe all his blather about home rule and the land league” (*U* 18.1186-88). Conscious of their common marginalization, she realizes the exclusive nature of patriarchal ideology, which simply disfranchises the Other of any political voice.



Occupying the position inside/outside colonial system and patriarchal society, Molly dialogizes authoritative discourse, breaks open the closures of binary oppositions, composes in her body a bisexual text distinct from masculine writing, and speaks for Joyce's new nationalism or cosmopolitanism. Schwarz asserts that "Molly represents hope for Ireland" (263). This may sound like an overstatement, but Molly does offer a different way of thinking and writing the nation. Whether or not "her libidinous self-renewing energy puts aside the problems of Ireland's twin occupation by England and the Roman Catholic Church by implying that she will survive and transcend them" (Schwarz 263), it is nevertheless true that Molly survives and transcends oppressions, and meanwhile resists and revises ready-made ideologies. The inside/outside position, in short, bestows upon Molly the advantage of seeing from both sides, which accounts in part for her infamous contradictions—which are in effect more the process of dialogic construction than the display of inconsistency. The oscillation between inside and outside is inevitably a bitter struggle: it is not easy to turn away from the inside position to be an outsider—this may also account for the contradictions. But her awareness of the manipulative nature of colonialism—contradictory to her own temperament—helps her refuse the colonial incorporation, as she says no to imperial Boylan, finally and determinedly. Colonialism may be imbricated in Molly's writing, but, as Bazargan points out, she makes it and its "gender-based ramifications" to a considerable extent "a subject of scrutiny" and of "even mockery," and it is "the hybridity, the dialogism, in her language" that empowers Molly as an agent of colonial resistance (125). Due to the hybridity in her language, attributed to her hybrid origin and sexuality, Molly's text therefore belongs to bisexual writing, written by an androgynous author who merges sexuality with textuality in her body. Molly's history may be "that of the survival of the modern ego in exile," but she is not a tragic or sentimental figure as Bazargan sees her, "suffering from colonial angst, in perpetual displacement and transition, tracing, writing/seeing itself (and been seen) in and through the pane/pain of history" (133). In fact, her sexual/textual writing transforms the passive suffering modern ego in exile into an active constructing author trying to see through the pain of history and to find a

remedy for the nightmarish history and renew the sentimental image of the poor old woman. Throughout her text, Bakhtinian subversive laughter replaces tragic sentimentalism, however painful the nightmare of history may be. It is this laughter of comic destruction and regeneration that gives vitality to the stagnancy of paralysis imposed by authority. In this respect, Molly does represent hope for Ireland, revealed through her affirmative response to Bloom in the process of her grotesque-bodily writing, which, despite its inconsistent style, centers basically on three motifs: pacifism, renewal, and reunion.

Joyce's attitude toward non-violence is well-known. Early in 1898, when he was only sixteen, he wrote the essay "Force" to argue for his non-violent stand (*CW* 17-24). This attitude remains unchanged throughout his life, and it is hence unsurprising that his new Irish couple speak for pacifism. In an epoch of wars—colonial wars of independence such as the Boer War in South Africa and the Easter Rising of 1916 in Ireland, and the slaughterous First World War—pacifism is not an unusual appeal, especially when a person witnesses or experiences the indifferent cruelty and meaningless casualties during the First World War. Among Joyce's contemporaries, Rosika Schwimmer seems an ideal model for Bloom and Molly, though no evidence shows Joyce's acquaintance with Schwimmer. Born a Hungarian-Jew, Schwimmer was a feminist-pacifist active in national and international political arenas in the first half of the twentieth century. Before World War I, she was a suffragist-feminist leader for women in Hungary and around the world, founding the Hungarian Feminist Association of women and men to promote trade unionism, land reform, feminism, suffrage, and pacifism. During the War, she concentrated her efforts on promoting peace and ending the War. In 1918, she was appointed by the Hungarian government, then a democratic republic, as Minister to Switzerland,<sup>18</sup> an appointment unprecedented for its placing a woman in a diplomatic post. In 1920, however, Schwimmer exiled herself to Vienna and emigrated to the United States the following year for her uncompromising opposition to the succeeding communist government

---

<sup>18</sup> Coincidentally, Joyce was staying in Zurich when Schwimmer was at the post.

and dictatorship of the anti-Semitic Horthy regime. In the States, she was charged variously with being a German spy, a Bolshevik agent, and a member of a Jewish conspiracy. Her application for U.S. citizenship denied, she lived statelessly in the States for the rest of her life, and worked hard to lobby the government to create a world federal government.<sup>19</sup> Schwimmer's Hungarian-Jewish background, her advocacy of feminism, pacifism, socialism, and internationalism, and her suffering from exile, persecution, and accusation bear resemblance to Joyce's Irish couple: Bloom is of Hungarian-Jewish background, interested in political activism, socialist internationalism, and pacifism, and accused of conspiracy in "Cyclops"; and Molly is a female pacifist, familiar with migrancy, oppression, and callous wars. Although there is no proof of Joyce's knowledge of Schwimmer, he had probably heard or read about her, judging from her celebrity and their stay in the same city at the same time. In that case, we may assume that Joyce transforms Schwimmer into Bloom and Molly, echoing her political appeal yet at the same time reaccentuating her image.

Joyce might have no documented acquaintance with Schwimmer, but he was close to Francis Sheehy-Skeffington, renowned as a feminist, socialist, and pacifist, whose wife, Hanna, was also active in the campaign for women's emancipation, the couple being the founder members of the Irish Women's Franchise League in 1908. Early in 1901, Joyce and Skeffington<sup>20</sup> cooperated in publishing *Two Essays*—"The Day of the Rabblement" by Joyce and "A Forgotten Aspect of the University Question" by Skeffington—in protest against College censorship. Sheehy-Skeffington was imprisoned for campaigning against conscription during the First World War. In 1916, he was arrested and, ironically, summarily shot when attempting to prevent looting during the Easter Rising (Connolly 510). It would be over-simplistic to argue for direct influence, but Joyce does share Sheehy-Skeffington's feminist, socialist, and pacifist ideas in his advocacy of equality between the sexes, socialist internationalism, and anti-war pacifism. Nevertheless, Joyce rejects Sheehy-Skeffington's idea of

---

<sup>19</sup> For Schwimmer's life and career, see Warren F. Kuehl, ed., *Biographical Dictionary of Internationalists*.

<sup>20</sup> The name Sheehy, belonging to his wife, was not added to his own until his marriage with Hanna in 1903.

sexual purity and disregard for sexuality,<sup>21</sup> which, according to Joyce, simply falls into the trap of patriarchal ideology that suppresses sexuality. In this respect, Joyce dialogizes Sheehy-Skeffington, revises his concepts, and constructs his own, as reified by Molly in her interior dialogue.

Unlike Schwimmer and Sheehy-Skeffington, Molly is not keen on social movements: labels such as feminist, pacifist, and internationalist do not seem to accord with her image. Her interior dialogue, however, reveals that she is not ignorant of the social status quo, but has her own ideas—deeply rooted in the body and sexuality—about the society, culture and politics she takes part in. Through the process of interior dialogue, she gradually forms her own sociopolitical ideas, which coincide with Bloom's beliefs and, to a certain degree, Schwimmer's and Sheehy-Skeffington's. In contrast to Bloom's interest in politics, Molly shows little patience with political activities: she complains that Mrs. Riordan “had too much old chat in her about politics” (*U* 18.7-8), and that “Kathleen Kearney and her lot of squealers” skit “around talking about politics they know as much about as my backside anything in the world to make themselves someway interesting” (*U* 18.878-81). Molly's critique of the female nationalists may sound harsh, but it is not without reason or meaning: they do nothing authentic to construct a new Irish nation but instead engage themselves in unauthentic “old chat,” busy with either trivial sectarianism or the search for self-interest. In *A Portrait*, Mrs. Riordan “betrays” Parnell after the scandal and follows the Church's call to dismiss the immoral leader. In “A Mother,” Mrs. Kearney “take[s] advantage of her daughter's name” (*D* 137), Kathleen, to gain personal interest from the revival, as the name traditionally symbolizes Ireland. Politics, in this sense, is indeed meaningless “old chat,” triggering a row between Bloom and Molly:

we had the standup row over politics he began it not me when he said about Our Lord being a carpenter at last he made me cry of course a woman is so sensitive about everything I was fuming with myself after for giving in only

---

<sup>21</sup> For the relationship between Joyce, Sheehy-Skeffington, and feminism, see Scott, *Joyce and Feminism*, pp. 29-53.

for I knew he was gone on me and the first socialist he said He was he annoyed me so much I couldnt put him into a temper. (U 18.174-79)

Significantly, Molly registers Bloom's affection for her ("only for I knew he was gone on me") and his good temper ("I couldnt put him into a temper"), and this acknowledgment makes her willing to open her mind for Bloom's "education": "still he knows a lot of mixedup things especially about the body and the inside I often wanted to study up that myself what we have inside us in that family physician" (U 18.179-81). Politics, the body, physical interiority, and the family emerge in Molly's consciousness/writing, but she is unaware of the connection between them at this stage, let alone willing to accept and affirm Bloom's offer.

In spite of her approval of Bloom's affection and mild temper, Molly is not satisfied with his lack of masculinity: "he was too beautiful for a man" (U 18.210); "I wish hed even smoke a pipe *like father* to get the smell of a man" (U 18.508-9, emphases added). Implicitly at least, she is in league with patriarchy, and wishes Bloom to be a part of it, though on the other hand she dismisses the cruelty in male writing: "when I came to page 50 the part about where she hangs him up out of a hook with a cord flagellate sure theres nothing for a woman in that all invention made up" (U 18.493-95). Only after a bitter inward struggle does she reject displays of violent masculinity such as bullfighting ("the brutes of men shouting bravo toro . . . ripping all the whole insides out of those poor horses" [U 18.631-33]), and begin to approve Bloom's gentle feminine temperament ("I love to hear him falling up the stairs of a morning with the cups rattling on the tray and then play with the cat" [U 18.933-34]), as well as the love and pacifism he stands for.

A primary display of masculinity, war occupies an important part in Molly's interior dialogue. As evinced in "Penelope," Molly's attitude toward war is ambivalent: she is susceptible to the martial display of colonialism, *and* resents death engendered by warfare:

I hate the mention of their politics after the war that Pretoria and Ladysmith and Bloemfontein where Gardner lieut Stanley G 8th Bn 2nd East Lancs Rgt of enteric fever . . . Im sure he was brave too . . . they could have made their

peace in the beginning or old oom Paul and the rest of the other old Krugers go and fight it out between them instead of dragging on for years killing any finelooking men there were with their fever if he was even decently shot it wouldnt have been so bad I love to see a regiment pass in review the first time I saw the Spanish cavalry at La Roque it was lovely . . . O the lancers theyre grand or the Dublins that won Tugela. (*U* 18.387-403)

As the daughter of a British officer in Gibraltar, Molly is fascinated by colonial displays, especially the masculinity and martialism associated with them. The only problem with colonialism, it seems to her, is that it promotes war and death. Her preference for peace lies in the premise that wars kill finelooking men like Gardner, whose death is “so bad” because he died of fever instead of a “decent” death like being shot in battles. She may long for peace, but she desires martial display as well: she wants both. It is only when she recognizes that peace cannot coexist with colonial martialism, that colonial wars necessarily generate death, that she chooses pacifism over colonialism. The process of this recognition of the nature of war as violence and death rather than bravery is essentially a struggling process of interior dialogue, in which Boylan plays a crucial part.

For Molly, Boylan personifies masculine sexuality, which Bloom loses, or at least is incapable of mastering, after Rudy’s death: “O thanks be to the great God I got somebody to give me what I badly wanted to put some heart up into me” (*U* 18.732-33). Boylan’s large phallus, “that tremendous big red brute of a thing” (*U* 18.144), particularly relates him to phallocentric dominance:

I never in all my life felt anyone had one the size of that to make you feel full up he must have eaten a whole sheep after whats the idea making us like that with a big hole in the middle of us or like a Stallion driving it up into you because thats all they want out of you with that determined vicious look in his eye I had to halfshut my eyes. (*U* 18.149-54)

Molly is satisfied with Boylan’s sexual force, but implicitly she is aware of the brutality correlated with the force: it aims to dominate women, so that Molly has to yield to its “determined vicious look” by halfshutting her eyes; and it proposes to

impregnate women (“like a Stallion” to “make you feel full up”), so that the female body, under control, can be the vehicle of procreation. Clearly, Molly knows the close connection between Boylan and colonial war: “his father made his money over selling the horses for the cavalry” (*U* 18.403). According to the I-narrator of “Cyclops,” “Dirty Dan the dodger’s son off Island bridge that sold the same horses twice over to the government to fight the Boers” (*U* 12.998-99). What is remarkable is not Daniel Boylan’s wicked double-dealing in horses, out of which he made huge profits, but the implication behind the double-dealing: that he participates in the colonial war and the conquest of the colony. If profit tempts Daniel Boylan to join the ruler’s camp, the loss of it drives his son to reveal his violent personality: “he was like a perfect devil for a few minutes after he came back with the stoppress tearing up the tickets and swearing blazes because he lost 20 quid he said he lost over that outsider that won” (*U* 18.423-25). The “outsider” refers to the black horse, Throwaway, which is generally associated with Bloom, the outsider in patriarchal Dublin society. Boylan thus regards himself as the insider within the circle of the manipulation of power in the colonial system. Inside/outside colonial manipulation, Molly is no stranger to the manoeuvres of colonial power, and is therefore aware of the significance of Boylan’s role as the colonizer who tries to colonize her body and restrain her freedom, a gesture she is against: “theres the mark of his teeth still where he tried to bite the nipple I had to scream out arent they fearful trying to hurt you” (*U* 18.569-70). Despite her acknowledgment of Boylan as “the savage brute” (*U* 18.594), Molly fails to reject him affirmatively, until she reflects upon textual communication in her life, and recognizes Boylan’s failure in it.

Effectively, Molly’s reflection on textuality leads her to a full recognition of what Boylan, and thus imperialism, is: domination, violence, and death. Her recollection of Mulvey’s letter—her first textual contact with men—begins with excitement (*U* 18.762) and ends with a sense of helpless despair, “he went to India . . . going out to be drowned or blown up somewhere” (*U* 18.853-56), which is followed by her musing on unnecessary death, “Gardner going to south Africa where those Boers killed him with their war and fever” (*U* 18.867-68). Lying in bed weaving and unweaving her

textile/text, which starts from Ireland, travels to Gibraltar, India, South Africa, and comes back to Ireland—all colonies suffering from wars and imperial exploitation—Molly finally acknowledges that colonial imperialism is inseparable from violence and death, which destroy the life, vitality, and masculinity of the finelooking men, whether Mulvey or Gardner. If she falls into line with Boylan, the west Briton, she will never acquire the equality-based textual communication she desires, for he takes interest only in her sexual body, which he can conquer and control, not the textual body she is constructing, which he fails to dominate. Once she acknowledges this, Molly can see through the superficiality of phallogentrism: “anyhow he didnt make me pregnant as big as he is” (*U* 18.1123-24). Phallogentric brutality and martial masculinity are not as powerful as they are supposed to be. It is at this point that Molly determinedly rejects the masculine Boylan and affirms the bisexual Bloom:

no thats no way for him has he no manners nor no refinement nor no nothing in his nature slapping us behind like that on my bottom because I didnt call him Hugh the ignoramus that doesnt know poetry from a cabbage . . . you might as well be in bed with what with a lion God Im sure hed have something better to say for himself an old Lion would. (*U* 18.1368-78)

The lion may traditionally symbolize the British Empire, but in the context it is transformed by Molly, unconsciously at least, into Leo/Leopold, who does “have something better to say for himself.”<sup>22</sup> Bloom probably lacks masculinity, but he also lacks the domineering tendency and violent brutality affiliated with masculine and colonial domination. More importantly, he is interested in poetry, which connects him textually with Molly.

Like Bloom, who advocates love, the opposite of hatred and force, as “really life” (*U* 12.1483), Molly also longs for love and resents brutal violence. Despite her remark that “there was no love lost between us” (*U* 18.967), she is reconstructing the lost love between herself and Bloom in her text. To a considerable extent, Bloom accords with

---

<sup>22</sup> Also importantly, Odysseus is often likened to a lion in *The Odyssey*.



her definition of love: “it must be real love if a man gives up his life for her that way for nothing . . . full up of each other that would feel the same way as you do” (*U* 18.1056-60).<sup>23</sup> Molly may doubt the existence of this “real love,” and maintain that “the majority of them with not a particle of love in their natures” (*U* 18.1058-59), but, significantly, she attributes the suicide of Bloom’s father to his love for his wife: “I suppose he felt lost” (*U* 18.1062). In this way, she indirectly affirms Bloom’s love, which enables her to approve his feminine temperament, his empathizing capacity, and his lack of masculine domineering tendency: “I saw he understood or felt what a woman is and I knew I could always get round him” (*U* 18.1578-80). By affirming Bloom, Molly affirms the love and pacifism he stands for, unknowingly responding to him and backing his advocacy in “Cyclops,” and meanwhile rejecting Boylan and what he symbolizes: phallocentrism, masculine domination, colonial exploitation, and brutal violence.

Whilst she renounces colonial violence, Molly is dubious about nationalist movements, impatient with “old chat” by Mrs. Riordan and Kathleen Kearney and campaigns led by Griffith and Sinn Fein alike:

on account of those Sinner Fein or the freemasons then well see if the little man he showed me dribbling along in the wet all by himself round by Coadys lane will give him much consolation that he says is so capable and sincerely Irish he is indeed judging by the sincerity of the trousers I saw on him. (*U* 18.1227-31)

Molly’s disbelief in nationalism on the whole is not as superficial as her statement seems to imply: the problem with Irish nationalism resides in the fact that it is too “sincerely Irish,” incapable of accepting the Other and different voices. Her critique of the sincerity of nationalism also echoes Bloom’s experience in “Cyclops,” in which he is rumored to be Griffith’s advisor-ghostwriter, contributing to yet excluded from the new nation under construction (*U* 12.1574-77). Whether colonial or nationalist, the

---

<sup>23</sup> This definition recalls Michael Furey’s love for Gretta in “The Dead,” based on Nora’s personal experience in Galway where a young man, as she claimed, died for her. For details, see Brenda Maddox, *Nora*, pp. 26-28; and Ellmann, *James Joyce*, p. 243.

political stage belongs only to men—masculine men, not womanly men—and is rife with unnecessary killing: “I see it all now plainly and they call that friendship killing and then burying one another and they all with their wives and families at home” (*U* 18.1270-72). To avoid the slaughter and violence correlative to masculine rule, Molly attempts to replace patriarchy with matriarchy: “itd be much better for the world to be governed by the women in it you wouldnt see women going and killing one another and slaughtering” (*U* 18.1434-36); but she deconstructs herself immediately by admitting that women can also be violent: “or its some woman ready to stick her knife in you I hate that in women” (*U* 18.1457-58)—recalling the similar brutality and violence of matriarchy in “Circe.” What is important, Molly seems to suggest, is not gender, but something transcending the boundaries between genders such as love or tolerance, which would eliminate violence and slaughter.

Oscillating between the subject positions of colonizer and colonized, Molly acquires the excess of seeing from both sides, and consequently sees through the nature of colonialism as violence and destruction. Certainly not an intellectual, she nevertheless registers the power struggle in the colony, and proposes, if indirectly, to counteract the hatred and force embraced by the Citizen with love and pacifism. In this way, Molly responds to, and affirms, Bloom’s advocacy of love and pacifism, and echoes feminist-pacifists such as Schwimmer and Sheehy-Skeffington, whose ideas she shares to a certain degree. Molly’s approval of love and pacifism makes her occupy, as it were, a revisionary subject position between Katherine O’Shea and Maud Gonne, the most famous—or infamous—women in the political arena of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Ireland, both mistresses involved in triangular relationships, from upper-class backgrounds, and with military connections.

Probably the most notorious scandal in recent Irish history, Spanish-connected<sup>24</sup> Kitty O’Shea’s liaison with Charles Stewart Parnell resulted in the downfall of the nationalist leader. In the words of the misogynous Deasy, Kitty O’Shea, a *femme*

---

<sup>24</sup> Captain William O’Shea and Katherine O’Shea stayed in Spain for a period of time after their marriage, but she was not Spanish as Bloom mistakenly claims in “Eumaeus” (*U* 16.1411-13). For the O’Sheas’ Spanish connection, see Jules Abels, *The Parnell Tragedy*, p. 136.

*fatale* like Eve, Helen, and Devorgilla, is the woman who “brought Parnell low” (*U* 2.394). Deasy is not the only person in the novel who accuses Kitty O’Shea. In the “Eumaeus” episode, the shebeen proprietor comments upon the sinful mistress: “That bitch, that English whore, did for him [Parnell] . . . She put the first nail in his coffin” (*U* 16.1352-53). These are typical of the accusations leveled at Kitty O’Shea, the unfaithful wife whose transgressive sexuality leads to the collapse of “home.” As Shloss notes, “Kitty O’Shea, in one generation, or the women suffragists in the next, played the role of demon lovers whose acknowledgement had broken/would break the solidarity and effectiveness of the Irish Party” (114). According to Parnell’s biographers, the liaison played a crucial role in removing the leader from the center of nationalist campaigns and diminishing his authority.<sup>25</sup> Though Parnell tried to argue that his liaison had no bearing on his politics, the triangular relationship of Parnell-Kitty O’Shea-Captain William O’Shea was political: when he was supposed to meet his colleagues in Paris, Parnell stayed with Kitty O’Shea at Eltham instead, and, as a favor to his mistress, he used O’Shea, not a very capable and reliable man, in all-important negotiations with the English government.<sup>26</sup> The affair degenerated into a classic misogynist fable, with Kitty O’Shea as a Siren-like woman, a fatal mistress causing the downfall of the uncrowned king by means of her seductive charm.

But was she such a *femme fatale* whose sexuality led men to damnation? From the political point of view, Kitty O’Shea was in reality a pawn in the men’s power game, whether in terms of her relation with O’Shea or with Parnell. As Lyons points out, “long before 1886, if not actually from the beginning of the affair,” O’Shea “had known of the relationship between Katherine and Parnell and had connived at it” (1977, 333-34). He was willing to keep silent and act the cuckold for political and financial reasons. Politically, he could exploit his connection with the nationalist leader for the advancement of his career (Hurst 28, Connolly 420, Lyons 1977, 242, Abels 146). Financially, he could share in the fortune he expected Katherine to inherit from her wealthy aged Aunt Ben (Connolly 420, Lyons 1977, 242, 340, Abels 141).

---

<sup>25</sup> For details, see Lyons, *Charles Stewart Parnell*, pp. 149-51, 174-75, 185-88, 239-41, 333-40.

<sup>26</sup> For details, see Abels, pp. 181-83

Only when the will disappointed his expectations did he institute the divorce petition. Kitty O'Shea, in this light, was more a manipulated object than a manipulating subject, her body being the tool in her husband's "pet schemes of self-advancement" (Hurst 28). In actuality, early in 1880, when O'Shea decided to enter the Irish political arena, Katherine had to pay for the election expenses of her husband *and* the other candidate to ensure O'Shea's seat in the Parliament:<sup>27</sup> she had long been a pawn in his game of political and financial advancement. As the liaison progressed, however, Katherine refused to be her husband's pawn any longer: she turned to Parnell, both for love and for freedom.

It is perhaps true that Parnell was in love with Katherine from the beginning, that he cherished her throughout their days together, and that he paid more attention to her than the cause; nevertheless, he used her as a tool in the game of political manipulation, just as her husband did. Unable to deal with Gladstone directly and personally, Parnell made Katherine, an English woman with an aristocratic background, his "private link of communication with Gladstone" (Abels 184-86, Hurst 50, Lyons 1977, 224-25). For years, Katherine was not only Parnell's mistress; she also played a role as an intermediary in negotiation with the English government. This role of negotiator is similar to the role Molly plays when Bloom was fired by Joe Cuffe "for giving lip to a grazier" (*U* 12.837-38): "he could have been in Mr Cuffes still only for what he did then sending me to try and patch it up" (*U* 18.510-11). Whether as wife or mistress, women are implicated in masculinist power games, scripted as negotiator and/or bargaining tool.

Molly resembles Kitty O'Shea not merely in her role as negotiator in Bloom's career; her status as Boylan's mistress also relates her to the "English whore." The difference between the two mistresses, however, lies in the fact that for Molly the adultery acts as a sign of sexual freedom and resistance to the restraint of marriage system, or in Shloss's words, a "refusal of paternalistic tradition" (115), whereas for Katherine the advancement of her husband motivated her meeting with Parnell, which

---

<sup>27</sup> For details, see Abels, pp. 140-41.

resulted in the ten-year liaison causing Parnell's downfall. Nevertheless, Katherine's materialistic aim turned into love in the process of the affair, which led her to break out of the confinement of marriage. In Lyons's words, O'Shea, by the year 1886, "had been supplanted so completely that his wife was now—and apparently had been for some years—his rival's wife in all but name" (1977, 338). Bloom's response to the affair in "Eumaeus" echoes Lyons's statement:

Whereas the simple fact of the case was it was simply a case of the husband not being up to the scratch, with nothing in common between them beyond the name, and then a real man arriving on the scene, strong to the verge of weakness, falling a victim to her siren charms and forgetting home ties, the usual sequel, to bask in the loved one's smiles. (*U* 16.1379-84)

Bloom attributes the cause of the affair to the husband's impotence, in the broad sense of the word. If Kitty O'Shea could have obtained love from her husband, if he had been "strong" enough, she might not have chosen Parnell. As he offers Molly sexual freedom, Bloom also comments on the Parnell affair with an open mind, suggesting that the adulterous couple should liberate and enjoy their sexuality, irrespective of the public view: "Since their names were coupled, though, since he was her declared favourite, where was the particular necessity to proclaim it to the rank and file from the housetops" (*U* 16.1370-72). For Bloom, marriage or extramarital liaisons should be based on love, and sexuality should be liberated. His tolerant attitude toward the Parnell scandal speaks for his approval of the liberation of female sexuality.

Supporting Kitty O'Shea and the affair, Bloom, unconsciously at least, associates the English mistress with Molly, both adulteresses in search of love and freedom.

In her memoirs *Charles Stewart Parnell: His Love Story and Political Life*, Kitty O'Shea wrote that Parnell's sin was not the adultery, but the violation of the Eleventh Commandment, "Thou shalt not be found out": that the breach of morality was in the public scandal rather than the adultery itself (Abels 324). In the hypocritical Victorian society, the violation of decorum was indeed more sinful and intolerable than the violation of mores. Molly's speculation about sexuality echoes this point: "God knows its not much doesnt everybody *only they hide it* I suppose thats what a woman is

supposed to be there for or He wouldnt have made us the way so attractive to men” (*U* 18.1518-20, emphases added). Interestingly, she ascribes female sexuality to God’s doing. This ascription both undermines Victorian hypocrisy and demystifies religious mores. In other words, Molly goes even further than Kitty O’Shea in her attempt to legalize sexuality by attributing it to the work of God—the ultimate masculine authority.

If Molly shares with Kitty O’Shea the characteristics of a Spanish connection, a military background, and the role as adulteress involved in men’s power games yet using sexuality in a bid for love and freedom, Maud Gonne resembles Molly even more, both in background and temperament. Whilst Kitty O’Shea’s army connection rested on her brother and husband, Maud Gonne was herself the Colonel’s daughter, whose father, Thomas Gonne, was brigade-major of the cavalry in Dublin (Ulick O’Connor 121). As soldiers’ daughters, Maud Gonne and Molly lost their mothers at an early age. The most striking similarity between them, however, is that like Molly, Maud Gonne was regarded as a manly woman on the Irish political stage (Kiberd 182). Keen on political affairs, Maud Gonne was not only a revolutionary leader and humanist, but also a sexual liberator, whose affair, surprisingly, did not blemish her reputation as the Irish Joan of Arc: she seemed able to connect her sexuality with politics and balance them.

Like Kitty O’Shea and Molly, Maud Gonne was a mistress before her marriage with John MacBride: she had had an affair with Lucien Millevoeye, a French journalist, politician, and married man, for years, and had two children by him, a boy dying in childhood, and a girl, Iseult Gonne, reputed to resemble her mother in her outstanding beauty—though she was usually introduced as Maud Gonne’s “adopted daughter,” “niece,” or “kinswoman” (Coxhead 35). In “Proteus,” Stephen recalls the affinity between Maud Gonne and Millevoeye: “Maud Gonne, beautiful woman, *la Patrie*, M. Millevoeye, Félix Faure, know how he died? Licentious men” (*U* 3.233-34). What is noteworthy in Stephen’s reflection is not merely Maud Gonne’s alliance with “licentious men” such as Millevoeye, suggesting her status as a sexual liberator that interests Stephen; the reflection also insinuates her connection with politics: both

Millevoye and Faure were political figures, the latter the president of the French Republic, rumored to have died of sexual excess (Gifford 55). Devoted to Irish politics, Maud Gonne related her sexual liberation to Irish freedom: her attraction to Millevoye rested partly upon the fact that he was a French nationalist, who *seemed* eager to help her with the cause of Ireland. When she realized that for all his French patriotism, he had never cared about Irish liberation—which had merely been a bait to keep her with him (Coxhead 43)—she called an end to the long-term affair and bid farewell to her first and probably only lover. As rebellious as Molly, Maud Gonne rejected subjection to paternalistic authority. As Elizabeth Coxhead remarks, she held the opinion that “no one should dictate to her, not even Millevoye” (31). Maud Gonne might have connected sexuality with politics, but she placed the cause of Ireland above her love life, an act distinct from that of Parnell and Kitty O’Shea, for whom the love affair was as important as, if not more important than, “home ties” (*U* 16.1383). When Maud Gonne refused Yeats’s proposal once again and married John MacBride in 1903, four years after the end of her alliance with Millevoye, the reason she agreed to marry him was partially political: he was an Irish hero fighting against the English, the second in command of the Irish Brigade in the Boer War. In her speech to an audience in Limerick, she declared: “I consider that John MacBride has done more for Ireland by organising the Irish Brigade in the Transvaal than any living man. It saved Ireland’s honour at a time when there was great need” (quoted in Coxhead 56). Despite her lack of love for him, despite her awareness of the incompatibility between them and that “he was really nothing but a fighting machine,” and despite all the voices of opposition from her friends and from his, Maud Gonne married MacBride out of political considerations and her inclination to take up challenges (Coxhead 56-57). A nationalist like her, MacBride was in the same camp with Maud Gonne, a candidate more heroic and nationalist than Yeats, who, in her opinion, wasted time writing love lyrics.

As she handles her marriage like a political game—in which she was unfortunately but predictably a loser, for she sought the civil dissolution of their marriage two years later—Maud Gonne was inevitably radical in politics. Famous as

an Irish revolutionary directing her energy to the cause of Ireland, she believed that “no revolution that shrank from force could hope to prevail” (Coxhead 23). This belief contributed to her marriage with MacBride, since he embodied the powerful revolutionary force she believed in. Her belief in force and her activism in politics were put into practice during the Boer War. As Bloom recalls in “Lestrygonians,” when Joseph Chamberlain, an aggressive imperialist antagonistic to Gladstone’s policy of Home Rule for Ireland, came to Dublin in 1899 to receive his honorary degree at Trinity College, a group of radical nationalist leaders organized a pro-Boer meeting across the Liffey from Trinity College to protest against Chamberlain’s presence (*U* 8.423-26; Gifford 168). Bloom does not mention the name of Maud Gonne, but she was among the leaders who organized the protest. In the following year, Maud Gonne founded her own revolutionary women’s society, Inghinidhe na hEireann, Daughters of Ireland. These female patriots “went to action at once, with leaflets urging Irishwomen not to consort with soldiers of their country’s enemy” (Coxhead 44). Bloom recalls this in “Lotus-Eaters”: “Maud Gonne’s letter about taking them [soldiers] off O’Connell street at night: disgrace to our Irish capital” (*U* 5.70-71). But judging from Cissy Caffrey’s association with English soldiers, which results in Private Carr’s attack on Stephen in “Circe,” the campaign did not seem to work well. To fight against enlistment in the British army, Maud Gonne also published an article of protest, respectively in *L’Irlande Libre*, a French journal edited by Maud Gonne herself, and in *The United Irishman*, edited by Griffith. In the article, she accused Queen Victoria of being an exploitative criminal, who “dares to ask Ireland for soldiers—for soldiers to fight for the exterminators of their race” (quoted in Coxhead 45-46).

In spite of her radicalism and preference for force, Maud Gonne was essentially a humanist, whose radicalism stemmed from the fact that she had witnessed oppression, exploitation, and injustice in colonial Ireland.<sup>28</sup> Throughout her life, therefore, she fought against oppression, exploitation, and injustice: she organized the peasants to

---

<sup>28</sup> For details, see Coxhead, *Daughters of Erin*, p. 23.



resist eviction, worked for prisoners, set up soup kitchens and temporary camps for those who had been unhoused, prevented a famine in Mayo, organized the Patriotic Children's Treat, etc.<sup>29</sup> Ulick O'Connor comments that Maud Gonne dedicated herself to the dispossessed (122), a comment properly summarizing her life. Coxhead also concludes that Maud Gonne "was always, and passionately, on the side of the under-dog" (77): "To the end of her life she continued to call for drastic changes in the Irish prison system, particularly as it affected women and children" (74). She might have become "a legendary figure in the west," as O'Connor claims (121), but the legend was derived from facts: the deeds she performed to help the dispossessed. Maud Gonne's belief in force and radicalism differs drastically from Molly's preference for pacifism and impatience with politics, but they share similar humanitarian inclinations: both are sympathetic to the poor. In her text, Molly expresses her sympathy for Dignam's widow and children: "poor Paddy Dignam all the same Im sorry in a way for him what are his wife and 5 children going to do unless he was insured" (*U* 18.1279-81). When Father Conmee, with "one silver crown" in his purse, only blesses the onelegged sailor in "The Wandering Rocks" (*U*. 10.7-11), Molly, with her "plump bare generous arm," flings forth a coin to the sailor (*U* 10.249-53)—one of the two persons in the panoramic episode of Dublin life generous and sympathetic enough to help the dispossessed. Compared with Maud Gonne's deeds, Molly's sympathy may seem trivial and insignificant. Indeed, she is not active or radical in actual political affairs—her activism and radicalism are reified in her text.

Like Molly, Maud Gonne was eager to participate in textuality. During her alliance with Millevoeye, she had written articles for *La Patrie*, of which he was the editor (Coxhead 34). She then edited in Paris her own propaganda magazine, *L'Irlande Libre*, in 1897, and wrote articles for Griffith's *The United Irishman*. More than a decade later, she published a women's journal *Bean na hEireann*, another propaganda magazine, which claimed to be "the ladies' paper that all the young men read" (Coxhead 60-61). In 1938, she published her memoirs, *A Servant of the Queen*.

---

<sup>29</sup> For details, see Coxhead, pp. 19-77; and Ulick O'Connor, *Celtic Dawn*, p. 121.

The Queen referred not to Victoria, but to Kathleen ni Houlihan, the personification of Ireland, a role Maud Gonne played on stage in 1902. As the title of her memoirs suggests, Maud Gonne's writing tended toward political propaganda: unlike Molly, she had little patience with poetry. Coxhead explains her indifference to poetic literature: "While people were starving, or being evicted, or languishing in English prisons, the writing of love-lyrics appeared to her just so much waste of time" (72). The reason Maud Gonne dismissed Yeats's poetry was practical and realistic: she believed in the power of the press, but she preferred actions to words. In her writing of propaganda, therefore, she promoted action and force, and reported the suffering of Irish working-class women and children. Notwithstanding the propaganda in her writing, Maud Gonne's texts could be read as her resistance to Yeats's male writing of stereotype. It is well-known that Yeats regarded Maud Gonne as his Muse, for whom he wrote numerous love-lyrics to sing of her peerless beauty. But the portrait given by Yeats is fundamentally distorted: she was depicted as a perfectly beautiful woman, and *only* a perfectly beautiful woman. In a distorting way, Yeats idealized and stereotyped Maud Gonne, turning a vehement humanist into an inhuman and sublime image, a perfect reflection of his idealistic dream, and a fleshless goddess for his worship. Coxhead mimics Yeats's attitude toward Maud Gonne in the late period of his life, when his attitude turned bitter: "such a pity Maud had to waste her beauty on those ugly politics, instead of preserving it for man's delectation." He wanted to make her, as it were, "an odalisque" (76). This might partly account for Maud Gonne's persistent refusal to Yeats's marriage proposals: for she was fully aware that "if [Yeats] were ever to take a wife, she must be a woman who would sink her interests utterly in his" (Coxhead 43). And she proved to be correct. Engaged in her own writing—however "unliterary" it might be—Maud Gonne resisted Yeats's endeavor to turn her into an idealized and lifeless image; she withstood his attempt to textualize her. It is a resistance to masculinist textualization, as well as to the imposing authority and confinement underlying it.

The problem with Maud Gonne's campaign, however, resides in the fact that the Irish political arena basically belonged to men, and women had little space in it.

Sheehy-Skeffington detected this “misogynistic streak” in the nationalist movement. He criticized the “nationalist hypermasculinity” and asked a thought-provoking question: “why were women not more centrally involved?” (Kiberd 363) His wife, Hanna, answered the question:

In revolutionary parties in their infancy . . . women have always been welcomed, possibly by reason of their inherent taste for martyrdom, a crown never denied their womanhood once it enters the lists. It is when parties grow circumspect through partial success and line up after the fight and the dust for the parade that woman falls naturally out of step and is duly left behind. (quoted in Scott 25)

This observation applies well to Maud Gonne. In spite of her activism, she was essentially a rare exception, one of the few women actively participating in politics. When freedom was achieved, she was left behind. As Coxhead notes, when Maud Gonne was imprisoned in 1923, William Thomas Cosgrave, president of the executive council of the Irish Free State, replied to Yeats’s appeal for her freedom that “women ought to keep out of politics” (71)—an attitude typical of misogyny and paternalism.

In spite of her resentment of coercion and confinement, Maud Gonne’s appeal to force fell nonetheless into the trap of masculine authority and aligned her with the oppressor. The question Sheehy-Skeffington put in his critique of nationalist hypermasculinity pinpointed the ambivalence displayed by lovers of force: “will not those who rejoice in barbarous warfare inevitably come to control such an organization?” (Kiberd 363) By fighting against force with force, Maud Gonne intended to terminate oppression and injustice, but the embracing of force simply allows for the emergence of another oppressor, as evidenced in post-independent Ireland. Moreover, force has not always been helpful in Irish history. Jules Abels comments on the 1882 Phoenix Park Murders: “The total time consumed was three minutes, but it was to set the cause of Ireland back many years” (177).<sup>30</sup> Force, in this case, acted as a hindrance rather than a springboard to freedom.

---

<sup>30</sup> For details, see Abels, p. 180; and Connolly, p. 440.

As a wife/mistress musing upon sexuality and politics, Molly occupies a revisionary subject position between Kitty O'Shea and Maud Gonne: a new woman who gives potential to Irish freedom. While all three women share military connections, Molly's middle-class background replaces the upper-class backgrounds of the others. By making his heroine bourgeois, Joyce brings privileged politics down to the commonplace: politics belongs not to the few and exceptional, but to everyman and everywoman who live within the polis. It is clear that for Joyce the symbol of or spokesperson for Ireland should not be high and noble like Countess Cathleen and Kathleen ni Houlihan, but a commonplace person who can speak as/for the commonplace. Kitty O'Shea might be labeled as "the English bitch," but she was aristocratic by origin. Also with an upper-class background, Maud Gonne emerged as the Irish Joan of Arc; and yet, as Scott points out, it is "her heroic nationalist posing" (23) to which Joyce is antagonistic. Notwithstanding her efforts to help the dispossessed, Maud Gonne, for Joyce, appears as a patronizer, basically related to the literary revival led by Yeats. Joyce may seem harsh toward Maud Gonne's connection with the revival, in which she showed little interest—she was in fact more a political radical than a literary revivalist—but his critique is meaningful: in resisting Maud Gonne's heroic nationalist posing, Joyce dismisses the traditional image of Ireland created, or resurrected, by Yeats. In Bakhtinian terms, Joyce attempts to carnivalize the symbol of Ireland, to bring regenerating laughter to the dull seriousness of the high, and Molly is such a carnivalesque figure whose grotesque image revives the traditional and stale symbol of Ireland. Capable of demystification, Molly transforms the heroic image of Joan of Arc into a vivid and comic figure, and meanwhile appropriates a voice to speak as/for the politically excluded.

In the process of interior dialogue, Molly redefines mistress and new woman, and merges sexual liberation with political freedom. Kitty O'Shea might embody a notorious adulteress, but in actual fact she played the role of negotiator, a bargaining tool in men's power games. Although she refused to be her husband's pawn as the affair progressed, she nevertheless became a willing communication vehicle of her lover's. She was subjected to men, her sexuality exploited, and, what is worse, herself

regarded as a hindrance to political liberation. Maud Gonne, on the other hand, refused to submit to the yoke imposed by patriarchal society, and chose to give free play to her sexuality, which, however, was inseparable from her political enthusiasm. Notwithstanding her attempt to fuse sexuality with political enthusiasm, she dedicated herself to political activism at the expense of sexuality, as demonstrated in her alliance with Millevoeye and her marriage with MacBride. Unlike Kitty O'Shea, Molly rejects men's control, whether Mulvey's, Boylan's, or Bloom's. For her the act of adultery helps to shake off the manacles of patriarchal marriage and open the gate to sexual freedom. As Boylan's mistress, she wants to give free play to her sexuality, not to submit to the domination of masculinity: for a mistress should act as a sexual liberator, not as subordinate to masculine domination. The liberation of sexuality potentially leads to the liberation of the nation: when half of the population is liberated from the bondage of masculine control, the nation is subsequently freed from the shackles of imperial rule. Maud Gonne did act as a sexual liberator defying oppression and submission, but in a sense she remained subject to political activism, advocating force—representative of masculine dominion—as a means of fighting against oppression and injustice. As Molly has seen through the danger of masculine force, she turns Maud Gonne's physical activism into textual activism, echoing but substantially revising Maud Gonne's radicalism, which aims to redeem the nation. To put it more precisely, Molly participates in redeeming the nation by means of her radical textuality: her resistant and constructive voice enters her bodily text, which, based on sexuality and the grotesque, is in essence revolutionary and active—even more radical than Maud Gonne's campaigns, judging from the censorship "Penelope" had encountered. To be a new woman and political radical, in other words, it is not necessarily imperative to actually participate in the political arena. Textually, Molly provides a different way of radicalism: she sacrifices neither sexuality nor patriotism, and transforms force into Bloomian love and pacifism.

Notwithstanding the fact that both Kitty O'Shea and Maud Gonne engaged themselves in writing, Molly's text differs from theirs in its bisexuality. Kitty O'Shea's memoirs were published in 1914, with the title *Charles Stewart Parnell: His*

*Love-Story and Political Life*. It is obvious from the title that the book is about Parnell: a text of man's history, in which the woman plays a subordinate part. But even as a man's history, the text is so romanticized that it turns into a Gerty-style romance, as when Kitty O'Shea recounts the consummation of the affair:

I had fought against our love; but Parnell would not fight and I was alone. I had urged my children and his work, but he answered me 'For good or ill I am your husband, your lover, your children, your all. And I will give my life to Ireland, but to you I give my love, whether it be your heaven or your hell. It is destiny. (quoted in Abels 151)<sup>31</sup>

Abels comments on the account: "This quote is hard to accept as coming from Parnell. James Joyce wrote in his notes, 'He was tongue-tied and she was English' [*E* 354]. He might have added that she had read many English romances" (151). However romantic the affair might be, Kitty O'Shea's narration exaggerated the event into a cheap romance, and fell into the category of supposedly female discourse. "Her manner of writing," Joyce remarks, "is not Irish" (*E* 354)—or, at least, is not what the Irish need.

Maud Gonne's writing is similarly unisexual in perspective, if not in content. Her journal articles, predictably, are politically oriented, serving as propaganda promoting war and force. Her autobiography, *A Servant of the Queen*, carries a similar purpose. As the title suggests, Maud Gonne served Queen Ireland, a title implying her submission to Irish politics. But a major problem with her text is that she tends to distort facts concerning her private life: Millevoeye appears only as her partner in their joint war against England, never as her lover, and Iseult is introduced as her adopted child or niece, never as her daughter (Samuel Levenson 33, 381). Furthermore, she shares with Kitty O'Shea an inclination to exaggerate, and shows in her text a "tendency to rewrite history, either to make events more dramatic and suspenseful or to increase the importance of her role in them" (Levenson 382). Samuel Levenson summarizes Maud Gonne's inclination to make a heroine of herself:

---

<sup>31</sup> See also Lyons, *Charles Stewart Parnell*, p. 128, for the romantic first meeting between Kitty O'Shea and Parnell.

[T]he parts played by other people and other organizations in the events she describes are largely absent in her recital; complementary, objective data are few. In the end, by portraying herself as a single-minded, selfless, tireless advocate of Irish independence, as a humble servant of Queen Cathleen ni Houlihan, Maud becomes incredible. What is worse, she fails to do justice to her real concern for evicted peasants, hungry school children, and prisoners. Her genuine tireless benevolence is submerged in melodrama.

(382)

In order to propagandize war, Maud Gonne made her text a heroic account of adventure, in which she was the fearless and undaunted heroine dedicating herself to the cause of Ireland. Her text, as a result, is essentially unisexual, not too different from the heroic adventure in male writings.

Molly's writing, however, incorporates both the feminine and the masculine, love and war, sexuality and politics, poetry and propaganda: she reaccentuates and transforms masculine discourse in her bisexual body, recounts the love and war she experiences in life, speculates about sexuality and imperial/colonial politics, and writes a text which is simultaneously poetic and political. The text is a realistic—or grotesquely realistic—account of her life, in which she may be sentimental and romantic at times, but, with an excess of seeing, she possesses the power to demystify, and thus is able to avoid romanticizing and mythologizing events and people. Her text is also a page of Irish history, written in her body and based on her personal history. Bisexually written, it points a way to genuine Irish freedom: love refers not to sentimentalism or romanticism, nor to chauvinism or violence, but to genuine mutual understanding, as she affirms Bloom's love for her, "that was why I liked him because I saw he understood or felt what a woman is" (*U* 18.1578-79); and war and force lead not to liberation, but to the vicious circle of violence, killing, and unnecessary death. In her tribute to Yeats published in 1940, Maud Gonne lamented that "The Ireland I live in is very different from the Ireland of our dream, because our dream is not yet achieved" (quoted in Coxhead 72). It seems that early in 1904 Molly had foreseen the

turmoil in future Ireland and proposed a solution in her bisexual writing, which is yet to be carried out.

The most distinctive point in Molly's bisexual writing which distinguishes herself from Kitty O'Shea and Maud Gonne is that she transforms and redeems their triangular relationships. In the "Eumaeus" episode, Bloom contemplates the "eternal question of the life connubial" as he muses on the Parnell-Kitty O'Shea-William O'Shea triangle: "Can real love, supposing there happens to be another chap in the case, exist between married folk? Poser" (*U* 16.1385-86). Bloom's answer to the question, in regard to the Parnell triangle, is negative. But in asking the question, Bloom is in fact reflecting on his own triangular relationship with Molly and Boylan: he yearns to know if love can exist between himself and Molly when he offers her sexual freedom. Considering Boylan's association with the empire, he feels pessimistic about the answer: Boylan is more likely to expel him from the triangle and wield control over Molly than enliven their connubial life. This is why Bloom invites Stephen home: to replace Boylan with Stephen, with whom he shares a mutual understanding. Molly is aware of Bloom's intention. In recognizing the intention of his offer, she acknowledges his role as the liberator rather than the cuckold, and assents to his proposal that love can exist between the married couple in triangular relationships. In other words, she reverses the role of the jealous husband and the liberating lover in the Parnell triangle by affirming Bloom's part as the liberating husband in relation to the liberating leader, and thus redeems the critical and unhappy Parnell triangle.

Maud Gonne's triangular relationships were more complicated, for she had been involved in multiple triangles,<sup>32</sup> among which the best-known were perhaps the one involving MacBride and Yeats and the one implicating Yeats and Iseult. Despite her consistent refusal of Yeats's incessant proposals, and despite her denial of an affair between herself and the poet, it seems nonetheless probable that she had been in a

---

<sup>32</sup> For example, Maud-Millevoeye-Mrs. Millevoeye, Maud-Millevoeye-Yeats, Maud-MacBride-Griffith, Maud-MacBride-Yeats, Maud-Iseult-Yeats, etc.



spiritual marriage with Yeats ever since 1898.<sup>33</sup> Yeats's attitude toward her husband, MacBride, was predictably hostile and bitter: in "Easter, 1916," he was called a "drunken, vainglorious lout" who "had done most bitter wrong" to some near the poet's heart (1983, 181). When Yeats finally gave up the hope of entering into wedlock with Maud Gonne, he, in 1917, proposed to Iseult instead, for she bore a strong resemblance to her beautiful mother.

To a certain degree, the relationship between Bloom, Molly, and Milly is similar to that between Yeats, Maud, and Iseult: for Bloom often associates Molly with Milly. By inviting Stephen home, Bloom intends to introduce him into the new Bloom-Molly-Stephen triangle he plans, but it is not too unlikely to speculate that the triangle might turn into a quadrilateral, as the Maud-MacBride-Yeats and Maud-Iseult-Yeats triangles turn out. After all, "the way to daughter led through mother, the way to mother through daughter" (*U* 17.943-44). Accepting Bloom's offer of Stephen, Molly, unconsciously at least, acquiesces in the possibility of the quadrilateral relationship. While the Maud-MacBride-Yeats and Maud-Iseult-Yeats triangles broke down after MacBride's death in 1916 and Iseult's refusal of the proposal in 1917, the Bloom-Stephen-Molly-Milly quadrilateral is full of potential since it consists of a liberating husband, a freedom-seeking lover, a nonconformist new woman, and her double, another unconventional new female. This new quadrilateral merges and transforms the Parnell triangle and the Maud Gonne triangles, turning jealousy into acceptance, and antagonism into life potential.

Significantly, the offer of triangle which Molly accepts is double. On the one hand, it comprises mainly three members: Bloom, Stephen, and Molly. But it is Molly who is writing the text within her body, a text incorporating politics and based on sexuality. The text, sexuality, and politics, in this respect, also form a triangular relationship interacting with each other. Written by an androgyny into a bisexual text, the politics dealt with by Molly is likewise bisexualized: it is demystified, its closure of binary oppositions split open, as she sees through the nature of both imperialism

---

<sup>33</sup> For the spiritual marriage, see Samuel Levenson, pp. 242-48.

and nationalism. Thus, Molly can revise and redeem the Kitty O'Shea and Maud Gonne triangles and write a bisexual text in contrast to their unisexual writings. She is Kitty O'Shea and Maud Gonne in a sense, but she differs from them at the same time. She occupies, as it were, a revisionary subject position between them as a freedom-seeking new woman, who affirms her partner's advocacy of love and pacifism in her bisexually bodily text by asserting that members in a triangle should "remain friends over it instead of quarrelling" (*U* 18.1393)—an assertion reflecting Joyce's own political credo.

A second motif prominent in Molly's writing is renewal. Throughout her text, she reveals an inclination toward change and regeneration. As a young girl in Gibraltar, she longed for the coming of new soldiers to enliven her dull life after Mulvey's departure for India: "Id like a new fellow every year" (*U* 18.782). As a middle-aged woman in Dublin, however, "youve no chances at all in this place like you used long ago" (*U* 18.733-34). Boylan for her is a change after sixteen years' matrimonial life and eleven years' sexless life: "hes a change in a way not to be always and ever wearing the same old hat" (*U* 18.83-84). To read the adultery from this angle, Boylan serves as a medium for Molly's accomplishment of her desire of renewal. The textual communication she yearns for, in this light, also speaks for her aspiration to change the status quo: "true or no it fills up your whole day and life always something to think about every moment and see it all round you like a new world" (*U* 18.737-39). Presumably, her longing for change and renewal derives from her status as a colonial subject confined in the colony by the colonial system and institution. Notwithstanding her fascination for colonial display in Gibraltar, Molly is fully aware of its influence on daily life: "their damn guns bursting and booming all over the shop especially the Queens birthday and throwing everything down in all directions if you didnt open the windows" (*U* 18.679-81). It is uncertain if this is the reason "people were always going away" (*U* 18.668), but it is beyond doubt that after Hester Stanhope—probably Molly's only female friend in Gibraltar—and her husband leave, Molly feels imprisoned in the colony: "it got as dull as the devil after they went I was almost planning to run away mad out of it somewhere were never easy where we are father or

aunt or marriage waiting always waiting" (*U* 18.676-78). Her life in Dublin does not seem much of an improvement, since it is also a highly political and masculine city characterized by "killing and then burying" (*U* 18.1271): "I dont like being alone in this big barracks of a place at night" (*U* 18.978). The house at 7 Eccles Street, or the city of Dublin in general, becomes a military camp to Molly, a place demanding order, obedience, and discipline. Living in such a place, Molly is aware of the inevitability of submission to coercive forces, which, nevertheless, does not accord with her temperament: she prefers active change to passive submission. As Shloss points out, "Molly Bloom is not without knowledge of political life, and, in fact, it is often dislike of what she knows that leads her to turn back to the private sphere and toward its implicit possibilities for change and renewal" (106). Whether she turns back to the private sphere or not, Molly expresses a longing for change and renewal, which is politically motivated.

What accompanies her longing for change and renewal is the aspiration for youth: to be young enough to attract men as she did in the past, to be young again to relive the happiness and retrieve the communication she shared with Bloom before Rudy's death, and, implicitly and semiconsciously, to be young so that she, at the prime of her life, might ideologically direct the unsatisfactory political status quo to a different route, more dialogical and less authoritative. The longing for the preservation of youth, therefore, stems from the desire for lost joy and dialogue, and from her dissatisfaction with the present world of war, violence, and injustice. Youth, in this sense, embodies potential for a renewed life. The adultery thus functions as a means of maintaining juvenescence, for Molly associates sexuality with youth. It is how she justifies her sexual desire and adultery:

what else were we given all those desires for Id like to know I cant help it if  
Im young still can I its a wonder Im not an old shrivelled hag before my  
time living with him so cold never embracing me except sometimes when  
hes asleep the wrong end of me. (*U* 18.1397-401)

For Molly, sexual contact enlivens juvenescence, both physically and spiritually. For this reason "a woman wants to be embraced 20 times a day almost to make her look

young no matter by who so long as to be in love or loved by somebody" (*U* 18.1407-9). The aspiration for youth is consequently analogous to an aspiration for love, which for Molly signifies communication: she is desperate for dialogue with other people. This explains her fascination for the "fine young men" in Margate strand bathingplace (*U* 18.1345-46): they represent the vitality of youth and the potential for regeneration she yearns for.

To read Molly as a consumer in this light, the commodities she consumes reflect her aspiration for the preservation of youth: she is curious about the potency of the antifat medicine (*U* 18.456), needs the face lotion which has made her "skin like new" (*U* 18.459), and longs to possess new clothing to make herself look younger and sexually more attractive, for she is no longer at the age when "any old rag looks well on you" (*U* 18.1037). When she reflects upon the photo Bloom showed Stephen, she expresses her dissatisfaction with the old-fashioned dress she wore when the photo was taken: "its not good of me I ought to have got it taken in drapery that never looks out of fashion still I look young in it" (*U* 18.1303-4). Clearly, Molly is conscious of aging and yearns for juvenescence, and commodities like clothes help her possess younger looks and attract men. In this regard, she is similar to Gerty: both women participate in the advertising rituals of English commodity culture, and aspire after fashion so as to appear younger and more attractive. As Molly emphasizes, "you cant get on in this world without style" (*U* 18.466-67), an attitude Gerty certainly agrees with, echoing Bloom's belief in fashion as "part of [women's] charm" (*U* 13.804).

Capable of assimilative dialogue, however, Molly distinguishes herself from the culturally constructed Gerty in a specific way: she resists blind absorption into and determination by commodity culture. She takes part in the rituals of fashion, but is not defined or constructed by them. Heininger observes that Molly rejects the incorporation of imperial consumption culture by personalizing images of commodities: she turns the invented images of consumption culture into meaningful personal symbols—e.g., the floral trope—and in so doing "legitimizes her resistance to the spectacle of consumption and decolonizes her mind and body" (171). Indeed, Molly despises convention and conformity, and refuses to fall prey to public

discourses and ready-made ideologies. Her capacity to transform the fantasy of invented images of commodities into significant personal symbols echoes Bloom's capability to personalize public discourse, as demonstrated in "Sirens." Molly, in a word, is capable of turning fashion into self-fashioning. But before her decolonization of imperial commodity culture, she has to recognize the constraint fashion imposes on her—a recognition initiating her colonial resistance.

Clothes, as a trope, can be both positive and negative: they protect the body from harsh outer environments on the one hand, but may oppress it on the other hand. In the context of colonial Ireland, fashion as manifested in women's clothes is undoubtedly oppressive rather than protective, especially the corset. In the hallucinatory world of "Circe," when Bloom is "unmanned" by Bello, the corset plays an important part in feminizing Bloom, who becomes "a thing under the yoke," forced to put on the "punishment frock" (*U* 15.2965-66). As Bello tells Bloom: "You will be laced with *cruel force* into *vicelike corsets* of soft dove coutille with whalebone busk to the diamondtrimmed pelvis, the absolute outside edge, while your figure, plumper than when at large, will be *restrained* in nettight frocks . . ." (*U* 15.2975-78, emphases added). Depicted as "a true corsetlover" "fascinated by sister's stays," Bloom in the Circean world is willing to have "her" body shaped by restraining clothes and submit to fashion as the "[c]ult of the beautiful" (*U* 15.3009-13). Critics have noted that in "Circe" clothes usually determine gender: Bloom becomes a woman when he sheds his male garments and puts on the female "punishment frock." But clothes, particularly corsets, also serve to fashion the female body according to masculine will and expectation. Restraining and repressing, the corset is indeed a yoke and punishment frock imposed with cruel force upon women by masculine society and colonial rule—in the name of fashion.

As she participates in the advertising rituals of English commodity culture, Molly wants to purchase "one of those kidfitting corsets . . . advertised cheap in the Gentlewoman with elastic gores on the hips" claiming to "give a delightful figure line" (*U* 18.446-48). Heininger points out that "Molly's wearing the *Gentlewoman's* corset and acceding to the claims of the advertisement would colonize her body by

transforming her into a sexual and political commodity shaped by the ideology of the British-dominated magic system” (166). But despite her interest in the kidfitting corset, and her general yearning for new clothes to help her stay young and fashionable, Molly, with an excess of seeing, is aware of the strangling force clothes impose on her. As she recalls later, the corset restrained her physical freedom and put her in danger when she watched the masculine game of bullfighting in Gibraltar:

these clothes we have to wear whoever invented them expecting you to walk up Killiney hill then for example at that picnic all stayed up you cant do a blessed thing in them in a crowd run or jump out of the way thats why I was afraid when that other ferocious old Bull began to charge the banderilleros.  
(U 18.627-31)

Clothes become a source of danger, preventing Molly from ensuring her own safety and freedom. Implicitly, she knows who invented the restraining clothes: men, or rather imperial rulers, who attempt to fashion women’s bodies by means of strangling clothing for the purpose of control and domination, just as they rule and colonize the land. Even Bloom is not without blame in his participation in fashioning Molly: “that black closed breeches *he made me buy* takes you half an hour to let them down wetting all myself” (U 18.251-52, emphases added). When she negotiates with Joe Cuffe for Bloom’s offence against a customer, the dress she wears again brings her discomfort: “I felt rotten simply with the old rubbishy dress that I lost the leads out of the tails with no cut in it but theyre coming into fashion again *I bought it simply to please him*” (U 18.513-15, emphases added). Although she registers Bloom’s fascination with her dress as a gesture of fondness and affection rather than control (U 18.519-23), Molly nevertheless feels the constraint of clothes, especially during her menstruation: “O this nuisance of a thing I hope theyll have something better for us in the other world *tying ourselves up*” (U 18.1210-11, emphases added). The restraint of clothes may partially explain Molly’s aspiration for new garments, especially undergarments such as chemises, drawers, silkette stockings, kidfitting corsets, garters, etc.: she is looking for clothes—as a trope—which are less restraining and more comfortable, able to give free play to her grotesque body.

In her search for new clothes as ideology, Molly echoes to a certain degree the Clothes Philosophy expounded in Thomas Carlyle's *Sartor Resartus*: outward representations such as ideologies and institutions are forms of clothing, which, though functioning as the foundation of society, need renewing when they fail to conform to the reality of the body. For Carlyle, as well as Molly, what is crucial is not outward clothing, which are superficial and changeable, but rather what is covered by them: the body, which signifies the essence of existence, the greater reality. As Carlyle stresses, "the whole External Universe and what it holds is but Clothing," "*put on for a season, and to be laid off*" (175, emphases added). Each ideology or institution has its term of validity—when it is "in fashion"—and is impossible to be fashionable forever. Once they are out of date, clothes should "be altered to serve better" instead of "tailoris[ing] and demoralis[ing]" people (165, 163). What happened in early-twentieth-century Ireland, however, was that clothes shaped the human body, as seen in the case of Gerty, not vice versa. Remarkably, similar images of putting on and taking off clothes appear in both Bloom's and Molly's interior dialogues. In "Nausicaa," Bloom muses on women's clothes: "Put them all on to take them all off" (*U* 13.799). What Molly did as a young girl echoes Bloom's musing: "I had the big doll with all the funny clothes dressing her up and undressing" (*U* 18.916-17). Both Bloom and Molly note the process of undressing—which is important once the clothes do not fit the body and need retailoring. The metaphorical tailor therefore acts as the creator of society, whose service shapes the images of the external universe (Carlyle 324-26). As a weaver and unweaver tailoring her textile/text, Molly resembles a Carlylean tailor, endeavoring to renew the ill-fitting, strangling garment of colonial culture and imperial ideology.

In her reading of Molly's resistance to matrimonial and colonial bonds, Shloss considers Molly's dissatisfactions as "the beginning signs of insurrection" (115). Rebellious and unconventional, Molly rejects bondage and searches for freedom, whether linguistic or physical. Capable of carnivalization, she challenges the "reigning discourses by rendering them profane rather than sacred, interested rather than authoritative" (Shaffer 143). As Heininger points out, Molly creates "cultures of

resistance” by “first accept[ing] and later reject[ing] the imperial culture’s images, products, and social goods” (161): she participates in English commodity culture, but resists its incorporation by imbuing it with personal significance.

As the creator of cultures of resistance, the tailor of new ideology as clothing, Molly registers the censorship of discourse and sexuality in the colony: the one deeply connected with the other. Discourse related to sexuality is considered taboo:

I hate that confession when I used to go to Father Corrigan he touched me father and what harm if he did where and I said on the canal bank like a fool but whereabouts on your person my child on the leg behind high up was it yes rather high up was it where you sit down yes O Lord couldnt he say bottom right out and have done with it what has that got to do with it. (*U* 18.106-11)

Father Corrigan censors the word “bottom,” and yet he shows great curiosity about sexuality. By inquiring into the details of the indecent behavior, he secretly satisfies his forbidden sexual desire. But Molly’s attitude toward the censorship is critical and impatient: the bottom is but a part of the body, bearing no relation to practical sexual intercourse. To show interest in sexuality but to censor all discourses related to the body is simply hypocritical—especially to a person praising the body and sexuality. Molly criticizes not only censorship in the verbal form, but also censorship in the written text: “her a—e as if any fool wouldnt know what that meant I hate that pretending of all things” (*U* 18.490-91). Impatient with the discursive censorship of sexuality, Molly is similarly critical of the censorship of sexuality itself: she contends that sexual desire is natural and should be satisfied (*U* 18.1397-98), and that “everybody” is as interested in sexuality as she is, “only they hide it” (*U* 18.1518). By writing her text within the body, Molly attempts to unveil “that pretending of all things” and reveal the truth beneath the clothes.

While criticizing discursive and sexual censorship, Molly resists censoring authority and searches for freedom. Her subject position as a manly woman is in effect a form of resistance, in terms of her transgression of sexual boundaries set by patriarchal authority. According to patriarchal ideology, the gender boundaries



between the sexes are fixed, and each gender should abide by its naturally allocated role: man as the conquering warrior, woman as the sacrificial angel in the house. Molly obviously does not agree with such an obedient, conventional role: her disinterest in tending the sick (“I hate bandaging and dosing” [*U* 18.31]) and housekeeping (“the damn cooking and throwing out the dirt” [*U* 18.72]) detaches her from the image of the traditional domestic angel. Her decision to take a lover, as Shloss notes, is also a gesture of challenge to paternalistic tradition (115), which does not allow the act of adultery, let alone the free play of sexuality and the emergence of the triangular family unit. Molly’s singing career, moreover, may seem trivial and insignificant, dependent on men’s management; and yet, as Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson points out, it “suggests something of the liberated Irish woman of the time” (146). To be a singer in Dublin in 1904, in fact, was anything but a common career for women—since most women were shut up in the house. Unwilling to be a stereotyped woman like Gerty, Molly also rejects the conventional role of procreative earth-mother as Gea-Tellus. The fact that she gave birth merely twice and only one child survives distinguishes her from the role of prolific mother—in contrast to Mina Purefoy, one of the numerous Irish “proliferent mothers” bringing “prosperity” to the land (*U* 14.51-52). Although she is not against giving birth again, Molly is critical of women being treated as men’s vehicle of procreation: “not satisfied till they have us swollen out like elephants” (*U* 18.165-66). Very likely, she is aware of the implication of being prolific: the restriction of bodily freedom. For this reason she rejects the role of prolific mother earth. Molly may act as Joyce’s symbol of Ireland, full of life potential for regeneration, but she is not a traditionally fecund mother/earth goddess: she wants to be an autonomous subject having control over her own body.

Dissatisfied with the stereotypical roles bestowed upon women by patriarchy, roles depriving women of bodily freedom, Molly resists patriarchal authority, which in Ireland is simultaneously imperial, and longs to change and renew colonial culture, or in Carlylean terms, to retailor new clothes for society. Her longing for new garments reflects her aspiration toward ideological change and renewal, as her yearning for youth suggests her desire for enough vitality to transform the unsatisfactory status quo.

It is impossible to regain youth, but Molly finds her younger ego in Milly, who in a sense represents the regeneration of her mother. In Bloom's stream of consciousness, Milly is usually analogous to Molly. In the interior dialogue of "Penelope," Molly also registers similarities between herself and her daughter. When she recalls her date with Mulvey and their running around in Gibraltar, Molly, like Bloom in "Nausicaa," associates her breasts with Milly's: "they are shaking and dancing about in my blouse like Milly's little ones now when she runs up the stairs I loved looking down at them" (*U* 18.849-51). Milly's breasts remind Molly of her own, a reminder of past romance and happiness. The daughter's flirtation with young boys is also connected with the mother's: "now shes well on for flirting too with Tom Devans two sons imitating me" (*U* 18.1023-24). Interestingly, Molly regards Milly's habit of flirtation as an imitation of her own. Pretty as her mother, moreover, Milly is fond of Molly's belongings:

shes always making love to my things too the few old rags I have wanting to put her hair up at 15 my powder too only ruin her skin on her shes time enough for that all her life after of course shes restless knowing shes pretty with her lips so red a pity they wont stay that way I was too. (*U* 18.1063-66)

Molly asserts that she was pretty at Milly's age, and admits that youth will not last long. In indicating Milly's similar prettiness and fondness for her belongings, Molly insinuates that Milly represents her younger ego, i.e., the regenerated Molly. But what makes Milly the regenerated Molly is not only their physical and habitual similarities, but their shared resistance to domination. While Molly refuses to be tied up, Milly objects to being kept under control: "she has nobody to command her as she said herself . . . I was just like that myself they darent order me about the place" (*U* 18.1075-78). With Milly as her younger ego, who is as defiant as she is, Molly, metaphorically, regains the youth she aspires after, and Milly, another unconventional new female, embodies the continuing potential for colonial resistance and ideological renewal.

Molly's recognition of Milly as her younger ego and the potential for regeneration significantly echoes Bloom's version of his daughter as a self-willed new female, in contrast to the culturally constructed Gerty, as discussed in the preceding

chapter. Milly's career in photography is an even more novel career than singing for a young girl in 1904 Dublin, a career which transcribes visual text, as writing transcribes verbal text. Although it is Bloom who chooses the career for Milly, Bloom intends to liberate rather than dominate her. It is in a sense a gesture of double liberation, which grants both women freedom. Molly acknowledges Bloom's intention of "send[ing] the girl down there to learn to take photographs": "only hed do a thing like that all the same on account of me and Boylan thats why he did it Im certain the way he plots and plans everything out I couldnt turn round with her in the place lately" (*U* 18.1004-5, 1007-9). While Milly's absence frees Molly, Molly's absence also liberates Milly: "its as well he sent her where she is she was just getting out of bounds" (*U* 18.1027). Sending Milly to Mullingar to learn photography, Bloom does not merely choose an unconventional career for untraditional Milly; he also offers freedom to both his wife and daughter, as he interferes neither in Molly's affair with Boylan, nor in Milly's with the young student Bannon. Molly registers Bloom's intention of double liberation: he gives the one freedom in order to give the other liberty, since the mother and the daughter are analogous to him. By admitting Milly as her younger ego, Molly responds both to her younger self and to Bloom, who regards Milly as the regenerated Molly.

Molly's transformation of fashion into self-fashioning may also be interpreted as a response to Bloom. As an advertisement canvasser, Bloom inevitably participates in the advertising rituals of English commodity culture, selling goods and ideas, and is familiar with fashion. When he views the display of fashion by Gerty on the strand, Bloom regards fashion as part of women's charm (*U* 13.804), and considers that he should "attend to [his] appearance" at his age (*U* 13.835-36). In "Penelope," Molly also notes Bloom's interest in fashion: "only he thinks he knows a great lot about a womans dress and cooking mathering everything" (*U* 18.519-20). A womanly man capable of dialogic incorporation, Bloom attempts to help Molly fashion herself. But Molly is not satisfied with his taste in fashion: "he can scour off the shelves into it if I went by his advices every blessed hat I put on does that suit me yes take that thats alright the one like a weddingcake standing up miles off my head he said suited me"

(*U* 18.520-23). Defiant and resistant, Molly declines imposed meaning and rejects being domineeringly shaped, even by Bloom. Notwithstanding her willingness to have him participate in her self-fashioning, Molly prefers to be her own ruler, and to regard Bloom as an adviser: she responds to him that she is capable of fashioning herself. Importantly, the clothes Molly desires are mostly undergarments. After resolving to “give [Bloom] one more chance,” Molly decides to “put on [her] best shift and drawers” to “let him have a good eyeful” (*U* 18.1498, 1508-9). If she successfully seduces Bloom, she will “tell him [she] want[s] to buy underclothes” (*U* 18.1523)—echoing Bloom’s decision to buy Molly petticoats at the end of “Nausicaa” (*U* 13.1244). Molly’s reaction to clothes, in the end, is sexually oriented: clothes should not strangle the body, but liberate and stimulate sexuality. Instead of passively receiving imposed meaning, Molly prefers to create meaning for clothes herself: by endowing them with personal significance.

Like Molly, Bloom also longs for regeneration. Throughout the book, he is conscious of aging: “Soon I am old” (*U* 11.1069); “Never again. My youth. Only once it comes” (*U* 13.1102-3); “Then I did Rip van Winkle coming back. . . . The young are old” (*U* 13.1113-16); “Not so young now” (*U* 13.1253). He is fully aware that juvenescence comes only once; nevertheless, he desires to regenerate his “race” through an heir: “I too. Last of my race. Milly young student. Well, my fault perhaps. No son. Rudy. Too late now. Or if not? If not? If still?” (*U* 11.1066-67) The son represents the key to the continuation of the race, whether it be the Blooms in particular or the diasporic Jews in general, and, more importantly, to Bloom and Molly’s reunion and the renewal of their lost communication. While Molly finds her younger ego in Milly, Bloom finds his in Stephen, whose introduction into the Bloom family renews Bloom and Molly’s relationship, and meanwhile points to a way which potentially leads to the acquisition of genuine Irish freedom.

As Bloom associates Stephen with the reincarnation of Rudy, Molly also connects her descendent with the newly found spiritual son:

I saw him driving down to the Kingsbridge station with his father and mother I was in mourning thats 11 years ago now yes hed be 11 though . . . I

suppose hes a man now by this time he was an innocent boy then and a darling little fellow in his lord Fauntleroy suit and curly hair like a prince on the stage. (U 18.1305-12)

Molly's image of Stephen as a prince in a Lord Fauntleroy suit on the stage distantly but significantly echoes Bloom's final vision of Stephen-Rudy on the Circean stage: "*a fairy boy of eleven, a changeling, kidnapped, dressed in an Eton suit with glass shoes and a little bronze helmet, holding a book in his hand. He reads from right to left inaudibly, smiling, kissing the page*" (U 15.4957-60). Rather than merely a devout inheritor of Hebrew tradition, Bloom's vision of his son is a combination of Irish, English, and Jewish cultures.<sup>34</sup> More significantly, the reincarnated Rudy is pleasantly engaged in textuality, which relates him to Stephen; and one of the reasons Molly shows great interest in Stephen is that "hes an author" (U 18.1301), capable of textual communication.

For Molly, Stephen embodies the potential solution to the double bind of sexuality and textuality. She is fascinated by Boylan's sexuality, but resents the brutality correlated to his sexual domination. Bloom's attempt at textual communication, on the other hand, is similarly unsatisfactory and, in a subtle sense, stifling, propelling Molly to welcome Stephen as "a change":

itll be a change the Lord knows to have an intelligent person to talk to about yourself not always listening to him and Billy Prescotts ad and Keyess ad and Tom the Devils ad . . . Im sure hes very distinguished Id like to meet a man like that God not those other ruck besides hes young. (U 18.1341-45)

What attract Molly to Stephen are both his intelligence and youth: she needs someone intelligent enough to make contact with her spiritually and intellectually, and young enough to revitalize her physically and sexually. Young and literary, Stephen represents what Molly longs for: the potential for sexual/textual communication and cultural/ideological regeneration. When she claims that "Im sure itll be grand if I can only get in with a handsome *young poet* at my age" (U 18.1358-59, emphases added),

---

<sup>34</sup> "[A] *fairy boy of eleven, a changeling*" comes from Celtic folklore (Gifford 529); the "*Eton suit*" represents English culture; and the book Rudy is reading is Jewish.

she simultaneously points out the double characteristics she registers in Stephen, which Boylan and Bloom lack.

Despite Bloom's attempt to enter into textual communication with Molly, his efforts have so far proved unsuccessful. The books he brings Molly annoy her owing to their unisexual writing, which fails to represent women fairly and properly; his advertising shop-talk bores her, making his attempt at textual contact more monologic than dialogic; his skill at discursive explanation is insufficient, usually "leav[ing] us as wise as we were" (*U* 18.241-42). What is worse, his attempts at discursive contacts are easily misunderstood, as Molly probably misinterprets his dreamy discourse of the "roc's auk's egg" (*U* 17.2328-29) at the end of "Ithaca" as an order for breakfast and hence a gesture of command: "will I indeed did you ever see me running Id just like to see myself at it show them attention and they treat you like dirt I dont care what anybody says" (*U* 18.1432-35). Nevertheless, Molly acknowledges Bloom's difference from other domineering men: he acquiesces in her adultery with Boylan. She also admits his knowledge of the body: "he knows a lot of mixedup things especially about the body and the inside I often wanted to study up that myself what we have inside us in that family physician" (*U* 18.179-81). Bloom's interest in the body influences Molly, who expresses her inclination to "study up" the body as he does. To put it in other words, Molly is willing to accept Bloom's "education," as long as it is not imposing and patronizing. Consciously or unconsciously, she has internalized his "education": she may dismiss Bloom's use of scientific discourse as a means of refuting religion ("he says your soul you have no soul inside only grey matter because he doesnt know what it is to have one" [*U* 18.141-43]), and yet she assimilates and reaccentuates his discourse to rebuke other men's incomprehension of her attempt to communicate ("where does their great intelligence come in Id like to know grey matter they have it all in their tail if you ask me" [*U* 18.709-10]). Her acceptance of Stephen into the family acts furthermore as a veiled acceptance of Bloom's offer of sexual freedom and textual communication.

But the pivot connecting Bloom, Molly, and Stephen together is poetry: "I always liked poetry when I was a girl first I thought he was a poet like lord Byron and not an

ounce of it in his composition I thought he was quite different" (*U* 18.1323-26). In spite of her disapproval of Bloom's literary composition, Molly relates Bloom to Stephen through poetry, which decisively joins Molly and Bloom during their courtship. Not only did Bloom try "to look like Lord Byron" and give Molly "the present of lord Byrons poems" (*U* 18.209, 185), he also sent her an "acrostic upon the abbreviation of his first name," as noted in "Ithaca" (*U* 17.410-16)—a gesture suggesting his offer of himself to her. The poem, in a sense, indicates their union in the text, with him as the form and her as the theme. Accordingly, Bloom was also a handsome young poet before their marriage, just like Stephen in 1904—though not a very talented one.

The reason Molly is fascinated by literary men is practical: she likes to be written into the text *as she really is*. Her dissatisfaction with Bloom's literary constitution may be ascribed to his inadequacy of portraying her truly and realistically, as demonstrated by his poem. When she recalls her masturbating Mulvey "in broad daylight" and "in the sight of the whole world"—interestingly echoing Bloom's description of their date on Howth Hill in "Lestrygonians" (*U* 8.899-900)—Molly asserts that "they could have put an article about it in the Chronicle" (*U* 18.828-30). Rather overtly, she expresses her desire to be textualized according to her own will and way. Her interest in Stephen is based on this reason: "hell write about me lover and mistress publicly too with our 2 photographs in all the papers when he becomes famous" (*U* 18.1364-66). It is noteworthy that Molly wishes to be textualized both verbally and visually, and as a consequence unknowingly incorporates Milly into her plan of textualization. To achieve her purpose of attracting Stephen, Molly is willing to educate herself: "Ill read and study all I can find or learn a bit off by heart if I knew who he likes so he wont think me stupid if he thinks all women are the same" (*U* 18.1361-63). But Stephen has to serve her: to write her unconventionally, or at least to transcribe her bodily text faithfully into a written text. Writing her text within her body, Molly needs someone to transform her flesh into words—as Joyce was doing—so that it can be read verbally and publicly. Her relationship with Stephen, in this

respect, reverses the relationship between Yeats and Maud Gonne, who is written into his poems with a twisted image according to his will, not hers.

Through poetry, Molly relates Bloom to Stephen, merging them into one. When she speculates that “he could do his writing and studies at the table in there for all the scrabbling he does at it” (*U* 18.1489-90), the image of Stephen writing and studying at the table overlaps with Bloom’s. And it is only when she remarks that “Id love to have a long talk with an intelligent welleducated person” (*U* 18.1493-94) that she decides to give Bloom one more chance: she recognizes that Bloom is analogous to Stephen, the intelligent well-educated person she can communicate with. To put it more precisely, Stephen is the regenerated young Bloom with whom Molly fell in love in 1888. Twenty-two years of age in 1904, Stephen recalls the twenty-two-year-old Bloom in 1888 when he proposed to Molly—when he was able to connect sexuality and textuality. While she wants Stephen to textualize her at her will, Bloom’s intention to co-write a sketch with Molly—or more exactly, to transcribe her discourse and make it into a story—echoes, in a subtle sense, her desire to be faithfully written. Thus, the text she is writing within her body not only acts as her affirmative answer to Bloom, but, supposing it were transcribed into a written text, would also be the sketch Bloom wants to write.

With Stephen as the agent, Molly respeculates about her relationship with Bloom. The process of dialogic speculation enables her to affirm Bloom’s uniqueness as a womanly man, unwilling to dominate her in every respect. To put it another way, Bloom’s offer of Stephen to replace sexually domineering and textually inadequate Boylan results in Molly’s recognition of Bloom’s unusual capacity for love and her final affirmation of him as her ideal partner. Stephen, in the triangle, plays the agent who reunites the couple rather than the lustful adulterer who sunders them apart. As reincarnated Rudy, indeed, Stephen is the only person who can renew the Blooms’ communication, both sexually and textually.

In response to Bloom, for whom all women metamorphose into Molly, Molly echoes his capacity for metamorphosis at the end of her interior dialogue, and in so doing responds positively to his earlier unsatisfactory explanation of metempsychosis.



As a result of her metempsychosis, the Moorish Wall where Molly had her first kiss with her first lover Mulvey—an event Bloom recalls in “Sirens” and comments as “First kiss does the trick” (*U* 13.886)—changes into Howth Hill where she received Bloom’s proposal and had her first sexual encounter with him; Mulvey is transformed into Bloom, the first lover’s peak cap and transparent shirt (*U* 18.836, 799) turning into the proposer’s straw hat and grey tweed suit (*U* 18.1573). But the straw hat also recalls the one Boylan wears on 16 June 1904, the grey tweed suit recalling his blue suit (*U* 18.420). The adulterer whose sexuality satisfies Molly is transfigured into twenty-two-year-old Bloom. Moreover, the kisses also undergo significant transformation. While Mulvey under the Moorish Wall puts his “sweetlike young” tongue into Molly’s mouth (*U* 18.771), Molly on Howth Hill gives Bloom “the bit of seedcake out of [her] mouth,” nearly losing her breath “after that long kiss” (*U* 18.1574-76). The receiver becomes the giver, who gives what she has received from her first lover to the proposer of liberation, meanwhile metamorphosing the first love scene into the proposal scene, and acknowledging Bloom’s capacity for profound and liberating love. In stating “as well him as another” (*U* 18.1604-5), Molly affirms Bloom’s characteristics, turns him from the victimized underdog into the triumphant liberator, and countersigns the offer of triangle that potentially leads to Irish liberation.

The significance of Molly’s affirmation of Bloom and their likely reunion, then, lies in the possibility of renewal, which both Bloom and Molly yearn for. Ellmann reads the novel as an epithalamium, and love its cause of motion (1982, 379). Despite the ever-changing chronotopes in Molly’s interior dialogue, the final chronotope pauses on the day when she accepts Bloom’s proposal on Howth Hill—the chronotope deciding their union and the generation of their offspring. The overlap of the chronotope in which the proposal takes place with the chronotope in which Molly rethinks her life indicates that the two chronotopes, merging with each other, are in essence a single one, the one determining their matrimonial life together, full of vitality and potential. The recollection of the seedcake, which Bloom in “Lestrygonians” also recalls and associates with joy and young life (*U* 8.908-9), is itself suggestive enough. Molly’s decision to make Bloom breakfast and seduce him—

indicative of her confirmation of the triangle offer rather than her return to the traditionally wifely role, which she never is—also implies a change in their current sterile and stagnant relationship, a change which may generate another Rudy. As Molly puts it: “Id love a big juicy pear now to melt in your mouth like when I used to be in the longing way” (*U* 18.1503-4). Transformed from Stephen’s plums, the pear, like the seedcake, symbolizes generating power in the context, and the fact that Molly desires a pear *now* as she did when she was pregnant also insinuates the possibility of new life. Furthermore, judging from the fact that Milly represents the regenerated Molly, who had her first kiss with Mulvey at the age of fifteen, exactly the age of Milly on 16 June 1904, and that Stephen embodies the regenerated Bloom, who proposed to Molly at twenty-two, the same as Stephen’s age when he was invited to the Bloom family, it is not improbable that the quadrilateral relationship turns into two couples: Milly the younger new woman and Stephen the younger new man as the regeneration of Joyce’s Irish couple, Molly and Bloom.

As Schwarz points out, “the putative reunion of Molly and Bloom within the novel represents the potential restoration of Ireland” (265). That their reunion would potentially lead to genuine Irish freedom is not because, as Schwarz argues, Bloom the wandering Jew finds and is accepted by the Holy Land, personified by Molly, at the end of his journey (264-66), but because the unconventional couple provide new ways of thinking through the Irish problem. Both Bloom and Molly are bisexual in temperament and internationalist in perspective, capable of incorporating different voices. While Molly refuses the domination of phallogentric ideology and the closure of binary oppositions, Bloom allows her the space to liberate her sexuality, showing no sign of domineering control. On the other hand, Molly is aware of Bloom’s involvement in extramarital relationships, but chooses to ignore it (*U* 18.46-55, 1208-10). Neither of them, in other words, desires to possess or dominate the other. The desire to possess, as Joyce elaborates in *Exiles*, contradicts love, “understood as the desire of good for another” (*E* 343). By liberating the other, the subject liberates itself as well: it is a gesture of double liberation. Joyce’s notes on his play underline this double liberation: “Richard must not appear as a champion of woman’s rights. . . . He

is in fact fighting for his own hand, for his own emotional dignity and liberation in which Bertha, no less and no more than Beatrice or any other woman is coinvolved” (*E* 348-49). Compared with Richard, an earlier character created when Joyce’s relationship with Nora came to a crisis, Bloom seems more active in Molly’s liberation and shows more interest in her freedom than in his own, though neither is he a champion of woman’s rights. As he offers Molly freedom, Bloom enjoys greater freedom himself, and reestablishes communication with her. His proposal of the triangular family unit is therefore accepted and slightly revised by her, as she semiconsciously incorporates Milly into it. Based on open relationship, the triangular family unit undermines the traditional family values supported by patriarchal society, and breaks open the confinement, both physical and spiritual, imposed by paternalistic ideology. Molly declares that friendship, rather than jealousy and strife, should exist in triangular relationships: “why cant we all remain friends over it instead of quarrelling” (*U* 18.1392-93). While Bloom questions the possibility of happy triangles, Molly gives him a positive answer, claiming that they can exist, as long as the desire for possession is not involved. More significantly, the new family can be the model for the new nation, capable of accepting the Other—who has the gift of excess of seeing that makes possible tentative visual wholeness—and of exercising friendship and love and dissolving dispute and violence. It would be a heteroglot state, dialogic and international, without domineering control and exploitation of one by another. It sounds utopian, but it is not beyond reach: the Blooms’ new family unit, seen as the ideal new nation in miniature, is likely to work.

As Molly recalls one of Bloom’s “mad crazy letters”: “my Precious one everything connected with your glorious Body” (*U* 18.1176-77). Both accepting and rejecting, sexual and textual, Molly’s body is indeed the pivot with which everything is connected, the key to the acquisition of genuine freedom—the capitalized “Precious” and “Body” underscore its significance. Bisexually grotesque, Molly’s body is unsealed and regenerative, always in the process of dialogic assimilation and reconstruction, and open to the world and the future. The writing within her body can thus be read as a quest for renewal and freedom in sexually and politically paralytic

Ireland, and an affirmative response to Bloom's question and suggestive offer of Stephen. Terrence Doody and Wesley Morris summarize the offer: "Molly wants renewal and the freedom to take a lover; Bloom wants a son and reconciliation with Molly. . . . In offering Stephen to Molly as a replacement for Boylan, Bloom affirms her freedom and still presents her with the son he has always wanted for himself" (227). More importantly, the young and literary Stephen can reconcile sexuality and textuality, and potentially free Molly from the double bind. Accepting Stephen, Molly accepts Bloom at the same time, for she recognizes that Stephen is the regenerated Bloom. As a consequence, she unites Stephen and Bloom in her body by transforming them, who become stars in "Ithaca," into her eyes (*U* 18.1339-40), and suggests the possibility for the change and renewal of the paralytic forces imposed by patriarchal and colonial ideology and culture. Change and renewal, indeed, are not only what Bloom, Molly, and Stephen yearn for, but also what Ireland needs. In this way, the writing within the body turns into a political text for the construction of the new nation, the inside turning into the outside, the one identical with the other.

The construction of Joyce's new Ireland is based on Molly's "glorious Body," the androgynously grotesque body of sexuality and textuality that transmits the external body, through the sexual body, into the textual body which is "Penelope." Writing about Molly writing herself, Joyce is in effect writing Ireland, as Molly is: both writers are outsiders, the supposed Other providing the necessary excess of seeing which complements the One's horizon. Composed of the triangular family unit in which individual freedom prevails over coercive domination and contact supersedes closure, Joyce's new Ireland would be a different version from nationalist Ireland. International, dialogic, and non-violent, the new Ireland is written—but is yet to be created.

## CONCLUSION

### Rethinking Joyce, Bakhtin, and Postcolonial Modernism

“Ireland is a First World country, but with a Third World memory” (3), with this statement Luke Gibbons begins his book-length study of transformations in Irish culture. Investigating the paradoxical position of Ireland as the influx of complex intersections between center and periphery, imperial force and colonial impact, and high and popular cultures, Gibbons urges a rethinking of key issues such as tradition and modernity, race, and gender—issues bearing on an understanding of contemporary Ireland—for the purpose of working toward non-exclusive and open-ended forms of national identity which allow for a critical engagement with both past and present and open up new possibilities for the future. The all-inclusive and dynamic forms of national identity, with their potential construction of alternative futures, are essentially Joycean: they are what Joyce endeavors to blueprint for postcolonial Ireland when he incorporated into his text observations of and meditations upon the anticolonial turmoil during the revolutionary period of 1916 to 1922. Bakhtin is of great help here, not only because his theories serve especially well to explain the meeting and intersection of social, political, and cultural forces in periods of transition, but also because his attempt to establish a “historical poetics,” based on the notion of the utterance as the medium of dialogue inflected by historicity, helps both to explore discourse as social/individual ideology constituting the text and to interpret the dialogic interaction between sociohistorical forces and textual representation. As Bakhtin articulates, “A particular language in the novel is always a particular way of viewing the world, one that strives for a social significance. It is precisely as ideologemes that discourse becomes the object of representation in the novel” (*DI* 333). From this point, the Joycean interior monologue *is* Bakhtinian dialogism: the speaking person as ideologue acts as, as it were, the contact zone where social discourses meet, interact, and undergo reaccentuation, and the “monologue,” or ideologemes, epitomizes the dialogizing process and the individual’s response to assimilated discourses, ideologically transformed and textually represented, so as to

resist the collectivization imposed by social discourse, or to turn authoritative discourse into internally persuasive discourse, in Bakhtinian terminology—but not to resort to the measure of extreme individualism. Joyce’s imagined Irish couple, Bloom and Molly, are such idea-system-carrying ideologues, who participate in the centripetal force of the social status quo, but try to find a way out of social and discursive absolutism embraced by both imperialists and nationalists. Their monologues, a dialogic product of the weaving and unweaving of public discourse, result from the interaction between social forces and individual reaccentuation. This interaction aims to negotiate between sociality and individuality, egomania and alterity, centripetal force and centrifugal force—a modernist issue of concern both to Joyce and to Bakhtin. Bakhtin’s dialogism, on the other hand, is Joycean, whether in terms of his emphasis on positive construction rather than negative destruction, on productive communication rather than noxious antagonism, or on potential openendedness rather than finalized closure. A Bakhtinian reading of Joyce, therefore, demonstrates a two-way dialogue between the Russian thinker and the Irish novelist, a dialogue of interillumination and mutual enrichment casting light on the invention of a postcolonial Ireland.

From the Bakhtinian concept of the chronotope, the first chapter dealt with Stephen’s attempt to construct an alternative version of postcolonial Irish history. By recalling and reaccentuating the authoritative discourses of May Dedalus, Garrett Deasy, and literary predecessors like Blake and Shakespeare, Stephen chronotopically encounters the nightmarish impact of the past, textually transforms its implications, and tentatively creates a new version of history which transgresses boundaries between historical material and artistic creation, between private memory and cultural history. This history differs radically from the contemporary colonial history of patriarchal rule, misogynistic ideas, and racial discrimination that typify imperial ideology, and from the epic history of “peak times,” of the “absolute,” “sacred,” “valorized” past (*DI* 15) worshipped by revivalists. As the accumulation and reorganization of chronotopic encounters and reaccentuations, Stephen’s “Parable of the Plums” and Shakespeare theory insinuate the paralysis of colonial/nationalist

history and the partiality of imperial/patriarchal history, and place emphasis on the chronotopic here and now in which drastic revision and reenactment of the past make alternative futures possible—which, however, depend on the connection Stephen makes with Bloom and Molly, a connection potentially leading him out of the dilemma of father's law and mother's love and inspiring the composition of a divergent postcolonial history of liberation.

This proposal of liberation, however, is suggested by Bloom, the sexual/racial outsider inside Dublin community. In the light of the notion of architectonics, the second chapter investigated the process of Bloom's mediation between such binary oppositions as inside and outside, private and public, Self and Other. This mediating process conduces to the construction of the architectonic self. Mobile and ongoing, Bloom's subjectivity is plural and hybrid in constitution, negotiating between private memories of Molly and public discourse manifested in songs of love and war, in order to form a new subject position which revises the Nietzschean solipsist and the sociopolitical mouthpiece. This new citizen subject participates in communal life but maintains individuality, as Bloom reflects upon public discourse and reaccentuates it with recollections of Molly when alone, and associates with personal images of Molly when confronting the collectivization exercised by songs. In this way, Bloom challenges the boundaries between private and public, Self and Other, and consequently undermines the confines of gender, domestic, and racial roles designated by patriarchy and the empire. As the Other excluded from urban territorialization of social order, Bloom overturns the social order discursively and spatially in his *flânerie* in Dublin, and thus redefines the postcolonial subject position as plural, mutable, and developing by constructing an architectonic self, in expectation of making himself a habitable home in hostile urban space.

The home Bloom desires is where Molly is. Throughout his eighteen-hour wandering, Bloom has wished that Molly could understand the reason of his absence from home that day. The third chapter therefore dealt with Molly's response to Bloom's proposal of liberation. In terms of the principal Bakhtinian concept of dialogue, this chapter investigated Molly as the superaddressee in Bloom's interior

monologues, which are essentially dialogues in triangular structures, and examined in detail Bloom's unstated questions for Molly and her unvoiced answers to him. A cuckold, Bloom experiences humiliation and distortion in the hallucinatory world of "Circe" and suffers from interrogation and hostility in the mechanically catechetical world of "Ithaca," but is saved in the sexual/textual body of Molly, which is a Bakhtinian grotesque body, incorporative and regenerative. By weaving and unweaving incorporated materials such as the Boer War and the New Woman, Molly echoes Bloom's advocacy of pacifism and sexual freedom, and in the process of textualization eventually rejects Boylan the reproducer of imperial domination and affirms Bloom the cosmopolitan liberator. Through dialogue, Molly unites Stephen and Bloom in her sexual/textual body, and ratifies the triangular family of freedom proposed by Bloom, a proposal which may ultimately lead up to the genuine liberation of postcolonial Ireland, ideologically, sociohistorically, and nationally.

The reason that Joyce and Bakhtin illuminate and enrich each other may partly derive from the similarity of the shaping of their careers: like the nomadic Bloom, both Joyce and Bakhtin underwent numerous migrations and created their works in acts of nomadism. Migrancy, for one thing, literally transgresses boundaries between, say, languages, cultures, societies, and nationalities. As Iain Chambers points out, the migratory act implies a new sense of home, of "being in the world":

It means to conceive of dwelling as a mobile habitat, as a mode of inhabiting time and space not as though they were fixed and closed structures, but as providing the critical provocation of an opening whose questioning presence reverberates in the movement of the languages that constitute our sense of identity, place and belonging. (4)

Migrancy, in short, "calls for a dwelling in language [*sic*], in histories, in identities that are constantly subject to mutation" (Chambers 5). This new concept of home inevitably leads to a new sense of subject position which threatens the immutability and closure demanded by the nation state. As linguistic, cultural, and political boundaries are transgressed in the migratory act, the migrant stands in an ambiguous position of alterity between inside and outside: s/he is a stranger both inside and



outside frames of languages, histories, and identities, potentially blurring and destabilizing binary classification as such. To make him/herself at home, Chambers argues, the stranger needs to negotiate between “a scattered historical inheritance and a heterogeneous present” (6)—an argument similar to Salman Rushdie’s. Himself a migrant, Rushdie declares his unwillingness to be excluded from either the heritage of his roots or the culture of immigrant society, and suggests that the displaced writer’s identity be “at once plural and partial” on an ambiguous and shifting ground of alterity. This ambiguity, however, benefits literary creation, as distance or “long geographical perspective” provides new angles for the author to enter reality (15). To put it slightly differently, this ambiguity enables the writer as stranger to observe objectively from the outside and to construct inside the boundaries of linguistic, social, and cultural frames, producing something new beyond the binary classification of inside-outside. Bloom’s nomadism and Molly’s migration, in this light, could be seen as an act which simultaneously deconstructs the binary colonial structure of Self-Other characteristic of metropolitan Dublin in 1904 and constructs a plural postcolonial structure of heterogeneity befitting to cosmopolitan Dublin yet to be created, as Rushdie, Joyce, and Bakhtin try to reconstruct a new concept of home in migrancy by leveling down the boundaries between home and the world.

Ever since his self-exile from Ireland in 1904, Joyce had wandered around European cities. Dublin may be the setting of *Ulysses*, but the corpus was composed in Trieste, Zurich, and Paris, as though it were a text dialogizing Ireland and Europe, a text both inside and outside the frame of colonial Dublin. Bakhtin, on the other hand, was not an international migrant. And yet, living in multicultural Russia before, during, and after the revolutionary period, Bakhtin was familiar with nomadism and exile. The places where he had stayed, in fact, are comparable to the cities Joyce had passed through. Despite his critique of the traditional travel novel, including the picaresque novel, as lacking the emergence and development of the protagonist, Bakhtin sees this genre as useful in describing the social diversity of the world and exploring “the entire existing social structure” (*SG* 10-11, *DI* 165). As the convergent center where social forces intersect and interact, the city serves as an ideal setting for the description and

exposure of social diversity. If, as Rushdie suggests, to redescribe a world is the necessary first step toward changing it (14)—a lifelong task Joyce takes on—to experience different social realities and observe diverse cultural contexts, then, is the indispensable initial step toward perceiving the world and redescribing it with penetration. Joyce's and Bakhtin's nomadic experiences enable them to gain insight into the world from different perspectives, so as to rethink and reconstruct the world with innovative vision, whether the world be postcolonial Ireland or postrevolutionary Russia.

Migrancy and exile, so to speak, associate Joyce with Bakhtin, whose nomadic life parallels Joyce's to a considerable degree. While Joyce's hometown, Dublin, was a colonial city in which diverse sociopolitical forces converged, Bakhtin spent his late childhood and most of his adolescence in Vilnius and Odessa, both with a large Jewish population. Vilnius, where Bakhtin stayed from nine to fifteen, bore a remarkable resemblance to Dublin: capital of Lithuania, it was then a colonial city of Russia, having undergone colonial control by various rulers during the course of its history, thus "a living museum of contrasting cultures and periods" with "the colorful mix of languages, classes, and ethnic groups," and accordingly "a realized example of heteroglossia" (Clark and Holquist 21-22).

When his university education came to an end, Bakhtin moved to Nevel and then Vitebsk, both essentially Jewish towns. It was in these towns where Bakhtin participated in numerous group discussions and accomplished his major work on aesthetics and subjectivity. Also importantly, Bakhtin met Maria Veniaminovna Yudina in Nevel. Daughter of a Jewish doctor, Yudina was close to Bakhtin and frequently engaged in philosophical discussions with him. When he was arrested a decade later, she "used every contact she could muster" to campaign for Bakhtin's release (Clark and Holquist 40-41, 142-43). It is not clear how much Yudina contributed to Bakhtin's works, but it is presumable that Bakhtin would not welcome the idea of anti-Semitism on account of his affinity with the Jews. While Bakhtin passed through his first productive period, resulting from literal dialogue, in Nevel and Vitebsk, Joyce began the composition of his novelized epic of modern cultures in

Trieste, a city, like Dublin, under foreign domination and in pursuit of Irredentist movement. Trieste is important to Joyce, not only because it is there that he started writing *Ulysses*, but also because he met Teodoro Mayer, son of a Hungarian Jew, leader of Italian nationalism, and founder of the Italian newspaper *Il Piccolo della Sera* where Joyce published his articles on British imperial rule of Ireland. The encounter with Teodoro Mayer helped the formation of Joyce's protagonist, also son of a Hungarian Jew engaged in the newspaper business and enthusiastic about the independence movement. In writing Dublin, Joyce was also writing Trieste, in terms of his weaving Trieste experience into the texture of Dublin—similar to Bakhtin's converting discussions (life) into theories (work).

In Zurich, an international city with a history of harboring political exiles such as Lenin and artists like Tristan Tzara and Romain Rolland, Joyce absorbed the cosmopolitan atmosphere of the city, spent the War years, and accomplished most of *Ulysses*, which significantly betrays images of war and the concept of cosmopolitanism. This stay in Zurich corresponds to Bakhtin's Leningrad period when his theories achieved maturity. In Leningrad, a metropolis where new trends of thoughts encountered each other, Bakhtin again participated in group discussions, mediating between Marxism and Freudianism to form his own dialogism. Noticeably, the previous Russian capital played another important role in the shaping of Bakhtin's career: before the Nevel-Vitebsk period, he attended Petrograd University and took part in the Petersburg Religious-Philosophical Society, which aimed at "liberating the Jews and non-Orthodox Christians from religious persecution" (Clark and Holquist 29). It is clear that early on—approximately at Stephen's age in 1904—Bakhtin had been fascinated by the idea of liberation.

But this involvement in religious liberation caused trouble to Bakhtin more than ten years later when authoritarianism began to take shape once again, eliminating different voices and encroaching upon individual freedom: he was arrested and exiled to Kustanai, an agricultural center where he witnessed both agricultural and ethnic collectivization. After the exile, Bakhtin stayed at Saransk and Savelovo, where he spent the years of the Great Purge and most of the rest of his life. During this eventful

and turbulent period of arrest, exile, and Purge, Bakhtin reached another climax of his writing career: he developed his theories of the novel and the carnival, cloaked under which were his reflections upon the issue of the nation state in relation to the individual. As Bakhtin contemplated new concepts of home and national identity in remote Kustanai and Saransk, Joyce had migrated to Paris, an imperial metropolis unusually allowing for the coexistence and interaction of diverse voices, whose interillumination made the world city “the hub and the spokes of the literary universe” (Anderson 98). In this panoramic hub, Joyce finished and published his text of neo-nationalism, composed his book of world history, and spent most of his late years.

Both Joyce and Bakhtin, in short, are great nomads, who wander among cities and towns, engage themselves in social heterogeneity, turn observations and meditations into literary or theoretical work, and attempt to develop a new sense of home in migrancy which undermines boundaries and to work out a new form of nation which welcomes the polyphonic orchestration of heteroglossia. In a word, they both endeavor to turn domineering monologism into open-minded dialogism, literarily, sociopolitically, and nationally. In their biography of Bakhtin, Clark and Holquist describe the thinker as a lover of Russian tradition but with “a broad, pan-European perspective” and as a man with “tolerant,” “ecumenical,” and “internationalist” spirit (30, 33). This description applies well to Bloom, if not Joyce.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, the following description is suitable for both Bakhtin and Bloom: “His ability to survive was due in part to his equanimity, his sense of humor, and his capacity for accepting gracefully any interlocutor” (Clark and Holquist 254). Bakhtin, so to speak, is Bloomian: the word “equanimity” is attributed in “Ithaca” to the humorous Bloom who accepts Molly’s adultery. Bloom, on the other hand, is Bakhtinian, as demonstrated in his fascination with the human body and the ideas of human contact and liberation.

Similar to Joyce in his nomadic experience, affinity with the Jews, and concepts of individual and national identities, Bakhtin helps to shed light on interpretations of

---

<sup>1</sup> Personally, Joyce is not as “tolerant” as his protagonist. A well-known fact is that he “revenge” himself on those who irritate him by assigning their names to “bad guys” in his text. E.g., Private Carr in “Circe.” See Gifford, p. 453; and Ellmann, *James Joyce*, pp. 426-29, 440-59.

*Ulysses*. Booker argues that reading Joyce through Bakhtin suggests Joyce's attempt to undermine authority, whether literary, political, or cultural, and its hold on the present of Ireland (1997, 13). The issue of authority, indeed, is a major concern in the development of Bakhtin's theories: throughout his career, Bakhtin seeks to challenge any authority which advocates absolutism and centralization. His rejection of the epic as a "completed" and "antiquated" genre with "its own canon" and "a hardened and no longer flexible skeleton" (*DI* 3), his approval of the carnival in which the hierarchy of power is turned upside down and inside out, and his preference for the Rabelaisian grotesque body which is open to other bodies and the outer world: all these speak for Bakhtin's intent to decentralize absolute authority. From personal experience—from the persecution he and his circle suffered during the turbulent period of revolutions and purge—Bakhtin is aware of the danger, violence, and inhumanity of monologic authoritarianism, and therefore strives to counter it by inviting the Other into the game and accentuating the significance of alterity, not in order to reestablish the Other as a new authority, but in order to triangulate the binary structure of Self-Other, in an attempt to engender a new possibility beyond imperialistic domination and slavish subjection. To use his own terminology, we may state that Bakhtin strives to replace monologue with dialogue, monoglossia with heteroglossia, so as to transform domination and subjection into polyphonic orchestration of diversity. As Bakhtin indicates, "It is necessary that heteroglossia wash over a culture's awareness of itself and its language, penetrate to its core, relativize the primary language system underlying its ideology and literature and deprive it of its naïve absence of conflict" (*DI* 368). Conflict for Bakhtin does not refer to destructive antagonism, but to creative potential for new possibilities. To read *Ulysses* in this light, it seems proper to argue that Joyce is aware of the danger of ideological absolutism and centralization, as illustrated by the hostility Bloom, the Other, experiences from the Cyclopean Citizen and other single-minded Dubliners, and hence tries to find a way out of the vicious binary opposition by triangulating its structure and undermining the boundaries.

The reason for Bakhtin's insistence on dialogue and heteroglossia resides in his attention to the idea of contact. His preference for the novel as a genre stems from the

novel's affinity with contemporary reality: "From the very beginning the novel was structured not in the distanced image of the absolute past but in the zone of *direct contact* with inconclusive present-day reality. At its core lay personal experience and free creative imagination" (*DI* 39, emphases added). To put it another way, the superiority of the novel as a genre lies in its capacity to appropriate contemporary social phenomena, mediating between immediate reality and creative imagination. But the idea of contact is not limited to the interaction of social reality with the text: Bakhtin emphasizes communication between individuals, societies, and cultures, and objects to physical, political, social, and cultural closures. Bakhtin remarks on the significance of human contact: "The very being of man (both external and internal) is the *deepest communication*. *To be* means *to communicate*. Absolute death (non-being) is the state of being unheard, unrecognized, unremembered. . . . To be means to be for another, and through the other, for oneself" (*PDP* 287). This encounter with the other is a continuously open-ended relationship, which, instead of trying to incorporate the other into one's own territory, refuses to swallow up the other and repudiates the idea of self-sufficient closure. The unions of Stephen and Bloom and of Bloom and Molly reveal Joyce's similar concern with this communication, which potentially leads to understanding, acceptance, and regeneration. Also importantly, this communication extends to that between individual and public, through the medium of language. As Barry A. Brown et al. put it, "Bakhtin is helpful when considering how a single speech act is not a product of a single individual, but rather comes from and responds to the language of a community" (18). Discursive communication, in this sense, is not only a relation to other individuals, but also a relation to the public as collective self, which may not welcome the communicative attempt of a challenging individual. To maintain communication with the public but refuse its collectivization, or to find the balance between individuality and collectivity, becomes a crucial issue for Bakhtin—as well as modernist writers such as Joyce. Throughout *Ulysses*, Bloom has tried to communicate with other Dubliners who represent the community, whose refusal to be engaged in dialogic contact bespeaks a state of absolute death, as Bakhtin calls it.

Bakhtin's focuses on decentralization and human contact and critique of closure therefore point to his political orientation as cosmopolitan. Some critics have registered that Bakhtin's theories of the novel are implicit theories of nationalism: his refutation of stylistic closure and approval of polyphonic orchestration in the novel insinuate his idea of the ideological and sociopolitical decentralization of the nation. From the disintegration of "a single national language," Bakhtin describes the rise of the novel:

The novel is the expression of a Galilean perception of language, one that denies the absolutism of a single and unitary language—that is, that refuses to acknowledge its own language as the sole verbal and semantic center of the ideological world. It is a perception that has been made conscious of the vast plenitude of national and, more to the point, social languages—all of which are equally capable of being "languages of truth," but, since such is the case, all of which are equally relative, reified and limited . . . The novel begins by presuming a verbal and semantic decentering of the ideological world, a certain linguistic homelessness of literary consciousness, which no longer possesses a sacrosanct and unitary linguistic medium for containing ideological thought . . . (*DI* 366-67)

For Bakhtin, the historical rise of the novel corresponds to the disintegration of cultural and political centralization, involved in "a radical revolution in the destinies of human discourse: the fundamental liberation of cultural-semantic and emotional intentions from the hegemony of a single and unitary language" (*DI* 367). In other words, the linguistic decentering of the unitary political entity contributes to the development of the novel, whose refusal to assume ascendancy correlates to the disunification of sociohistorical contexts and enables the genre to be accommodated to heteroglot voices emerging when a single national language ceases to prevail. Bakhtin's account of the origin of the novel, Galin Tihanov comments, "rests on the supposition that its rise was facilitated by the transcendence of a narrow national tradition," and therefore acts as "a tacit response to the preoccupations with center and periphery, with cultural domination and subjection" that characterize imperialism and

petty nationalism (56, 62). The insistence on the polyphony of heteroglot coexistence hence implies an emphasis on cosmopolitan interaction. Tihanov observes that Bakhtin, disapproving “narrow nationalistic values” and promoting “cosmopolitan dialogue between cultures,” expresses in his essays on the novel the “ideal state of dialogue and cosmopolitan exchange,” and uses the concept of the chronotope to “address the problems of the growth of human consciousness beyond national constraints” (55, 62). Bakhtin does not specify that the chronotope *is* related to the growth of human consciousness or national identity; nevertheless, he does highlight the encounter of chronotopes, the dialogical encounter of diverse time-spaces and consciousnesses. As Tihanov concludes his argument: “Bakhtin’s implicit theory of nationalism privileges an imagined freedom of cross-cultural contacts over the narrow existence of insulated national traditions” (63). Bakhtinian nationalism, in this regard, is internationalist in nature, based on his theorization of the origin of the novel and his rethinking of the novelistic discourse in relation to the individual and community.

For Bakhtin, national construction is analogous to narrative creation: stylistic/cultural diversity excels monopoly, and discursive/social interaction surpasses oppression. Robert Bennett contends that the approach of Bakhtin’s dialogical theory of the novel “reconceptualizes national identity as a narrative construction rather than a natural essence”—in the sense that national identity is mobile and constructable, not inherent and immutable—and that the approach “simultaneously redefines the nature of both nations and novelistic discourse as transnational, pluralistic, fragmentary, and historical rather than nationalistic, monological, unitary, and atemporal” (177). To read Joyce’s text in this light, its multiple styles and perspectives indicate not simply a display of techniques, but an ethical insistence on the cosmopolitan interaction of languages, peoples, and cultures. Both Joyce and Bakhtin, we may argue, attempt to achieve cosmopolitan interaction between Ireland/Russia and the world through discursive and stylistic interaction in the novel, the most suitable genre, to Bakhtin’s mind, to reflect the heteroglot composition of the modern nation, in expectation that the presentation of textual heteroglossia will lead to the recognition of national heteroglossia.



In his interpretation of Dostoevsky's heroes, Bakhtin suggests the possibility of an open-ended "truth" provided by the text as a unity, one that consists not of a single consciousness but of plural consciousnesses:

It is quite possible to imagine and postulate a unified truth that requires a plurality of consciousnesses, one that cannot in principle be fitted into the bounds of a single consciousness, one that is, so to speak, by its very nature *full of event potential* and is born at a point of contact among various consciousnesses. (*PDP* 81)

If we replace "truth" with "nation," it is likewise possible to imagine a national identity that necessitates a diversity of voices, which together constitute and enrich the nation and whose interillumination opens the door to an unfinalized and potential future. Such a cosmopolitan nation, a state of diversity-in-unity or union-of-diversity, appeals to Joyce and Bakhtin, who may both seem politically radical, but neither appreciates the idea of anarchism.<sup>2</sup> Despite his accentuation of diversity, Bakhtin does not discard the idea of unity or union altogether, as Joyce does not dismiss the idea of nation: Bakhtin admits the presence of "an abstractly unitary national language," within which "[a]ctual social life and historical becoming" create "a multitude of concrete worlds" and "verbal-ideological and social belief systems" (*DI* 288). For Joyce and Bakhtin, the status of unity—whether textual or national—is unavoidable, as Joyce unites heteroglot voices to form his text, and Bloom regards Ireland as his nation. What is important is that the unity does not expel diversity from it, as the epic ignores contemporary social heterogeneity and authoritative discourse denies differences. As the centripetal force coexists with the centrifugal force, diversity had in effect existed in Ireland and Russia when Joyce composed his novels and Bakhtin developed his theories. The problem is that the hegemony of centralization—in Joyce's case, imperialists and nationalists, in Bakhtin's, the authoritarian government—refuses to recognize and accept the coexistence of differences, but tries instead to eliminate differences and create a unity-in-singularity, which leads to

---

<sup>2</sup> For Joyce's and Bakhtin's disapproving attitudes toward anarchism, see Booker, *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition*, p. 13.

sociohistorical nightmares in colonial and postcolonial Ireland and in postrevolutionary Russia. Conscious of the danger, Joyce, by means of stylistic and discursive diversity, delineates the adulterant reality of postcolonial history, the hybrid nature of postcolonial subjectivity, and the heteroglot character of the postcolonial nation, and meanwhile depicts the outcome of refusal to recognize and accept them: hostility, hatred, and violence, as witness the “Cyclops” episode.

Examining transformations in Irish culture, Gibbons declares that “modernization is not solely an external force, but also requires the active transformation of a culture from within, a capacity to engage critically with its own past” (3). This “past” refers to the colonial past, which, like the ghost of May Dedalus, keeps haunting the living. It is impossible to root out the past as such, but, as Bakhtin would suggest, the impact or residue of the past could be reaccentuated and transformed into something productive which does not hinder the present. To construct a profitable history leading up to an alternative future and not to be trapped in the nightmarish history confined within the parameters of a dead past necessitates the conjuring up of the past chronotope into the present time-space, where the past is reenacted but perceived from new perspectives and endowed with new meanings, both discursively and ideologically. Stephen’s attempt to write a divergent version of history which negotiates between past and present and points to an alternative future could therefore be seen as a gesture of Bakhtinian dialogue, which is essentially triangular in structure. Chronotopic encounters, after all, are dialogical in a trinary sense, where past and present overlap to bring out the future. Significantly, colonial history is inseparable from binary thinking. As Gibbons goes on his argument: “both the strengths and weaknesses of Irish culture derive from its confounding of such neat polarities” as “periphery and centre, the country and the city, tradition and modernity” (3). Gibbons is right that binary thinking and the confounding of it can be either strength or weakness: when polarities are dialogized and transformed into something new and constructive, they become productive, but when they are internalized and reproduced according to imperial models, they become symptomatic. Rather than enhancing the bifurcation of binary classification, Bakhtin strives to turn hostile binary opposition into harmonic

creative power that negotiates polarities in a triangular structure, which blurs, if not eliminates, boundaries between binaries. Bloom's subject position, we may assume, results from the negotiations of polarities such as Self and Other, inside and outside, private and public, and, in a peculiar sense, home and the world. This subject position assimilates each polarity of the dichotomy but differs from both: it emerges as a new concept of subjectivity which goes beyond and triangulates binary structures. Written when Ireland was struggling for Home Rule and freedom, *Ulysses* refutes the narrow conception of a pure Ireland and welcomes the idea of cosmopolitan interaction. Gibbons has it that "it is often the integration of Ireland into the new international order which activates some of the most conservative forces in Irish society" (3). As they both witnessed the dangerous outcomes of petty nationalism, which advocates political and cultural closure, Joyce and Bakhtin favor cosmopolitanism or internationalism, rooted in nationalism yet more open-minded in spirit and more comprehensive in capacity. A nomad herself, Molly exemplifies resistance to closure, from physical to nationalistic and sociocultural, who transgresses boundaries and deconstructs frames with/within her sexual/textual body. The Joycean text, in brief, conveys in the Bakhtinian sense the importance of engagement with the past to transform its nightmarish impact into creative power for the composition of a postcolonial history, the significance of incorporating and negotiating dichotomies in a triangular structure and recognizing their coexistence for the constitution of a postcolonial subjectivity, and the consequence of integrating nationalist projects with cosmopolitan dimensions for the construction of a postcolonial nation.

As the work was published in the year when Ireland gained political independence, *Ulysses* is anything but limited to literary concerns. To read the Joycean text from the Bakhtinian approach shatters the traditional view of Joyce as high modernist focusing only on aesthetic problems and paying no attention to the sociopolitical status quo—a dominant view since the prevalence of New Criticism. Booker points out that Bakhtin helps to refigure modernism: Bakhtinian readings of Joyce suggest a Joyce whose texts are "politically committed, historically engaged, and socially relevant," a Joyce whose work "differs radically from conventional

notions of modernist literature as culturally elitist, historically detached, and more interested in individual psychology than in social reality” (1997, 16). To put it slightly differently, Bakhtinian Joyce is a negotiator between individual psychology and social reality, between aesthetic matters and sociohistorical concerns, who weaves into his text elements of both sides, and transforms clear-cut dichotomy into textual diversity-in-unity, a third presence beyond dualism. Both Bakhtin and Joyce, indeed, are concerned about human subjects in relation to society. If, as Childs remarks, to celebrate human dignity was impossible after the First World War (20), it becomes even more important—and helpful—to rethink the issues of alterity and dialogism, emphasized by Bakhtin in his theories and illustrated by Joyce in his novel.

Bakhtinian concepts shed light on the Joycean text; the Joycean text, on the other hand, enriches Bakhtinian theories. To say the least, *Ulysses* demonstrates concretely that Bakhtin’s theories can be applied to the reconsideration of postcolonial history, subjectivity, and national identity. Joyce’s ability to weave social reality into aesthetic forms also embodies Bakhtin’s comparable concerns with aesthetic problems and ethical issues. *Ulysses*, as it were, puts Bakhtinian ideas into practice. But in enacting Bakhtin’s theories, *Ulysses* discloses their insufficiency and complements them. However ideologically radical, Bakhtin’s theories are hypothetical, anticipating innovation but not offering any specific blueprint for the transformation of the sociopolitical status quo. The Joycean text, however, provides in detail that blueprint, which advocates a radical and potential change by proposing a new family unit for the postcolonial new nation in the process of becoming. This triangular family unit consists of members who transgress boundaries of genders, races, and cultures, and turns the colonial relationship of domination and subjection into postcolonial polyphonic orchestration of heteroglossia. Gibbons argues that cultural identity is negotiated and transformed by its representations, and insists that “the transformative capacity of culture” can “give rise to what was not [in society] before” (10, 8). *Ulysses* could be seen as such a cultural representation, which attempts radically and practically to transform culture and society in the act of redescribing them—as

redescribing a world is the necessary first step toward changing it, according to Rushdie (14).

With regard to the concept of the chronotope, Joyce may help out what Bakhtin leaves unsaid. Tihanov comments that Bakhtin “dwells so lovingly on [Rabelais’s] prose” because “he sees in him the author who restores the folkloric chronotope and reinstates the condition of intimate overlap between public and private, nature and culture” (62). In spite of his undeniable idealization of the Rabelaisian world,<sup>3</sup> it would be an overstatement to indicate that Bakhtin aims to restore the folkloric chronotope, which, after all, is irrestorable in modernity. Rabelais fascinates Bakhtin not because of his actual restoration of the folkloric chronotope, but because of his textual representation of the spirit of the folkloric chronotope, which focuses on close relation to the land, the contact of human bodies, the interaction of individual and community, and, above all, the carnivalesque spirit of laughter, decrowning, and regeneration. What is important, consequently, is not the restoration of the folkloric chronotope itself, but the recovery of its communicative, decentralizing, and regenerative spirit. And yet rethinking the concept of the chronotope through *Ulysses* points to another even more important aspect of the chronotope Bakhtin fails to specify: the chronotope of the past needs to be reenacted in the present time-space, in which the present reinterprets the past and the past enlightens the present. In a letter to Carlo Linati, Joyce asserts that a purpose of writing *Ulysses* is “to render the myth *sub specie temporis nostri*” (SL 271)—to bring the myth of the past to the present time-space and confront it with contemporary circumstances. In *Ulysses*, the reenactment of chronotopes is a frequent occurrence: Stephen’s reimagining of the historical past and giving it new meanings in “Proteus,” Bloom’s chronotopic conjuring up of Molly to avoid the trap of collectivization imposed by songs of love and war in “Sirens,” and Molly’s recalling of the Howth Hill chronotope which leads to her final reaffirmation of Bloom in “Penelope.” These instances evince the indispensable significance of chronotopic reenactments in Joyce’s text: that the chronotope, in terms of its capacity

---

<sup>3</sup> It has been a critical commonplace that Bakhtin idealizes the folkloric. For the argument, see, for example, Clark and Holquist, pp. 310-11.

for revising the past, may strategically stimulate ideological and sociohistorical transformation. These instances from the Joycean text also exemplify the variety of chronotopic reenactments, enlarging the scope of the Bakhtinian concept.

Also importantly, *Ulysses* brings out the third party implicit in Bakhtin's theories. Notwithstanding his suggestion of the ever-presence of a third party in dialogue, the superaddressee, Bakhtin never articulates or elaborates on this notion. Joyce, however, actively and practically inserts a third member into his new triangular family unit, extending dialogue into triologue. Bakhtin may object to binary opposition and try to enact dialogue in a triangular structure; and yet to some extent "dialogue" is binary, in the sense that only two members occupy the stage, the third being the mediative power, process, or outcome. But with the invitation of a third party into the dialogue, binary turns into plural—the real embodiment of heteroglossia. Whatever the superaddressee may be, in Joyce's text it is no longer an invisible and silent ever-presence, but a living third member actually participating in the formation of a new family unit and, by extension, in the construction of a new nation, whether this third party be Stephen, Bloom, Molly, or a third power beyond Britain and Ireland.

Joyce and Bakhtin, to conclude, illuminate and enrich each other; just as they could also be connected by their common interest in and critique of socialism and psychoanalysis. It has been a critical controversy whether Bakhtin should be labeled as a Marxist or not. Nevertheless, it is certain that Bakhtin was immersed in Marxist thought, and actively took part in debates on the subject with his Leningrad circle. Published under the name of V. N. Volosinov, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* focuses on the issue of language usually ignored by Marxist criticism, tries to divert critical attention from commodity and materialism to human life and human consciousness, from the hostility of endless class conflict to the creative power of dialogism, and in the meantime criticizes Saussure's asocial simplification of discourse into clear-cut signifier/signified. Whoever wrote the book, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* is Bakhtinian in essence, in terms of its concerns with the human subject, dialogue, and sociality-oriented discourse. The book may be written from the Marxist point of view, and yet it revises orthodox Marxism into Bakhtinian

dialogism. Also written from the Marxist viewpoint and published under the name of Volosinov, *Freudianism: A Critical Sketch* deals with the relationship between language, human consciousness, and social reality. As the author contends, Freud is correct in his awareness of the conflict between the “official” discourse of the conscious and the “unofficial” discourse of the subconscious, but incorrect when he attributes the constitution of human consciousness to the psychic, and in so doing ignores the significance of social reality in subjectivity-construction. The book, it could be said, results from negotiating between Marxism and Freudianism: it enlarges Freud’s focus on individual psychology into broader social concerns and casts Marx’s theory with psychoanalytical insight. Similar to Bakhtin and his circle, Joyce pays much attention to socialism and psychoanalysis: he claims to be a socialist, and is familiar with Freud’s theory. As demonstrated in *Ulysses*, Stephen’s Shakespeare theory is basically psychoanalytical, and Bloom’s reformist ideas tend toward socialism. But Joycean socialism and psychoanalysis, as in the case of Bakhtinian Marxism and Freudianism, have been revised radically: comparable to Bakhtin, Joyce endeavors to turn social struggle and conflict into dialogue and construction, and to add sociohistorical aspect to psychosexual analysis. Referring to Fredric Jameson, Gibbons speaks of Joyce’s ability to place individuals in a network of social and historical interactions: “Everything seemingly material and solid in Dublin life itself can presumably be dissolved back into the underlying reality of human relations and human praxis” (161). To read *Ulysses* in this respect, the text serves as an example of the dialogue between the social and the psychoanalytic, the former dealing with material and solid social reality, the latter with human relations and human praxis, particularly the work of the individual psychic. It would be a stimulating and fruitful enterprise to deeply and thoroughly explore the dialogue between Joyce, Bakhtin, Marx, and Freud—a task beyond the scope of the present research due to its postcolonial modernist focus, as well as its limited length.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources:

- Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Eds. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Austin: U of Texas P, 1990.
- . *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- . *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- . *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Joyce, James. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*. Eds. Ellsworth Mason and Richard Ellmann. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1959.
- . *Dubliners: Text, Criticism, and Notes*. Eds. Robert Scholes and A. Walton Litz. New York: Penguin, 1996.
- . *Poems and Exiles*. Ed. J. C. C. Mays. London: Penguin, 1992.
- . *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man: Text, Criticism and Notes*. Ed. Chester G. Anderson. New York: Viking, 1968.
- . *Selected Letters of James Joyce*. Ed. Richard Ellmann. London: Faber and Faber, 1975.
- . *Ulysses: The Corrected Text*. Eds. Hans Walter Gabler, Wolfhard Steppe, and Claus Melchior. New York: Vintage, 1986.
- Voloshinov, V. N. *Freudianism: A Critical Sketch*. Trans. I. R. Titunik. Eds. I. R. Titunik and Neal H. Bruss. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.
- . *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Trans. Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986.

### Secondary Sources:

- Abels, Jules. *The Parnell Tragedy*. London: Bodley Head, 1966.
- Anderson, Chester G. *James Joyce*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1967.



- Arendt, Hannah. Introduction. *Illuminations*. By Walter Benjamin. Trans. Harry Zohn. Ed. Hannah Arendt. London: Fontana, 1992. 7-58.
- Arnold, Matthew. "On the Study of Celtic Literature." *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*. Vol. 3. Ed. R. H. Super. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1962. 291-396.
- Barker, Francis. *The Culture of Violence: Tragedy and History*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993.
- Bazargan, Susan. "Mapping Gibraltar: Colonialism, Time, and Narrative in 'Penelope.'" Pearce 119-38.
- Begnal, Michael H. "James Joyce and the Mythologizing of History." *Directions in Literary Criticism: Contemporary Approaches to Literature*. Eds. Stanley Weintraub and Philip Young. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1973. 211-19.
- Bell, Michael. "The Metaphysics of Modernism." Michael Levenson 9-32.
- Bell, Michael Mayerfeld, and Michael Gardiner, eds. *Bakhtin and the Human Sciences*. London: Sage, 1998.
- Benjamin, Walter. *Charles Baudelaire: A Lyric Poet in the Era of High Capitalism*. Trans. Harry Zohn. London: Verso, 1983.
- . *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. Ed. Hannah Arendt. London: Fontana, 1992.
- Bennett, Robert. "National Allegory or Carnavalesque Heteroglossia? *Midnight's Children's* Narration of Indian National Identity." Brown et al. 177-94.
- Blake, William. *The Complete Writings of William Blake*. Ed. Geoffrey Keynes. London: Oxford UP, 1966.
- Bloom, Harold. *Yeats*. New York: Oxford UP, 1970.
- Booker, M. Keith. "Decolonizing Literature: *Ulysses* and the Postcolonial Novel in English." *Pedagogy, Praxis, Ulysses: Using Joyce's Text to Transform the Classroom*. Ed. Robert Newman. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1996. 135-51.
- . *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition: Toward a Comparative Cultural Poetics*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997.

- . *Ulysses, Capitalism, and Colonialism: Reading Joyce after the Cold War*. Westport: Greenwood, 2000.
- Boone, Joseph Allen. "A New Approach to Bloom as New 'Womanly Man': The Mixed Middling's Progress in *Ulysses*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 20.1 (1982): 67-85.
- Booth, Howard J., and Nigel Rigby. Introduction. Booth and Rigby 1-12.  
---, eds. *Modernism and Empire*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.
- Bowen, Zack. *Bloom's Old Sweet Song: Essays on Joyce and Music*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1995.
- . *Musical Allusions in the Works of James Joyce: Early Poetry through Ulysses*. Albany: State U of New York P, 1975.
- . "Ulysses." *A Companion to Joyce Studies*. Eds. Zack Bowen and James F. Carens. Westport: Greenwood, 1984. 421-557.
- Brown, Barry A., et al. "Introduction: Bakhtin and the Nation." Brown et al. 11-27.  
---, eds. *Bakhtin and the Nation*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2000.
- Brown, Dennis. *The Modernist Self in Twentieth-Century English Literature: A Study in Self-Fragmentation*. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Brown, Richard. *James Joyce and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.
- Budgen, Frank. *James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1960.
- Burton, Stacy. "Paradoxical Relations: Bakhtin and Modernism." *Modern Language Quarterly* 61.3 (2000): 519-43.
- Cairns, David, and Shaun Richards. *Writing Ireland: Colonialism, Nationalism and Culture*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1988.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *A Carlyle Reader: Selections from the Writings of Thomas Carlyle*. Ed. G. B. Tennyson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Chambers, Iain. *Migrancy, Culture, Identity*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Cheng, Vincent J. *Joyce, Race, and Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Cheng, Vincent J., and Timothy Martin, eds. *Joyce in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992

- Childs, Peter. *Modernism*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Clark, Katerina, and Michael Holquist. *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1984.
- Cocks, Geoffrey. "Contributions of Psychohistory to Understanding Politics." *Hermann* 139-66.
- Connolly, S. J., ed. *The Oxford Companion to Irish History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Connor, Steven. *James Joyce*. Plymouth: Northcote House, 1996.
- . "The Modern Auditory I." *Porter* 203-23.
- Coxhead, Elizabeth. *Daughters of Erin: Five Women of the Irish Renaissance*. Gerrards Cross: Colin Smythe, 1979.
- Coyle, John, ed. *James Joyce: Ulysses, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Icon Critical Studies*. Cambridge: Icon, 1997.
- Davison, Neil R. "'Cyclops,' Sinn Fein, and 'the Jew': An Historical Reconsideration." *Journal of Modern Literature* 19.2 (1995): 245-57.
- . *James Joyce, Ulysses, and the Construction of Jewish Identity: Culture, Biography, and "The Jew" in Modernist Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Deane, Seamus. "Joyce and Nationalism." *James Joyce: New Perspectives*. Ed. Colin MacCabe. Sussex: Harvester, 1982. 168-83.
- . "Joyce the Irishman." *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*. Ed. Derek Attridge. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. 31-53.
- Dentith, Simon. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Doody, Terrence, and Wesley Morris. "Language and Value, Freedom and the Family in *Ulysses*." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 15.3 (1982): 224-39.
- Doyle, Laura. "Races and Chains: The Sexuo-Racial Matrix in *Ulysses*." *Joyce: The Return of the Repressed*. Ed. Susan Stanford Friedman. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993. 149-89.
- Druff, James H., Jr. "History vs. the Word: The Metaphor of Childbirth in Stephen's Aesthetics." *James Joyce Quarterly* 19.3 (1982): 303-14.
- Duffy, Enda. *The Subaltern Ulysses*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994

- Edmond, Rod. "Home and Away: Degeneration in Imperialist and Modernist Discourse." Booth and Rigby 39-63.
- Eliot, T. S. *Selected Prose*. Ed. John Hayward. London: Penguin, 1953.
- Ellmann, Richard. *James Joyce*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.
- . *Ulysses on the Liffey*. London: Faber and Faber, 1972.
- Elster, Jon. *Political Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Epstein, E. L. "Nestor." Hart and Hayman 17-28.
- Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. "Narrative, Modernism, and the Crisis of Authority: A Bakhtinian Perspective." *Science in Context* 7.1 (1994): 143-58.
- Erdman, David V. *Blake, Prophet Against Empire: A Poet's Interpretation of the History of His Own Times*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1954.
- Fairhall, James. *James Joyce and the Question of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
- Ford, Jane. "Why Is Milly in Mullingar?" *James Joyce Quarterly* 14.4 (1977): 436-49.
- Froula, Christine. *Modernism's Body: Sex, Culture, and Joyce*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996.
- Fuller, David. *Blake's Heroic Argument*. London: Croom Helm, 1988.
- . *James Joyce's Ulysses*. New York: Harvester, 1992.
- Gardiner, Michael. "Alterity and Ethics: A Dialogical Perspective." *Theory, Culture and Society* 13.2 (1996): 121-43.
- . "'The Incomparable Monster of Solipsism': Bakhtin and Merleau-Ponty." Bell and Gardiner 128-44.
- Gardiner, Michael, and Michael Mayerfeld Bell. "Bakhtin and the Human Sciences: A Brief Introduction." Bell and Gardiner 1-12.
- Gibbons, Luke. *Transformations in Irish Culture*. Cork: Cork UP, 1996.
- Gibson, Andrew. "'An Aberration of the Light of the Reason': Science and Cultural Politics in 'Ithaca.'" Gibson 133-74.
- . Introduction. Gibson 3-27.
- , ed. *Joyce's "Ithaca."* *European Studies* 6. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1996.

- Gifford, Don, and Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
- Glad, Betty. "Contributions of Psychobiography." Knutson 296-321
- Gleckner, Robert F. "Joyce's Blake: Paths of Influence." *William Blake and the Moderns*. Eds. Robert J. Bertholf and Annette S. Levitt. Albany: State U of New York P, 1982. 135-63.
- Hampson, Robert. "'Allowing for Possible Error': Education and Catechism in 'Ithaca.'" Gibson 229-67.
- Hart, Clive, and David Hayman, eds. *James Joyce's Ulysses: Critical Essays*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1974.
- Heininger, Joseph. "Molly Bloom's Ad Language and Goods Behavior: Advertising as Social Communication in *Ulysses*." Pearce 155-73.
- Henke, Suzette. *Joyce's Moraculous Sindbook: A Study of Ulysses*. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1978.
- Hermann, Margaret G., ed. *Political Psychology: Contemporary Problems and Issues*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
- Herr, Cheryl. *Joyce's Anatomy of Culture*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1986.
- Hirschkop, Ken. "Introduction: Bakhtin and Cultural Theory." Hirschkop and Shepherd 1-38.
- Hirschkop, Ken, and David Shepherd, eds. *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.
- Holquist, Michael. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- . Introduction. *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. By M. M. Bakhtin. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986. ix-xxiii.
- . "Introduction: The Architectonics of Answerability." *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Eds. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Austin: U of Texas P, 1990. ix-xlix.
- Hurst, Michael. *Parnell and Irish Nationalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.

- Innes, C. L. "Modernism, Ireland and Empire: Yeats, Joyce and Their Implied Audiences." Booth and Rigby 137-74.
- Innes, Christopher. "Modernism in Drama." Michael Levenson 130-56.
- Jackson, Tony E. "'Cyclops,' 'Nausicaa,' and Joyce's Imaginary Irish Couple." *James Joyce Quarterly* 29.1 (1991): 63-83.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Modernism and Imperialism." *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*. Comp. Seamus Deane. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1990. 43-66.
- Johnson, Jeri, ed. *Ulysses: The 1922 Text*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.
- Jones, Ernest. *Essays in Applied Psycho-Analysis*. London: International Psycho-Analytical P, 1923.
- Joyce, Stanislaus. *My Brother's Keeper*. Ed. Richard Ellmann. London: Faber and Faber, 1958.
- Kenner, Hugh. "Circe." Hart and Hayman 341-62.
- Kershner, R. B. *Joyce, Bakhtin, and Popular Literature: Chronicles of Disorder*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1989.
- Kiberd, Declan. *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*. London: Vintage, 1996.
- Kimball, Jean. "Family Romance and Hero Myth: A Psychoanalytic Context for the Paternity Theme in *Ulysses*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 20.2 (1983): 161-73.
- Kinser, Samuel. "Chronotopes and Catastrophes: The Cultural History of Mikhail Bakhtin." *Journal of Modern History* 56.2 (1984): 301-10.
- Klein, Scott W. *The Fictions of James Joyce and Wyndham Lewis: Monsters of Nature and Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- . "Speech Lent by Males: Gender, Identity, and the Example of Stephen's Shakespeare." *James Joyce Quarterly* 30.3 (1993): 439-49.
- Knowles, Sebastian. "The Substructure of 'Sirens': Molly as *Nexus Omnia Ligans*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 23.4 (1986): 447-63.
- Knutson, Jeanne N. "Personality in the Study of Politics." Knutson 28-56.
- , ed. *Handbook of Political Psychology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

- Kolocotroni, Vassiliki, Jane Goldman, and Olga Taxidou, eds. *Modernism: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1998.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Une Poétique Ruinée." *La Poétique de Dostoïevsky*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.
- Kuehl, Warren F., ed. *Biographical Dictionary of Internationalists*. Westport: Greenwood, 1983.
- Larkin, Emmet J. *The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland and the Fall of Parnell, 1888-1891*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1979.
- Law, Jules David. "'Pity They Can't See Themselves': Assessing the 'Subject' of Pornography in 'Nausicaa.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 27.2 (1990): 219-39.
- Lawrence, Karen. *The Odyssey of Style in Ulysses*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.
- Leckie, Barbara. "Reading Bodies, Reading Nerves: 'Nausicaa' and the Discourse of Censorship." *James Joyce Quarterly* 34.1-2 (1996-97): 65-85.
- Lees, Heath. "The Introduction to 'Sirens' and the *Fuga per Canonem*." *James Joyce Quarterly* 22.1 (1984): 39-54.
- Leonard, Garry M. "Joyce and Lacan: The Twin Narratives of History and His[§]tory in the 'Nestor' Chapter of *Ulysses*." *Cheng and Martin* 170-83.
- Levenson, Michael, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Levenson, Samuel. *Maud Gonne*. London: Cassell, 1977.
- Levitt, Morton P. "The Modernist Age: The Age of James Joyce." *Light Rays: James Joyce and Modernism*. Ed. Heyward Ehrlich. New York: New Horizon, 1984. 134-45.
- Lewiecki-Wilson, Cynthia. *Writing Against the Family: Gender in Lawrence and Joyce*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1994.
- Lewis, Linda M. *The Promethean Politics of Milton, Blake, and Shelley*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1992.
- Lewis, Pericles. *Modernism, Nationalism, and the Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

- Lewis, Wyndham. *The Caliph's Design: Architects! Where Is Your Vortex?* Ed. Paul Edwards. Santa Barbara: Black Sparrow, 1986.
- . *Time and Western Man*. Ed. Paul Edwards. Santa Rosa: Black Sparrow, 1993.
- . *Wyndham Lewis on Art: Collected Writings 1913-1956*. Eds. Walter Michael and C. J. Fox. London: Thames and Hudson, 1969.
- Lincoln, Andrew. "Blake and the 'Reasoning Historian.'" *Historicizing Blake*. Eds. Steve Clark and David Worrall. London: Macmillan, 1994. 73-85.
- . *Spiritual History: A Reading of William Blake's Vala or The Four Zoas*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Lloyd, David. *Anomalous States: Irish Writing and the Post-Colonial Moment*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.
- Lodge, David. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction and Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Lyons, F. S. L. *Charles Stewart Parnell*. London: Collins, 1977.
- . *The Fall of Parnell: 1890-91*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.
- Maddox, Brenda. *Nora: A Biography of Nora Joyce*. London: Penguin, 2000.
- Mahaffey, Vicki. "Ulysses and the End of Gender." *Norris* 151-68.
- Martin, Timothy. *Joyce and Wagner: A Study of Influence*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
- Mason, Ellsworth, and Richard Ellmann, eds. *The Critical Writings of James Joyce*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1959.
- Matzov, Anna. "The Idea of Time in the Works of Bakhtin." *Russian Literature* 26 (1989): 209-18.
- Mays, J. C. C. Introduction. *Poems and Exiles*. By James Joyce. Ed. J. C. C. Mays. London: Penguin, 1992. xvii-xxvii.
- McGee, Patrick. "Joyce's Nausea: Style and Representation in 'Nausicaa.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 24.3 (1987): 305-18.
- . *Paperspace: Style as Ideology in Joyce's Ulysses*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P. 1988.
- Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London: Routledge, 1985.



- Moore, Thomas. *Irish Melodies. The Poetical Works of Thomas Moore*. Vol. 3-4. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1841. 10 vols.
- Morson, Gary Saul. "Bakhtin, Genres, and Temporality." *New Literary History* 22.4 (1991): 1071-92.
- Morson, Gary Saul, and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thoughts Out of Season*. Trans. Adrian Collins. Ed. Oscar Levy. Edinburgh: T. N. Foulis, 1909. Vol. 5 of *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*. 17 vols.
- Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Norris, Margot, ed. *A Companion to James Joyce's Ulysses: Biographical and Historical Contexts, Critical History, and Essays from Five Contemporary Critical Perspectives*. Boston: Bedford, 1998.
- O'Brien, Enda. *James Joyce*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1999.
- O'Connor, Theresa. "Demythologizing Nationalism: Joyce's Dialogized Grail Myth." Cheng and Martin 100-21.
- O'Connor, Ulick. *Celtic Dawn: A Portrait of the Irish Literary Renaissance*. Dublin: Town House, 1999.
- Osteen, Mark. *The Economy of Ulysses: Making Both Ends Meet*. New York: Syracuse UP, 1995.
- Otis, Laura. *Organic Memory: History and the Body in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1994
- Overton, Bill. *The Novel of Female Adultery: Love and Gender in Continental Fiction, 1830-1900*. London: Macmillan, 1996.
- Pearce, Richard, ed. *Molly Blooms: A Polylogue on "Penelope" and Cultural Studies*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1994.
- Pile, Steve, *The Body and the City: Psychoanalysis, Space and Subjectivity*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Platt, L. H. "'If Brian Boru Could But Come Back And See Old Dublin Now': Materialism, the National Culture and *Ulysses* 17." Gibson 105-32.

- . "The Voice of Esau: Culture and Nationalism in 'Scylla and Charybdis.'" *James Joyce Quarterly* 29.4 (1992): 737-50.
- Porter, Roy, ed. *Rewriting the Self: Histories from the Renaissance to the Present*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Reizbaum, Marilyn. *James Joyce's Judaic Other*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1999.
- Rickard, John S. *Joyce's Book of Memory: The Mnemotechnic of Ulysses*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999.
- Rogers, Margaret. "Decoding the Fugue in 'Sirens.'" *James Joyce Literary Supplement* 4.1 (1990): 15-20.
- Rose, Nikolas. "Assembling the Modern Self." Porter 224-48.
- . *The Psychological Complex: Psychology, Politics and Society in England, 1869-1939*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Rowbotham, Sheila, and Jeffrey Weeks. *Socialism and the New Life: The Personal and Sexual Politics of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis*. London: Pluto, 1977.
- Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*. London: Granta, 1992.
- Sacks, Peter M. *The English Elegy: Studies in the Genre from Spenser to Yeats*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1985.
- Said, Edward W. "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors." *Critical Inquiry* 15.2 (1989): 205-25.
- Schwarz, Daniel R. *Reading Joyce's Ulysses*. London: Macmillan, 1987.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime. *Joyce and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- Segev, Tom. *One Palestine, Complete: Jews and Arabs under the British Mandate*. Trans. Haim Watzman. Abacus: Little, Brown and Company, 2001.
- Senn, Fritz. "Nausicaa." Hart and Hayman 277-311.
- Shaffer, Brian W. "Negotiating Self and Culture: Narcissism, Competing Discourses, and Ideological Becoming in 'Penelope.'" Pearce 139-51.
- Shepherd, Naomi. *Ploughing Sand: British Rule in Palestine 1917-48*. London: John Murray, 2000.

- Sherry, Vincent. *James Joyce: Ulysses. Landmarks of World Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
- Shloss, Carol. "Molly's Resistance to the Union: Marriage and Colonialism in Dublin, 1904." *Pearce* 105-18.
- Sicari, Stephen. "Reading *Ulysses*: 'Ithaca' and Modernist Allegory." *Twentieth-Century Literature* 20.3 (1997): 264-90.
- Silverman, Kaja. *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Simmel, Georg. "The Metropolis and Mental Life." Kolocotponi et al. 51-60.
- Sinclair, Alison. *The Deceived Husband: A Kleinian Approach to the Literature of Infidelity*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Somit, Albert, and Steven A. Peterson. "Biological Correlates of Political Behavior." *Hermann* 11-38.
- Spoor, Robert. *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus's Nightmare*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994.
- Stubbings, Diane. *Anglo-Irish Modernism and the Maternal: From Yeats to Joyce*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000.
- Suvin, Darko. "On the Metaphoricity and Narrativity in Fiction: The Chronotope as the Differentia Generica." *SubStance* 14.3 (1986): 51-67.
- Tanner, Tony. *Adultery in the Novel: Contract and Transgression*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1979.
- Thornton, Welden. *The Antimodernism of Joyce's Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1994.
- Tihanov, Galin. "Cultural Emancipation and the Novelistic: Trubetzkoy, Savitsky, Bakhtin." *Brown et al.* 47-67.
- Trench, Richard Chenevix. *On the Study of Words and English Past and Present*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1927.
- Trotter, David. "The Modernist Novel." *Michael Levenson* 70-99.
- Vice, Sue. *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1997.
- Wall, Anthony, and Clive Thomson. "Cleaning Up Bakhtin's Carnival Act." *Diacritics* 23.2 (1993): 47-70.

- Weaver, Jack W. *Joyce's Music and Noise: Theme and Variation in His Writings*.  
Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1998.
- Wesling, Donald. "The Speaking Subject in Russian Poetry and Poetics Since 1917."  
*New Literary History* 23.1 (1992): 93-112.
- Williams, Patrick. "'Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities': Theorising Modernism and  
Empire." Booth and Rigby 13-38.
- Williams, Trevor L. *Reading Joyce Politically*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1997.
- Wills, Clair. "Upsetting the Public: Carnival, Hysteria and Women's Texts."  
Hirschkop and Shepherd 130-51.
- Woods, C. J. "Parnell and the Catholic Church." *Parnell in Perspective*. Eds. D.  
George Boyce and Alan O'Day. London: Routledge, 1991. 9-37.
- Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Yeats, William Butler. *Essays and Introductions*. London: Macmillan, 1961.
- . *Mythologies*. London: Macmillan, 1959.
- . *The Poems*. Ed. Richard J. Finneran. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Macmillan, 1983.
- Ziarek, Ewa. "The Female Body, Technology, and Memory in 'Penelope.'" Pearce  
264-86.

