Fall 2022

Culture/Capital A Speculative Consideration of James Joyce's Ulysses

Audrey del Grosso
ad901979@wcupa.edu

Fall 2022

Culture/Capital A Speculative Consideration of James Joyce's Ulysses

Audrey del Grosso

Culture/Capital

A Speculative Consideration of James Joyce's *Ulysses*

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the

Department of English

West Chester University

West Chester, Pennsylvania

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

Master of Arts

By

Audrey del Grosso

December 2022

Dedicated with love to the memory of my parents,

Helen and Emanuel Himmelstein,

with gratitude for what they passed on to me:

a love and knowledge of music, a sense of irony, and

an understanding of the need to fight for social justice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Eleven years ago, I unexpectedly embarked on a journey that I had no desire to take. But with the support of incredible family, friends, and the medical community, the twists and turns of that journey led me to the graduate English Literature program at West Chester University and the completion of this thesis. My gratitude is unlimited.

I am especially grateful for the support, insights, wisdom, and perspectives of Dr. Graham MacPhee, who chaired my thesis committee and was my advisor throughout my tenure at the university. Thank you for introducing me to new ways of thinking; I am forever changed and gratefully so. I also want to thank Dr. Eleanor Shevlin and Dr. Rachel Banner for their willingness to serve on this project's committee. My classes with each of them were extraordinary experiences.

My friends and family have been amazingly supportive of this endeavor even though it created disruptions to life as usual. I cannot list them all, but I do thank all of them. But I must point out one person amongst this group. And so, a bouquet of thanks to my husband, Bob, for his forbearance and support.

I also want to extend my thanks to Dr. Janet Belitsky for her ongoing support that helped me get to the finish line. Lastly, I must thank and remember my dear friend Jude Douglass, whom I met ten years ago. A deep friendship developed in a short time, and she left too soon, in 2021.

ABSTRACT

Culture/Capital

A Speculative Consideration of James Joyce's *Ulysses*

By Audrey del Grosso

Chairperson: Graham MacPhee, Ph.D.

This thesis explores how a speculative consideration of James Joyce's novel *Ulysses* that combines postcolonial and Marxist and theoretical perspectives can challenge traditional critical approaches that are dogmatically one-sided. Three episodes of the work are analyzed to demonstrate the relationship between culture and economics, which aligns with the above-mentioned theoretical approaches.

The selected episodes—"Telemachus" (episode 1), "Nestor" (episode 2), and "Scylla and Charybdis" (episode 9)—focus on Stephen Dedalus and provide the opportunity to consider the manifestation of colonialism and imperialism in his various relationships.

Adopting a speculative approach anchored in the Hegelian-influenced philosophy of Gillian Rose, this thesis engages in the process of thinking together the particular (as expressed in postcolonialism) and the universal (as expressed in Marxism). Accordingly, it does not seek a solution that falsely unites the two. It offers instead a consideration of possibilities that remain open. A speculative approach suggests that Marxist theory alone—unmediated by an understanding of local histories, situations, and concerns (such as those described in *Ulysses)* is incomplete. Likewise, postcolonial approaches that ignore or obscure economic concerns fail to adequately address situations and motivations faced by Stephen Dedalus and others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TEXTUAL REFERENCES

Textual references to *Ulysses* consist of a parenthetical episode number and line number, separated by a colon. For example, the line from the second episode, "Nestor" would be referenced as follows: "History, said Stephen, is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake" (2:377).

All such notations refer to the Vintage Books Gabler Edition published in 1986.

Chapter 1

Theoretical Approach

Initially read and understood primarily from an aesthetic perspective and critiqued mainly on style or form, *Ulysses* has, over the years, been the subject of just about every form of literary interpretation. A number of these readings have been informed by Marxist interpretations, especially after the 1970s, when alternatives to formalist approaches became more commonplace. While Marxist and postcolonial perspectives inform this thesis, crucially, it is anchored by the works of Gillian Rose, most notably by her writings on "speculative thinking" and recognition, which were a response to and an extension of Hegel's phenomenology. Therefore, rather than considering Marxist theories and postcolonial approaches as mutually exclusive, they are contemplated speculatively and accepted as having the potential to co-exist in a manner that allows for consideration of the Marxist universal and the postcolonial particulars, with acknowledgment of the inherent tension that exists between the two.

As broad theoretical schools, Marxist and postcolonial studies offer literary and sociological critiques and provide important paradigms for literary studies, with Marxist studies providing insights into class, social relations, and commodification. In contrast, postcolonial approaches stress the particularity of local histories and voices. Discussing Marx in *Hegel Contra Sociology*, Rose examines Marx's failure to read Hegel speculatively.[1] She believed this misreading resulted in Marx's inability to grasp the relationship between the universal and the particular and his consequent focus on the universal. Consequently, his theories are abstract and generalized: all conflicts are explained as an example of the tension

between base and superstructure. And subsequent vulgar Marx*isms* magnified the rigidity of this misreading/interpretation. On Rose's reading, the traditional Marxist dialectic of historical materialism, although responding to Hegel, fails to "develop any notion of subjectivity" (*Hegel Contra Sociology* 232); she believes Marx ignores the "speculative" movement that is key to Hegel's approach. While she challenges Marx's dialectic, she does not abandon his propositions but reads him speculatively.

> It is always possible to take the claims and conceptuality of philosophical works…*deterministically* or *aporetically*—as fixed, closed, conceptual structures, colonising being with the garrison of thought; or according to the difficulty which the conceptuality represents by leaving gaps and silences in the mode of representation. These alternatives are well-known in the case of Marx and Marxism. Marx's works can be interpreted deterministically: as formulating the iron laws of history from which the inevitable outcome of class struggle in the victory of the proletariat can be predicted. The same works can be interpreted aporetically: by stressing the gap between theory and practice, which strain toward each other*;* as insisting on the uncertain course of class struggle, which depends on the unpredictable configurations of objective conditions and the formation of class consciousness*;* as imagining the multiplicity of eventualities which might emerge between the extremes. (*Mourning Becomes the Law* 7-8)

This aporetic approach rejects the rigidity of linear master narratives with predetermined outcomes. Unlike Marx, who insists on the inevitability of class struggles and their singular outcome, Rose's philosophy centers on the unknown and unpredictable future.

The problematic nature of a strictly universalist interpretation of Marxist theory is evident when applied to the development of Ireland. A focus on economic factors to the exclusion of other critical issues (in this case, social impacts of colonization and imperialism) is addressed by Joe Cleary in "Misplaced Ideas? Locating and Dislocating Ireland":

> Marxist political economy has produced a rich corpus of theoretical scholarship on imperialism, but imperialism is usually conceived … in essentially economic terms …these theories of imperialism …had little to say about distinct historical compositions of land, labor, and capital or about the modalities of state formation within specific colonial situations. …The object of colonialism, … [is the] transformation of the colonized society: the eradication of its indigenous structures of feeling, the institutionalization of the colonizer's modes of legality and property relations, and the displacement of indigenous social institutions by those of colonial modernity. (11)

Cleary objects that some forms of Marxist historiography or historical materialism conceive of a direct connection between historical events and outcomes, devoid of other influences — in other words, that humans are absolutely determined by past events.

However, Rose did not endorse a conception of history as absolutely determining. Furthermore, she suggests that Marx *can* be read speculatively, so rather than discarding his approach she proffered that we *are* and *are not* determined by the past, so that the future is open-ended and not fixed. By extension, when applied to Marx(isms), it allows for the possibility that there are alternatives to the overthrow/downfall of capitalism that can be

incorporated and be beneficial to the working class and other oppressed groups. Rose subscribed to Hegel's proposition that the absolute cannot

> be treated methodologically from the outside as an unknowable, nor 'shot from a pistol' as an immediate certainly. This 'whole' can only become known as a result of the process of the contradictory experiences of consciousness which gradually come to realise it. (*Mourning* 49)

Interpreting and following Rose, Kate Schick explores how left and right Hegelians emerged and what they represent politically, culturally, and philosophically (27-28). Critically, both groups miss the speculative movement essential to Hegelian thinking. Instead, each group uses what supports its beliefs: left Hegelians endorse Hegel's method but not his system, while right Hegelians endorse his system but not his method. According to Rose and Schick, the result is that both the left and right Hegelians fail to think together recognition *and* misrecognition, so that right Hegelians focus on ideas while left Hegelians focus on actions.

Andrew Latz explains that Rose developed her approach to Hegel in the context of her evaluation of social theory in the 1970s, culminating in the publication of *Hegel Contra Sociology* in 1981. He stated, "her work asks to be judged not as a strict exegesis of Hegel but as a contribution to social theory" (14). Schick explains, "[Rose] refuses to perceive the world in terms of irreconcilable binary opposites, such as universal and particular, law and ethics, finite and infinite. Instead, she holds these ideas together in thought, aware of the ways in which the one mediates our understanding of the other" (33). In other words, this is the argument for considering the particular within the universal—both are necessary. Clearly, this is relevant for literary studies at a general theoretical level and when applied to specific works such as *Ulysses.* Rose's speculative approach is a viable, productive

framework for theoretical approaches to *Ulysses* as well as the novel form itself. Crucially, it offers an expansive scaffolding that can accommodate multiple and mutable interpretations.

Examining the emergence of postcolonial studies, Neil Lazarus and Rashmi Varma propose that in the academic arena, the field prioritized identity politics as opposed to class struggle, so supporting neoliberal doctrine by

> privileging a rhetoric of recognition over one of redistribution even as universities were being brought systematically within the purview of neoliberal calculation and instrumentalism. The intersections of postcolonial studies and multicultural politics provided a domain in which radicalism could be espoused with the constraints of a seeming undefeatable global order. (312)

The dichotomous nature of the primary positions espoused by Marxist theories and postcolonial studies reflects oppositional thinking lacking the mediation advanced by Rose.

However, while there has been ongoing and evident polarization between the two disciplines, there has also been evidence of collaboration, as noted by Sara Salem in "Stretching Marxism." Referencing Franz Fanon, Rahul Rao, Samir Amin, and others in a discussion of the debate regarding the Eurocentricity of Marx/Marxism, she considers "connections between capitalism, colonialism, and racism" (4) as viable sites for collaboration.[2] In addition, Declan Kiberd astutely positions Joyce's works to provide context for his supposition that *Ulysses* should not be interpreted as either a "Third World" or "First World" narrative (343). However, despite references to Fanon in critiques of *Ulysses* by postcolonial theorists such as Vincent Cheng, these inclusions were largely superficial according to M. Keith Booker (11). Booker considers this reflective of the more significant trend to ignore Fanon in postcolonial studies; he attributes this to a focus on poststructuralist

theory and resistance to Marxist-oriented approaches. Arif Dirlik explored this extensively, writing that postcolonialism's denial of capitalism's "foundational status" was an example of postcolonialism's culturalist ideology that shifts the focus of discussion of European power from capitalism to cultural Euro-centrism (515).

Booker and Paul Stasi consider Marxism's critical reception by non-Marxists in the context of the aesthetic focus of New Criticism. Booker points out that New Criticism essentially shaped the canon of art and literature so that modernism and New Criticism became virtually synonymous (176); this also meant that New Critical modes of interpretation dominated (and continue to dominate) to a great degree, which Booker attributes mainly to the Cold War climate in academia that prevailed in the 1950s (176-77). Booker suggests that the overwhelming dominance of the New Critical modernist critiques in the "conscription of modernism by that [cultural arm of the bourgeois] establishment resulted in a consensus among critics about modernism's "lack of historical engagement," which he finds notable "if we now find that modernism was not so disengaged after all" (174). While he decries the aesthetic formalism of the New Critics, Booker also argues forcefully against its replacement with a culturalist approach that ignores economic structures. Furthermore, he believes that even politically oriented critiques of Joyce disregard class considerations and instead focus on gender and ethnicity and largely ignore Marxism in "a suspiciously bourgeois movement toward a critical free market based on plurality and liberal open-mindedness"(7). In other words, postcolonialism, with its focus on the particular absent consideration of the universal, demonstrates remarkable similarities to what Nancy Fraser coins "progressive neoliberalism" ("Neoliberalism to Trump" 48-51), discussed in the following chapter.

Suggestive of a speculatively oriented approach, Stasi argues that the one-sided perspectives rendered in many Marxist and postcolonial critiques of *Ulysses* fail to sufficiently explore the impact of modernity and imperialism on the colonial subject. He argues that *Ulysses* is neither a "reactionary evacuation of historical agency" nor a validation of "stasis as the specific condition of postcoloniality itself" (13). Stasi proposes that modernism arose as a response to the 1848 revolutions in Europe and that the resulting disruptions are articulated through literature that dialectically understands/relates the progress promised by the revolutions and the tradition it seeks to replace. He seeks to bridge the gap between Marxist theory and postcolonial studies and frames this gap as a divide between center and periphery, and aesthetics and politics.

In his analysis of *Ulysses*, Stasi explores these critical approaches through what he refers to as "the binary of authenticity/collaboration" that he associates with Stephen (84). He argues that the two discourses meet "in the commodity form itself. The commodity structures the consciousness of the center *and* periphery, embodying both the omnipresence and the erasure of colonial dependence" (8). He uses the example of Bloom's "potato soap" (15:241-43) in "Circe," when the agricultural potato and the pharmaceutical soap both carried by Bloom are linguistically fused. Stasi suggests that the potato represents authenticity and tradition while the soap represents collaboration and modernity. With this instance, Stasi models a speculative reading of *Ulysses*, although he does not position it as such. Pointing out that the potato and soap are fetishes of the Irish and British respectively, he suggests that the potato represents Irish nationalists' embrace of the myth of purity promulgated by the Revivalists and the soap represents the "imperial narrative of progress" (88). Stasi's exegesis about the soap and the advertising of commodities cites

Enda Duffy (*Subaltern* 69) in exploring how encouraging consumption is a form of exploitation (87). Unfortunately, Stasi gives less attention to the potato than the soap, which means his discussion elides British underdevelopment of Ireland. For example, the only mention of Britain's involvement (or lack thereof) in the potato famine of 1845-52 is a footnote (162n5). Given the logic and impact of Britain's willful failure to intervene, it seems that a discussion of the economic and social ramifications of policy decisions made by the center (Britain) for the periphery (Ireland) was appropriate.

Stasi's arguments suggest a speculative orientation: "Ultimately, I see Joyce presenting utopian hope and political discouragement in equal measure" (84), and his conclusion is also open-ended. Although Stasi offers a literary-critical model for the approach followed here, because he frames his observations and findings in dualisms, he creates strictures and structures that are antithetical to a speculative approach.

While broadly able to see the particular in the universal, Marxist critics in the 1930s (most notably Lukács) were very specific about how it was to be served up—through realist novels that reveal the human condition and make the crushing effects of capitalism explicit, as exemplified by Honoré de Balzac's *Lost Illusions.* Lukács opposed what he viewed as overt subjectivity, which he interestingly referred to as "particularization"; to him, *Ulysses* was a prime example (62,171). He could not see *Ulysses* as a response to modernity rather than an endorsement.

If, as suggested by Rose and others, subjectivity is ignored or downplayed in some Marxist analyses, in postcolonialism it is overdetermined to a point where it threatens to disappear. A speculative reading allows for consideration of *Ulysses* from the vantage points of postcolonialism and Marxism and for reflection on how they interact and how they

are similar and dissimilar. In turn, this reveals how the particularity and universality each proposes works, succeeds, and fails. There are elements of value for literary studies in each paradigm, and analyses in either discipline can benefit more when considered together than separately—when they mediate each other to uncover the gaps within each and between the two. Marxism offers, through historical materialism, a lens through which to consider the impacts of the domination of capitalist society. Postcolonialism counters the totalizing perspective a Marxist approach can engender. As Rose might suggest, this is not a "one-and-done" solution. It entails constant work, ongoing revision, and acknowledgment of the tension between the two perspectives.

Walter Benjamin's opening statement in a 1921 fragment, "One must see capitalism as a religion" provides such an opportunity (Löwy, "Capitalism as Religion" 61). This provocative proposal (explored in greater detail in chapter 5) encompasses the Marxian/economic (through the register of capital) and postcolonial/identity (through reference to religion), considerations that are central to this thesis. Traditionally, Marxist analyses distinguish between the forces and material relations of production (the base) and the realm of non-productive aspects of life such as government, culture, law, and religion (the superstructure). In this fragment, Benjamin argues that critical traits and practices of capitalism *are* religious, that the base is superstructural and the superstructure is basic. Specifically, he refers to capitalism's cultic nature: its projection of permanence and its capacity to generate guilt. He proffers that capitalism was originally a parasitic offshoot of Christianity but has evolved to "the point where Christianity's history is essentially that of its parasite" (*Selected Writings* 288-89). Read in the spirit of Rose and Hegel as a speculative rather than an ordinary proposition, Benjamin's pronouncement suggests that the economic *is*

and *is not* cultural, and vice-versa. Accordingly, it suggests that capitalism mediates religion and economics mediates identity; and as this thesis demonstrates, that is certainly the case in *Ulysses.* Although Walter Benjamin is generally considered a more pessimistic philosopher than Gillian Rose, his influential works are nonetheless meaningful, insightful, and, in their difficulty and inscrutability, thought-provoking.

Benjamin's cultural analyses are a significant theoretical source for this thesis in pursuing a speculative approach to *Ulysses*. Chapter 5, which focuses on "Nestor", considers Benjamin's insights regarding Weber/Protestantism, collecting, and accumulation and relates them to Stephen Dedalus's experience of his employer's overstuffed study. Again, the interpenetration of capitalism and religion is apt.

Finally, a significant negative critique of *Ulysses* within early Marxist criticism related to its lack of political and personal closure. In response, I offer the perspective of Kate Schick. Schick writes that, "speculation opens up a space beyond the present—a space for political action, which points to the future, without providing a blueprint for what the future might look like" (27). This is the "broken middle" developed by Rose (*Mourning* 75-6*)* which provides the most fruitful basis, I propose, for approaching *Ulysses.*

Chapter 2

Overview: Social and Cultural Terrain

In order to focus discussion of a speculative approach to *Ulysses*, this thesis focuses on the figure of Stephen as he provides an *opening* to what is usually conceived as the main body of the novel, the relationship of Bloom and Molly. To that end, the ways in which colonialism and imperialism impact Stephen's relationships and life are explored in the following four chapters. As noted in chapter 1, a postcolonial approach stresses the particular; it emphasizes culture and identity. In the "Telemachus" (chapter 3) and "Nestor" (chapters 4 and 5) episodes, power dynamics and commodification are considered. Stephen is confronted by figures and symbols of authority—both traditional and contemporary: Catholic, Anglican, and Presbyterian. He is mocked, used, and abused by his putative friends and his employer. Stephen's social status—a marginalized member of the Catholic middle class—provides a distinct perspective from which to observe his social peer and fellow Catholic, Buck Mulligan; his social superior, the visiting Englishman Haines; the milkwoman who serves him; and his employer, the Presbyterian Garrett Deasy. In "Scylla and Charybdis" (chapter 6), Stephen encounters Anglo-Irish members of the Irish Literary Revival who reveal a myopic tendency that obstructs meaningful dialogue.

Joyce demonstrates many ways in which culture is deployed to assert power. For example, Mulligan as comprador assigns himself the role of Stephen's literary representative. Deasy's students play British, not Gaelic, sports. The Anglo-Irish Literary Revivalists promote a cultural agenda that would de-politicize the polity, a move that advantages them.

Seeking recognition, in the cold, barren rooms and on the roof of the Sandycove Martello tower, in Deasy's oppressively close office, and in the National Library of Ireland, Stephen refuses to passively accede to the misrecognitions he encounters. The recognition Stephen seeks is complex. He insists on mutual recognition in the Hegelian sense, as addressed by Rose. That Stephen is not successful in accomplishing this goal speaks to the speculative (Rosean/Hegelian) nature of the work and the incomplete and nondialectical nature of the struggle.

There is significant value in recognizing other histories, modes of representation and thinking, and the acceptance of otherness that a critique of Eurocentrism may engender. But however valuable the questions raised by a postcolonial approach may be, an analysis based solely on a particularist perspective that focuses on identity and, by extension and design, eschews engagement with Marx/ism—and universalist considerations—would be incomplete. Therefore, in reviewing relevant topical literature, some omissions are as notable as inclusions. For example, critics like Robert Spoo[3] and Vincent Cheng often minimize or even exclude meaningful discussions of obvious alternatives or supplements.

This is not to suggest that the arguments and considerations put forth by postcolonial scholars are without merit. But as I will demonstrate, incorporating economic factors and class relations allows for a more comprehensive analysis of *Ulysses.* Focusing on the "Telemachus", "Nestor", and "Scylla and Charybdis" episodes, I will argue that a Marxian perspective is integral for a comprehensive analysis of *Ulysses* that can provide insights regarding the universal and particular, and about imperialism, colonialism, and capitalism.

Stephen demands economic as well as cultural recognition. In her critique of neoliberalism, Nancy Fraser argues that both recognition and redistribution (which align with

the cultural and economic acknowledgment that Stephen sought) are essential if justice is to be achieved (*Redistribution or Recognition* 9-26*)*. She argues forcefully against the particularity of the meritocratic recognition that progressive neoliberalism offers as a substitute for broad-based racial, gender, or other equalities, stating

> The progressive-neoliberal program for a just status order did not aim to abolish social hierarchy but to "diversify" it, "empowering" "talented" women, people of color, and sexual minorities to rise to the top. And that ideal was inherently *class specific:* geared to ensuring that "deserving individuals" from "underrepresented groups" could attain positions and pay on a par with the straight white men of their own class. (*American Affairs* 50)

Her thesis is helpful in its insistence on including economic factors often excluded or minimized in postcolonial and post-structural analyses.

Aijaz Ahmad addresses how the poststructuralist insistence on denying universalisms and determinations renders them (in general) unable to distinguish critically between "progressive" and "retrograde forms of nationalism" (38). He suggests that in doing so, they not only reject the universalisms they decry, but they also fail to critically examine nationalism(s) or the particularity they endorse. Dirlik points to the irony of postcolonialism's rejection of "structure and totality in the name of history" and submits that "the cover of culture" allowed a shift from a criticism of capitalism to a "critique of Eurocentric ideology", which paradoxically allowed for the continued expansion of capitalism (347). For example, neoliberal Hindu nationalists (Modi, for example) make use of common cultural signifiers to mark their non-European identity and alignment; in doing so, they mask their capitalistic exploitation of their people and are spared critique of their

duplicitous actions. Likewise, "the cover of culture" will be deployed by Haines and Mulligan to obfuscate their roles and motivations. Lacking their polish and worldliness (and therefore, ability to manipulate), Deasy's capitalist orientation is more clearly displayed.

In *A Portrait of an Artist as a Young Man (Portrait),* Stephen declares that he will not follow the path expected of him; he will not become a priest, nor does he intend to stay in Ireland. "I will not serve" (510), he declared to Cranly, serving notice of his intention to leave the Catholic church, his family, and his nation. Whereas *Portrait* depicts the Dedalus family's life in and fall from the middle class over the course of a number of years in the late nineteenth century, *Ulysses* is focused on a particular day: June 16, 1904. Although he earns a respectable wage as a teacher at the start of the day, his inclusion in the middle class is as tentative as it was earlier in his life. By the day's end, he will quit.

Stephen does not want to be like his father, like Haines, like Mulligan, or like Deasy. At this point, perhaps he could be accused of throwing out the baby with the bathwater, having not bathed for eight months and only knowing that his identity will not blindly conform to societal norms. But unlike the conventional Bildungsroman, Joyce's works do not make clear if Stephen will resolve his challenges: if he will leave Ireland and become a successful artist. Instead, exploring notions of identity/non-identity, he offers partial or potential solutions and unanswered questions. Many critics take this to suggest that Stephen will, like Joyce, permanently leave Ireland. Others suggest that he will fall victim to the overwhelming stasis they read in *Portrait* and *Ulysses.* Generally, they fail to consider that Joyce left room for aporetic outcomes—for different, not necessarily predetermined, pathways. Among those is the truth that even if he physically departs from Ireland, he will never really leave it behind. This is true for all people in all nations, but especially for

Stephen, who has an active and rich mind that recalls sights, emotions, sensations, and memories in great detail.

Issues of identity and nationality arise in "Telemachus"; they have been previously addressed in *Portrait.* Just as Bloom will be questioned about his identity later in the day, the legitimacy of Stephen's nationality has been questioned: "What with your name and ideas. Are you Irish at all?" (*Portrait* 468) to which he responds, "This race and this country and this life produced me . . .I shall express myself as I am" (*Portrait* 469). However, his ability/right to self-expression—his very agency—as an artist/individual, as a mourner, as a (lapsed) Catholic, as an Irish person, as a colonial subject, as an employee—are called into question by almost all of those whom he encounters in this day, with the notable exception of Bloom.

In *Portrait,* Stephen struggled to understand himself and forge his identity; at some point, he desired the recognition and acceptance of others: "constant voices of his father and of his masters" told Stephen "to be a gentleman above all things" (*Portrait* 333). As Allan Hepburn points out, "just as Stephen later copies the gestures and movements of priests in an effort to know if he has a vocation for the priesthood, he is urged also to copy the manners and gestures of a class to which he no longer belongs. Class is therefore a question of self-identification. It is possible to be genteel, yet impoverished, aristocratic in temperament, yet depleted of funds" (203).[4] This suggestion recalls Homi Bhaba's conception of mimicry as a privileged, subversive form of cultural resistance (130). The seeds of Stephen's resistance are sown in his earlier years when he is mistreated at school because (as he perceives it) his family's fall from the middle class. As a young schoolboy, he lacked power and had nothing of value to offer. As he matures, he becomes increasingly thoughtful about how he has been

mistreated. He also comes to understand his intellectual and linguistic abilities and the power those abilities can wield.

In *Ulysses,* Stephen rejects the advice to "be a gentleman" and all that it entails (*Portrait* 333*)*. Instead, he struggles against repeating and respecting imperialist doctrine; his thoughts on this subject are revealed in "Telemachus", "Nestor", and "Scylla and Charybdis", appearing in his interior monologues and conversations with Mulligan, Haines, the milkwoman, Deasy and the Revivalists. As Stephen matures, he shifts from a Bhabhaian posture of mimesis-as-resistance to one in which he is more aware of and actively resistant to the economic and imperialist exploitation he faces. This is played out in *Ulysses* in scenes in which he attempts to stand up for his economic rights and others in which he blatantly rejects bourgeoise standards of behavior. I propose that purely culturalist, postcolonial analyses such as those espoused by Spoo, Cheng, and others fail, to varying degrees, to engage with the economic dimension adequately and are, hence lacking. By repudiating totalizing perspectives that are anathema to poststructuralist, postcolonial theorists, economic insights are also eschewed, yielding incomplete analyses of imperial domination in colonial Ireland. In what follows, I will argue that economic domination and exploitation are fundamental elements to a comprehensive consideration of imperialism in colonial Ireland in *Ulysses.*

Chapter 3

To See the World in a Pint of Milk: Colonialism, Capitalism, and Recognition in "Telemachus"

The interplay between colonialization and capitalism is played out in several interactions in "Telemachus". These are small interactions; they are insidious. Discussing a section of Marx's *Grundrisse,* Nicholas Brown explains the universal and particular nature of capitalism:

> First, capitalism always comes from elsewhere; second, capitalism is indigenous everywhere. There is neither any pure capitalist space nor any purely noncapitalist space. Therefore, Capital is always encroaching, even in the capitalist "West," as it infiltrates as yet uncommodified aspects of social life. But it is also always, as Deleuze and Guattari have pointed out, already everywhere, as the specific nightmare of every social formation that produces social inequalities—that is to say, every social formation. As any number of postcolonial narratives attest, this is precisely Capital's colonizing power. Therefore, each development of capitalism is absolutely idiosyncratic; but this does not make Capital any less universal. (203, n.19)

The idiosyncratic nature Brown mentions is on display in "Telemachus." We see it in the purchase of milk, the appropriation of language, the co-opting of a phrase, and the language used to complete these transactions.

The decidedly comfortable Buck Mulligan is described as "stately" and "plump" (1:1) at the opening of the episode. This depiction not only describes Mulligan's physical attributes: this also explains his political, economic, and personal status as an equal-opportunity exploiter. He repeatedly seeks to assert his economic and social superiority over

Stephen, and his attempts to entice/co-opt Stephen demonstrate the malleability and complicity of (some members of) the Irish Catholic professional class. Buck's shifting allegiance will ultimately follow the money; he plays both sides of the proverbial nationalist/imperialist coin. Mulligan is manipulative and cruel, exploiting those "below" him and behaving obsequiously to Haines, the imperialist. A colonial subject, he is, in other words, a member of the bourgeois comprador class seeking to curry favor with the conqueror to advance his social and financial position. Typically, a comprador will act as an intermediary between the native artisans and peasants, and a foreign power. In *Ulysses,* these roles are played by Stephen and the milkwoman as artisan and peasant, and Haines as the foreign power. Mulligan as comprador has assigned himself the role of translator and dealmaker to further his self-serving motives, anticipating the role of the Irish upper-middle class in the Irish Free State.

While Stephen is a product of educational and religious systems, he turns his back on both as sources of spiritual or financial—private or public—sustenance. Although Mulligan's religious faith is questionable at best, he objects to Stephen's public demonstrations of apostasy. For Mulligan, the external markers and professions of faith — the public demonstrations and social implications—are of primary import because they will ultimately accrue value. Despite (or because of) his hypocrisy, he is affronted when Stephen refuses his offer of a pair of grey slacks, citing his incomplete period of mourning. "He can't wear them, Buck Mulligan told his face in the mirror. Etiquette is etiquette. He kills his mother but he can't wear grey trousers" (1:121-22). It is Stephen's poverty that has instigated Mulligan's offer. However, Stephen's poverty is deliberate and a political statement; his public mourning protests the encroachment of the logic of capitalist rationality on the

spiritual. It is an affront to the imperialist, the comprador, and, as will be explored in the next chapter, the unionist, Deasy. Stephen's refusal of his offer indicates a broader rejection to which Mulligan is highly attuned. Disingenuously offering recognition to Stephen: "I'm the only one that knows what you are. Why don't you trust me more?" (1:161-62), Mulligan is alarmed by the rejections of his attempts to insert himself in others' transactions. Mulligan's denial of Stephen's humanity contributes to Stephen's increasingly wary perspective of him. Stephen chastises Mulligan for insulting him and inflicting emotional pain on him following the death of his mother: "*O, it's only Dedalus whose mother is beastly dead"* (1:198-99), however Mulligan cannot fathom that Stephen would take it as a personal offense rather than an offense to his mother. Indeed, Stephen felt it deeply, "…Shielding the gaping wound the words had left in his heart"(1:216-17). This betrayal adds to Stephen's sense that Mulligan's mockeries are not for the amusement of others but are, in a sense, preparation for his future roles in the Irish Free State, in which self-interest will be his primary concern.

The conflict between comprador and native artist is examined through the image of the cracked mirror that Mulligan has stolen from a servant (1:135). Commonly and simply, a mirror represents mimesis, but in this situation, it also provides commentary about how Irish self-representation has been undermined by colonization. The inability of the colonizers to recognize the colonized is neatly summarized in a brief scene in "Telemachus": "Shouts from the open window startling evening in the quadrangle. A deaf gardener, aproned, masked with Matthew Arnold's face, pushes his mower on the somber lawn watching narrowly the dancing motes of grasshalms" (1:172-75). Arnold, as personified in the gardener, cannot hear and intentionally limits his field of view, allowing himself to initiate/instigate a limited construction of Irish representation that will serve the needs of the English. Arnold, arguably

the principal propagator of the Victorian concept of the "Celt," attributed his racialized distinction between the Irish (Celt) and the English (Anglo-Saxon or "German") to personality, ascribing passionate qualities to the Irish and rational to the English. While he seemingly admired the passion, he did not dismiss the need for reason and authority, justifying his anti-Home Rule position (Kiberd 32). The narrative of the Celtic Irish, as portrayed by Arnold, was barbarian, lawless, emotional, and violent—and by extension, incapable of self-government.[5]

It was the Arnoldian Celt to which the Irish Revival responded. As Kiberd explained, rather than completely discarding Arnold's wild Celt, the revivalists sought to rehabilitate the negative imagery associated with it. They sought to change perceptions by changing the language used to describe them. But the problem with this strategy is that it unintentionally ceded power to the English. Kiberd states:

> The modern English, seeing themselves as secular, progressive, and rational, had deemed the neighboring islander to be superstitious, backward and irrational. The strategy of the revivalists thus became clear: for bad words substitute good, for superstitious use religious. The positive aspect of this maneouvre was that it permitted Irish people to take many images which were rejected by English society, occupy them, reclaim them, and make them their own: but the negative aspect was painfully obvious, in that the process left the English with the power of description and the Irish succumbing to the picture which they had constructed. (32)

Gerry Smyth suggests that Arnold "perfectly anticipated Antonio Gramsci's thinking on the relationship between 'leadership' and 'consent'" (39) in his conception of a fruitful,

productive relationship between England and Ireland. He posits that Arnold's motivation for his promotion of the idea of the Celt and Celtic was that he recognized the increasingly powerful position (or at least the possibility) of the Irish and sought to help define the nature of the relationship with the English.[6] "Arnold delineated specific Irish, Anglo-Irish, and English identities, inviting the subject he calls the 'Celt' to participate in a necessary but constantly inferior relationship with the 'Anglo-Saxon.' Implicit throughout is the idea that such a cultural model should be read as an analogue for a desired political one" (36). While attributing seemingly positive qualities, such as spirituality, passion, and sociability to the Celt, Arnold's characterization also enables the implications suggested by those terms: irrationality, unpredictability, ineffectualness, and needing protection and guidance— in other words—not fit for self-rule.

Mulligan does not want to be defined in Arnoldian terms—as inferior to the Anglo-Saxons, or anyone. Already well-off financially as a member of the upper-middle class, Mulligan aims to further his standing by, as discussed earlier, acting as a comprador. In this role, he has a need to manage everyone around him. He literally wants to control Stephen's ability to reflect by providing and removing the mirror from him. However, having mocked Stephen relentlessly, he rightfully fears retribution. "He fears the lancet of my art" (1:152), Stephen muses to himself, demonstrating his awareness of his agency.

If Mulligan is the comprador, Haines is the imperialist. An Anglican Englishman, he adapts his self-identification depending on to whom he is speaking and the context of the conversation. While Haines appears deferential, his actions are performative, not heartfelt. He consistently misrecognizes Stephen. When Stephen tells Haines that he considers himself a servant of two masters: English and Italian, Haines homes in on the latter and repeats,

"Italian?" denying both Stephen's claim and his identity. Whereas Haines had previously declared himself an Englishman when speaking to the milkwoman, in this context, in quick succession, he refers to himself as both an Englishman and a Britisher. Telling Stephen, "You are your own master" (1:636-37), he speaks as if this is a universal truth when a more honest assessment might suggest that, at least metaphorically, he is the master (and Mulligan is jockeying for position). In making this claim about Stephen being his own master, Haines is either speaking in platitudes or repeating what he learned and is valid for him.

The same does not apply necessarily apply to all. Haines extends his authority to speak for the Irish yet again when in response to Stephen's statement that he is "a servant of two masters. . .the imperial British state . . .and the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church" (1:636,643-44), he states, "An Irishman must think like that, I daresay" (1:647-48), rhetorically assuming the role of the ruler. In doing so, he assumes the correctness and reasonableness of his perspective and demonstrates his inability to recognize Stephen outside of the parameters of imperialist ideology. Pointing out the national distinctions between them, he then says, "We feel in England that we have treated you rather unfairly" (1:648), using language that absolves him of personal or collective responsibility, as well as, to quote Stasi, distancing himself "from the primitive accumulation of his ancestors, failing to realize its continuities with his own neo-colonial form of cultural accumulation" (83). To make that explicitly clear, he deflects even further: "It seems history is to blame" (1:649). Confusing the lines between nation and empire yet again, he finds another opportunity to deflect: "Of course I'm a Britisher, Haines's voice said, 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" (1:666-69).

Kiberd astutely positions Joyce's works (the time that he wrote and the time that he wrote about) to provide context for his supposition that *Ulysses* should not be interpreted as either a "Third World" or "First World" narrative (343). However, Stasi directly addresses the problematic of adopting a narrow postcolonial perspective absent a historical materialist framework. Referring to Stephen's interactions with Haines and Mulligan in the "Telemachus" episode, he criticizes Kiberd's analysis for its "unwitting echo of Haines' agentless vision of history" (83). Stasi also notes a similar approach in other postcolonial — and early Marxist—critiques. The difference is that early Marxists, specifically Lukács, derided *Ulysses* for what was deemed to be its static nature; postcolonial critics tend to consider Stephen's inaction as a marker of colonial oppression and hence endorse the work as an expression of the impact of dominance.

Another consequence of imperialism and colonialization is the impact of the encroachment of capitalism on a largely agrarian society: this is encapsulated in the encounter between Stephen, Mulligan, Haines, and the milkwoman. A seemingly banal transaction—the straightforward purchase of fresh milk from a local milkwoman—is reworked to emphasize the unbalanced relationship between the conqueror, the conquered, and the complicit. Through this simple transaction, Joyce accomplishes much, both stylistically and theoretically. In lines 399- 403, Stephen's thoughts on the milkwoman's arrival are revealed through his interior monologue in which he alludes to her as the personification of Irish nationalism and Celtism through references to Shan Van Vocht and "silk of the kine".[7] It indicates his keen awareness of Ireland's complex history, indicated by his internal summoning of the Hellenic with Homer's *Odyssey* ("old and secret" …" a messenger," a reference to Athena) and the Celtic with Shan Van Vocht ("silk of the kine and

poor old woman"). A cynical tone can be implied to be (inwardly) providing commentary on the milkwoman's distance from her native language. The names may have been given to her in old times, but the language she has forgotten has been appropriated by the Revivalists, including the Englishman Haines.

> Old and secret she had entered from a morning world, maybe a messenger. She praised the goodness of the milk, pouring it out. Crouching by a patient cow at daybreak in the lush field, a witch on her toadstool, her wrinkled fingers quick at the squirting dugs. They lowed about her whom they knew, dewsilky cattle. Silk of the kine and poor old woman, names given her in old times. (1:399-404)

Despite her identification with Ireland, the milkwoman does not advocate for the nation and instead tries to, from Stephen's perspective, ingratiate herself with "her conqueror and her gay betrayer" (1:405), Haines and Mulligan.

> A wandering crone, lowly form of an immortal serving her conqueror and her gay betrayer, their common cuckquean, a messenger from the secret morning. To serve or to upbraid, whether he could not tell: but scorned to beg her favour. (1:404-407)

As the conversation expands to include Haines and Mulligan, Stephen's outrage is revealed through further interior monologue and third-person narration, both spoken and omniscient. Stephen is troubled by what he perceives as her obsequious behavior. He views her (representing Ireland) as embracing modernity through her naïve deference to Mulligan, a representative of the comprador class. Meanwhile, she ignores Stephen and tacitly rejects art, history, culture, and a critique of the imperialism that is upending her life.

— Are you a medical student, sir? the old woman asked.

— I am, ma'am, Buck Mulligan answered.

Stephen listened in scornful silence. She bows her old head to a voice

that speaks to her loudly, her bonesetter, her medicineman: me she slights. (1:415:418)

Indicative of the degree to which Irish culture has been transformed by colonialism, she does not understand the Gaelic that Haines speaks, mistaking it for French. Further underscoring the domination that was wielded by the comprador as well as the imperialist, Mulligan, too, is guilty of cultural appropriation, deploying a Gaelic-derived colloquialism ("Is there Gaelic on you?") when he speaks to the milkwoman:

— Do you understand what he says? Stephen asked her.

— Is it French you are talking, sir? the old woman said to Haines.

Haines spoke to her again a longer speech, confidently.

— Irish, Buck Mulligan said. Is there Gaelic on you?

— I thought it was Irish, she said, by the sound of it. Are you from the west,

sir?

— I am an Englishman, Haines answered. (1:424-430)

As Duffy notes, the above excerpt is a "bitterly ironic comment" (*Subaltern* 50) on how the Irish lost even their language to the colonial power. At the same time, in this interchange, Joyce has removed Haines' power to speak for the Irish by excluding the text of his Gaelic dialogue.

Haines, the imperialist, plays the role of the ruler and directs his underlings /lackeys to pay the milkwoman.

Haines said to her:

— Have you your bill? We had better pay her, Mulligan, hadn't we?

Stephen filled again the three cups. (1:439-441)

Notably, both Stephen and Mulligan compensate her, doing the bidding of the imperialist Haines, which indicates that the colonial power is ultimately in charge. However, they do not pay her in full—the purchase is settled with a combination of coin and credit — manifestations of capitalist modernity that provide a stark counterpoint to the rustic agrarian setting with which the scene commenced. Moreover, that she does not require immediate payment ("time enough sir") as opposed to Haines' exhortation to pay immediately points to the distinction between capitalist/modern time and the less-frenetic pace of the milkwoman's existence.

Stephen laid [Mulligan's]coin in her uneager hand.

— We'll owe twopence, he said.[8]

— Time enough, sir, she said, taking the coin. Time enough. Good morning, Sir. (1:457:460)

Given Stephen's consideration of the milkwoman's subjectivity, Mulligan's lack of insight is noteworthy. Partaking of the milk she has delivered, he remarks, "If we could live on good food like that. . .we wouldn't have the country full of rotten teeth and rotten guts. Living in a bogswamp, eating cheap food and the streets paved with dust, horsedung and consumptives' spits"(1:413-17). Ignoring the poverty of much of Ireland's population and the specificity of Ireland's geography, he ascribes living conditions to a choice and blithely ignores the political and economic conditions that caused this situation. Having misinterpreted the causes, he misjudges the effects. Clearly, he is also unaware of or chooses

to ignore the broader universal relationship to imperialism, and the significance of his position as an enabler is made more significant, given that he is a medical student.

Whereas subsequently, in “Lotus Eaters,” Bloom will blissfully ignore the backbreaking labor entailed in the production of Ceylon tea (5:28-39), Stephen is quite aware of the source of the milk he puts in his tea; the nameless milkwoman is right before his eyes. He is also aware of and contemplates the labor that is involved. However, his awareness is not revealed directly. Instead, the milkwoman's arrival is described with realistic prose and straightforward dialogue (1:386-98). As the text proceeds, it seamlessly switches to a mix of interior monologue and indirect discourse, enacting the scene from Stephen's perspective and providing, rather than describing, his experience. Proximity and familiarity do not enhance Stephen's enjoyment of the milk or engender sympathy or empathy for the milkwoman.[9] Scenes such as this indicate how firmly *Ulysses* is a modernist novel despite the relatively realistic style (compared to subsequent episodes).

In his postcolonial analysis of *Ulysses* (151-162), Cheng fails to fully explore the nature and significance of the class structure and economic relationships in which Stephen is engaged. He fails to consider a Marxist perspective; indeed, there are no mentions of Marxism and only passing and inconsequential mentions of socialism and Marx. Spoo's analysis (3-13) deploys a poststructuralist approach to refute a universalist perspective, rendering it incapable of conceptualizing how identity/particularist and economic/universal considerations can be thought through together.

To summarize, absent the consideration of Marxian perspectives, a purely postcolonial reading of “Telemachus” provides a story with limited motivation. However, the situations and struggles in this episode can be evaluated as one in which capitalism is

inextricably implicated and is, at times, the root cause. Mulligan and Haines have attempted to extract everything of value from Stephen and the milkwoman—milk and phrases, culture and commodities. The Marxist perspective illuminates the postcolonial and in a somewhat paradoxical way. The Marxian consideration of class, typically considered "universalist", allows for the humanization of the individual characters and reveals the duplicity of Haines and Mulligan. It provides the opportunity to contemplate the relationship between the particularness of England and Ireland relative to universal considerations and, importantly, the gap between the two.

In considering the relationships in "Telemachus," it would be easy to revert to dualisms and to consider those relationships as either/or propositions, such as powerful/powerless, moral/immoral. For example, Cheng situates his postcolonial analysis as an issue of the perception of the Irish as primitive as compared to the respectable English (19-22;162). Furthermore, such an evaluation sidesteps consideration of the role the Irish played in Ireland's economic underdevelopment and British domination, as Joyce explores in "Ireland, Island of Saints, and Sages" (114-126). That view would render Stephen voiceless, powerless, and without agency, but that is not the case. Stephen's agency is that of a young man's: it is tentative and evolving, but it exists. It is expressed in his comments, actions, and refusals to speak and act on command.

Exploring the problematic nature of dualisms as it relates to recognition in her study of Gillian Rose, Schick argues that Rose responds to a context where simplistic dualisms abound and reduce players to winners and losers: dominator or dominated, powerful or powerless, "imperial agent or oppressed other" (92). Following Rose, she notes that "'the other' is also enraged and invested. To attribute agency solely to the powerful is to fail to

recognize the dynamism and fluidity of action wielded by 'all agents *in power and out of it'"* (92). It denies the speculative possibility, the broken middle that gives voice to the other. Mapping "Telemachus" to Schick's quote, we can see that Haines and Mulligan are the imperial agents, and Stephen is the oppressed other. Haines and Mulligan—the conquering imperialist and the conniving bourgeoisie—both assume that power and agency are theirs — Haines, by virtue of his nationality, religion, and class, and Mulligan, by virtue of his class (social relationships and economic status). Indeed, Mulligan's ability to "speak for" the rural poor anticipates the postcolonial hegemony of the Catholic upper-middle class.

Nevertheless, Stephen, too, has power. His is not economic but is significant, as demonstrated by the degree to which both Haines and Mulligan require his cooperation and desire his respect. In that respect, it is, perhaps, similar to Hegel's master-slave dialectic in which the recognition desired by the "master" (Haines or Mulligan) is not possible because they have not granted full recognition to the "slave" (Stephen). In a comment that is particularly relevant to Stephen's interaction with Mulligan and Haines, Schick noted, "the enactment of interventions by the powerful on the behalf of the powerless leaves little room for the process of recognition: those who intervene do so largely on their own terms, with little or no reference to the underlying structural factors that contributed to the crisis" (91).

The culturalist emphasis of postcolonialism is valuable in providing a critique of the colonial ideology of Haines. However, without an economic analysis of capitalism and class, it fails to pick up the incipient class hierarchy being formed by the comprador class as it deploys cultural nationalism to assume hegemony of the postcolonial state, so entrenching inequality and underdevelopment within the Irish Free State.

Chapter 4

Repeat After Me: Capitalism and Education in "Nestor"

In "Telemachus," class struggles are laid bare, with Stephen verbalizing many of his defiant, oppositional thoughts while others are conveyed via interior monologue. Social and economic roles and relationships, power dynamics, and corresponding modes of interacting are significantly different in the following episode. In "Nestor," Stephen's subservient position as a Catholic teacher employed in a Protestant-run school requires the deployment of different forms of resistance than those he utilized in "Telemachus."

A meeting between Stephen and his employer, Garrett Deasy, headmaster of the Dalkey School, allows an examination of the impact of British imperialism in Ireland, historically and contemporaneously, as explored through the relationship between (Ulster) Presbyterians and Catholics. That impact is manifested, subtly and obviously, in words, songs, coins, and collections. It is manifested in the way people talk to and think about each other. It can be seen by examining their perspectives on interrelated issues related to politics, religion, power, and money. Trevor Williams summed it up thusly:

> …. dialectic of fluidity/fixity is apparent in Nestor. Here history … is a terrain of struggle for interpretation, which, once won, becomes fixed … and puts thought to sleep. The interpretation of the likes of the Ulsterman Deasy becomes, because he represents the dominating class, received opinion, or rather "the dictates of common sense". (38)

The way these issues and situations are viewed, understood, and thought about by Stephen and Deasy are quite different and epitomize the many gaps between them. As in

"Telemachus," conflicts exist between members of different religions: the Presbyterian Deasy and the Catholic Stephen; the Anglican Haines and the Catholic Stephen. However, in both instances, the tensions are not theological but rather are symptomatic of broader, related issues of class and "ethnicity," economics and culture. While money is an ongoing concern in "Telemachus," in "Nestor," it is imbued with moral significance. The educational system is deployed as a means of enforcing and expanding the hegemonic dominance of capitalism generally and, in Deasy's case specifically, as expressed through his Protestant ethic that equates moral superiority with the accumulation of money.

Deasy seeks to control and contain everything, and this includes historical narratives. Because he is smugly sure of his righteousness, he does not truly listen to or hear Stephen; that is, he "misrecognizes" him in the Hegelian/Rosean sense. Deasy speaks incessantly, mindlessly, and often incorrectly. As a de facto representative of Ulster Protestant Orangemen, he relishes his dominant position and its symbolic representations. Deasy has a distorted view of history, and Stephen's reactions and responses to his employer's imposed and ill-founded pronouncements reveal his evolving willingness and ability to more actively resist misrecognitions and mistreatments. Whereas Deasy's pronouncements are bombastic and error-filled, Stephen's are insightful, poetic, and demonstrate a deep historical knowledge. Stephen is the subservient participant in these conversations, and his challenging and ironic responses are often unspoken; they are reminiscent of the flashes of insight described by Benjamin.

The episode commences with Stephen teaching a room of Protestant schoolboys. As the opening text shifts seamlessly between first-person and third-person narration and internal and external focalization, we become privy to Stephen's musings as he reflects on

the Romantic era poetry of William Blake and the classical philosophy of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* in his consideration of the concept of history, invoking a key theme of the episode and the novel. Stephen considers Blake's counter-enlightenment principles and speculatively interprets Aristotle's argument that historical possibilities may be "infinite" until one of the possibilities is actualized: "was that only possible which came to pass?" (2:48-52). Stephen's expansive and speculative considerations will subsequently be contrasted with Deasy's narrow-minded, teleological perspective.

There are many other differences between Stephen and Deasy. Some are obvious: Stephen is young; Deasy is old. Deasy is established in his profession; Stephen is just starting. Deasy saves; Stephen spends. Stephen is Catholic; Deasy, who is Protestant, has a teleological and narrow perspective of history: he assumes his perspective is correct and that history is deterministically "all pointed to one great goal, the manifestation of God" (2.380-81). Even though he does not consciously understand it as such, this goal is the reproduction of capital—the perpetuation of existing class structures, which in his worldview, goes hand-in-hand with religious and ethnic domination.

Unlike Deasy, Stephen thinks about history deeply. He resists the predetermination of the spatio-temporal dominance of capitalism with its inherent drive for self-reproduction. He chafes at his participation in this process as manifested in his role as an educator of upper-class Protestant youth: he is a wage-laborer preparing young members of the ruling class to dominate. Stephen considers the history he teaches and that Deasy endorses a construction: a narrative molded to fit the needs of the powerful and enacted to continue the teleological movement toward their further accumulation of capital. Stephen is not

proclaiming an ahistorical mantra when he states, “History is a nightmare from which I am trying to escape” (2:377). Instead, he is stating his resistance to his role as a propagator of a teleological status quo and voicing the possibility of speculative outcomes. He may, indeed, be referencing Marx’s *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte:* “Men make their own history, but they do not make it as they please; they do not make it under self-selected circumstances, but under circumstances existing already, given and transmitted from the past. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living*”* (1852).

However, Stephen’s position is anathema to Deasy. Having no desire to engage in a meaningful dialogue with Stephen, he responds to his statement with a banal appropriation of a biblical quote: “the ways of the creator are not our ways” (2:380), closing down discourse in a decidedly anti-democratic gesture. Stephen's response—that God is “A shout in the street” (2:386) is open to interpretation, vibrant, and newly created. Deasy lacks the capability to appreciate complexity. As an unintellectually-oriented, unquestioning Presbyterian, Deasy embraces a belief system based on predestination and an individually focused dogma that suggests that material and financial success is God-given. Like this version of Protestantism he espouses, and unlike the Catholicism he rejects, he is purely materialistic. This focus on materiality is best understood through a consideration of the discussions he chooses *not* to participate in: he does not attempt to engage with Stephen's provocative or inscrutable remarks.

Max Weber’s *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* introduced the proposition that capitalism developed as a result of the Protestant ethic that encouraged the accumulation of individual wealth and highlighted the importance of individual effort.

Expanding upon Weber's thesis, Benjamin attacks capitalism, stating, "One must see capitalism as a religion"[10] (Löwy, "Capitalism as Religion," 62). Stephen's inability to save money evinces a misalignment with or rejection of the Protestant ethic. Although his reasoning may differ from Deasy's, they both aim to obtain money. For Deasy, the accumulation of money is his "one great goal" (2:381). While this goal is not stated directly, it can be surmised from Deasy's actions; he exemplifies Weber's statement that the "idea that man has duties toward the possessions which have been entrusted to him and of whom he is only a devoted administrator . . . weighs over life with all its icy weight. He must . . . increase them by working without respite" (Löwy, "Historical Materialism" 65, citing Weber). Reflective of the repetitive nature of accumulation in capitalism, the acquisition of currency for its own sake, in multiple forms—coins, shells, and one might even say cattle, drives him. He imbues it with moral and religious significance, conflating its meaning.

For Stephen, money is a medium of exchange, and he uses it on a transactional basis. As he mentions in "Telemachus," "The problem is to get money" (1:497): it is the means by which he can acquire food, drink, books, prostitutes—items he deems essential. The distinction between Stephen's and Deasy's attitudes toward money reflects the distinction between pre-capitalism and capitalism: Stephen seeks to acquire it; Deasy seeks to accumulate it.

Signaling Stephen's awareness of the (un)changing nature of both religion and labor (capitalism), he connects his salary negotiations with the *Gloria Patri:* "As on the first day he bargained with me here. As it was in the beginning, is now" (2:200-201). Upon receiving his salary from Deasy, Stephen thinks about the repetitiveness of the situation and his participation in it:

> The same room and hour, the same wisdom and I the same. Three times now. Three nooses round me here. Well? I can break them in this instant if I will. (2:233-235)

This is the *repetition* that is central to capitalism[11]: the unchanging logic repeated everywhere and seemingly for all time. Stephen comprehends what is happening and fears that he will be locked into the wage-labor system if he continues working for Deasy. He will later signal his refusal to participate in this form of the repetition of capital via the education of the ruling classes and resign.

The concept of social reproduction, introduced by Marx, refers to "the non-economic preconditions of economic reproduction, starting with the social reproduction of labor power itself in superstructural institutions such as the family and education" (Morrow 707). The educational system is an essential building block, subtly educating the future elite and workers about their roles in society and imparting cultural and behavioral norms along with their academic subjects. Although particular in the example of a Protestant boys' school (or even the more extensive Irish educational system), the depiction of how, from an early age, hegemonic behaviors are imparted through cultural institutions is simultaneously universal.

In that, Stephen would not be, from Marx's perspective, different from other wage laborers. In her analysis of today's service sector, Fiona Tregenna concludes that Marx explicitly, if unenthusiastically, recognized the service sector, including education in that category: "If we take an example from outside the sphere of material production, a schoolmaster is a productive worker when, in addition to belabouring the heads of his pupils, he works himself to the ground to enrich the owner of the school. That the latter has laid out his capital in a teaching factory, instead of in a sausage factory, makes no difference to the

relation" (Tregenna 289, citing Marx, *Capital*,1967, 644). Indeed, because Stephen was not a permanent employee of the Dalkey School, one could compare him to a present-day adjunct professor subjected to economic exploitation by a profit-oriented educational institution.[12] Both these adjunct professors and Stephen are interchangeable entities in their workplaces.

Cyril Sargent's befuddled mathematical endeavors encapsulate the students' preparation for their role as capitalists. Unable to understand the assignment he has been asked to complete, he is instead instructed by the headmaster Deasy to "copy them off the board" (2:136). This interaction also demonstrates Stephens's humanity: in his interior monologue, Stephen reveals empathy and kindness; he speaks to the boy patiently and calmly, in contrast with Deasy's harsh demeanor toward his charges. Similarly, Bloom displays an unexpected awareness and tenderness in "Lotus Eaters." Seeing a young boy smoking (a form of escapism, one of the themes of that episode), he debates to himself the wisdom of advising him not to smoke. "O let him. His life isn't such a bed of roses. Waiting outside pubs to bring da home" (5:8-9). But given Cyril's place in society—the son of a well-to-do Presbyterian—he does not need to understand the logic of the numbers, only how to oversee them, highlighting the role of education of the ruling class in capitalism. Likewise, his classmates memorize John Milton's "Lycidas," underscoring not only the repetitiveness of capitalism but the ease with which it is perpetuated and indoctrinated—dead British poets/poetry and culture kept alive through rote memorization in the educational system. Further underscoring their indoctrination in Unionist values and culture, the sport of choice at the Dalkey School is hockey, a "British" sport, rather than hurling, the sport endorsed by Gaelic revivalists. The use of hockey to represent British and unionist culture is ironic given its Indian origins and is yet another example of Deasy's ignorant misappropriations.

Deasy provides a quintessential, if boorish, example of a capitalist disposition. Focused on money and constantly quantifying things, he demonstrates the related acquisitive capitalistic concerns and thrifty Protestant tendencies. Money, whether it is the cowrie shells or old coins that Deasy collects or the new coinage with which he compensates Stephen, serves as an organizing principle of his life. "Money is power" (2:337) is the advice he offers to Stephen upon meting out his salary, stating his philosophy, and asserting his position. Stephen understands the shells as "symbols soiled by greed" (2:226-27) from the perspective of them being stolen bounty, the spoils of war. Admonishing Stephen to save money,[13] Deasy cites the ability to acquire and save as a sign not just of individual success but of the success of the British empire. As a Unionist member of the middle class, he is loyal to the monarchy and true to his capitalistic nature, he also worships the coinage that features British monarchs: sovereigns and crowns.

Indicative of his thrifty nature and the influence of modernity, he insists that Stephen acquire what Stephen refers to as a "savings box" (2:218), but Deasy interestingly calls it a machine: his advice to Stephen is "you just buy one of these machines" (2:230). The items Deasy collects are modern and ancient. He does not seem to distinguish between them; they are all commodities to him and devoid of inherent meaning. While several items in the room have symbolic meaning and allude to historical events, Deasy's knowledge of or appreciation for the significance of these events is questionable. For example, Deasy has amassed a collection of shells, which Stephen refers to as "An old pilgrim's hoard, dead treasure, hollow shells" (2:215-16). Unsurprisingly, Deasy misses both the religious connotations of specific shells (the scallop of saint James) and, ironically, the financial significance of the cowries. With the latter, Deasy has provided another demonstration of the replication of capitalism.

Whereas Stephen is keenly aware of the interconnectedness/possibilities of things, Deasy is more limited and singularly focused. Deasy is a religious and historical determinist; he does not question how things are related. He alters facts to fit his narrative rather than change the narrative. He wants to simplify things—to put them "in a nutshell" (2:321) — dead, closed, hard, like the shells and coins he collects. Stephen connects and combines. He thinks conceptually; he has an artist's perspective and combines ideas, events, and images, from various (not necessarily linear) time frames, in a single contemplation. Deasy is more singularly focused in his discourses and his writings. While he may be long-winded, as evidenced by his 'Foot and Mouth' letter, his inflated, obsequious language does not say much and leaves no room for dissent: "There can be no two opinions on the matter" (2:322-23).

Stephen responds not only to words and concepts but also to visual and physical stimuli: the room reminds him of his first meeting with Deasy, and as he thinks about the repetitiveness of the situation, he makes a mental connection to the *Gloria Patri,* which he recites in part to himself. Unlike Deasy, he understands the cosmology of repetition, and the repetitive ritual of the doling out of his salary is juxtaposed with the prayer, again calling to mind Benjamin's observation that "capitalism is religion." After thinking internally about other items in the room, Stephen returns to the conclusion of the *Gloria Patri* and concludes to himself—at least for now—that the Protestant establishment has prevailed.

> As it was in the beginning, is now. On the sideboard the tray of Stuart coins, base treasure of a bog; and ever shall be. And snug in their spooncase of purple plush, faded, the twelve apostles having preached to all the gentiles: world without out end. (2:200-204)

The debased Stuart coins represent the failure of the Catholic church in England. Silver apostle spoons, often christening gifts from well-to-do people, were initially a Catholic custom, but English Protestants adopted the practice during the Reformation. Deasy's acquisition, control, and containment of these symbols of money, rank, and religion, signifies his—and the Protestants'—dominant position. Deasy holds the victors' booty—that is, their currency—and also, with his collections, monetizes and sets the terms for the value of Irish history, an act different in its manifestation but similar in its violence to the commodification of culture and history put forth by Mulligan and Haines. Emblematic of Deasy's delusional perception of himself and his brethren is his sense of righteousness, articulated in his comment to Stephen: "We are a generous people also, but we must be just" (2:262). His statement is reminiscent of Haines' half-hearted concession, which denies personal responsibility and therefore avoids the need for corrective action: "We feel in England that we have treated you rather unfairly" (1:648). In combination with his abbreviated and incorrect historical memory, Deasy has fabricated a narrative that rationalizes the economic and physical pain inflicted on Irish Catholics by Irish Protestants while simultaneously justifying Unionist domination. Similarly, he will rely on platitudes and "commonsense" to justify his anti-Semitism and misogyny.

Deasy blames Jews and women for Ireland and Britain's problems, universalizing his racist and sexist beliefs. In lines 346 - 377 of "Nestor," Deasy warns Stephen of the infiltration of the Jews in British finance and press sectors leading to England's decay. Deasy (and the Ulster Protestants) have submitted to the dominance of British imperialism and capital because Britain supported Unionism, and he faces a conundrum when Britain, countenancing support for Home Rule, acts against his interests. However, instead of

criticizing Britain, he deflects by blaming Jewish influence. Stephen counters his claim that the "jew merchants are already at their work of destruction" (2:350-51) by pointing out that the common element between the merchants is their profession, not their religion: "A merchant, Stephen said, is one who buys cheap and sells dear, jew or gentile, is he not?" (2:359-360). Deasy can only reply by paraphrasing a banal biblical adage, stating "the ways of the creator are not our ways" (2:380).

In summary, cultural iconography and education are vehicles used by Deasy to reinforce and promote a capitalist, imperialist ideology that promulgates a distorted interpretation of history. Both Haines and Deasy universalize to distance themselves from the historical actions of their predecessors and their contemporaneous actions. Their need to distance suggests an awareness, perhaps unconscious, of their complicity. Rose's comment is appropriate: "modern law is that of *legal status,* where those with subjective rights and subjective ends deceived themselves and others that they act for the universal when they care only for their own interest" (*Mourning* 73). Both Haines and Deasy impose their cultures and norms on the Irish Catholic Stephen, even though they are, respectively, a visiting Englishman and a descendant of Ulster Scots and, as such, are both, to some extent, transgressors in Ireland. History repeats itself.

Chapter 5

The Emptiness of a Crowded Room: Lessons from the Headmaster's Study

That Stephen and Deasy are different in temperament, beliefs, and intellect is unquestionable. So too is the way they live, as expressed in the novel by the way they are "housed." Stephen has been living in barren quarters in a Martello Tower, although he may soon be dispossessed. While the specifics of Deasy's residence are unknown, much can be gleaned from descriptions of his study, and he is clearly materially well endowed. As discussed in chapter 4, Deasy wants to contain, collect, and control, whether it is his students, historical narrative, or money. This orientation and need apply to his study, where his collections are housed. However, "study," as he refers to it, is an ironic name for this room: Deasy has learned little about or from the items he collects.

His study illustrates the paradoxical, ahistorical nature of capitalism and imperialism in which history does not entail change but instead endless repetition. In this room, history is frozen—in static pictures of British racehorses, in petrified shells, in spoons ensconced in velvet-lined cases. Yet, simultaneously, it is expanding as Deasy continues to amass new treasures, demonstrating Marx's general formula of capital, M-C- M'. Stephen feels suffocated in this room, characteristic of the crammed Victorian bourgeoisie interiors that Benjamin described. It is the relevance of Benjamin's contemplations[14]—of bourgeois domestic interiors, collections, time, and more—that is the focus of this section of this thesis. Benjamin speaks of the emptiness of these densely packed rooms:

> The space disguises itself—puts on, like an alluring creature, the costumes of mods. The well-fed petit-bourgeois philistine should know something of the feeling that the next room might have witnessed the coronation of Charlemagne as well as the assassination of Henry IV. . . In the end, things are merely mannequins, and even the great moments of history are only costumes beneath which they exchange glances of complicity with nothingness, with the petty and the banal. Such nihilism is the innermost core of bourgeois coziness . . . extravagant interior design of the period. To live in these interiors was to have woven a dense fabric about oneself, to have secluded oneself within a spider's web, in whose toils world events hang loosely suspended like so many insect bodies sucked dry. (*Arcades*, 216, I2,6)

Accordingly, Deasy *should* know the feeling the objects in his study connote. But he does not. Despite the harbor or safe haven that Deasy has created for himself in his office, the world still intrudes. Jews, women, and the cattle trade threaten his well-being. Closer to home, his pupils, the source of his capital, require his attention. Public and private spaces, interiority and exteriority, are always inextricably related to each other. This is particularly obvious in the example of a headmaster's study.[15] Deasy's persona and dwelling reflect the extent to which exterior/external factors shape his interior/interiority. His accumulative drive is visible in his collections which are expressions of religious, cultural, and economic domination. In his office, he has created his perfect, orderly world. But he cannot remain there, apart and aloof. Despite

his sense of individuality and self-sufficiency ("*I paid my way*"(2:251)), he is inexorably linked to the external world: his students provide his livelihood.

Deasy's study is decorated with relics of a history of his construction and memorabilia of a past that he does not understand. (That is made clear by his ongoing literary and historical misstatements). As Benjamin would explain it, he has nihilistically wrapped himself in a dense façade, creating a narrative for himself, Ireland, and Great Britain:

> We must understand dwelling in its most extreme form as a condition of nineteenth-century existence…The original form of all dwelling is existence not in the house but in the shell. The difference between the two: the <latter> bears quite visibly the impression of its occupant. In the most extreme instance, the dwelling becomes a shell. The nineteenth century, like no other century, was addicted to dwelling. It conceived the residence as the receptacle for the person, and it encased him, with all his appurtenances, so deeply in the dwelling's interior that one might be reminded of the inside of a compass case, where the instrument with all its accessories lies embedded in deep, usually violet folds of velvet. (*Arcades,* 865, P^{O},3)

The disenchantment of the world that was ushered in by the asceticism of Calvinist Protestantism ironically led to the enchantment of capital. Rejecting the sanctification of the other-worldly found in medieval Catholicism, Protestants sanctified the worldly. Eugene McCarraher states: "the rejection of *works* as a means of salvation entailed a

gospel of *work*," with work taking the place of Catholic ritual (30). Protestantism emptied Christianity of its metaphysical (irrational) value by destroying/devaluing its ritual, iconography, and universality. Capitalism *re-enchants* the world by imbuing material objects, especially money itself, with metaphysical significance.

As a Presbyterian, Deasy would shun the worship of religious iconography, relics, and symbols. But his collections show how the re-enchantment of capitalism allows for the ironic influence of pre/Catholicism in his collections. Deasy has replaced earlier forms of worship with his own. Statues of saints have been replaced by shells (including one that honors a saint); religious icons are replaced with artwork of venerated horses and princes. The conquerors have subsumed/adapted and taken ownership of the cultural practices of the conquered.

Deasy is *living* capitalism. His "money machine" is one of his prized possessions, and his quarters are furnished with displays of various forms of currency. Although he is the owner/putative collector of those objects, he is seemingly unaware of or unmoved by the humanity associated with them. Unlike Deasy, Stephen is aware of these objects' history and representational power. Stephen juxtaposes the Stuart coins with the shells; both connect to James. "On the sideboard the tray of Stuart coins, base treasure of a bog, and ever shall be. And snug in their spooncase of purple plush, faded, the twelve apostles having preached to all the gentiles: world without end" (2:200-204). The Stuart coins refer to James II of England, who converted to Catholicism and debased the Irish currency to support his (unsuccessful) efforts to stay in power. Silver apostle spoons, often christening gifts from well-to-do people, were initially a Catholic custom, but the practice continued during the Reformation. "The scallop of St. James" (2:215)

> makes the connection not only between money and religion but also refers to the Catholic adoration of saints. Although he belongs to a church that eschews the worship of symbols, Deasy collects profane symbols of saints. Pondering the shells and coins in Deasy's study, Stephen understands that the cowries and scallops at one time were currency and makes connections between these inanimate objects, past events, and the salary he receives to teach the history and culture they represent: "Symbols too of beauty and of power. A lump in my pocket: symbols soiled by greed and misery" (2.226-27)". He thinks of the sovereigns and crowns—signifiers of British rule—he receives as payment and makes connections between political power, religion, and capital. With these connections, Stephen (unknowingly) connects capitalism and imperialism, Marxism and postcolonialism.

The ease with which Deasy forgets or re-arranges/re-imagines history is contrasted with Stephen's reactions to these retellings. That Deasy is an "educator" does not imply that he has a commitment to the pursuit of the truth. On the contrary, he is an "educator" in the ironic, ideological sense supportive of capitalistic reproduction. Committed to the promulgation of the Protestant Unionist agenda in maintaining control, he imagines a recent past in which pro-unionist Protestants were best suited to champion Irish interests. He asks Stephen, "Do you know that the orange lodges agitated for repeal of the union twenty years before O'Connell did?" (2:270-1). Stephen's response, communicated via interior monologue, provides a counterpoint to Deasy's white-washed, self-congratulatory narrative and recalls scenes of physical and financial violence inflicted upon Catholics by Protestants in the 1790s:

> Glorious, pious and immortal memory. The lodge of Diamond
> in Armagh the splendid behung with corpses of papishes. Hoarse,
> masked and armed, the planters' covenant. The black north and true blue
> bible. Croppies lie down. (2:273-76)

This is an apt demonstration of how Stephen is, in Benjamin's understanding of the collector, a "physiognomist" or "interprete[r] of fate":

> It must be kept in mind that, for the collector, the world is present, and indeed ordered, in each of his objects. Ordered, however, according to a surprising and, for the profane understanding, incomprehensible connection…within this circumscribed field, we can understand how great physiognomists (and collectors are physiognomists of the world of things) become interpreters of fate. (*Arcades* 207, H2,7, H2a,1)

Deasy considers himself a collector in the everyday, familiar sense of the term, and his collections provide a sense of order and structure. But he finds greater inherent value in the objects as capital. He lacks appreciation for the value of the objects in themselves, and it is Stephen who, in a moment of dialectical reversal, is the collector in Benjamin's sense of the term and can understand the history, interpret the stories, and try to find meaning in Deasy's items. With this insight/orientation, a perspective of how historical events and contemporary interpretations of those events are understood by Deasy and Stephen is enriched.

"Glorious, pious and immortal memory"(2:273). Stephen connects this benign-sounding Orange Order toast to William of Orange (William III) with images of physical and economic violence that ensued in the years that followed: "The lodge of Diamond in

Armagh the splendid behung with corpses of papishes, Hoarse, masked and armed, the planters' covenants, The black north, and true blue bible. Croppies lie down" (2:274-77). For Stephen, history as a collection of isolated frozen moments, images, and slogans repeated endlessly reveals a different historical understanding in what Benjamin calls a "dialectical image" (*Arcades* 462; n2a, 3). Instead, he understands that the English were the true barbarians whose actions have been glossed over or reimagined by the Ulstermen and, in "Nestor", by Deasy.

Deasy's version of history demonstrates how it can be constructed or modified to provide the required narrative. In his case, it justifies his interpretation of British imperialism that brought the Protestants to Ireland and then justifies his subsequent othering behaviors such as blaming Jews for England's problems and essentializing Catholics—to wit, calling Stephen a Fenian and connecting his spendthrift behaviors to his ethnicity. Whereas Stephen connects long-ago events and the present, Deasy disassociates and rationalizes. It is this tendency and ability to rationalize, which Weber associates with Protestantism (most specifically, with the Presbyterian theology of John Calvin), that allowed the Ulster Protestants to not only slaughter the Irish referred to in Stephen's internal monologue but to celebrate and historicize the moment in a mocking song ("Croppies lie down" 2:274), reflecting the moral emptiness of Ulster Unionism. Deasy even gets his personal history wrong. He states that he is descended from Sir John Blackwood and incorrectly asserts that Blackwood voted for the union when actually, he made an extraordinary effort to vote against it (Gifford 36-7). Stephen's inscrutable direct discourse response—"alas"—may be his commentary on the fact that Blackwood voted for the union, that "we are all Irish," or that he knows Deasy was incorrect. Being in a

subordinate position, there are limits to the degree to which he can openly mock or challenge Deasy. However, he internally mocks Deasy's continued mistelling of history by countering Deasy's narrative, with its connotations of wealth and glory associated with Unionism, with a song about a poor Irish Catholic boy who is abused as he travels from Connacht to Liverpool.

> *Lal the ral the ra*
>
> *The rocky road to Dublin.* (2:284-85)

He then imagines the scene Deasy has proposed, complete with polite dialogue, demonstrating his awareness of the distinction between told history and what probably happened.

> A gruff squire on horseback with shiny topboots. Soft day, sir John! Soft day, your honour!... Day!... Day!...
>
> Two topboots jog dangling on to Dublin. Lal the ral the ra. Lal the ral the raddy. (2:286-88)

As Nolan points out, Stephen's unspoken response not only corrects the inaccuracies of Deasy's pronouncement; it suggests a counterargument to those who believe that Stephen finds "historical fact uninteresting or irrelevant" (*Nationalism* 71).

Stephen's interior monologues (in "Nestor" and elsewhere) anticipate Benjamin's "On the Concept of History*,"* in which he speaks to flashes of recognition of the past in the present: "The true picture of the past flits by. The past can be seized only as an image that flashes up at the moment of its recognizability and is never seen again…For it is an irretrievable image which threatens to disappear in any present that does not recognize itself as intended in that image" (Löwy, *Fire Alarm* 40).

Stasi addresses how modernist writers understand and conceptualize space and time differently than their predecessors:

> [Eliot, Joyce, Pound, and Woolf] …seek to alter the appropriative subject of Western imperialism, … reimagining its relation to its own locale or confronting it with values …outside of its parameters, even as they reveal the subjective and situated interest of such efforts… they suggest that history is of our own making, but the object out of which we make it are the historical agency that can only be recuperated through the creation of various forms of community, in this case: imperialist expansion, the intertwined notions of endless progress and static tradition, and the seeming loss of various forms of community. Modernism attempts to disclose community through a dialectical understanding of tradition that rescues values from Europe's precapitalist past, suggesting both the recovery and persistence of the values capitalism imagines itself to have eliminated from view. (37)

His commentary on attempts to recover lost values has great relevance for an analysis of *Ulysses* as Deasy's need to amass comes into conflict with Stephen's need to survive. As told through Deasy's collections and Stephen's and Deasy's recollections, the past may be fettered in collections but cannot be forgotten.

> Modernist writing thus retains the redemptive stance associated with Benjamin's dialectical images, those constellations of then and now … Once again we encounter the methodological imperative to totalize. Modernism, though, achieves totality only in the momentary flashes Benjamin associates with redemptive temporality (37).

At twelve pages in length[16], "Nestor" is the shortest episode in *Ulysses.* But in this brief episode, Joyce provided a focused consideration of a simple but fraught exchange between unequals. Illuminated by Stephen's thoughts—what might be referred to as Benjamian recollections of the past—the events that occur in the Dalkey School in the space of one hour span many centuries. In this way, past and present are recoverable, memorialized, and totalized to the extent that events can be seen as parts of a larger whole, if only briefly.

Chapter 6

"To Be or Not To Be": Considering Recognition in "Scylla and Charybdis"

In "Scylla and Charybdis," a veneer of culture masks issues of class and sectarian bias. As in "Nestor," where historical narrative is shown to be molded to fit the needs of the Unionists, or in "Telemachus," where we witness ancient Irish culture being appropriated by Haines and mocked by Mulligan, so too in "Scylla and Charybdis" are the meanings, veracity, purposes, and motivations of histories and storytellers questioned. The battlefield is the Irish National Library, and the combatants are the librarians and revivalists who are present when Stephen presents his argument about Shakespeare and Hamlet. Also present, literally in passing, is Leopold Bloom, whose appearance is brief but significant.

There is an unmistakable thematic connection to Book XII of Homer's Odyssey, where Odysseus must chart a course between two evils, the sea-monsters Scylla and Charybdis. However, unlike Odysseus, the challenges Stephen faces are oratorical and intellectual, not physical. The Charybdis he encounters is the swirling vortex of his interlocutors' Platonist arguments—metaphysical and confusing; and Scylla would be Stephen's own Aristotelian, multi-headed, materialist, biting, and pointed arguments. As in Homer's tale, the navigation of oppositions is central in the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode in *Ulysses*: between idealism and materialism (Plato and Aristotle), aesthetic and historical experience, and tradition and modernity, the three central oppositions which provide the focus here. And just as Odysseus did in *The Odyssey*, Stephen follows Circe's advice and hews closer to Scylla: it is better to lose a few men (or points in an argument) than to lose everyone (everything) and get lost forever in a swirling vortex. In addition, the speculative

negotiation of oppositions is also addressed more obscurely through the episode via a series of allusions to the Trinity and the relationship of Father, Son, and Spirit (Geist). However, a fuller exploration of this particular line of allusion is beyond the scope of the present study. Joyce (via Stephen) explores oppositions speculatively, unlike Stephen's audience members (members of the Dublin literary community that Joyce knew, fictionalized to a degree), who are presented as fixed in their positions.

As in the episodes discussed thus far, cultural and economic issues are in contention. And as Marx suggests, the two are inextricably linked through ideology. According to Marx (*The Eighteenth*), culture is an expression of objective reality shaped "by socially generated ideologies" (MacPhee). However, in this episode, while the cultural issues are quite clear, economic concerns are more oblique, and as I will demonstrate, it is left to Stephen to bring them to the surface; the others are quite happy to ignore them.

Although it was not a formal organization, the members of the Irish Literary Revival were aligned in their goal to develop and promote a distinct Irish literary and cultural identity. Most literary revivalists were Anglo-Irish Protestants, and for them it was vital to establish themselves as authentically Irish and, accordingly, distance themselves from the Englishness with which they were associated. They were, in this sense, a part of the nationalist intelligentsia. But the Irish identity that they imagined was shorn of political conflict, and this desire to de-politicize Irish cultural nationalism was paradoxically a decidedly political statement. Despite their minority status, the Anglo-Irish literary revivalists wanted to lead the movement for cultural renewal, so it was advantageous to shut down discourse about politics (specifically, Home Rule) and focus exclusively on culture.

Accordingly, it was to their advantage to elide the issue of sectarianism, both political and religious, and focus on shared culture.

They did so through literature that presents an aestheticized, idealized past that celebrates and romanticizes pre-Christian Irish society, Irish mythology, and folklore, and which eschews the modern. Doing so allowed them to bypass some uncomfortable stages in Irish and English history. Ironically, they not only bypass the English invasions of Ireland but also displaced themselves by overlooking their own arrival. By venerating their Celtic heritage, they, like Matthew Arnold, pick and choose the characteristics they find most desirable. These characteristics are anti-bourgeois, anti-modern, and anti-Catholic. By claiming ownership of Celtic literature in Ireland, the Anglo-Irish Revivalists attempt to dominate the language, favoring an English-based canon of newly generated texts they created. These texts reference their vision of Celtic ideals in poetry, plays, fiction, and journalism; they translate Gaelic-language works into English (sometimes accompanied by Gaelic text). As I will explain, they venerate, essentialize, and misrecognize the Irish peasant to accomplish their goals.

The group has similarly idealized and objectified Shakespeare and so their representatives in *Ulysses* object to Stephen's version of a historical Shakespeare. They bought into the culturally dominant Shakespeare promulgated by Arnold among others: a rational, imperialistic, infallible Shakespeare who was the epitome of Englishness. The Shakespeare they revere is a Platonic ideal and is the Shakespeare espoused by the Anglo-Irish Shakespearean scholar Edward Dowden, who is discussed in greater detail below. However, it is worth noting at this point that Stephen's audience fails to see the irony in their own reconstruction of and admiration for such Gaelic mythology via an idealized aesthetics

developed through the canonization of Shakespeare. Instead of considering Stephen's approach speculatively—as a reconsideration that opens up the future—they think it an affront. Because they do not understand ideas and ideals as historically generated concepts, they fail to see the irony of mixing and matching Platonic ideals—imperialist Shakespeare and pre-Christian peasants, for example.

Stephen has come to the library seeking the recognition of these very people, representatives of the Irish literary community. Although he has been repeatedly misrecognized (by the milkwoman, Haines, Mulligan, Deasy, and numerous others not mentioned herein), he is not closed to the possibility of recognition and reconciliation. But he also seems to understand that such states are transitive and speculative—here in the library as elsewhere. (Mis)recognition is indeed the subject of Stephen's argument, in which he asks, "Who is King Hamlet?" (9:150). Drawing parallels between the biographical Shakespeare, the fictional Hamlet, and their relationships, he presents a trinitarian argument that is also profoundly personal.

Haines is present as the episode commences, but he is enticed by the mention of the availability of a new book of revivalist poetry, Douglas Hyde's translation of *Lovesongs of Connacht*. Rather than supporting his friend, Haines chooses to depart (9:91) and misses Stephen's free and fleeting lecture in favor of purchasing Hyde's book. In response, Stephen recalls and comments to himself on earlier duplicitous comments proffered by Haines: "We feel in England. Penitent thief" (9:101). Once again, Stephen has been treated unfairly by the colonizer.

The group will later be joined by Mulligan, the only Catholic in the room besides Stephen. True to his nature, Mulligan actively engages with and surreptitiously mocks

members of the Literary Revival. He is a medical student and is not at the library to present a theory. Upon his arrival, Stephen reflects on his displacement: "They make him welcome. *Was Du verlachst wirst Du noch dienen* (9:491)" (That which you laugh at, you shall nevertheless serve). This may be Stephen's commentary on Mulligan's behavior toward the revivalists, suggesting that he is less empowered than he thinks. It may also refer to Stephen's relationship with Mulligan and the former's increasing sense of agency.

Nonetheless, Mulligan manages to get himself welcomed into the discussion, with librarian Lyster stating, "Mr Mulligan, I'll be bound, has his theory too of the play and of Shakespeare. All sides of life should be represented" (9:503-05). It demonstrates Mulligan's duplicity, providing further proof of his manipulative nature as a comprador, as discussed in chapter 3. Recognizing potential opportunities from alliances with the future literary elite, he has managed to ingratiate himself with the group. Therefore, it is not surprising that he, not Stephen, is invited to a gathering of prominent literary figures that evening. Stephen's comment on Mulligan in "Telemachus," the first episode of Ulysses, is apt once again: "Usurper" (1:744).

However, Mulligan is not the only one who puts on airs. While Stephen inwardly seethes at the insults that are heaped upon him by his audience, he remains, in his words, "super-polite" (9:56), simultaneously seeking to ingratiate himself with a group whose influence he knows could be meaningful but also dismissive of many of their positions. Reminiscent of Bhabha's formulation of mimicry, Stephen's seemingly earnest politeness is decidedly edgy.

Although the Revival is sometimes cited as an example of rapprochement in tense sectarian relationships in Ireland, it (also) reveals another instance of Protestant domination

over the Catholic majority, this time in the literary arena. It is significant that Stephen's interlocutors—the writer, critic, and editor George Russell (AE), the librarians Thomas Lyster and Dr. Richard Best, and the librarian and critic John Eglington (William Magee), are Protestant, at least by birth. Eglinton, who iconoclastically does not endorse the Revival or cultural nationalism, is a well-known member of the literary community as a critic and essayist; he is the most fervent participant in the discussion.

Given that the assembled listeners (sans Mulligan) come from Protestant backgrounds, typically considered more practical and present-focused, it is noteworthy that the Catholic Stephen reveals a concrete, realist perspective. It is those with a Protestant heritage who engage with the transcendental via theosophy, and all, excluding Eglinton, share a reverence for the past. The revivalists and Eglington strongly endorse a neo-Platonic approach; Stephen favors Aristotle, although he does not present himself as dogmatically as his challengers. Stephen's materialist leanings shape his analyses of Shakespeare and Hamlet; these are grounded in the histories of Shakespeare, Hamlet, and himself. The other participants are idealists and have varying perspectives and degrees of interest in biographical and historical information and context as it relates to understanding literature.

Stephen's approach conflicts with the group's Platonic idealism that insists that literature reflects idealized forms; it provokes outright anger from Eglinton: "Upon my word it makes my blood boil to hear anyone compare Aristotle with Plato" (9:80-81). Stephen's clever and appropriate response, "Which of the two ... would have banished me from his commonwealth?" (9:82-83) serves as a reminder to the group that Plato objected to poetry, i.e., the literary arts in general, as potentially dangerous imitations or misrepresentations of ideals. Specifically, he endorsed teaching state-sanctioned poetry to children because it

promulgated a singular, non-pluralistic perspective. In contrast, while Aristotle agrees that poetry is imitative, he does not consider this a potentially dangerous factor: he thinks it is always educational and views it as a means of opening up multiple perspectives.

He also invokes the groups' anger by suggesting Shakespeare's potential financial motivations and sexual improprieties. Stephen's interlocutors prefer to view the bard from a Platonic, idealist position: untainted by the reality of human interactions, motivations, and emotions. Cleary notes Stephen's realistic assessment of Shakespeare: "For Stephen, … that Renaissance is already decidedly capitalist and imperialist and displays all the signs of their corrupt excesses" (*Modernism, Empire and World Literature* [*MEW*]175). Stephen remarks that Shakespeare "was a country gentleman…with a coat of arms, and landed estate at Stratford and a house in Ireland yard, a capitalist shareholder, a bill promoter, a tithefarmer" (9:710:12). Certainly, this runs counter to the Shakespeare that is promoted in the colonies or imagined incorrectly by Deasy as Polonius. That Shakespeare is the epitome of civilized Englishness and a manifestation of the cultural supremacy of British imperial culture; Stephen's assessment is just the type of thinking that Plato feared when he warned of the potential dangers of poetry.

For Stephen's audience, that is irrelevant. Shakespeare, and literature in general, should be pure, devoid of speculation and historical grounding. As Russell states, "Art has to reveal to us ideas, formless spiritual essences" (9:48-49). This logic extends to Shakespeare's characters as well, and Stephen's analysis of Hamlet is as poorly received as his thesis about the biography of the playwright. But Stephen's theory is not purely Aristotelian: it mediates idealism and materialism, Plato and Aristotle. In turn, it mediates England and Ireland, culture and economics, and the past and the present. Finally, it might

suggest to the contemporary reader that both postcolonial and Marxist theories are appropriate grounds for evaluating this episode.

For the most part, the plays of the Revival were written by Protestants and acted by Catholics, reflecting how the Revival mirrored existing patronage hierarchies that reinforced the sectarian status quo. At the National Library, Lyster, Best, and Eglinton held the type of senior positions that typically were assigned to Protestants, with Catholics assigned to low-level positions (Potts 162). There is perhaps an assumptive sense of superiority/righteousness in the demeanor of the revivalists/Protestants as they critique Stephen, due not to their employment status but rather to a sense of class and religious superiority.

Although the revivalists claimed that a culturally united Ireland was their goal, with one notable exception, they refused to acknowledge a glaring issue confronting the nation. Only Eglinton addressed the issue of Catholic/Protestant relationships, stating: "the Revival had not succeeded in creating the sectarian harmony at which many of its leaders aimed; but that instead, there had been a 'recrudescence among us of religious bigotry'…. must not give offence by any too direct utterance on the central problem of Irish life, the religious situation" (Potts 2). They did not acknowledge the tension that existed between the native- born Irish and the Anglo-Irish, between the native Catholics and the Protestants who arrived later.

The literary revivalists prefer apolitical interpretations of the Irish past that ignores the sectarian animosity and resulting damage. Potts states, "…the Irish Revival, like much else in the country, developed a Protestant side and a Catholic side. Whereas the former focused on the literary Revival and emphasized literary principles, the latter dominated the

Gaelic League and the GAA and tended to follow a rigorous form of cultural nationalism known as 'Irish Irelandism'" (27). However, it should be noted that although Eglinton distanced himself from the Revival and espoused a conciliatory non-sectarian attitude, he demonstrated contradictory/paradoxical behaviors in his fervent endorsement of Dowden, professor of English at Trinity. Dowden was a renowned Shakespeare critic, a staunch unionist who denigrated the Revival, and vocally anti-Catholic. Cleary notes that Dowden positioned Shakespeare as the "epitome of manly English Protestant value [which] was itself part of a larger unionist and imperialist commandeering of Shakespeare" (*MEW*164). His commentary led to the publication of *Literary Ideals in Ireland*, a 107-page pamphlet in which Eglinton (and William Larminie) squared off against Russell and Yeats in arguing the merits of Irish versus English culture. Although the two groups disagreed on the form of cultural nationalism they endorsed, both the revivalists and Dowdenists dismissed or ignored Irish Catholic economic claims. In that, the attitudes of both groups suggest current issues regarding reparations to African American and Native American communities.

In a discussion of Protestant intellectuals (which would include the Literary Revivalists), Edward Hirsch proffers that their absolute distance from peasant life and history renders them incapable of understanding the richness, fullness, complexity, and multi-faceted nature of the peasantry. Consequently, it was much easier to essentialize them. He states:

> because they did not see the peasant as a figure out of their immediate or historical past, they had no trouble in preserving the rural archetype as pagan and primitive rather than as fundamentally Catholic. By mystifying an ancient, unchanging folk life, removed from the harsh realities of land agitation and social conflict…they

> could treat the peasant as a romantic emblem of a deep, cultural, pastoral and significantly anticommercial (or nonmaterialistic) Irish life. (1122)

Often, this meant ignoring the abject material conditions in which those peasants lived. The revivalists essentialized "the peasant" and, in doing so, reconfigured history. They circumvented the era of medieval Christianity in Irish history, forgoing the Catholicism of the rural Irish and focusing on pagan heritage—it is easier to claim a connection to the essential Irishness of the peasant if a few chapters of history are overlooked. They considered the emulation of the peasant as a noble figure a positive alternative to the negative characterizations of the Irish that appeared in English publications that caricatured the Irish as "a subhuman figure, a 'white Negro' portrayed in Punch as a primitive Frankenstein or a peasant Caliban" (Hirsch 1119). Hirsch writes that "the Irish peasant not only represented some essential Irish identity but seemed wholly Other, an outlook not shared by urban, middle-class Catholics or by later Catholic writers like Joyce, O'Brien, and Kavanagh" (1122).

To the revivalists, the idealized peasant was also an essentialized persona based on misrecognition. Discussing Yeats, a literary revivalist and friend of Russell, Emer Nolan noted that while he decries modern civilization and capitalism, he "does not specifically mention the horror of the Great Famine (and here his sketch is characteristic of revivalist discourse which is frequently veiled such historical trauma)" ("Modernism and the Irish Revival" 158). This misrecognition provides room for oppressors—most notably, Protestant Unionists, to avoid acknowledging the political and economic violence inflicted on the predominantly Catholic peasantry by the Anglo-Irish protestants and their English predecessors. Nolan further points out that Yeats is representing a "mainly anglophone

movement...at the very moment of their historical eclipse" as the … "emerging Catholic bourgeoise, rural and urban, stood to inherit the Irish earth" (158). Furthermore, alliances between the peasantry and the middle-class Catholics further threatened the stability, status, and future of the Anglo-Irish.

Bemoaning the absence of a Shakespeare-like talent in their midst (9:43-44) to "[write]our national epic" (9:309), the group fails to recognize the talent in their midst, namely, Stephen, the fictional counterpart of a young James Joyce. Given that the hegemonic influences of imperial Britain shape their narrow aesthetic preferences, it is unlikely that they would recognize such a talent nor indeed the kind of modernist epic it would generate. Even their very need for a national epic is shaped by hegemonic forces. Indeed, in the library, Stephen, as a challenger to the hegemony and the literary status quo, in the Hegelian sense is and is not recognized. Although he has been given an opportunity to present his thesis, he is not addressing a welcoming, open-minded audience who are open to considering who he is and what he has to offer. They have not acknowledged mutuality in their relationship with Stephen—mutuality that Hegel (and Rose, following Hegel) deemed essential.

Similarly, the Revival recognizes the historical experience of "The Irish," but in insisting on their own definitions and creating their own version, they willfully misrecognize the experience and the Irish. The Revival recognizes the spatio-temporal experience of the Irish, but in insisting on their version of it, they willfully misrecognize it. In its aestheticization of Shakespeare's works, they recognize idealized forms of the man and his art but misrecognize the same, and in doing so, miss the broader potential of his and all art.

While others have suggested that Stephen's refusal to support his theory proves his lack of belief or confidence in it, I suggest otherwise. Prior to this point in *Ulysses* and as the novel continues, Stephen, although at times stubborn or tactless, has shown himself to be a decidedly speculative thinker. Whether it is in the classroom as he ponders Blake and Aristotle, piers and Pyrrhus, on the shoreline as he thinks about sight and sound, or in the library as he discusses and thinks about the real and the ideal, Stephen demonstrates an understanding of how they inform each other on an ongoing basis.

That is why Stephen denies belief in his theory, for believing it would imply unequivocal and final acceptance and therefore eliminate the possibility of other possibilities. However, he understands that a theory is not a fact but a point of departure for further exploration and speculation.

> —You are a delusion, said roundly John Eglinton to Stephen. You have brought us all this way to show us a French triangle. Do you believe your own theory?
>
> —No, Stephen said promptly (9:1065-67).

Unlike his Platonist opponents, he is not seeking a single, unquestionable approach that ends speculation. Instead, his actions demonstrate that speculative thinking is about the potential, modification, and progression of ideas. It is about openings and possibilities, not dead ends and finality.

One can read Hegel's writings about the "speculative Good Friday," in which he stated that "God himself is dead" from this perspective. Rose explains:

> This is how the philosophy of history should be conceived, not as a teleology of reconciliation, not as replacing the exhausted attempt to create a Christian

> civilization, but as perpetual repetition, as the perpetual completing of the historic Good Friday by the speculative Good Friday. There is no end of religion and no end of history, but a perpetual "speculative justification" to complete the faith which "justifies nothing". (*HCS* 127)

In reference to this thesis, Hegel's thoughts are relevant from the perspective of the ongoing speculative relationship between transcendence and immanence, which he frames in a discussion of religion. The death of the abstract, non-historical, transcendent God makes way for an understanding of the immanent nature of God. This relationship is continually rethought and relived—by individuals, by the community, and by the polity. What is fixed and transcendent is considered immanently, and a new (or another) relationship or theory may come to pass or not, but the process of coming to know is repeated.

Transposing this concept to Stephen's assessment of Shakespeare provides room to consider and speculate on the implications of historic events in the life of Shakespeare and his characters. Stephen understands Shakespeare as a fallible human being. He does not view the narrative of Shakespeare and his creations as a simple repetition of accepted wisdom. Accordingly, he remains open to (re)interpretation. As such, Shakespeare's personal history and questionable behavior are relevant to Stephen's assessment, in contrast to his audience members who prefer to ignore or explain Shakespeare's "faults."

> All these questions are purely academic, Russell oracled out of his shadow.
>
> I mean, whether Hamlet is Shakespeare or James I or Essex.
>
> Clergymen's discussions of historicity of Jesus. Art has to reveal to us ideas, formless spiritual essences. The supreme question about a work of art

> is out of how deep a life does it spring. The painting of Gustave Moreau is the painting of ideas. The deepest poetry of Shelley, the words of Hamlet bring our minds into contact with the eternal wisdom, Plato's of ideas. All the rest is the speculation of schoolboys for schoolboys. (9:46-53)

Stephen does not agree that the questions (of Shakespeare's history and its relation to his works) are purely academic. A work of art that speaks to apparently universal concerns cannot be separated from the particularity from which it emerges. There is always a history and materiality that preceded and generated it. Stephen, I believe, implicitly understands a concept that is central to Hegelian speculative reason: that of identity/non-identity. Hamlet is/is not Shakespeare.

Stephen comprehends the idealized, universalized Shakespeare that Russell worships, but through his arguments implies that this proposed ideal Shakespeare cannot exist absent the existence of particular Shakespeare(s), such as the capitalistic, cuckolded subject of Stephen's discussion. Furthermore, contrary to Russell's proposition, ideals are subject to questioning, speculative reconsideration, and modification.

In contrast to Russell's authoritarian position that disallows speculation, Rose's Hegelian approach strives toward the ideal and universal but knows it is unachievable. For embedded in the concept of what something is, is the concept of what it is not. As Kate Schick writes:

> Part of the function of speculative philosophy is to facilitate a broader and deeper understanding of individuals and their place in the world, a deeper understanding of their humanity. Thus, Rose emphasizes the necessity of understanding embedded in

> historical, social and political context, arguing against fixed and abstract guidelines that neglect the particular. (33-34)

Indeed, Schick seems to describe the positions of Stephen and Russell.

Stephen's embrace of speculative possibilities is seen throughout the novel: in his interior monologues and spoken dialogues, in the Dalkey School, the National Library, the Martello tower—everywhere he goes, for that is the way he thinks. In contrast, many with whom he interacts with appear single-minded and stuck. Stephen's speculative considerations apply to the tangible and the metaphysical, literature and life, and how the real and the fictional interact. Stephen pondered piers and Pyrrhus in "Nestor," the visible and the invisible in "Proteus". Even the many passageways to which Stephen refers suggest openings and/or closings, access and/or egress, and comings and/or goings: gates, doors, turnstiles, and porticoes. As he walks along the shore in "Proteus", he speculatively considers these points of access: "If you can put your five fingers through it it is a gate, if not a door"(3:8-9).

Further on in the "Proteus" episode Stephen recalls fragments of a dream; with its suggestions of welcome and warmth, the dream foreshadows Stephen's encounters with Bloom:

> Wait. Open
>
> hallway. Street of harlots. Remember. Haroun al Raschid. I am almosting it. 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. (3:365-69)

Bloom is associated with Haroun al Raschid, caliph of Bagdad from 753-809, who was known to roam the streets of Bagdad to "keep himself aware of … [his subjects'] moods and concerns" (Gifford 60). Similarly, in "Circe", "Eumaeus", and "Ithaca", Bloom will wander the streets to find and care for Stephen.

Two years earlier, shortly before Stephen left Ireland to go to Paris to "forge in the smithy of [his] soul the uncreated conscience of [his]race" (*Portrait* 526), he stood under the portico of the National Library searching for signs.

> What birds were they? He stood on the steps of the library to look at them, leaning wearily on his ashplant…Why was he gazing upwards from the steps of the porch, hearing their shrill twofold cry, watching their flight? For an augury of good or evil? (493-4)

It is his intersection with Bloom in the library that sparks Stephen's recollection of that previous experience watching the birds. Stephen then makes the connection to the prophetic dream he had the previous night:

> A man passed out between them [Stephen and Mulligan], bowing, greeting.
>
> —Good day again, Buck Mulligan said.
>
> The portico.
>
> Here I watched the birds for augury. Aengus of the birds. They go,
>
> they come. Last night I flew. Easily flew. Men wondered. Street of harlots
>
> after. A creamfruit melon he held to me. In. You will see. (9:1203-08)

Bloom provides a transition between past and present, ushering in a state of transformation that occurs in a dreamscape in which the fixity of spatio-temporal reality no longer binds the characters. In this dreamscape, the worlds of Stephen and Bloom overlap and intertwine (as

they do elsewhere in *Ulysses* in narrative, dreams, and fantasies). In Stephen's dream, Haroun (the symbolic Bloom) presses a melon against Stephen's face; melons are widely accepted to be a reference to Molly Bloom's derriere, a subject of Bloom's admiration and obsession. Therefore, the reference may simply suggest Bloom's willingness to share himself with Stephen.

The intersection of the material Bloom, Stephen, and Mulligan at the library is a speculative moment in the relationship between the three men. That it occurs under the portico is telling: a portico is a transitional space between inside and outside. In this episode, it signals a transition in the state of relationships, as Stephen anticipates:

> Part. The moment is now. When then? If Socrates leave his house today, if Judas go forth tonight. Why? That lies in space which I in time must come to, ineluctably. (9:1199-1201)

In the above lines, Stephen refers internally to Maeterlinck (Gibson 250) to anticipate events that will soon occur. Bloom/Socrates will leave his house and impart wisdom to Stephen; Judas/Mulligan will go forth— to the literary soiree to which Stephen is not invited— thereby betraying him yet again.

It is, therefore, unsurprising that the temporary shelter Stephen obtains is in the home of Leopold and Molly Bloom. For whereas his "friends" locked him out of his own home, Bloom goes out of his way to make room for him, climbing over a railing to gain entry because he has forgotten his key.

It is fitting that in a country in which notions of what it means to be Irish are contested, be it based on nationality (famously argued by Bloom and The Citizen in "Cyclops") or religion, it is the Blooms that take Stephen in. Leopold Bloom is considered

by all, including himself, to be Jewish. Although the son of a Jewish father, he is technically Catholic by conversion and Irish Protestant by birth, and he has been baptized as a Protestant and a Catholic. Molly Bloom, an Irish/Gibraltan (therefore, British) woman whose mother was a Spanish Jew, identifies herself as Catholic, like her father. And it is further fitting that Bloom, a father without a son, comes to temporarily care for Stephen, a metaphorically fatherless son, speculatively echoing the relationships of Hamlet, Shakespeare, and the Trinity.

My argument in this thesis is that Joyce well understands the speculative moment. The repeated delay of the publication of *Dubliners* in favor of works of the Literary Revival was the stimulus for Joyce to leave Ireland and begin his self-imposed exile abroad. As John McCourt notes, "this departure is also ultimately a moment of liberation: Joyce's extremely trying experience of seeking publication in Dublin helped to seal his sense of alienation from the other writers of this generation. And served him with a rich seam of material for *Ulysses*, a text which works very hard to expose the occasionally amateur and self - congratulatory nature of revivalist literary culture and publishing practice" (200-201). When in "Scylla and Charybdis," the librarian Lyster asks Stephen, "Is it your view, then, that she [Anne Hathaway] was not faithful to the poet?" (9:331), Stephen replies, "Where there is a reconciliation …there must have been first a sundering" (9:334-5). He will repeat this idea soon thereafter in a discussion of Hamlet:

> —The spirit of reconciliation, the quaker librarian breathed.
>
> —There can be no reconciliation, Stephen said, if there has not been a sundering. Said that. (9:396-99)

"Said that" is voiced internally. Stephen realizes that the statement he has just issued is provocative because his audience cannot or will not, at this time, recognize the sundering and their role in it historically and contemporaneously. He recognizes that, therefore, reconciliation will remain incomplete. However, as Rose recommends, the struggle to achieve reconciliation should continue, leaving open possibilities of envisioned and unforeseen outcomes.

Despite the seemingly positive intentions of the Irish Literary Revivalists to advocate for the Irish peasantry, as I have demonstrated, a closer examination reveals other potential motivations. Having failed to recognize the sundering that occurred, they cannot begin the ongoing process of redressing the wrongs imposed in the past and the present.

Chapter 7

Afterword

On its surface, *Ulysses* is extraordinarily particular: it is about two men and one woman: Stephen Dedalus, Leopold Bloom, and Molly Bloom, navigating their way through the streets of Dublin on June 16, 1904. It is also about navigating modernity, the nation, the world, and one's place in it. Navigation requires choices—big and small, individual and interrelated, about whether and how to adapt to ongoing changing conditions. It requires the ability to see the big picture and minute details. It requires mediation between the universal and particular.

On a literary theoretical level, universality and particularity are expressed in Marxist and postcolonial critiques, respectively. However, I was concerned that critical interpretations of *Ulysses* are most often dogmatically one-sided. and therefore, cannot adequately interrogate the economic *and* cultural concerns that align with these critical approaches. My aim therefore was to offer a holistically comprehensive analysis that considers the particular and universal—that is, postcolonial and Marxist, cultural and economic, perspectives—in relation to each other. However, my intent was not to "solve a problem" by determining *an answer* but instead to explore *Ulysses* speculatively in a way that challenges single-minded postcolonial and Marxist assessments.

Focusing on Stephen Dedalus's experience of and responses to manifestations of colonialism, imperialism, and capitalism, I centered my analysis on three episodes that allowed for the exploration of different economic and social relationships: "Telemachus", "Nestor", and "Scylla and Charybdis."

In chapter 3, I show how Stephen's encounters in "Telemachus" demonstrate the ways in which the upper middle class Irish Catholic Mulligan colludes with Anglican British imperialist Haines in seeking to extract everything of value—commodities and culture — from Stephen and the milkwoman. While Stephen's responses are often voiced internally, a meaningful move on his part is the denial of recognition to Mulligan and Haines.

In my analysis of "Nestor" (chapters 4 and 5), I show how Ulster Protestant hegemony deployed an educational system which reinforces British cultural values in order to promulgate a capitalist and imperialist ideology. Deasy's inaccurate and biased reconstruction of the past erases anti-Catholic violence and is countered by Stephen's internal (and occasionally voiced) responses to Deasy's ideology. Stephen also relates his experience in Deasy's study, which I interpret as physical manifestations of Deasy's values exhibited in the items he collects and I explore the relevance of Walter Benjamin's writings to this consideration.

In chapter 6, I contend that Stephen's encounter with the Anglo-Irish Literary Revivalists in "Scylla and Charybdis" exposes both cultural and economic motivations in their drive to develop a unique Irish literary culture. In doing so, they idealize and misrecognize the Irish Catholic peasant and Shakespeare. Because their "idealist" approach is in conflict with Stephen's historically based Shakespearean theory they reject him, implicitly rejecting speculative approaches.

During the course of his day, Stephen has encountered and resisted Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Anglo-Irish Protestants. He has encountered, and will accept, insult, and finally leave a nominal Jew who treated him kindly unlike the others he

encountered that day. Stephen's goal and challenge are to achieve both socioeconomic and cultural justice, or recognition *and* redistribution, to utilize Nancy Fraser's terminology. Those are the goals for the broader Irish Catholic population (not just the upper and upper-middle classes). But to the extent that they could potentially become goals for Irish people of all classes, denominations, and ethnicities, and indeed for others beyond the borders of Ireland, then they are universal goals—at least until new moments of misrecognition become apparent.

This thesis opened with a consideration of Gillian Rose and speculative thinking. Given how strongly her philosophical thinking influenced this project, it is appropriate that she is noted again in closing. In her introduction to *Mourning Becomes the Law*, she wrote: "Wisdom, theoretical and practical, develops when the different outcomes of ideas and policies are related to predictable modifications and to unpredictable contingencies affecting their meaning and employment. Wisdom works with equivocation" (2-3). By this she means that limitations can be viewed as opportunities to reevaluate and discover new perspectives or outcomes.

Although in the following, she does not use the word "speculative", it is indeed speculative concepts to which she is referring:

> 'Fictions', theoretical and literary, are themselves facetious forms which configure the double danger as it changes historically: *aporia* of the universal and *agape* of the singular. They configure the aporia, the difficulty, of the relation between universal, particular and singular. This is the political difficulty *par excellence*: the opposition between particular and general will, to use Rousseau's terms, or the struggle between particular and universal class, to use Marx's terms; and the difficulty of representing

> this relation in terms of political institutions and aesthetic values. While arcadian and utopian universalism would reconcile and posit the unity of particular and universal, aporetic universalism explores and experiments with the disunity of singular and universal. Fiction and facetiousness maintain this tension, this aporia of the universal, and prevent it, even when personified and characterized, from succumbing to the contrary danger: from representing the agape of the singular, the inwardly piteous, outwardly pitiless individual, or the clockwork community set in an authoritarian locality. (*The Broken Middle 164-65)*

By connecting different types of Irish people, and recalling historical events, philosophy, and literature from various time frames, Joyce demonstrates in *Ulysses* what Rose discusses in the excerpts above. *Ulysses* has been criticized because "nothing happens". I humbly disagree. Joyce insists that his readers recognize the fullness of any given day and the necessity of considering multiple perspectives and how they work together so we may be able to understand not only Stephen Dedalus, Leopold Bloom, and Molly Bloom in Dublin on June 16, 1904, but to understand other people, places, and times.

Notes

[I] In *Hegel Contra Sociology,* Rose explains "Hegel had no 'solution' to the contradictions of bourgeois productive and property relations. He searched for a different concept of law, but it could only be explicated abstractly. Marx did not resolve these aporias in Hegel's position. He inherited them and returned to a pre-Hegelian position by reading Hegel non-speculatively and by reviving the dichotomies which Hegel had sought to expose as rooted in bourgeois social relations" (223).

[2] Salem comments on how Fanon connected the universalism of Marxism with the specificity of the colony:

> For Fanon, stretching Marxism was an attempt to contextualise the specificity of capitalism in the colony without completely disregarding the assumptions underpinning Marxism. Where Marx located revolutionary potential within the capitalist core, Fanon instead located it within the colonies themselves—in a sense, he turned Marx's position on its head. Fanon's call to stretch Marxism can be understood as a methodology that allowed for a deeper exploration of colonial capitalism (6).

She refers to Fanon's introduction of the phrase "stretching Marxism" in *The Wretched of the Earth* in 1963.

[3] Spoo's stated dismissal of Marxism as an alternative to the culturalist perspective he espouses is troubling because he does not present an argument. In his historiographical analysis of *Ulysses,* he suggests that the likely source of Stephen's comment in "Nestor" that

"History is a nightmare" was Henry James (99). He had previously responded to David Higdon's suggestion the source might be Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire* with a claim that Jules Laforgue was the likely source.

[4] Hepburn does not endorse this position; he is saying that this is what Stephen has been taught. Elsewhere in his analysis, he considers the nature of Dublin's middle class and "capricious economy" (200), Irish poverty (to which the Dedalus's succumb) and a discussion of capitalism.

[5] This is not unlike the experiences of Native Americans and the European imperialists (and later, American citizens, who took it upon themselves to define what it meant to be an American). Kiberd notes that "from the later sixteenth century, when Edmund Spenser walked the plantations of Munster, the English have presented themselves as controlled, refined, and rooted; and so it suited them to find the Irish hot-headed, rude, and nomadic, the perfect foil to set off their own virtues".

[6] Joyce does not reject the concept of the "Celt" per se but he does reject both the Arnoldian Celt and the Revival's hegemonic adaptation of it. *Ulysses* explores its characters' Celtic roots but not as an exclusive origin story, but rather as a speculative consideration that acknowledges the Celtic and other histories.

[7] "Silk of the kine" and Shan Van Vocht are tropes that were used to define Irishness; they refer to, respectively, "the most beautiful of cattle" and an Irish ballad about a woman

who, “in legend looks like an old woman to all but the true patriots” (Gifford 21). Both define Irishness as passive and feminine.

[8] Although he asks for credit, it is subsequently revealed that he had the money to pay her; he simply chose not to (Cf 1:724-25).

[9] Neither the milkwoman nor Stephen are members of the proletariat. She represents agrarian, pre-capitalist Ireland, and he, as an artist and an educator is a representative of the bourgeoisie as expounded in Marx’s *Grundrisse*. But for this discussion I am considering them as workers, whose labors support the middle-upper classes via nourishment of the body and mind, the later reproducing the ideology of the ruling classes.

[10] Löwy attributes the origin of the phrase “Capitalism as religion” to Ernst Bloch (*Thomas Müntzer as Theologian of Revolution*) (“Capitalism as Religion”, 61).

[11] Discussing Marx’s M-C-M, W.H. Sewell observes “There is constant movement, but the movement is constantly repetitive. For capital at its most abstract, the movement is like running on a treadmill. At this level, as Louis Althusser might say, capital ‘has no history’; its logic is always the same” (526).

[12] Alternatively one could look to earlier forms of economic relationships to evaluate the relationship between Stephen and Deasy. Trevor Williams refers to Marx’s *Grundrisse* in noting the personal nature of the relationship between lord and vassal in feudal societies (40).

[13] In his critique of Stephen's spendthrift behavior, Deasy demonstrates the essentializing influences of not only Matthew Arnold, but also of Sir Horace Plunkett, an Anglo-Irish Unionist from a wealthy family whose religious prejudices were not based on theology but on his cultural perceptions/biased interpretations. Plunkett was apparently unaware of Arnold. He wrote the following, which is excerpted from his writings, in 1904, a year prior to the publication of Weber's *Protestant Ethic:*

> It is, however, with the religion of the majority of the Irish people and with its influence upon the industrial character of its adherents that I am chiefly concerned. Roman Catholicism strikes an outsider as being in some of its tendencies non-economic, if not actually anti-economic. These tendencies have, of course, much fuller play when they act on a people whose education has (through no fault of their own) been retarded or stunted. The fact is not in dispute, …. I am simply adverting to what has appeared to me, in the course of my experience in Ireland, to be a defect in the industrial character of Roman Catholics which, however caused, seems to me to have been intensified by their religion. The reliance of that religion on authority, its repression of individuality, and its complete shifting of what I may call the moral center of gravity to a future existence…appear to be calculated… to check the growth of the qualities of initiative and self-reliance, especially amongst a people whose lack of education unfits them for resisting the influence of what my present itself to such minds as a kind of fatalism with resignation as its paramount virtue. (Chapter IV, no page numbers).

[14] Löwy discusses this thesis (V) and all the others, individually in *Fire Alarm.* Especially noteworthy is his discussion of how Benjamin's work was both historical-materialistic and messianic, and he argues that rather than being purely pessimistic as many consider him, Benjamin left room in his works for outcomes that are not tragic (106-116). In this way, he proposes a speculative reading of Benjamin.

[15] Raymond William's concept of "mobile privatization," coined in a 1983 speech, referred to the increased freedom of movement made by possible increased consumer wealth and modes of transportation. He argues (and bemoans) t hat this did not lead to an increased sense of community. If, as he argues, identity is partly defined by one's dwelling place and possessions, today's mobile communications platforms (from both structural and interpersonal interactions perspectives) infrastructure accelerates the paradigm. The dwelling place is no longer limited to the physical building in which one resides. Williams describes it as a private place of conspicuous consumption rather than the accumulation of those items that define one's identity and is, therefore, mobile. Indeed, Deasy's study and especially Williams's concept anticipate today's mobile society in which one can be simultaneously social and anti-social; private and public, present and absent.

[16] Gabler Edition (Viking)

[17] Lazarus and Varma provide a "short" (their word) list of works that should be studied—especially by Marxists within postcolonial studies departments. It includes but goes beyond classical Marxist accounts. In their words:

The troping of power in semiological terms clearly (also) registers a disciplinary disposition. This has constituted a particular problem for Marxists within postcolonial studies, since the long history of Marxist or neo-Marxist engagements with questions relating to colonialism and 'postcolonialism', imperialism and antiimperialist, racism and nationalism, has been a dead letter for mainstream postcolonialists. A short list of the kind of work that might be referenced here would include:

1) early Marxist accounts of 'non-Western' or 'precapitalist' societies, colonialism and anticolonial revolt (not least, and certainly controversially, Marx himself on India);
2) classical-Marxist accounts of imperialism (Lenin, Bukharin, Luxemburg, Hilferding, etc);
3) later accounts of imperialism in the contexts of world-systems theory, development and underdevelopment, and 'dependency' (Baran, Cox, Frank, Furtado, Wallerstein, Arrighi, Amin, etc.);
4) writings by Marxist politico-intellectuals active in anti-imperialist, anticolonialist and/or national-liberation struggles (Ben Barka, Cabral, Castro, Fanon, Guevara, C.L.R. James, Li Ta-Chao, Lin Piao, Sison, Mao, Mariátegui, E.M.S. Namboodripad, Jayaprakash Narayan, Neto, Nkrumah, Padmore, Rodney, M.N. Roy, Truong Chinh, etc.);
5) writings by Marxist or socialist scholars, wherever located (Abdel-Malek, Eqbal Ahmad, Alavi, Chandra, Davidson, Galeano, Habib, Hodgkin, Kosambi, Rodinson, Sarkar, Worsley, etc.).

A Marxist appraisal of postcolonial studies would therefore need to register the debilitating loss incurred by the field in its neglect and ignorance of the resources suggested in and by this list. It would then also need to challenge the tendentious and selective reading of Marxism itself that surfaces in so much postcolonialist scholarship, including in writings by some of the most influential theorists (314).

Works Cited

Ahmad, Aziz. *In Theory. Classes, Nations, Literatures.* Verso, 1994.

Benjamin, Walter. *Selected Writings Vol.1, 1913-1926*. Edited by Michael W. Jennings, Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2004.

Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Edited by Rolf Tiedemann. Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1999.

Bhabha, Homi. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *October*, vol. 28, Spring 1984, pp.125-133.

Brown, Nicholas. *Utopian Generations: The Political Horizon of Twentieth-Century Literature*. Princeton UP, 2005.

Booker, M. Keith. "*Ulysses", Capitalism and Colonialism: Reading Joyce After the Cold War*. Greenwood Press, 2000.

Cheng, Vincent. *Joyce, Race, and Empire*. Cambridge UP, 1995.

Cleary, Joe. "Misplaced Ideas? Locating and Dislocating Ireland in Colonial and Postcolonial Studies." *Marxism, Modernity and Postcolonial Studies*, 2002, pp. 101-124

---. *Modernism, Empire, World Literature.* Cambridge UP, 2021.

Dirlik, Arif. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry,* Winter, 1994, pp. 328-356.

Duffy, Enda. *Subaltern Ulysses*. University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Fraser, Nancy. “From Progressive Neoliberalism to Trump — and Beyond.” *American Affairs Journal*, November 20, 2017, pp 46-64.

---. “From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a ‘Post-Socialist’ Age.” *New Left Review*, July/August 1995, pp.68-93.

Fraser, Nancy, and Axel Honneth. *Redistribution or Recognition?: A Political-Philosophical Exchange.* Verso, 2003.

Gifford, Don., and Robert J. Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*. 2nd ed., rev. and enl., University of California Press, 1988.

Hepburn, Allan. “A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Poverty.” *James Joyce Quarterly*, 42/43, no. 1-4, 2006, p. 197-218.

Higdon, David Leon. “A Ulysses Allusion to Karl Marx.” *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 3, 1985, pp.313-319.

Hirsch, Edward. “The Imaginary Irish Peasant.” *PMLA.* vol. 106, no. 5, October 1991, pp. 1116—1133.

Joyce, James. “A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.” *The Portable James Joyce,* The Viking Press, 1975, pp. 243-526.

---. “Ireland, Island of Saints and Sages.” *James Joyce. Occasional, Critical, and Political Writing,* Edited by Kevin Barry, Oxford UP, 2000, pp.108-126.

---. *Ulysses.* 1st Vintage Books ed., Random House, June 1986.

Kiberd, Declan. *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation.* Random House, 1995.

Latz, Andrew Brower. *The Social Philosophy of Gillian Rose*. Cascade Books, 2018.

Lazarus, Neil and Rashmi Varma. "Marxism and Postcolonial Studies." *Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism*, Brill, 2007, pp 309-331.

Löwy, Michael. "Capitalism as Religion: Walter Benjamin and Max Weber." *Historical Materialism*, vol. 17, no. 1, Mar. 2009, pp. 60—73.

---. *Fire Alarm: Reading Walter Benjamin's "On the Concept of History"*. Verso, 2005.

Lukács, Georg. *Writer & Critic, and Other Essays.* Grosset & Dunlap, 1971.

MacPhee, Graham. "Introduction to Marx: Subjectivity and Ideology." *ENG 501 Required Reading.* West Chester University, 2018.

McCarraher, Eugene. *The Enchantments of Mammon: How Capitalism Became the Religion of Modernity.* Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2019.

McCourt, John. *James Joyce in Context*. Cambridge UP, 2009.

Marx, Karl. *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon.* www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire

Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism.* Routledge, 1995.

Nolan, Emer. "Modernism and the Irish Revival." *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Irish Culture*, Edited by Joe Cleary and Claire Connolly, Cambridge UP, 2005, pp.157-172.

Plunkett, Sir Horace Curzon. *Ireland in the New Century.* John Murray, 1904, Guttenberg Project, December 13, 2004, eBook # 14342.

Potts, Willard. *Joyce and the Two Irelands*, University of Texas Press, 2001.

Rose, Gillian. *Hegel Contra Sociology*. Verso, 2009.

---. *Mourning Becomes the Law*. Cambridge UP,1996.

---. *The Broken Middle.* Blackwell, 1992.

Salem, Sara. "'Stretching' Marxism in the Postcolonial World: Egyptian Decolonisation and the Contradictions of National Sovereignty." *Historical Materialism*, vol. 27, no. 4, Dec. 2019, pp. 3—28.

Schick, Kate. *Gillian Rose: A Good Enough Justice*. Edinburgh UP, 2012.

Sewell, William H. Jr. "The temporalities of capitalism." *Socio-Economic Review*, vol.6,no.3,2008, pp. 517-537.

Smyth, Gerry. "'The Natural Course of things': Matthew Arnold, Celticism and the English Poetic Tradition." *Journal of Victorian Culture,* vol 1, no. 1, March 1996, pp. 35-53.

Spoo, Robert E. *James Joyce and the Language of History: Dedalus's Nightmare.* Oxford UP, 1994.

Stasi, Paul. *Modernism, Imperialism, and the Historical Sense*. Cambridge UP, 2012.

Tregenna, Fiona. "What Does the 'Services Sector' Mean in Marxian Terms*?" Review of Political Economy*, vol. 23, no. 2, Apr. 2011, pp. 281—298.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Routledge, 2001.

Williams, Raymond. "Problems of the Coming Period." *New Left Review*, I/140, July/Aug. 1983, pp. 7-18.

Williams, Trevor. *Reading Joyce Politically.* University Press of Florida, 1997.