

“IT’S NO USE...FORCE, HATRED, HISTORY, ALL THAT:”
JOYCE’S REJECTION OF MACRO-HISTORICAL NARRATIVE AND
TERMINISTIC SCREENS WITH SATIRE AND PERSPECTIVALISM IN *ULYSSES*

A Thesis
by
MACEY LAUREN COLDIRON

Submitted to the Graduate School
at Appalachian State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS

May 2019
Department of English

“IT’S NO USE...FORCE, HATRED, HISTORY, ALL THAT:”
JOYCE’S REJECTION OF MACRO-HISTORICAL NARRATIVE AND
TERMINISTIC SCREENS WITH SATIRE AND PERSPECTIVALISM IN *ULYSSES*

A Thesis
by
MACEY LAUREN COLDIRON
May 2019

APPROVED BY:

Carl Eby, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

Jessica Martell, Ph.D.
Member, Thesis Committee

Bret Zawilski, Ph.D.
Member, Thesis Committee

Tammy Wahpeconiah, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Department of English

Mike McKenzie, Ph.D.
Dean, Cratis D. Williams School of Graduate Studies

Copyright by Macey Lauren Coldiron
All Rights Reserved

Abstract

“IT’S NO USE...FORCE, HATRED, HISTORY, ALL THAT:”
JOYCE’S REJECTION OF MACRO-HISTORICAL NARRATIVE AND
TERMINISTIC SCREENS WITH SATIRE AND PERSPECTIVALISM IN *ULYSSES*

Macey Lauren Coldiron
B.A., Appalachian State University
M.A., Appalachian State University

Chairperson: Carl Eby, Ph.D.

The connection between James Joyce’s troubled relationship with the Catholic Church and his, often parodic, portrayal of the religion in his fiction has been the central focus of copious amounts of scholarship. In relation to Joyce’s *Ulysses*, Joyce’s interest in the Homeric tradition, its historicity, and parody have also been brought to the forefront. However, Biblical historicity has been left somewhat in the background of Joyce studies. My intent with this research is to show that, not only was Joyce aware of and interested in the study of the historical background of the Church, he devoted a significant portion of *Ulysses* to point out how the suppressed history of the Church, once exposed, illustrates the hypocrisy of Papal authority. Through the rhetoric of parody, both

the history and the doctrine supported by the Catholic Church are found lacking-- thereby challenging the notion that history is a definitive discipline and that authority must always go unchallenged.

Joyce's dealings with both history and rhetoric outside of the context of his fiction points to an interest in the Church as an historical and cultural authority behind the creation of a macro-historical and social narrative. The elements of satire present in much of the religious elements inside of *Ulysses* point toward a focus on deauthorizing this total authority by exposing the hypocrisy involved in the Church's views on modernism and historical study. Moreover, Joyce's use of multiple narrative voices and focalized perspectives throughout the various chapters of *Ulysses* provides a working example of perspectivalism that illustrates that any given viewpoint can be simultaneously authentic and incomplete. Joyce's multiplicity of perspectives that reject the limiting view of definitive master historical and cultural narratives is best explained through the rhetoric of Kenneth Burke's terministic screens, framing this type of screening as a potentially reductive and myopic viewpoint that truncates historical understanding.

Acknowledgments

This work was made possible through the dedication and hard work of an entire network of people. Dr. Carl Eby, who directed this research effort, has provided insight and direction beyond what I ever could possibly have hoped for; without him, an entire year of research and writing would never have been possible, and the outcome that you see here would never have come to fruition. Drs. Bret Zawilski and Jessica Martell have also provided untold service to the creation of this work, through their patience with deadlines barely met and in their constructive criticisms. I would also like to acknowledge the supportive presences of Dr. Georgia Rhoades, who offered me research ideas when they were most needed, and Dr. Laura Ammon, who was always available for coffee when I needed to talk about how frustrating the writing process can be.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
Part One.....	26
Part Two.....	52
Conclusion.....	78
Works Cited.....	83
Vita.....	86

Introduction

“Possibilities of the possible as possible”: Recognizing the Possibility of Multiple Truths

Ulysses is a text filled to the brim with complicated, multi-layered allegories and allusions--to historical figures, contemporary figures, and texts in a multiplicity of genres. Even large scale disciplines such as the theories of history, religion, and rhetoric cannot escape Joyce's all encompassing work. Many of these references appear as satire--particularly in the form of mocking and rejecting the authority of dominant discourses and ideologies, such as Irish Catholicism and Nationalism. Frequently, this mocking derision points out that the ideologies that are supported by these dominant cultural organizations are based on singular, and thus myopic, historical narratives that have appropriated and manipulated for the convenience of said authority. Again and again, the text of *Ulysses* offers its readers a multiplicity of perspectives that address the same moments in time, proving macro-narrative perspectives to be poor examples of history and cultural, reductive in their use of labels and terministic screens. I argue that Joyce offers his audience a novel that demonstrates the greater authority and authenticity of a multiplicity of truths arrived at through the recognition that every perspective of any given event will be both different and valid in its own way--a theory known as perspectivalism.

Much work concerning Joyce's interest in history involves a strictly Irish nationalist viewpoint. The history of the Catholic Church as an institution figures less

often, and most notably when it distinctly overlaps with nationalism, as in Parnell's being denounced by the Church for committing acts of adultery with a married woman. Such is the type of religion that figures prominently in James Fairhall's text *James Joyce and History*. However, Joyce's relationship to the history of the Church--and particularly the Church as an authority figure in the creation of a historical master narrative, must also be considered. A series of decrees from the Vatican in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, which are discussed at length in the beginning of the next chapter, declare a religious "war on modernism" that emphasizes a long standing tradition of papal authority over not only biblical interpretation, but biblical historicity as well. These edicts from the Church were a response to both German higher criticism and a Protestant interest in exploring biblical historicity. Passing references to Ernest Renan and Adolf von Harnack, who both emerge from this tradition, bring the interest in this field into the realm of *Ulysses* scholarship. However, it is the parodical work of Leo Taxil, which mocks both the Catholic Church for attempting to suppress historical study of the Bible and biblical scholars for attempting to narrativize it definitively, that appears most frequently as an allusion within *Ulysses*, and which therefore, along with satire and parody as rhetorical devices, must be considered as the primary perspective on religion that Joyce was portraying within his work.

Joyce's use of satirical and mocking rhetoric in *Ulysses* offers more than just a joke at which the reader can chuckle. Though Joyce's already well-documented contention with the Catholic Church can lead to the conclusion that he simply enjoys making fun of Rome, I argue that Joyce's satire against religion actually offers a means at

getting to a truth that the dominant religious discourse has not simply ignored in its macro-narrative, but has actively attempted to cover up. Joyce's most mocking characters, Stephen Dedalus and Buck Mulligan, are also the most highly educated and erudite of his major characters in *Ulysses*. Their rejection of authority through jokes and mockery, which will be illustrated through several examples in the next chapter, points out facts that, though they may be well known to the likes of Stephen, Mulligan, and even Joyce himself, go largely unnoticed by those steeped in the authoritative macro-narratives created by those in charge of dominant discourse--that is to say, the average citizen. This creates new perspectives on ideas that had previously been understood as definitively and empirically true--from the history of the Catholic Church to the history of the Irish nationalist way of thinking. Joyce Carol Oates, in borrowing a term directly from the text of *Ulysses* itself, as termed this mockery that reveals a truth as "jocoserious"--a combination of jocoseness and seriousness that echoes Richard Ellman's introduction to the Gabler edition of *Ulysses*, which states that the text is "the kind of parody that protects seriousness" (Nolan 95).

It seems, to me, that this form of social commentary on the part of Joyce is intended specifically to be noticed by the reader, whether or not it is accepted. While much of Joyce scholarship focuses on the writing of *Ulysses* as a purely artistic endeavor or as fulfilling some personal need for the author, Barbara Heusel argues that Joyce's text was written mainly for the growth and benefit of the understanding reader. "Joyce's energy," according to Heusal, "is concentrated on demonstrating that humans often fail to make use of their two eyes and therefore lack depth perception" (135). She points

towards Joyce's use of multiple perspectives--including radical and contentious one's such as that of the Citizen in "Cyclops"--to achieve this effect, which she has related to a parallax effect, based on a repeated reference--"eight literal references clustered in six places" (135)--within the novel. Heusel's parallax corresponds to what I identify as perspectivalism with *Ulysses*. Building upon Heusel's assertion that *Ulysses* demonstrates a human tendency for myopic adherence to a single master narrative, I argue that, through the use of micro-narratives and a multiplicity of perspective, Joyce illustrates the flaws in this way of viewing history, life, and the world around us.

In this thesis, I begin in part one by drawing attention to the many references that Joyce makes to both religious and anti-religious texts and figures (I hesitate to use the term 'atheist' at this moment for reasons that will become apparent later). In particular, I closely examine references to anti-Catholic scholars, and particularly biblical historians, that fill the pages of *Ulysses*--such as those associated with the German higher criticism movement, such as Ernest Renan, Leo Taxil, and Adolf von Harnack. It is my belief that these allusions, when paired with Joyce's mocking and misrepresentational views of the Catholic Church, challenge the assertion of any historical accuracy founded in religion--both within religious texts and within the history of the Catholic Church. I do not make the assertion that Joyce's mockery of religion has been passed over in any way--to do so would ignore a wealth of scholarship on the subject. However, to say that Joyce the break down of macro-history into something subjective told through a multiplicity of micro-narratives, and--most importantly--to illustrate that Joyce lends authenticity to each of these perspectives in turn, is, to my knowledge, a more unique perspective.

Joyce's continual conflation between history as a discipline and Christianity as an ideology within *Ulysses* demonstrates the pervasive power of macro-cultural narratives to come to be viewed as definitive macro-historical narratives through the guise of social authority, as in the authority afforded to the Holy Roman Catholic Church. In the "Nestor" chapter, as well as "Ithaca", the well known schema which Joyce gave to Stuart Gilbert references the style at work in the text as 'catechism'--both 'personal' and 'impersonal,' respectively. In "Nestor" in particular, the historical references are just as clear in the context as religion is in the form. However, history is present in the catechistic form of the chapter as well as in the content of Stephen's history lesson. Copland and Turner point to a secondary source for stylistic inspiration in the chapters marked 'catechism'--the textbook known as "Mangan's Questions" (760). The authors focus primarily on the second instance of catechistic style--"Ithaca"-- to make their arguments for the use of the textbook as a stylistic source, yet "Nestor" is also listed as a "catechism" in the Gilbert schema, and the contextual elements of the chapter easily lend themselves to the application of a schoolroom inspirations, as well. "Mangan's Questions", according to Copland and Turner, is comprised of series of lesson-based questions which are worded significantly similarly to the question-and-answer segments in both "Nestor" and "Ithaca." The textbook offers the same question and answer style presented in religious catechism, and what's more, the same type of ideology. Neither the answers in the catechism, nor the ones in the history lesson, are up for debate; they are taken as definitive history, though Stephen ponders the validity of this single perspective of historical events. The satire inherent in the combined parody of both religious and

historical education as a system for indoctrinating people into a myopic master narrative becomes essential in examining Joyce's portrayal of history in "Nestor", both as a discipline and in relation to the Catholicism represented in the catechistic overtones of the chapter. Stephen's questioning of this indoctrination, wondering over "the infinite possibilities they have ousted", relates not only to events that may have occurred but did not, but also so perspectives of the events that did occur, but that have been lost, ignored, or repressed. This allows for a new perspective on seemingly solidified dominant discourse--history--through the recognition of the multiplicity of preexisting perspectives that do not correspond to the dominant macro-historical master narrative.

The multiple micro-historical perspectives that are most often excluded from the macro-historical master narrative are typically those that are outcast or otherwise exiled from society. In *Ulysses*, these perspectives are represented through Stephen, who is willfully self-exiling himself from a society that he is still inherently steeped in and who views his own perspective as that of an artist, and Leopold Bloom, who is exiled unwillfully on the basis of his heritage and onto whom the most frequent perspective given is that of a Jew. The nature of this terministic screening becomes important within the scope of my research because these screens illustrate who is and is not authorized to contribute to the macro-perspective and the extent to which the master narrative created is myopic--including only those who fit a homogenous set of terministic screens, including "Christian," particularly "Catholic," and "Nationalist."

To understand the way that Joyce uses satire and parody as social commentary intended to reach his audience, we must first understand the general ways in which

parody can unveil levels of truth that are typically covered up, whether intentionally or coincidentally, in original narrative forms. In "The Aesthetics of Parody," G. D. Kiremidjian discusses the use of the parodic form in literature, asserting that the parody is not simply a bastardization of literary form. Kiremidjian argues that parodists like Joyce "ha[ve] as complete a mastery over the purely formal techniques of literary art as the artist whose work he imitates" (232). The parody, therefore, serves a primary function in literature by forcing the reader to raise "the question of what the relation is between form and content and force[s] us to become aware of the manner in which we experience a work of art as a fusion of form and content" (Kiremidjian 233). Joyce's parodies, both stylistic and character based, are not merely derisive mockeries of historical and/or Biblical images, and are, in fact, never meant to be interpreted as such.

In "Nestor," perhaps more so than in "Ithaca," the stated form of the chapter--the catechism--is at odds with the content of the chapter. In fact, Stephen is in the middle of a literal lesson on history, questioning the student Cochrane on Pyrrhus and referencing a textbook for (what must be assumed as) factual answers to his own questions. However, Stephen cannot come to terms with the history he holds in his hands. He notes that Cochrane's blank face indicated that he, along with Pyrrhus who was the subject of the lesson, was lost to "the daughters of memory," and then immediately recants this decree with the statement, "[a]nd yet it was in some way if not as memory fabled it" (24). This is the beginning of a circuitous round of thought in the study of history in which the likelihood of deviations between the historical textbook and the reality of any given situation confronts us with the notion that history, like memory, is, in fact, a

perspective--and a singular one, at that. However, it is also something more than this. Not only does this statement point toward a disparity between 'historical fact' and reality, it also points to a separate disparity between what one knows and the aforementioned 'historical fact,' or dominant discourse. Not only is it likely that the textbook Stephen is holding lacks some relevant information about the life of Pyrrhus, there exists a gap in Cochrane's memory that represents an accountable lack of both historical and factual information. Yet, what is recalled is a statement "*another victory like that and we are done for*" (24). This is most decidedly not an objective account of what occurred in the battle; rather, Cochrane's ability to recall Pyrrhus's *perspective* on the battle solidifies the notion that the most pervading aspect of the master historical narrative (in this case, textbook history) is the macro-perspective--and most importantly, it implies at least one other perspective, a micro-perspective, which the master historical narrative is actively ignoring (in this case, that of the Pyrrhus's opposition).

In Stephen's understanding, gaps exist both in Cochrane's personal historical perspective and the dominant discourse presented in his pseudo-factual textbook. Joyce builds a second metaphorical representation of these same gaps within the formal text of *Ulysses*. In "Gaps and Cracks in *Ulysses*," Clive Hart asserts that Joyce deviates between two literary aesthetics--whole and continuous, and fragmentary and disrupted--that result in gaps in the narrative intentionally left by Joyce, and which the reader must fill in himself. The resulting material will, ostensibly, differ from person to person, and yet the reading of the novel will not be any less accurate from one case to the other--in effect, Joyce's intentional gaps in narration force the creation of a multiplicity of truths in

perspective about *Ulysses*, and this mirrors the multiplicity of historical truths that Joyce is trying to bring to light in his parodies of the Church and his abundance of narrative voices. These gaps are recognizable in historical narrative in general, and outside of the confines of Joyce's fictional representation. Hayden White admits that, even in what might be considered definitive historical narrative, "the facts do not speak for themselves, but that the historian speaks for them" (125). White asserts that historical narrative inherently incorporates elements of fiction to explain why objective events come to be, but this is also necessarily an expression of a particular perspective, the direct perspective of the historian, often times indirectly channeling the perspective of the historical figure. This is the essence of Stephen's difficulty in accepting the authenticity of the lesson in his textbook at face value.

Hart's assertions on the gaps in narratives, and the perspectives that fill them, expand on the nature of parody within the novel by outlining a dualism in Joyce's narrative style that Hart claims is evocative of the human condition, and which is indicative of the relationships between dominant historical perspective, personal micro-historical perspective, and objective fact. Hart's argument for a whole and continuous literary style is based on Joyce's view of a singular moment in time from many perspectives. *Ulysses*, though it is a physically intimidating, lengthy novel, relates only the events of a single day from a multiplicity of angles. Yet, Hart also points out to us that there are significant portions of seemingly necessary expository action that are entirely absent from the narrative.

In *Ulysses*, the reader is faced with prolonged segments of interiority that necessitate gaps in the literal situational action. In other words, the book contains more motive than action. The textbook Stephen is using to teach his history lesson in "Nestor," if it is in any way similar to an actual textbook, must be assumed to contain the opposite--that is, the historical action without the complete interior motivation. Both offer incomplete pictures of that to which they refer. In this way, *Ulysses* becomes a literal example for the figurative incompleteness of history, and Cochrane's imperfect memory becomes the stand-in for the disconnect between what is remembered and what is historically 'known.' For Hart, the gaps in exposition that the reader is responsible for filling in equate to the gaps in fact that history itself must fill in--they are neither inherently correct nor incorrect, but they cannot and should not be accepted as absolute fact.

Cochrane's knowledge gaps reflect the shortcomings of history, of course, and the use of "Mangan's Questions" as a source material, so alike in ideological function to the defined thematic style of catechism, constitutes a definite satire of the study of history as a discipline. Focusing on the similarities between the way that the macro-historical narrative is propagated and the way that religious ideology is propagated calls into question the validity of both types of macro-narrative.

As Stephen continues to quiz his class on half-learned half-truths in "Nestor", his interior view on history becomes simultaneously clearer and less so. To himself, Stephen wonders about the fates of Pyrrhus and Julius Caesar, noting how different a place the world might be if they were not slain when they were, asking himself if it was "only

possible which came to pass" (25). Fact, then, becomes for Stephen the elimination of all other possible outcomes in favor of a real occurrence. However, this logical conclusion is not all that goes into the making of history, as Stephen sees it. He remarks that "[t]ime has branded" (Joyce 25) all historical figures. The obvious interpretation of this is, and it is one with which Hayden White would agree, that history is simply an act of hindsight. However, this simplicity is not to be taken for granted. Rather, the passing of time has "branded" all that we think we know of history--changed its appearance distinctively and permanently. Therefore, history becomes the elimination of all other perspectives into the large-scale acceptance of a single "factual" outcome--a collection of pseudo-facts that is, while not necessarily entirely incorrect, at least decidedly incomplete, harboring as it does a single myopic macro-perspective at the expense of a multiplicity of marginalized micro-perspectives.

It becomes even more difficult to distinguish between the parodical form of the catechism and the parodical context of the history textbook when the religion ceases to be simply stylistic influence for Joyce and becomes part of the content of "Nestor." Stephen's employer, Mr. Deasy, turns Stephen's quiet reference to his own tumultuous personal history into a discourse on the history of mankind--and a very particular narrative of history, at that. Deasy's version of history places women at the root of each of man's falls, based solely on the, in Deasy's opinion, wholly historical events concerning Eve in the Garden:

A woman brought sin into the world. For a woman who was no better than she should be, Helen, the runaway wife of Menelaus, ten years the Greeks made

war on Troy. A faithless wife first brought the strangers to our shore here,
 MacMurrough's wife and her leman, O'Rourke, prince of Breffni. A woman
 too brought Parnell low. (34-35)

But Deasy's relationship with the Bible and history is not entirely one directional. Just as he uses the Bible as the basis for his construction of the many falls of mankind, so to does he use known history to justify the Wandering Jew of the Bible:

They swarmed loud, uncouth about the temple, their heads thickplotting under
 maladroitness silk hats. Not theirs: these clothes, this speech, these gestures. Their
 full slow eyes belied the words, the gestures eager and unoffending, but knew
 the rancours massed about them and knew their zeal was vain. Vain patience
 to heap and hoard. Time would surely scatter all. A hoard heaped by the
 roadside: plundered and passing on. Their eye knew their years of wandering
 and, patient, knew the dishonours of their flesh. (34)

Stephen attacks authoritative macro-perspectives, such as Deasy's anti-semitic views, that use negative terministic screens to negate the validity of marginalized micro-perspectives when he asserts that a "merchant...is one who buys cheap and sells dear, jew or gentile, is he not?" (34). For Emer Nolan, who explores Joyce's portrayal of Irish history and nationalism, this is "an accusation of the rich and powerful for forcing the dispossessed to do their business and to behave according to their own values while hypocritically condemning them for doing so" (101). The hypocrisy being addressed here by Stephen directly challenges the right and authority of socially powerful governing groups to govern social action and understanding. Stephen must bear Deasy's racism and

warped historical perspective graciously, because much like the catechism and the textbook, Deasy's "facts" are not up for debate due to his status as an authoritative voice in the macro-perspective being portrayed at this moment.

The historical perspective provided by Mr. Deasy is a two way street, and a popular one in Biblical historicity studies, in which historical 'fact' and the Bible simultaneously prove each other to be true. Deasy's opinions on the history of mankind are brought to a head when he asserts that "[a]ll human history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God" (34). For Catholics, the study of Biblical historicity becomes complicated *because of*, rather than in spite of, this same type of Deasy-esque assertion. Papal infallibility became an issue for Catholic Bible studies, especially when one becomes concerned with the Bible in its original languages and the history of its translation. In *Help My Unbelief*, Geert Lernout discusses at length the controversy associated with Catholic study of the Bible, especially in comparison with contemporary study in both Protestant and atheist circles--a history and series of events that I will elaborate further on in Part One. Protestant circles touted a better understanding of God and the Bible because they claimed, according to Lernout, that "they dared to go back to the original meaning" (64) of Biblical scripture. Lutheran scholar Adolf von Harnack had, in fact, "demonstrated historically that the Catholic Church had changed the original biblical doctrines" (Lernout 38). It is because of this discrepancy that Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) decreed that the only Bible up for historical study in the Catholic Church was its own Latin Vulgate--and, it could only be studied within the context of papal infallibility.

Of course, the very nature of this type of Biblical study is problematic when we consider historical as a perspectival phenomenon. This decree significantly narrowed the scope of what Biblical historicity in Catholicism could be--all the way down to, essentially, exactly what Rome wanted it to be. The "manifestation of God" that Deasy is looking for in history becomes the infallible Pope. Without even meaning to do so, Deasy has pointed out the main flaw in the study of Catholic history--and even Catholic rhetoric. Rome essentially establishes the type of unity and wholeness that Clive Hart describes as part of the rhetorical human condition by simply rejecting, even denouncing, all other historical possibilities and micro-perspectives. The result, then, is not necessarily a wholly incorrect history--but it is one that is based solely on a single macro-perspective that has been appropriated to create and maintain discourse authority for the Church, at the expense of all equally valid perspective that do not embody the ideology presented in the dominant discourse of the macro-narrative.

Stephen, though a self-proclaimed atheist, cannot escape his own version of limiting Catholic history. He presents a willful exclusion from the macro-narrative, but even as such, he faces the same sort of reductive screening that Leopold Bloom suffers unwillingly for his Jewish heritage. He admits to Haines in "Telemachus" that he is "a servant of two masters... an English and an Italian... The imperial British state... and the

holy Roman catholic and apostolic church" (20). Though Stephen may not be subjected directly to Catholic interpretation of history and religion, he still feels that his personal history is limited to a similarly narrow scope. Deasy's mention of "years of wandering" and "dishonours of...flesh" prompt Stephen's melancholy assertion that "[h]istory... is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake" (Joyce 34). Stephen, recently returned to Ireland from a failed attempt at life in Paris--and following his licentious past, repentance, and subsequent rejection of life in the priesthood in *Portrait*--has himself participated in "dishonours of the flesh" by dishonouring the flesh from which he came--his mother¹. Mulligan's aunt accuses Stephen of having helped his mother into her grave with his refusal to pray for her. For all his rejection of religion, Stephen still feels the guilt associated with this act, as evidenced by his refusal to wear the grey pants Mulligan offers to give him, because they would violate his conventional mourning obligations. His history is marked by a discourse that is dominated by negative views of his behaviour, rather than support for his personal beliefs. Moreover, Stephen cannot possibly forget his obligations to his mother, because she is, somewhat literally, following him around everywhere. The ghost of Mrs. Dedalus is tantamount to the ghost of the dominant historical perspective--both of Stephen's past and of the Catholic Church,

¹ Stephen, though he is never identified as a Jew directly within the text, is in this passage established as one of several Wandering Jew figures within *Ulysses*. Part Two deals with the Wandering Jew mythology more directly in the context of Leopold Bloom's Jewish heritage.

which, after all, are nearly one and the same. Stephen's frustrations with history, voiced in "Nestor," are founded in his frustration in not being able to combat other people's perspective of his past with his perspective of the present--further proof that, even in instances when one actively attempts to thwart the dominant macro-perspective, it is still effective for those who accept it..

Stephen continually seeks ways in which he can manipulate history, such as Mulligan's assertion that "[h]e proves by algebra that Hamlet's grandson is Shakespeare's grandfather and that he himself is the ghost of his own father" (18). The reader gets to see Stephen enact this seemingly impossible feat in the National Library in "Scylla and Charybdis," while he argues with John Eglinton. The argument that Stephen puts forward in this vein is, while perhaps not technically algebra, one that is highly technical and difficult to refute logically. Yet, when questioned by Eglinton, Stephen steadfastly replies that he does not believe in his own theory. This is less a reflection of the compelling-ness of his argument, and more a function of Stephen being steeped in the history that he, himself, did not create. He cannot, due to the more dominant powers that be, rewrite his personal history in a way that does not condemn him, and therefore he cannot accept this new theory on the history of Shakespeare, despite the fact that he has argued it convincingly enough to change the dominant discourse occurring at this moment in the

library. Neither the arbiter of the dominant macro-perspective, Eglinton, nor those around him who ascribed themselves to his macro-historical narrative have acknowledged the validity of Stephen's micro-perspective. The reader recognizes it as being well-supported and convincing, which serves particularly well in illustrating Joyce's point that the micro-historical perspective, though entirely valid, will carry little weight inside the dominant discourse until larger number of the population embrace perspectivalism as a valid rhetorical creation of historical narrative.

Stephen's odd, circuitous, convincing-yet-not-quite-believable argument concerning the reinterpretation of Shakespeare points toward one argument that Stephen, and possibly Joyce himself, seems desperate to prove in a way that makes it believable: when it comes to the search for fact (truth), rhetoric trumps history. This is the crux of my argument. Lernout tells us that Adolf von Harnack has already proven that the rhetoric of original Biblical Scripture has disproved Catholic Biblical history. Hart has shown to us that Joyce's writing style leaves obvious gaps in the narrative, rejecting the single perspective wholeness and continuity that can be compared to the history of the Catholic Church in favor of the a multi-faceted, composite view that allows multiple perspectives, including that of each character, Joyce himself, and even the unpredictable string of readers. In this way, history is not simply rewritten into a more 'correct' form, but

disbanded as a singular form of truth altogether, through the use of rhetoric, embodied in satire, perspectivalism, and the rejection of negative, reductive, terministic screens. By extension, the Catholic Church--so dependent on its own closed-off version of history--and even the very idea of Christianity itself--dependent on some iteration or translation of the Bible for the foundation of its history of mankind--are equally disproven.

The rhetorical method Joyce chooses within *Ulysses* in his effort to deauthorize the ideology of the macro-narrative supplied by the Church by revealing the hypocrisy of what this macro-historical narrative ignores is satire. Theologian Adolf von Harnack's Protestant study of the Bible practically destroyed the authenticity of the Scripture in the Catholic Church. In his comprehensive chapter in *Help My Unbelief* concerning the historical setting in which *Ulysses* was written, Lernout writes that "Adolf von Harnack had demonstrated historically that the Catholic Church had changed the original biblical doctrines" (38), thereby forcing the Catholic Church to prove that the Bible was not the only, or even the most important, resource available to establish the history of the faith. This attitude toward the Bible in Catholicism was not necessarily a total reaction to von Harnack's work. Lernout documents a conversation between James Joyce and his father, John Stanislaus Joyce, in which Joyce comments that "catholics

should not read the bible at all” (Lernout 13). However, von Harnack’s work was the impetus for Roman’s direct action in policing Biblical study in the Catholic Church, leading to the outright rejection of cultural Modernism by Pope Pius X, which is recounted more fully in Part One.

Adolf von Harnack’s work also paved the way for questions concerning the authenticity of the Biblical text as an entity within itself, not just as it was appropriated by the Catholic Church. The beginning of the search for Biblical historicity corresponds to the beginning of the movement known as Higher Criticism, most frequently associated with von Harnack’s native Germany.

As German Higher Criticism became more focused on the person of Jesus Christ, the information collected and produced from the movement became fodder for anti-religious writers seeking to disprove, de-historicize, and un-authenticate religion from its very foundations. Two such writers in particular are referenced by Joyce in *Ulysses*-- Ernest Renan and Leo Taxil, both of whom published texts entitled “La Vie de Jésus” concerning the life of the man the Bible refers to as Jesus Christ.

Renan is mentioned only in passing, twice in a single conversation in “Scylla and Charybdis,” when John Eglinton remarks that he [Renan] was an admirer of Shakespeare’s later work. Nothing is mentioned of Renan’s own work; yet the connection

between Renan and Shakespeare is still of note simply because Renan's work against the divinity of Christ is paired with Stephen's argument against the "ghostly" manifestation of Hamlet's father in a way that highlights, not the similarities, but the differences between the two. The Shakespeare that Stephen attempts to justify is wrapped in intrigue, plagued by ghosts in much the same way that Stephen is plagued by the ghost of his mother. In fact, Stephen's circuitous argument involving Hamlet almost seems to allow Shakespeare to be at once both man and his own ghost--not unlike two aspects of the Holy Trinity: the Son and the Holy Ghost. For Renan, whose work focuses on removing the allusion of divinity in Jesus and proving him to be simply a man, to have been a fan of Shakespeare is to argue against the point Stephen seems to be "driving at" (207) in "Scylla and Charybdis."

Leo Taxil and his writing on the man called 'Jesus' are much more integrated, and indeed becomes thematically essential, in *Ulysses*. Taxil's version of "La Vie de Jésus" appears by name first in "Proteus," when Stephen recalls that he wishes his friend would return a borrowed copy of it. Taxil's work is also quoted at length at this moment in the text:

—*Qui vous a mis dans cette fichue position?*

—*C'est le pigeon, Joseph. (41)*

This moment in Taxil's work occurs when the pregnant virgin Mary attempts to explain herself to a distraught Joseph. We find a similar explanation of Jesus in

Mulligan's "Ballad of Joking Jesus" in *Telemachus*:

—I'm the queerest young fellow that ever you heard.

My mother's a jew, my father's a bird.

With Joseph the joiner I cannot agree.

So here's to disciples and Calvary. (19)

Stephen claims to have heard this parodic chanty, "three times a day, after meals" (Joyce 19). Not coincidentally, this parodic view of Jesus becomes the inverse of the Catholic Grace before each meal, and actually takes the place of a prayer normally said after the consumption of a meal. Stephen's understanding and use of the 'Ballad' is not simply parodic, but also sacreligious in nature, very much like Taxil's own work. While Renan's version of "La Vie de Jésus" simply endeavours to prove that Jesus Christ, influential as he may have been, was no miraculous Son of God, but rather a simple political revolutionary. Lernout tells us that Taxil's opinions of Jesus, as voiced in the introduction to his work, was much more controversial, even in the consideration of German Higher Criticism:

Taxil opens his introduction with the statement that there are three possible views on Jesus: he may be a god who spent time on earth in the skin of a man; he could be a jewish revolutionary who after his death was turned into a god by the supporters of his kind of social reform; or else neither he nor his

apostles ever existed, but they were invented by those who exploit human stupidity. (72)

Taxil favored the third of these options, while Renan sought to prove the second. Taxil's work, therefore, not only ridicules those who seek to prove the Scriptural narrative's historical accuracy, but also calls attention to the futility of Renan's efforts offer a more historical origin story for Jesus. In keeping with Kiremidjian's assertions about content and form in parody, we can see that Renan's text points to a disconnect between the content of the Bible and presumed form as a historical text, while Taxil's parody of Renan actually brings an unusual kind of unity to the content of Scriptural narrative, especially in his own outlandish version, and the form of his parodical text. It is unity that Hart describes as the basis for human condition and the foundation of what, in the terms of my argument, may be called 'fact.' The unity found in Taxil's work is made possible only through the rhetorical device of parody, offering us a targeted example of rhetoric's elevation above history in Stephen's and Joyce's search for the truth.

Both Renan's and Taxil's work, though focusing especially on religion, offer generalized and competing views on the accuracy of the singular macro-narratives as history--especially the Catholic² view of Biblical history, limited as it was the the study of the already-highly-altered Latin Vulgate--and Joyce creates a multiplicity of social perspectives within *Ulysses*, which all overlap the macro-narrative ideologies of religion and history in a way that makes them nearly impossible to separate, that can be seen to

² Taxil was outspokenly anti-Catholic when he published his mocking version of *The Life of Jesus*.

correspond with each of them. In fact, *Ulysses* is filled with an abundance of religious ceremonies, references, and allusions that at once illustrate a breadth of knowledge and accuracy to their given sources while simultaneously making intentional deviations that point toward the inability of any one of these references to provide an entirely accurate account of itself. Joyce addresses all perspectives of the debate on historical narrative perspective and the authority to create it; it would not do to attempt to separate, as some scholars have done, the factually accurate information from the inaccurate information in order to attempt to isolate the nature of Joyce's satire, for it is the nuanced relationship between the "fact" and the parody that can truly illustrate for us the depth of multiplicities in truth and perspective that Joyce is attempting to uncover.

The majority of my work involves discussing how Joyce's use of satire points to inconsistencies in the dominant perspective of history, while his multiplicity of narrative perspectives prove that a complete picture of history can only be achieved when one accepts the incompleteness of the macro-historical narrative, rejects the reductive terministic screens put into place to deauthorized micro-narratives, and views history as validated through all perspectives, not just a single myopic one. In each of the two sections that follow, I will address an aspect of this argument. Part One deals with ways in which Joyce's characters address themselves to mocking elements of the

macro-historical narrative, particularly as it is perpetuated in the dominant discourse of the Catholic Church. It illustrates what has been intentionally left out of and repressed in this macro-historical narrative.

Part Two, then, moves into a discussion of the ways in which terministic screens are applied to marginalized groups in order to devalue the multiplicity of micro-perspectives therein. Though Kenneth Burke's theories on rhetoric in society arose in the later half of the 20th century--well after *Ulysses* was written--the language concerning Burke's theory of terministic screening is helpful in considering the work implicit in Joyce's use of multiple micro-narrative perspectives. Particularly in part two of this thesis, I look closely at the work that terministic screens do in society, as laid out by Burke. In doing so, I argue that Joyce is rejecting the limiting nature of applying terministic screening within a singular master narrative--as when Bloom is consistently labelled a Jew by nearly everyone he encounters in the novel. While this label is not expressly incorrect, it is woefully incomplete as a description of Bloom's religious views and background. To facilitate this discussion, I will be exploring allusions and parallels to the Wandering Jew myth and the how the ejection of that mythic figure from became part of the macro-narrative that then continued to perpetuate the ejection of dissenters of the dominant discourse across the spanse of time to the historical moment in which Joyce is

writing. In both chapters, I delve into the nuances of major characters--Stephen and Mulligan in part one, and Bloom in part two--as well as particularly forceful minor characters, such as Deasy, who already been discussed at length, and the nationalistic Citizen of "Cyclops", that represent the perpetuation of dominant ideologies, giving particular interest to the ways in which they become functions of parody--drawing attention to the incompleteness of their perspectives when placed side by side with the perspectives of the other characters, as Joyce so frequently does within his exposition.

It is my belief that discussing the nature of history through parody and perspectivalism in Joyce is tantamount to discussing two sides of the same coin--that is to say, understanding Joyce's religious and historical parodies are key in understanding how Joyce views history, particularly the dominant macro-historical narratives of authoritative bodies such as the Church, and the recognizing the validity *and* the limitations of each given narrative perspective is essential in viewing how Joyce harnesses the aforementioned elements of parody to uncover the incompleteness of dominant narratives and the validity of the micro-perspective.

Part One

“To me it’s all mockery”: Highlighting Hypocrisy in the Macro-Narrative through Satire

It goes without saying that Stephen Dedalus, and his comrade Malachi “Buck” Mulligan, are enormously educated, though in different disciplines. Mulligan is a medical student whose character is redolent of the status of Anglo-Irish Catholics³ in Ireland at the time. His delving into the world of poetry and artistry seem more fanciful and hobby-like, at least from the perspective of Stephen, who endeavors above all things to be a “true” artist. He is afforded a great many luxuries that Stephen does not have, and he consistently reminds Stephen of this throughout *Ulysses*. Stephen, on the other hand, is an artist and an intellectual--neither of which comes with automatic wealth and status. Indeed, upon returning to Ireland after a failed trip to Paris somewhere between the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and the beginning of *Ulysses*, it is clear that Stephen is struggling to make it on his own--and his family is, unlike Mulligan’s, in no position to help him.

Still, we see that Mulligan and Stephen have, at least for some time prior to the opening scene of the novel, lived in a sort of symbiotic relationship. Mulligan is providing material safety for Stephen by allowing him to stay in the tower despite a tenuous (at best) ability to pay rent. Stephen’s concern is that Haines may become the keeper of the key to the tower, instead of Stephen, despite the fact that “I paid the rent”

³ The Anglo-Irish Catholics like Mulligan benefit from a higher social and economic status, as well as a Protestant education that traditional Catholicism, as was discussed in the introduction to this work, would not allow (Platt 77).

(20) indicates that he may be afraid that Haines may offer a more stable presence for Mulligan to feed off of, given that Mulligan encourages Stephen to “play them as I do” (16), implying that Mulligan views Haines as a form of joking income. Mulligan even offers Stephen cast-off clothing to replace Stephen’s own worn out clothes (we must assume that Mulligan’s discarded items are handed down from lack of interest, not lack of quality) and, as seen in “Telemachus,” it is Mulligan who pays the milkwoman for her deliveries, and so Stephen must depend on him for sustenance, as well. In exchange for practically keeping him up, it becomes apparent that Mulligan treats Stephen like a novelty and a housekeeper. He frequently makes fun of his poetic ideals, his tendency to complex inward thought, and even his heritage and former status as a member of the Jesuit school. He even requests that Stephen carry his shaving materials down the stairs for him, to which Stephen complies, while recognizing that he is, in fact, “a servant” (11).

One would be hard pressed to argue that Stephen does not know he is being mocked. Though he is not, perhaps, the most socially aware (as in “Circe,” when he goes to a brothel in Nighttown and proceeds to have a philosophical discussion with the women he meets there), but his frequent references to Mulligan’s tendencies to mock *everything*, and his seeming insecurity at having not yet succeeded as an artist, give us a greater insight into why Stephen chooses to be around Mulligan. Namely, he is proud. Stephen is intensely prideful and judgemental of many of the average Dubliners that we see characterized in *Ulysses*. Mulligan is, after all, not average. He is both affluent in comparison to the majority and also more intelligent. This marks the resemblance between Stephen and Mulligan--they both know too much. Both are intimately aware of

problems faced by the Irish, most of them centering around the Catholic Church and the English colonizers, all of them presenting issues of authority and autonomy. Yet, change on a large scale does not seem likely. For Mulligan, the condition of Ireland is not a serious concern; his status is an advantageous one, and that makes him, if not arbiter of, at least safely within the macro-perspective of dominant discourse. For Stephen, who is both willfully exiled from the religious macro-narrative and forcefully exiled from the economic dominant discourse, the inability to change his own position takes precedence over larger initiatives for a nation that he seems to feel is already doomed. In both cases, the understanding of the relative powerlessness of the average Irish citizen becomes fodder for satire and jest, though one is playful and the other cynical in nature.

The satire provided by Stephen and Mulligan is often posed as a mockery of the dominant narrative that, in the instant that the satire occurs, remains unstated; by this, I mean that the satire is intentional and often originary on the part of the one who is creating it, and not necessarily in response to something. This is a consequence of the body of knowledge that both Stephen and Mulligan have at their disposal concerning the the history and practice of the Catholic Church and the national history of Ireland, and it stands in contrast to the illustrations of incomplete micro-perspectives facilitated through (primarily Bloom's) misunderstanding of the Church and the tone of Irish nationalism, butted against the dominant, yet still incomplete, macro-perspectives perpetuated by the devout religious practitioner and the Citizen--the limits of individual perspectives and the importance of recognizing the role perspectivalism plays in creating a complete and accurate picture of history, religion, and culture are the focus of the next chapter. A major

factor in recognizing Stephen and Mulligan as enactors of satire mocking the hypocrisy of the myopic macro-narrative is their frequent references to other satirical material--most significantly, to Leo Taxil multiple times in the first three chapters that make up the "Eumaeus" sections, particularly through Mulligan's parodic *Ballad of Joking Jesus* in "Telemachus."

In order to gain a clear picture of the religious history that Stephen and Mulligan are being so critical of, and thus to realize what micro-perspectives may have been actively excluded from this formation of the dominant macro-historical narrative and identify the hypocrisy inherent in this exclusion, it is relative to include here a brief discussion about the recent history of the Catholic Church and its authority in formulating dominant ways of thought and historical narratives. To do this, I will discuss major issues that arose within the Catholic Church in the century preceding the publication of *Ulysses*. These events were set into motion by the German Higher Criticism movement, and they (along with the criticism itself) sparked the parodies of writers like Taxil, to whom Joyce frequently alludes.

It all started, one might say, with the encyclical *Mirari vos*, which was established in 1832. This encyclical "unequivocally condemned the liberal ideas of freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, the separation of church and state, religious tolerance and even the very idea of democracy itself" (Lernout 30-31). Geert Lernout⁴ tells us that this encyclical was primarily a response to a French trend advocating for a more liberal Catholicism. Moreover, the movement was, on the whole, successful at squelching the

⁴ *Help My Unbelief: James Joyce & Religion* is a fantastic comprehensive look at Joyce's complicated relationship with the Catholic Church. His text has provided much of the historical background necessary to frame my arguments in this section.

romantic notions of individual agency and free-thought. Even a hundred years prior to *Ulysses*, the Church was still immensely concerned with the idea that an individual left to his own devices may come to the conclusion that Church authority is not only oppressive, but also unreasonable.

Mirari vos sufficed for nearly forty years before the Church saw fit to intervene in laypeople's understanding of their religion once again in 1870 with the proclamation of papal infallibility (Lernout 34). This, of course, essentially meant that the Pope was never wrong, even insofar as he may have contradicted previously Vatican discourse, because he was more or less a direct conduit to God, and therefore could not be disagreed with. The most direct message from this proclamation is, of course, that the Vatican's decisions are not up for debate on any level. However, the notion of the Pope as infallible also begins to set up a space where the Pope himself can (perhaps even should, if the decree is taken to extremes) be viewed as his own sort of deity. We see this in "Telemachus" when Stephen tells Haines that he serves two Masters, the King of England and the Catholic Church. He does not, however, serve the God that the Church purports to worship--only the Church itself.

Still, despite declaring ultimate control, the Church still suffered at the hands of modernity, and the social and cultural trends that emerged near the end of the nineteenth century. The Protestant church was making headway in the field of textual historicity concerning the Bible and, it seems, the Catholic Church was not to be outdone.

Saepenumero considerantes, a pastoral letter published in 1883, opened the Vatican archives and began an interest in the history of the Church as an institution. As may be

expected, however, Pope Leo XIII, who wrote the letter, made clear that “the truth could only belong to the church” (Lernout 28). In other words, Protestant historical work was not considered valid or accurate, despite the fact that both are sects of Christianity.

Building off of *Saepenumero considerantes*, an encyclical was finally published concerning biblical criticism a decade later in 1893. *Providentissimus Deus* appeared in part as a reaction to Catholic scholarship not being taken seriously, because it was too heavily dependent on what the Church approved as history and understanding (Lernout 36). Still, conclusions reached by non-Catholic study were, on the whole, discounted--even historical criticism reached by those who were educated in Catholicism but had since moved away from the faith, such as Ernest Renan, were not entrusted with uncovering accurate Bible history. As Lernout points out, the seeming freedom that the *Providentissimus Deus* gave to Catholic scholars was, in actuality, still very limiting--and it was recognized as such. The Latin Vulgate, which was the definitive Catholic Bible, “had at best a tenuous relation with the original text of the Old and New Testament: no serious criticism of the bible [sic] was possible without recourse to the originals” (Lernout 37). Moreover, the Catholic Church had also made significant changes to the original doctrine as even presented in the Latin Bible, as Adolf von Harnack had previously proved (Lernout 38). Yet, the doctrine of Papal infallibility, relatively new though it was, offered for the Church the ultimate loophole for changing the doctrine--it simply could not have been wrong for the Pope to do so.

The touchy nature of both interpreting the Bible and situating it in an historical narrative, and the Catholic Church’s tendency to throw out anything that did not fit

entirely with the narrative it desired to create for itself, became great fodder for satire and mockery for those outside the Church, even before Joyce was writing *Ulysses*. Leo Taxil, a French author outspoken against the Catholic Church, wrote his *La vie de Jesus* in 1900, mocking the fantastical nature of the Bible narrative. This book, as will be discussed later in this chapter, becomes a recurring theme in *Ulysses* where Stephen and Mulligan are concerned.

The concern for textual criticism and historicity concerning the Bible was, by and large, considered to be a modernist issue--at least in the definition that was provided by the Catholic Church. As Finn Fordham points out, artistic and cultural movements are typically identified retrospectively; artistic modernism is only viewed as such from our contemporary perspective. The Church, on the other hand, was very outspoken against trends that it had labelled as modernist as early as the late nineteenth century--including a particular interest by both non-Christians and Protestants alike in the history behind sacred Christian doctrine, dogma, and scripture--and the debates that occurred around the Catholic Church's (non)participation in the trend of study and its subsequent mockery by other, more comprehensive scholars, all lead into a series of Papal actions that are directly targeted toward so-called modern interests between 1904 and 1910.

It should be noted that, while Taxil's biblical satire occurred in 1900 and found its way into *Ulysses* as a direct reference and von Harnack's criticism of the Church occurred early enough to be responded to in 1902, and would therefore have colored general intellectual discussion concerning the Church at around the time of the events taking place in *Ulysses*, the series of Papal encyclicals concerning modernism were

published after the setting of *Ulysses*, but prior to its publication. As such, these encyclicals still had the potential to color the work, and indeed it would be hard to argue otherwise. The issues with Church authority that are so irreverently mocked by Mulligan and so satirically attacked by Stephen are more than enough indication that the Church's attempt to stave off modern interests in historical accuracy were very much alive in the text of *Ulysses*.

The first of these documents, *Lamentabili Sane*, was published in July 1907. This reasserted issues of Church authority, establishing the the Divine authorship of the Bible and framing Church dogma as truth through (rather than interpretation of) said scripture. It also firmly declared that the Church's authority was absolutely Divine in both nature and origin--not political (Fordham 11). This particular point is important for the context of an argument on history and authority because it completely denies a large historical narrative in which the Church acts politically--which it nearly always does.

Pascendi Dominici Gregis, the second document published later that same year, calls out modernists directly as posing a threat to the Church. It is followed in short order by a third document, *Praestantia Scripturae*⁵, which threatens excommunication to all Catholics who still push a modernist agenda--also known as an interest in biblical and Church history outside of what is expressly approved by the Church. The final document, and perhaps the most recognizable, is commonly referred to the *Oath Against Modernism*, in which those seeking entry into the clergy were actually forced to renounce

⁵ 18 November 1907 (Fordham 10).

modernist ways of thought (Fordham 11). Fordham offers a shortened English version of the text of the *Oath*, which I have included here:

I _____ firmly embrace and accept each and every definition that has been set forth and declared by the unerring teaching authority of the Church, especially those principal truths which are directly opposed to the errors of this day. I reject that method of judging and interpreting Sacred Scripture which ... embraces the misrepresentations of the rationalists and with no prudence or restraint adopts textual criticism as the one and supreme norm ... Finally, I declare that I am completely opposed to the error of the modernists who hold that there is nothing divine in sacred tradition. (11)

Fordham contends that there can be no separation between cultural and literary modernism and religious modernist crisis of authority and historicity. He argues that the Church itself collapses all modernisms into a single entity, establishing no difference between literary, academic, and technological modern advancements; for Fordham, the Church's reaction to modernism is itself just another facet of modernism. I am included to agree with Fordham's desire to connect religious modernism with other forms of modernism, especially where Joyce is concerned.

Emer Nolan points to a tendency of viewing the Irish as continuously "prone to being led astray by words" (90). The reasoning behind this, as Joyce portrays it in *Ulysses*, is two fold. Interpretive failures and misaligned perspectives, such as are discussed more fully in the next section of this thesis, account for a large portion of the verbal misunderstandings between characters. However, Joyce seems also to point toward

written language as a means of leading people astray--as in written historical narrative. Recalling Hayden White's assertion that written history is, from the outset, framed from a particular perspective, and is also inherently political in nature (129) brings Buck Mulligan's mockery of political and religious authority, and Stephen's frequent references to Leo Taxil's biblical satire, into a new perspective. Given the Church's actions in limiting the historical perspectives of its practitioners, and its political agenda concerning modernism that aimed to protect its authority to do so, very little difference can be ascribed to the historically misleading statements from the Vatican and the intentionally derisive parodic mocking Joyce's characters employ in the examples that follow.

The macro-narrative created by the Church is easily accepted by those who ascribe to the dominant discourse. We can see this phenomenon by referring again to the library debate in "Scylla and Charybdis." In preparing to listen to Stephen's theory of Hamlet, John Eglinton passes off the historical accuracy of Hamlet in the life of Shakespeare as "purely academic" and thus not imbued with any import in life and understanding, just like "clergyman's discussion of the historicity of Jesus" (185). For Eglinton, a perpetuator of the dominant macro-narrative, the completion of the historical narrative is inconsequential if it involves validating dissenting micro-narrative perspectives.

Stephen and Mulligan, as opposed to Eglinton, are prime examples of modernist citizens in that they are highly educated and seem less likely to bow to Church authority blindly. Episodes in "Telemachus" illustrate how the Church is mocked in the discourse

between these characters. Stephen, in particular, also has an interest in history and how authority over history can force a change in perspective, as is evidenced in “Nestor,” when he attempts to internally contemplate how science is more accurate than history by rationalizing that, since all the cells in his body had since been replaced, he was no longer responsible for paying back a debt, because it was a different Stephen that borrowed it. In the remainder of this chapter, I will turn more fully to the text of *Ulysses* to examine how Stephen and Mulligan, among others, provide direct and pointed satire at the Church and its attitudes toward history and modernism.

“Telemachus” is irreverent from the outset, when a priestly Mulligan steps into the sun to shave his face, view the ocean, and make of fun of Stephen. Immediately, the reader is made aware that Mulligan’s character makes use of mockery as a direct mode of satire. In fact, Mulligan announces this fact himself on the very first page of text:

--The mockery of it, he said gaily. Your absurd name, an ancient Greek. (3)

Not only does Mulligan make fun of something nearly every time he speaks, he also finds mockery in preexisting conditions. Satire, for Mulligan at least, exists everywhere and touches everything. He does frequently turn his talent for satire on Stephen, but this mockery is often situated in Stephen’s religious background. The quote above, in fact, is in reference to Stephen’s Greek name in comparison to his staunch Catholic upbringing and education.

Stephen proves in short order that he is just as likely to make a mockery, and especially concerning the Catholic Church. Though Stephen seems to profess atheism⁶

⁶ Stephen’s atheism seems to be an intellectual endeavor. Though he steadfastly refused to pray while his mother was dying, his daily life as exhibited in *Ulysses* is still governed strongly by the Church. He confesses to Haines that he still views the Pope as his master (20).

and Mulligan has had the benefit of a Protestant education and calls for a “new paganism” (7), both characters were at one point in time closely identified with the Catholic Church. Stephen’s childhood at Clongowes was very strictly Catholic, and Mulligan is also Catholic by inheritance. Therefore, the pointed attacks, whether they be cynical or jocular in nature, are set apart in their intentionality from the peripheral understanding (and misunderstanding) of Catholicism on the part of Bloom that constitutes the indirect satire I discuss in the next section.

Stephen’s primary means of satirizing the Catholic Church is by normalizing liturgy and ritual into everyday, and oftentimes inappropriate settings. As Mulligan mocks Stephen’s refusal to grant his mother her dying wish and pray for her, Stephen recalls a dream that he had concerning her funeral:

In a dream, silently, she had come to him, her wasted body within its loose graveclothes giving off an odour of wax and rosewood, her breath bent over him with mute secret words, a faint odor of wetted ashes.

Her glazing eyes, staring out of death, to shake and bend my soul. On me alone. The ghostcandle to light her agony. Ghostly light on the tortured face. Her hoarse loud breath rattling in horror, while all prayed on their knees. Her eyes on me to strike me down. *Liliata rutilantium te confessorum, turma circumdet: iubilantium te virginum chorus excipiat.* (10)

Stephen’s rendering of the prayer, as Willis McNelly attests, is an extremely accurate recounting of this section of the *Ordo Commendationis Animae* (291). This might be considered especially astonishing because it is, in the context in which it appear here in

Ulysses, a recollection of a dream of a past event. Stephen's ability to recall it so flawlessly, it is true, adds to the mockery that Mulligan makes of Stephen's professed atheism by proving that he is much more fully steeped in Catholicism than he would like to admit. However, what is more important in terms of Stephen's own direct satire of the Church is the context of the dream in which this piece of liturgy appears. The *Liliata*, and the *Ordo Commendationis Animae* as a whole, is scripture that is reserved for the last rituals of dying Catholics (Gifford 19). Though these prayers are intended to help ease the soul into the afterlife and commend the deceased to the Lord, Stephen's satirical dream presents the scripture as having the opposite effect. Rather than dying, Stephen's dream mother has become undead; instead of resting peacefully, she is tormenting him--and she continues to do so throughout the rest of *Ulysses*. Yet, the prayer was said, in the dream, and assuredly in Stephen's reality, also. It has, obviously and like so many other aspects of Stephen's portrayal of religion--both in *Ulysses* and previously in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, proved ineffective.

To attack Church doctrine as ineffective is, of course, also to attack the Church as a historical institution. The decree of Papal infallibility established the Pope as a direct conduit for the blessings of the Lord, and to prove those blessings ineffectual is tantamount to disinheriting the Church of all authority--an important thought, considering how many other aspects of society Church authority has governed. It is equally important that someone like Stephen or Mulligan, who is so intimately familiar with Catholicism, is the one who is pointing out the illegitimacy of Papal authority. Yet, authority is also directly challenged from other, more ambiguous points of view in *Ulysses*.

Joyce's carefully targeted moments of satire do not simply attack the Church from the perspective of a religious dissidents who hope to make waves with controversial statements. Even in his neutral narration, he makes it abundantly clear that he is more than adequately familiar with even the most obscure elements of Catholic doctrinal practice--and that he is more than willing to take a jab at them, just as he is with the history of the Church. In fact, many of the religious ceremonies that occur or are parodied in *Ulysses* are written with extreme accuracy and attention to detail that belies Joyce's supposed mocking intentions. Two such encounters, focalized through Bloom and filled with moments of inattention and misunderstanding, are discussed in the next chapter. A second pair, discussed here, appear through what can only be described as neutral narration. Though Bloom features prominently in "Nausicaa," as does a young girl named Gerty, the descriptions of what is happening inside the church while the pair interact on the beach simply cannot be focalized through either of them. "Ithaca," on the other hand, presents moments of focalization between both Bloom and Stephen, but the narration is overall imbued with a detached tone from either character; it is, in fact, listed in the Gilbert schema as "catechism:impersonal". It is because of the avoidable presence of an unidentifiable, and thus an uncoded, narrative voice that I include the ensuing readings in this section on direct satire. The parodies created here cannot, after all, be ascribed to misunderstanding, such as the ones found in the next chapter. An average reader, or even an average Catholic, would not always immediately recognize moments of satire or inaccuracy in Joyce's description of religious events in the text. Yet, Joyce was not an

average Catholic, and it is likely that this was reflected in his expected readership, as well.

What is certainly understandable about Joyce is his tendency toward satirical portrayals in general, and of the Church specifically. Joyce's interrogation of Catholic doctrine in *Ulysses* through narrative exposition (as opposed to character dialogue or interiority) appears primarily in two forms--the question of the religious text itself, and the question of how it is presented to religious practitioners, through Mass and other religious rituals. The latter of these two methods is perhaps the one that is easier to overlook, because religious rhetoric Joyce uses to convey this satire is, by and large, correct--or so nearly correct that it is easy to overlook the inaccuracies, even for a devote practitioner. Joyce makes use of inappropriate times and locations to present religious practices and rituals out of context. The two most forward examples of this are the men's temperance retreat conducted conspicuously in the background of Leopold Bloom's masturbatory fantasy on the beach in "Nausicaa" and the catechistic question and answer technique employed in "Ithaca" as we see Stephen Dedalus and Bloom finally converge.

"Nausicaa" opens on three young women tending children on the beach where Leopold Bloom has happened to come to rest. Bloom, having just left the pub of "Cyclops" in a rather violent manner, is in a mental state of mental and emotional vulnerability equal to that of the young and impressionable Gerty MacDowell, which

may account for the events that follow. The opening paragraph of the chapter provides the reader with a brief description of the area as lit up by the setting sun, ending tellingly with "last but not least, on the quiet church whence there streamed forth at times upon the stillness the voice of prayer to her who is in her pure radiance a beacon ever to the storm-tossed heart of man, Mary, star of the sea" (346). Certainly, the church here described is not "least" in importance to the other buildings described in this paragraph, and it most definitely is not "least" in significance for this chapter of the novel.

Inside the church, Reverend Hughes is conducting a men's temperance retreat, and the open windows of the building allow the permeating of the involved sermons and rituals across the beach to where Gerty and Bloom are not listening, yet cannot help but overhear. In fact, the while the Cissy Caffrey, Edy Boardman, and the children begin to fade from the exposition as Gerty and Bloom enter into their concurrent moments of individual intense sexuality, the prayers issuing from the church seem to become all the more invasive. In fact, Joyce seems to go to great lengths to divorce the actions of Gerty and Bloom from the others on the beach, and instead connect them to the actions going on inside the church. Actions inside the church, such as the swinging of the censor being carried by the altar boy, mirror the actions outside the church between Gerty and Bloom, as when Gerty become conscious of the effect her swinging legs have on Bloom. Even

the sentence structure serves the purpose of aligning these two sets of actions at the exclusion of the other girls and the children:

Queen of angels, queen of patriarchs, queens of prophets, of all saints, they prayed, queen of the most holy rosary and then Father Conroy handed the thurible to Canon O'Hanlon and he put in the incense and censed the Blessed Sacrament and Cissy Caffrey caught the two twins and she was itching to give them a ringing good clip on the ear but she didn't because she thought he might be watching but she never made a bigger mistake in all her life because Gerty could see without looking that he never took his eyes off of her and then Canon O'Hanlon handed the thurible back to Father Conroy and knelt down looking up at the Blessed Sacrament and the choir began to sing *Tantum ergo* and she just swung her foot in and out in time as the music rose and fell to the *Tamtumer gosa cramen tum.* (Joyce 359-360)

Literally, within the context of the narrative, this single sentence provides exposition for three different sets of actions-- those of the clergy, Cissy and the twins, and Gerty--occurring in two different locations--the church and the beach--simultaneously. However, the stringing together of multiple independent clauses with conjunctions seems to imply a cause and effect pattern, as well. It is a narrative technique that see frequently

repeated once the sexual nature of the connection between Gerty and Bloom is established, as when, a few paragraphs later:

Then they sang the second verse of the *Tantum ergo* and Canon O'Hanlon got up again and censed the Blessed Sacrament and knelt down down and he told Father Conroy that one of the candles was just going to set fire to the flowers and Father Conroy got up and settled it all right and she could see the gentleman winding his watch and listening to the works and she swung her leg more in and out in time. (361).

There is a sense in which the causal implications of the Sacrament on the sexual scene taking place just outside the church is both literal and obvious--Gerty is swinging her leg, the primary sexualized object, in time to the music being played in the church. The broader suggestion here is, of course, that the presence of the church and the worshippers is the primary impetus for the sexual encounter between Gerty and Bloom; without the church and the music, there would be no leg swinging, no fetishization, and certainly no public masturbation. This association on its own is a fairly cruel bit of mockery, but it does not completely do justice to the complexity of Joyce's satirical allusions and representations. Each character in turn becomes a player in a larger biblical

narrative, in a technique reminiscent of the Taxil work that Joyce so frequently references.

The men's temperance retreat is engaged in the act of praying to the Virgin Mary, "a beacon ever to the storm tossed heart of man" (Joyce 346), a figure with whom Gerty MacDowell becomes strongly aligned as the chapter moves forward. Gerty, who views herself as a "Refuge of sinners. Comfortress of the afflicted" (358), is "a ministering angel too with a little heart worth its weight in gold" (355). Just as these descriptions align her works with those of the Virgin mother's, she is also aligned with Mary based on her literal physical position in space, relative to those who "worship" her. The same sentence structures pointed out earlier, that align moments of action inside the church with moments of action outside on the beach, also place Gerty and the Virgin Mary statue in similar literal positions. Inside the church, the supplicants kneel before Mary, giving themselves a direct view of her legs, while outside Bloom is also enraptured with Gerty's transparently stockinged calf, "literally worshipping at her shrine" (361). The worshippers look up to their statued figure in adoration, and Bloom also gazes up the hill toward Gerty. These observations are not new, in and of themselves, but they are important to note.

What is, perhaps, less obvious is Bloom's own alignment with God, which, though prevalent elsewhere in the novel, occurs in "Nausicaa" only once. After chasing the twins down the beach, Cissy "was itching to give them a ringing good clip on the ear but she didn't because she thought he might be watching" (359-360). Of course, the girls are all very much aware of the presence of the man, whom they assume to be gentlemanly due to his mourning attire, and Gerty has demonstrated the delicate sensibilities of the girls when she becomes embarrassed at Cissy's crass talk to the baby, which Gerty herself "would be ashamed of her life to say" (353). A fairly obvious conclusion, and one which the narration immediately confirms, is that Cissy is concerned about the impression she is giving Bloom--except, of course, that Bloom is not paying any attention to her. However, the prayers and sermons that are taking place so conspicuously in the background offer us another interpretation, as well. Just as would-be sinners are warned that God is always watching them, waiting to pass judgement upon them, so too is Cissy afraid of the judgement of Bloom. It is Bloom, acting as God, that has the power to condemn her for behaving poorly in disciplining her brothers.

By recognizing both the displacement of the religious ritual that has seeped onto the beach, and the presence of both God and Mary on the beach, as well, we may begin to see the mockery that Joyce is formulating concerning religion. To begin, the intentional

aligning of two climactic points--the end of the Sacrament and Bloom's orgasm--implies that that use religion is put towards in a society is purely a fetishistic and superficially pleasurable one. Moreover, it cannot be overlooked that Bloom's climactic catharsis is self-induced, the result of a masturbatory fantasy, endorsed but not truly aided by Gerty MacDowell's actions, which are, again, being facilitated by the church music. When we add to the parallel of the actions in and out of the church by factoring in the character allusions, in which Gerty transforms into the Virgin mother and Bloom becomes God, the relationship between practitioner and religion becomes even further complicated. The God Bloom is himself literally worshipping at the feet of mortal Mary--and in the most fetishized way, at that. In this reading of the situation, one cannot help but ponder the implications of the immaculate conception. Through satirizing the location and context of religious ritual, Joyce points out for his readers that Christianity, and Catholicism particular with its emphasis on the Virgin Mother, began with, and is currently still, fetishizing female sexuality and sexual purity, question the principles at work at the very foundation of the faith.

A later chapter, "Ithaca," also presents an appropriate religious form outside of its appropriate context. The schema provided for Stuart Gilbert lists the technique for this chapter as "catechism (impersonal)," and as such, this chapter is frequently paired

with readings of "Nestor," the technique of which is "catechism (personal)." I am choosing not to discuss these chapters in tandem, though I will at times draw on some of the similarities between them. Ultimately, the key to my reading of "Ithaca" is that parenthetical qualifications: (impersonal). "Nestor" taking in place as it does in the classroom where Stephen works, raises questions of history, both ancient and immediate, that affect the context of its content. "Ithaca," on the other hand, does not occur in the classroom setting, and moreover, follows immediately from the climactic end of "Circe," in which the Holy Ghost appears in the form of Bloom's deceased son Rudy, and the body of Christ is abused as Stephen is beaten down in the street.

Heusel argues that "Ithaca" represents a successful melding of perspectives because it is at this point, when they are alone together in Bloom's home, that Stephen and Bloom talk freely and honestly with one another without the ensuing confrontations that each character was faced with earlier in the day--Stephen's debate in the library in "Scylla and Charybdis" and Bloom's altercation with the Citizen in "Cyclops," not to mention Stephen's literal fight with the police at the end of "Circe." I would argue for the presence of a third perspective, that of the unidentified narrative voice, that lends an additional layer of depth to Heusel's observations. This narrative voice, by facilitating the thematic layout of the catechism in this chapter, introduces an element of satire which highlights

the absurdity of the myopia with which religion views life. Religions of all types, not the least of which is Catholicism, insist on religious obedience as the means of ensuring peace and happiness. The Catholic catechism, moreover, is an entirely myopic method of religious education and indoctrination in which everyone already knows the answer to the given question and replies in kind. That Joyce has appropriated this style to depict his two differently aligned characters drinking cocoa and enjoying each other's company while simply discussing everything from personal backgrounds and perspectives to the city itself illustrates that the limiting view of the myopic macro-history and education of the Catholic Church is not the only, or even the most successful, way to create understanding between people.

"Ithaca," therefore, is to be viewed in a fundamentally different way than "Nestor," despite their obvious similarities. The question and answer motif that lends itself to the category "catechism" is, first and foremost, carried out throughout the entire chapter, rather than being isolated to a particular scene, and they do not occur between the two characters themselves, but rather between the book and the reader. However, it is important in recognizing Joyce's satire of this catechistic form to note that there is something of a reversal of role in this line of questioning. The questions, which relate to the changing topics of conversation between Stephen and Bloom, appear to be the

primary inquiry of the reader, who is controlling the direction of the exchange with this specific line of inquiries. Thus, the flow of the catechism is from a place of inferior knowledge (and thus, inquiry) to a place of superior, even entirely omniscient knowledge. A typical catechism would, of course, be lead by a priest, channeling the spirit of the Lord, and supplemented by the congregation, therefore proceeding from ultimate knowledge and superiority and going for into a place of inferiority.

Both Bloom and Stephen are ascribed Christ-like characteristics within the text, in keeping with the satire of taking what is secular and showing it to be in line with religious interpretations. Bloom, as one example has already illustrated, is God. Stephen, beginning in Joyce's earlier work *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, grows through the Trinity. Harry Blamires, in *The New Bloomsday Book*, is only one of many scholars to point out that Stephen's brutal beating at the hand of Private Carr at the end of "Circe," and his subsequent revival by Bloom, is tantamount to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ by God (Blamires 195). This poses an interesting interpretation of the questioning in "Ithaca," as well, as the intentions and personal histories of each are questioned. Insofar as the questioning the novel represents the direction of the discussion between the characters, it may be assumed that they are questioning each other, which might be expected from the religious allegory, as when, in the critical moments before his death,

Jesus questions why his God has forsaken him--a moment in the synoptic gospel of Matthew that Christianity has grappled with long term in its confusion for the faith. Joyce may be emphasizing Jesus's own shaken faith in having his God and his Christ question each other as relative strangers.

The content and phrasing of several of the questions presented in the chapter pose a secondary problem, a new instance of satire that implies another level of questioning. Questions such as, "Did the man reappear elsewhere?" and "Did Stephen obey his sign?" (669) occur at a moment when Stephen and Bloom are temporarily separated, while Bloom looks for a way to unlock the door. Therefore, they cannot be written off as warped bits of the conversation that are adapted to the chapter's thematic layout, and must instead be considered differently, as if the reader is actively asking the book questions regarding the exposition. The book in question, tangibly, is *Ulysses*, but only as a stand-in for a different book that features God and Jesus as prominent characters, and which it appears Joyce is encouraging readers to question. Thus, what begins as a simple spoof on the call-and-answer motif of the catechism ends in highlighting an extremely problematic moment in the Jesus narrative as a jumping-off place for encouraging religious practitioners to question the source of the knowledge about the foundation of their faith.

Perhaps the fact that neither Bloom nor Stephen is willing to ascribe to a single macro-narrative for himself is what enables each of them to adapt to and accept the micro-narrative and perspective of the other as authentic in a way that they are not able to achieve with the other, dominant perspective inclined characters. The next chapter discusses in a more in-depth way the macro-historical master narratives at play and how Joyce shows them to be limiting in their relation to others and incomplete in their understanding of history through the technique of perspectivalism.

Part Two

“One story was good til you heard another”: Resisting Terministic Screens through Perspectivalism

Leopold Bloom is, unfortunately, frequently mistaken--at least, insofar as the context of the dominant macro-perspective against which he frequently is pitted is concerned. This could be a maxim for much of *Ulysses*. It cannot be said that Bloom is not extremely knowledgeable in a variety of subjects, but by the same token, it must be noted that he tends to read as confused--or rather, he does not read himself as confused, but it is apparent to the audience that he is, especially to the high modernist readers that Joyce would have been writing toward. Bloom's confusion of details is perhaps most apparent in the moments when he interprets religious ceremonies, as in "Lotus Eaters" and "Hades." We see a view of Catholicism that is at once an inside and outside perspective; Bloom was, after all, baptized into the Church prior to his marriage to Molly, yet he is of Jewish heritage *and* Protestant background.

Because he is consistently forced to identify only as Jewish, and given his somewhat aimless trip around Dublin during the course of the text, Bloom has often been viewed as the main contribution to the "Wandering Jew" trope found in *Ulysses*, though he is certainly not the only character that plays into this trope. To a certain extent, Stephen is also a Wandering Jew figure, though his trip through Dublin is not, on the whole, a solo sojourn, but rather seems to occur at the volition of Buck Mulligan. Moreover, Bloom, like the classic Wandering Jew myth, is not technically Jewish.

Paul Stob offers the following summary of the (most often thought of as Burkeian) field of social constructionism:

Generally speaking, "social constructionism" is a metaphor that attempts to capture the way Burke viewed the nature of the world and the function of language therein. It suggests that symbols, terms, and language form the building blocks, the bricks and mortar, of the structures of our collective life. We employ symbols that construct our social realities, similar to the way a contractor employs the materials and labor that construct a house. Consequently, the realities we face are not inherent in nature but are built up discursively and can therefore be reconstructed as we alter our discursive practices. (131)

As the examples illustrated through "Ithaca" described at the end of the last chapter have shown, Joyce employs a similar technique in his satire that prefigures social construction as a means of shifting dominant discourse. By appropriating religious themes in a strictly secular description of activities (activities which, significantly, bring about the peace and contentment religious authorities may insist can only be found through God), Joyce demonstrates that the purported function of the Church in society is defunct. Rather, he asserts the importance of recognizing and accepting the authenticity of a multiplicity of perspective.

I argue, also, that Joyce's creation of Bloom as a character with a complex religious background, who frequently embodies Wandering Jew mythology, and who is consistently forced into the label of "Jew"--to the exclusion of other equally (if not more)

fitting labels--rejects the use of what Burke would later come to call terministic screens as a definitive way to categorize, and thus limit potential within, society. For Burke, terministic screening offers a way to "help us notice certain parts of our experience while encouraging us to neglect others" (Stob 137). Bloom's Jewish heritage allows other characters of *Ulysses*, particularly in "Cyclops," to neglect the other aspects about Bloom and encourages him to do so with himself, as well--but only to a certain point. Once the point is reached where the other characters in "Cyclops" become aware of their use of terministic screens against Bloom, and especially his particular resistance to them, and therefore are no longer able to use said screens to hold him a comfortable distance from themselves and maintain the dominance of their macro-narrative, Bloom must necessarily be ejected from the bar in Wandering Jew fashion.

Though many versions of the Wandering Jew myth, each which offers a different perspective on the Jewish people through the macro-historical narrative of Christianity, Michael Woolf offers one originary form of the mythos that proves to be particularly helpful when we consider the damaging effects of reductive terministic screens on individuals who do not mesh well with dominant macro-narratives. This version, cited by Woolf in modern English from an anonymous ballad⁷, is as follows:

Being weary thus, he sought for rest,
 To ease his burthened soule,
 Upon a stone; the which a wretch
 Did churlishly controule;

⁷ The ballad is found in Thomas Percy's *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1858).

And sayd, "Awaye, thou king of Jewes,
Thou shalt not rest thee here;
Pass on; thy execution place
Thou seest nowe draweth neare."

And thereupon he thrust him thence;
At which our Saviour sayd,
"I sure will rest, but thou shalt walke,
And have no journey stayed."
With that, this cursed shoemaker,
For offering Christ this wrong,
Left wife and children, house and all,
And went from thence along. (20)

In this particular version of the myth, as Woolf points out, the Wandering Jew is not Jewish. In fact, he is anti-semitic in his views toward Christ. Yet his perspective, namely his negative views on Jesus, mark him as against the dominant narrative of Christianity, and therefore he must be vilified through terministic screening and ejected from society in order that his micro-perspective not be validated and detrimental to the propagation of the dominant macro-narrative.

Bloom, certainly, is not anti-semitic. But he is also most definitely not solely, or even primarily, Jewish. In fact, of the three religions that Bloom can be associated with, his ties with Judaism are perhaps the least strong. Bloom's father had renounced the

Jewish faith prior to his birth, and Bloom was born a Protestant, ostensibly never practicing any version of Jewish orthodoxy. We certainly never see him take his Jewish heritage into account as he meanders the streets of Dublin in search of a pork kidney to fry for his breakfast--certainly not a kosher meal. Yet, somehow, the Jewish identity is the only terministic screen that seems to stick to Bloom. The other characters identify him as a Jew despite the great likelihood that they are aware of the fact that he is non-practicing and has taken up other religious affiliations. This forced Jewish identity is consistent with a trope that has already long been recognized in *Ulysses*--that of the "Wandering Jew"--a figure that Woolf asserts "sustains a number of paradoxes that connect simultaneously, and at various points, with Jewish identities: those imposed upon them and those assumed by them" in an essay that examines the use of the Wandering Jew trope and its connection to the frequent instances of Jewish diaspora and the view of the Jew as cosmopolitan (Woolf 20). The notion of the Wandering Jew, according to Woolf, "suggests that identity is a construct not a natural or necessarily inherited condition" (20)--at least, not for marginalized groups. Rather, dominant discourse communities engage in a process of applying negative terministic screens to micro-perspectives that contradict the master narrative, thus ensuring that these micro-perspectives do not achieve validation within society and come to be seen as the historical and cultural truths that they really are. This is consistent with the characterization and experiences of Leopold Bloom throughout *Ulysses*--to a point.

It cannot be overlooked that the reason that the Jewish identity haunts Bloom is due to his historical background and heritage. Though Bloom's father, Rudolph Virag,

adopted Protestantism as his religion of choice, he was born Jewish and of Hungarian Jewish decent. The identity that he chose for himself and his family does not seem to be important to the way that his community perceives him in Dublin, and this is transferred to his son, who, in point of fact, never really had much of anything to do with Judaism. In fact, Bloom is not even a Jew by Jewish standards, as his mother was not Jewish, but Catholic.

The traditional Wandering Jew figure was not Jewish; he was condemned to his wandering fate after he displayed anti-semitic views toward Christ. It is the highest form of irony that, as a result, he must now also carry the Jew label. In creating Bloom for his Wandering Jew, Joyce exhibits his prowess at creating multi-level satire. Bloom, like the traditional myth, is not himself a Jew--except that he sort of is. Bloom's father renounced the Jewish faith to become a Protestant, and Bloom himself was eventually deemed a Catholic. But just as the original wanderer is doomed to carry the label of Jew, so Bloom must deal with Jewish stereotypes frequently as he travels through Dublin, particularly in the "Cyclops" episode.

The notable difference between the traditional myth and Bloom's experience is the Bloom does not exhibit any anti-Semitic tendencies that cause his punishment, but rather is cast out from the pub for pointing toward Christ's Judaism as a parallel between himself and Christ in an attempt to stave off the prejudices that he himself was facing in that moment. In this instance, as in many others, Bloom suffers, not from a poor historical education and memory, but from a fundamental misunderstanding of Irish Catholicism and the history that it has created for itself.

Joyce's satire in portraying the Wandering Jew begins in Bloom's complex relationship with the Jewish identity. He both is not Jewish, as the traditional figure is not Jewish, and yet he is. This points toward a particular version of Christian history in which the Wandering Jew and the actual Jew, though Woolf shows them to be originally distinct historical categories, become collapsed into the same identity. The Wandering Jew, as Woolf points out, is "only tenuously connected to biblical sources" and did not become commonplace as a tropological identity until the seventeenth century (22). Yet the myth is historically recorded as "an ancient Christian legend" (Woolf 21)--presumably because it is consistent with anti-Semitic rhetoric and terministic screening that is so prominent in Christian doctrine and which serves as both the source for and the product of the idea that Jewish people were responsible for the death of the Christian Messiah. Common assertions perpetrated against Jews by Christians often center around the idea that "the Jew offends Christian orthodoxy, transcends and affronts the evolution of nationalist ideologies" (Woolf 22). This is consistent with issues that Bloom must confront in *Ulysses*--particularly in "Cyclops," when it becomes clear that Bloom's understanding of both Catholicism and Irish nationalism are pitted against the dominant macro-narratives fully at work in the perspectives of the Citizen, the narrator, and the other bar patrons, most notably when he points out--not wrongfully--the Jewishness of Jesus.

In this chapter, I focus on how Bloom's presence within the narrative of *Ulysses* complicates both Irish Catholic ideology and Irish national history. Bloom consistently misinterprets Catholic religious practices, despite having chosen to enter into the religion, thereby place him against dominant perspectives as both a Jew and a Catholic. Bloom's

misunderstanding is, firstly, illustrated through his encounters with legitimate (to the extent that Joyce can be said to portray anything legitimately) Catholic doctrine and ceremony--the Mass exhibited in "Lotus Eaters" and the funeral proceedings for Paddy Dignam in "Hades." The misunderstanding is carried over into Irish history with a close examination of the altercation that occurs in the pub in "Cyclops," when Bloom is "sentenced" because of his blasphemy and continues his wandering.

The aim of these close readings is to illustrate how multiplicities of history do not always align, yet demonstrate how Joyce is careful to show not only the limitations of, but also the validity in each one. Lodge points to a turn in modern fictional uses of mimesis and diegesis in which he views mimesis as "unreliable" for being focalized through "multiple narrators, none of which is invested with ultimate interpretive authority" (358). Joyce multiple narrators, each of whom displays a different understanding and interpretation of macro-historical narratives of both politics and religion, exhibit how, though the mimetic representation of such is a primarily fictional concern, a multiplicity of micro-perspectives that maintain legitimized--though only partial--authority is a real-world cultural phenomenon. Bloom's personal understanding of Irish Catholicism, which cannot be wholly discounted because Bloom is both an Irish citizen and technically a Catholic, is diametrically opposed to the Catholic Church's history, and the history that Dublin has adopted for itself based on the history supported by the Catholic Church. That being said, Joyce takes great pains to show that each version of history is simultaneously validated by steadfast belief and dis-authenticated as a singular master narrative by the presence of the other micro-perspective histories.

Wandering Bloom makes his way around the city of Dublin both prior to and following his attendance of the funeral for Paddy Dignam. "Lotus Eaters," the chapter immediately preceding said funeral procession described in "Hades," captures much of this wandering, and with it much of Bloom's inner thoughts, most only tangentially related to what he encounters and what his surroundings remind him of about himself. Quite frequently, Bloom waxes poetic about his views of religion and offers up interpretations that color his understanding of the (more or less devout) Catholics that surround him--about much of which he is, unfortunately, frequently mistaken.

Bloom's first explicit reference to religion comes, not as direct scripture, but rather through reference to a play that he notices is currently showing. *Leah the Forsaken*, as the play is titled, was apparently one that Virag particularly enjoyed, to the point that he "waited all the afternoon to get in" to a performance starring a particular actress (76). Significantly, the moment that brings itself into Bloom's memory concerns Abraham's discovery of Nathan, who "left his father to die of grief and misery in my arms, who left the house of his father and left the God of his father" (76). Shortly after this recognition, in fact merely a few lines apart from what Bloom is able to recall, Abraham declares to Nathan "Thou art a Jew!" (Gifford 89). The reference to the play makes clear one particular notion about Bloom's identity⁸--he, like the Nathan of the play and the Wandering Jew, cannot shirk the Jewish identity just because he might choose to do so. Also similarly to Nathan, Bloom does not appear to be remorseful at the

⁸ It should be noted that, at least in Bloom's remembrance of it, the play seems to be making a reference to his father, Virag, rather than Bloom himself, as it was he who denounced Judaism in favor of Protestantism. However, as has been noted, the Wandering Jew is an immortal figure in traditional myth, and also in *Ulysses* insofar as Bloom must now adopt that label.

abandoning of his father upon the day of his death. "I'm glad I didn't go into the room to look at his face," is the thought that Bloom has when he first recalls his father's suicide. This, again, further solidifies the Wandering Jew mythos into Bloom's character--the turning away of Christ from the stoop upon which he seeks to rest can be read is analogous to Bloom's refusal to acknowledge his father in death.

Bloom's relationship with Christianity is, admittedly, not quite as overtly malicious as that embodied by the traditional Wandering Jew figure. Bloom does not intentionally offend Christ, so much as he suffers from a lack of decorum when it comes to speaking and thinking about Christianity, and particularly about Irish Catholicism--most frequently coming from a place of ignorance. For instance, after reading Martha's titillating letter to Henry Flower, Bloom imagines that he "could meet [her] one Sunday after the rosary" (78). The rosary is, as any good Catholic would know, a series of prayers that are counted out on a string of beads--certainly an extremely important part of Catholicism, but not traditionally part of Sunday Church proceedings. It is likely that Bloom simply does not know this--he is not a *good* Catholic, in the dominant perspective, after all; in fact, he is not even recognized by anyone in town as Catholic at all, despite his having been baptized into the Church for his wedding. Bloom's ignorance, however, provides Joyce with a unique way to take full advantage of Bloom's anticipation of a meeting between himself and Martha. Rosary prayers, among other things, are typically offered up as penance at the request of a priest following confession. If we were to take Bloom's thought at face value, it would mean that he intended to meet Martha for an act of extramarital indecency (of course, adultery, in the eyes of the

dominant discourse of the Catholic Church, is a mortal sin) immediately following an act of confession. Moreover, it is Martha's confession to which this situation alludes, as Bloom is "Thank you: not having any"⁹ (78).

Bloom's misunderstanding only becomes more apparent as he enters into All Hallows Church to sit in on a sermon by Father Conmee. It is interesting to note that, although much of Joyce's satire concerning the Wandering Jew myth in Bloom's characterization centers on parodying the traditionally critical figure who insults Christ with one who is just sadly confused, and given Bloom's own desire to avoid confrontation (as evidenced in "Cyclops" and as will be discussed in depth later), Bloom is not without his own prejudices--though his seem more aligned with figures within the Catholic Church than with Christianity as a whole. He reflects, rather regretfully, that he should have asked Father Conmee to allow Molly to sing in his choir, rather than "Father Farley who looked like a fool but wasn't. They're taught that" (80). Bloom has, of course, every reason to be bitter about putting Molly in touch with Father Farley, as it was her place in the choir that led her to Blazes Boylan, with whom she will, by the end of the day, have the type of extramarital meet up that Bloom was so flippantly anticipating having with Martha. Interestingly enough, though passing references and snide remarks concerning Bloom's status as a cuckold indicate that Molly's eventual infidelity was wholly expected and recognized in the community, neither they nor she seem to attach to it the "naughtiness" that Bloom attaches to his imagined trise with Martha. This is

⁹ Bloom's denial to "have any" could, given his later experience at All Hallows, refer to Communion, which is part Church proceedings. However, the point is little changed if we view it this way, it is still in large part distorted, jumbled, and misunderstood--especially when viewed alongside Bloom's preceding reference to the rosary as (a part of) Mass.

perhaps most obviously attributed to Molly's solidified place within the dominant macro-perspective; this insider view allows her to bend the rules without threatening them in the way the outsider Bloom would.

Later in "Circe," Bloom's wandering mind also touches upon a reference to Molly having been intimately involved with a priest, though there is not any concrete evidence presented to support that theory. Still, Father Farley seems to be a stand-in for a micro-perspective in which the priest figures as a somewhat deceptive and nefarious entity. This theme proves to be, while perhaps incomplete in that we have no reason to believe that Conmee has perpetrated any great intentional even, a valid and authorized micro-perspective within *Ulysses*, and is also touched upon in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, when Stephen suspects a priest of being intimately involved with his love interest.

Bloom's misunderstanding of what he is witnessing in the church also downplays the significance of the religious ritual. Michael O'Shea has noted "the relationship between liturgical allusions and the character making them" (129). Bloom's very existence, and especially his existence in Dublin (and more specifically to "Lotus Eaters," in All Hallows Church) is an affront to the Church. That is why Bloom is termed the Wandering Jew--not because of what he does, but simply because he *is*. Bloom does not speak to anyone while he is in the church, and he does nothing to draw attention to himself, but his misinterpretation of what he is seeing is enough to solidify this affront. While observing the Communion ritual, Bloom takes note that the priest "took out a communion, shook a drop or two (are they in water?) off it and put it neatly in her

mouth" (80). The action to which he refers is, of course, the sign of the cross--not the shaking of the Host. His misunderstanding is made all the more potent when we take into account that "Bloom likely has received the communion--at his wedding at the very least--but has apparently never given the sacrament much attention" (O'Shea 131).

Rather, as opposed to the veneration of a blessing, Bloom degrades the priest's actions into a sloughing off of water. Though, in this moment at least, Bloom's attitude toward the priest is not accusatory, his earlier thoughts on Father Farley have already paved the way for the image of the priest as a deceptive entity. His very plain, mundane interpretation of what he is seeing the priest do is, yes, a misunderstanding on one level, but it also represents another level of truth that the Church as an institution has tried to downplay--a very simple, non-magical, non-transforming motion of the hands. Of course, this is a perspective that is not simply ignored, but is actively repressed in the dominant macro-narrative of the Church, and those micro-perspectives that mirror Bloom's secular understanding are often vilified with the negative terministic screens of "atheist" or "heretic." Bloom's very human view uncovers the Church as a very human entity, and all because he has never paid enough attention to know the symbolic significance of the act.

If Bloom's consistent lack of attention has accidentally uncovered a truth, his current lack of attention presents a bit of a conundrum as he continues to half-heartedly observe the Church service. He notes correctly that the priest blesses the Host in Latin, thinks, in fact, that is a "Good idea the Latin. Stupefies them first" (80). Yet again, Bloom approaches the priesthood from a place of ridicule, noting the taboo and stigma of cannibalism and insinuating that the Church is somehow hiding the act under the guise of

Latin to confuse the congregation into taking part. In fact, the Church rituals are apparently so confusing, in fact, that Bloom cannot even accurately identify when he's actually hearing Latin. Willis McNelly points out that "all of the prayers said at the foot of the altar following the Last Gospel are said in the language of the country, and not in Latin" (296). McNelly concedes that Bloom's ignorance of Catholic procedure, and his lack of careful attention in the present moment, could lead to his mistaking English heard unclearly for Latin. That is, of course, a fair assumption--especially considering that happens again in "Hades," when Bloom hears "*Domine-namine*" (103), when the priest has actually, at least most likely, said *in nomine Domini* (Gifford 117). Still, we cannot discount that, as O'Shea pointed out, Bloom *is* a Catholic and he *has* done this before. It cannot be ignored, therefore, that Bloom's ignorance might be equivalent to Catholic ignorance, at least on the part of the laity. Viewing the Church and the clergy as great deceivers is not, after all, so far a reach.

Certainly the other people in the congregation do not feel confused and deceived as Bloom does--and their familiarity gives them reason not to feel as such. Bloom becomes obviously unaware when he fails to react at the proper times during the service:

All crossed themselves and stood up. Mr. Bloom glanced about him and then stood up, looking over the risen hats. Stand up at the gospel of course. Then they all settled down on their knees again and he sat back quietly in his bench. The priest came down from the altar, holding the thing out from him, and he and the massboy answered each other in Latin. (82)

Bloom is only somewhat aware of why he is standing, and certainly his standing has less to do with the religious import and more to do with conformity and passivity in the face of the crowd. Plus, he's a little slow on the uptake. But, what is most important about the beginning of this scene is that he does, in fact, eventually stand up. He goes through the motions of religiosity without embodying the spirit of the religion. At first glance, it would appear that this is to be understood in contrast to the other worshippers around him, and perhaps on some level it is just that, but Bloom's technical status of Catholic brings to mind questions of the legitimacy of Catholic worship as a whole.

Bloom's view of Latin as deceptive, his inability to even distinguish it from English, and his willingness to go along with it anyway, all point out just how unaware he is of his own previous revelation. Having no idea that he just debunked the whole spiritual metaphor of Communion with his previous conclusion about the priest's action in shaking the Host, Bloom continues to buy into the transubstantiation mythos, equating the Host with an actual body. His willingness to believe that which he has already proved untrue completes the satirical picture of his status as the Wandering Jew--Bloom may not be an avid Catholic (or Protestant, or Jew, or Irishman, or husband, or anything), but he certainly is a passive believer. He would not have perpetrated the blasphemy that the Wandering Jew is said to have purposely committed.

In fact, Bloom's Catholic behavior actually becomes more outwardly appropriate in the next chapter, "Hades," while he attends the funeral of his friend, Paddy Dignam. It can, of course, be argued that Bloom is simply non-practicing in the realm of religion, and therefore the only ceremony he attends are funerals; thus, his knowledge of the

funeral proceedings would outweigh his knowledge of the earlier Communion service. However, even to make this argument, we must acknowledge that what Bloom is, is non-practicing *Catholic*--and, to be sure, there are plenty of people in Ireland who are Catholic, were perhaps even raised that way, and have a similar knowledge base as himself. Therefore, it is again from Bloom's position, not as a Jew, but as a Catholic (and particularly a Catholic who seems aware of the historical and meaning-making power the clergy are imbued with) that I examine his attendance of Paddy Dignam's funeral.

Bloom's impression of Father Coffey, who leads to funeral ceremony, takes his view of the deviousness of the Catholic Church to new heights. Though it seems obvious that Bloom expects members of the priesthood to lie and trick him, suspects Father Farley of it to the point of near accusation, and seems to believe that they are trained in this ability specifically, his earlier points about the deceptive nature of the priests seem predicated on a level of indoctrination that allows 'good' Catholics to willfully be deceived. In Father Coffey, we see Bloom identifying a different type of threat:

Father Coffey. I knew his name was like a coffin. *Dominenammine*. Bully about the muzzle he looks. Bosses the show. Muscular Christian. Woe betide anyone who looks crooked at him: priest. Thou art Peter. (103)

In this case, the priest in question, Father Coffey, is not portrayed as cryptic and nefarious so much as threatening. It gives one the impression that, perhaps after all, the Church was less concerned with whether or not you believed in what they were preaching, so long as you served faithfully--and if they could not trick you into doing so, they may bully you into doing so, instead. It is, of course, true that the Church employs

quite a bit of force, both physical and spiritual, behind securing its own authority--both contemporarily to the time that Joyce was writing and historically--as was illustrated in the previous chapter.

Given the threatening presence of Father Coffey, Bloom once again stumbles on a truth buried in his misunderstanding. It has already been stated that, when Bloom heard the priest say *Dominenamine*, it is likely that what is actually said was *in nomine Domini*, or "In the name of the Lord" (Gifford 117). What Bloom thinks he heard, were we to really try to decode it, would be something more along the lines of "Lord's name." This is significant because, when appropriated by the Catholic Church, yes, *Domini* refers to the Christian God, but in Latin as a functional language, it also holds a generic meaning for any type of lord or master who shows dominion over others in a hierarchical system. It seems like an argument for semantics, and it might be, considering that the setting is a Church and the speaker is a priest who is performing a religious ceremony, but, as previously asserted by O'Shea, we must consider the liturgical reference in tandem with the character with which it is associated--in this case Bloom and his misunderstanding of it. This consideration lends new meaning to the *Dominenamine* as a phrase on its own (uncorrected, as it were) precisely because it occurs at the moment that Bloom is contemplating Father Coffey's name. The Lord's name, then, is not God, but rather Coffey. This seems less a concern about whether the Church was inventing religion entirely (though if the thought were Stephen's, that interpretation would be much more likely) so much as a recognition of the domineering and powerful nature of the Church, made by a man with a healthy suspicion of priests.

Bloom's criticism then turns from the powerful members of the Church to the laity who practice the religion, and thus continue to lend it power. He makes the assumption, in an accusatory way, that it "Makes them feel more important to be prayed over in Latin" (103). The Latin liturgy is, of course, one of the most important facets of any Catholic service. It was not until the second Vatican council in 1965 that the Catholic Church decreed it permissible for large portions of Mass and other religious ceremonies to be carried out in vernacular and local dialects¹⁰. As it stood at the time of the setting of *Ulysses*, all the critical elements of any religious ceremony¹¹ took place in Latin, and those with the most comprehension of Latin were, of course, either members of the clergy or (like Stephen) educated by the Jesuits. Bloom's assertion about the impact that Latin has on the clergy recalls his earlier statement about how the Church uses Latin to "stupefy" its followers into acts of cannibalism. It also implies that Catholic follows place more import than necessary on Latin as a powerful or spiritual language. It "makes them feel important" not because it has any inherent significance, because it is the language of the lords and masters--who are, we must recall, the clergy themselves and certainly not heavenly bodies.

One of the chief facets of the irony of the semi-Catholic Bloom as the Wandering Jew is that it takes half of *Ulysses* for Joyce to "cast him out" and force him to wander. A large portion of Bloom's circumnavigation of Dublin is done purely of his own volition--until, that is, we arrive at "Cyclops." Here, things come to a head. Though

¹⁰ The impetus for this change was a greater sense of inclusion of the laity in the ceremonies, thereby giving them more control over their religion and possibly greater direct communion with God--which, apparently, was not really a concern previously.

¹¹ The reader will recall the previous statement concerning prayers following the Last Gospel, but everything that occurs at the altar takes place in Latin.

various characters have been taking small stabs at Bloom's Judaism all day, the Citizen appears as the Christ who finally forced Bloom to verbally own up to the label himself. It is here where we see the Jew as the cosmopolitan figure that Woolf portrays, and Joyce makes explicitly clear the Dublin attitude toward Jew-Bloom; the irony, of course, is that Bloom does not actually commit any real offense to Irish nationalism (ever) or Christianity (until after he has already suffered his ultimate rejection from society at the hands of the Citizen).

Nolan views the "Cyclops" episode as a sort of parodic version of "Aeolus," in which "the citizen's rejection of the politics of the newspaper room, in its allegiance to what he calls 'the pledge bound party on the floor of the House'" is read as "radicalizing" and taking politics to an extreme (87). The Citizen himself is in this moment recognizing that his personal micro-perspective suffers at the hands of the political objectives and macro-perspectives of authoritative governing bodies--yet, as Joyce's parodic situational irony shows, the Citizen is still blind, or perhaps rather myopic, to how his perspective does not take into account Bloom's. Bloom's presence in the conversation, then, de-legitimizes the ultimate authority of the micro-historical narrative present in the perspective of the Citizen, simply by his being there--which ultimately leads to Bloom's ejection from the bar, but not before the Citizen's historical narrative is shown to be obviously lacking in perspectival complexity and authoritative completeness.

"Cyclops" offers the narrative perspective of an unnamed character whose particular micro-historical understanding is prominent at some times in the narrative and at other times seems to fade entirely away and leave to voice to serve only as a point for

observing the interchange between Bloom and the Citizen. It is important to note, however, that the narrator does have some characterization, the perspectival position of which must be assumed to color the perception of the events that he is retelling. One of the most important aspects of the narrator in "Cyclops" is that he is, along with most others and especially the citizen, harboring a lot of misconceptions and prejudices concerning Judaism. This is evidence from the very first page of the chapter, in which the narrator relates to Joe¹² an instance of theft which has recently occurred. As it happens, the narrator appears to be a bounty hunter of sorts, who is now "hanging on to his tar for the past fortnight" (292) in order to get him to pay off his debts. He offers the name of his quarry to his companion as Michael Geraghty, and Joe's immediate reaction ("Circumcised!" (292)) is to declaim the man as Jewish. Of course, he is not wrong--that much is confirmed by the narrator--and it might be argued that the assumption of Geraghty's heritage was made based on his name, rather on his offense, and that may be true, as well. The fact still remains that no one appears surprised at Geraghty's having committed an act of theft as a Jew, and he is subject to the same negative terministic screening and reduction in perspectival authority that Bloom is subjected to all throughout the novel. In fact, his Jewish-ness is seen as the primary concern when Geraghty attempts to avoid paying for his crimes:

But that's the most notorious bloody robber you'd meet in a day's walk and the face on him all pockmarks would hold a shower of rain. *Tell him*, says he, *I dare him*, says he, *and I doubledare him to send you round here again or if*

¹² I am using character names accurate to the text, but in this moment, Joe's background is not particularly relevant to my reading of "Cyclops," and thus has not been included.

he does, says he, I'll have him summoned up before the court, so will I, for trading without a license. And he after stuffing himself till he's fit to burst! Jesus, I had to laugh at the little jewy getting his shirt out. He drink me my teas. He eat me my sugars. Because he no pay me my moneys? (292)

It is tempting, especially because of his near non-existence at some points, to view the narrator as an impartial vessel to tell the story of Bloom's experience in Kiernan's pub. However, this episode warns us that he is anything but impartial. His opinions concerning the Jews are contrasted nicely when, after recounting the unpaid debts of Geraghty and entering Barney Kiernan's pub, the narrator, Joe, and others in the pub reminisce on Paddy Dignam, who was buried in "Hades" and whom everyone seems to like. He, unlike Geraghty (and later Bloom) was a model Irishman and Catholic, who "paid the debt of nature" (301) with his death.

Though Bloom has done nothing wrong up to this point, he is still equated with the criminal Geraghty. Before Bloom even really appears in the chapter, he is identified with the same rhetoric that was previously used to describe Geraghty: "What's that *bloody* freemason doing, says the citizen, prowling up and down outside?" (302, my emphasis). It is true that "bloody" is a commonplace adjective--it appears over one hundred times in *Ulysses*--but between the moment that it occurs in the narrator's initial description of Geraghty and the moment that it is then applied to Bloom ten pages later, it only occurs three times: twice in reference to Geraghty himself, and once in reference to the dog¹³ belonging to the citizen. It is clear, then, that there exists some sort of

¹³The dog's name is Gary Owen, and there is significant evidence that he is, rather, a man suffering from cynanthropy (Joyce 311). What is important to note in this comparison is that Gary Owen is identified and

equivalence between Geraghty the Jew, the dog, and Bloom the not-really-a-Jew.

Interestingly enough, this same rhetoric is applied to Christ prior to Bloom's entrance into the bar, by Bob Doran:

And says Bob Doran, with the hat on the back of his poll, lowest blackguard in Dublin when he's under the influence:

--Who said Christ is good?

--I beg your parsnips, says Alf.

--Is that a good Christ, says Bob Doran, to take away poor little Willy Dignam.

--Ah, well, says Alf, trying to pass it off. He's over all his troubles.

--He's a bloody ruffian I say, to take away poor little Willy Dignam. (302)

Yet none of the other patrons question this offense on Christ as sternly as they do Bloom's later assertion that Christ was also a Jew. Though Alf seems uncomfortable with his blasphemy, Doran's place within the macro-perspective, like Molly's concerning the earlier topic of infidelity, protects him from suffering rejection from society through negative terministic screens as an attempt to silence his alternative historio-religious micro-perspective.

It is into the animalistic comparison equating him to the dog that Bloom enters as he walked into Barney Kiernan's pub, amid some of Dublin's finest drunks--the Citizen included, and begins to commit a series of several misguided offenses. The first offense is

treated as a dog in this scene, and reacts throughout the chapter as a dog might be expected to do, and therefore he is; for my purposes, the dog that he either actually is or believes himself to be.

not having a drink in the company of other drinkers. Bloom's denial of libations creates an immediate confrontation:

So they started arguing about the point, Bloom saying he wouldn't and couldn't and excuse him no offence and all to that and then he said well he'd just take a cigar. Gob, he a prudent member and no mistake. (304).

The primary assertion in the mind of the narrator upon Bloom's denial of a drink is that he is cheap, which makes a clear parallel with Geraghty's refusal to pay his debt. Though Bloom does not owe any money, nor has he stolen anything, his seeming unwillingness to spend money in the pub brings the out his Jewish nature in the narrator's perspective. It should be noted that this is not likely the reason that Bloom does not wish to purchase a drink. It is mentioned elsewhere in the novel that Bloom is particularly careful about his alcohol intake. It is, in fact, noted from an outside perspective; therefore it would not be beyond the realm of expectation for the narrator (and the others in the pub) to be familiar with this aspect of Bloom's personality. This moment of equation between Bloom and Geraghty, then, in which Bloom's denial of a drink is proof positive of his prudence with money and therefore his status as a Jew, presents a willful denial of information that is clearly available because it does not fit into the predetermined perspective of the other pub inhabitants.

Bloom's initial argument with the bartender turns into an ongoing argument about every conversational topic. As he was entering the bar, the narrator and other patrons were discussing an upcoming hanging. Contrary to the apparently jocular tone the conversation had previously, now "Bloom comes out with the why and the wherefore and

all the codology of the business" (304). Alf attempts to return to the previous mood with an off-color joke about erections after death, and Bloom must ruin that with science and factual information, as well. Bloom has misunderstood the tone of the scenario he has entered. He is attempting to provide the other characters around him with accurate and insightful information that is relative to their conversation, but which does not fit the perspective from which they are viewing the topic, and therefore his additions result in conflict.

In much the same way, Bloom conflicts their notions of religion and history. He cannot be Christian, and especially not Catholic, as the other 'good' Irish Catholics see it. He has far too complicated a background, and he does not supplicate himself enough, despite his passive belief, before the Church to make up for it. He must, therefore, be Jewish. Identifying him as such allows the other characters in the book to remain steadfast in their perspective--but creating that identity poses a problem in that it denies certain segments of reality. Bloom was, as has been a recurring mention in this chapter, baptized into the Catholic Church. Prior to that, he was raised as a Protestant by his father. At no point was he ever a practicing Jew. Yet, no--least of all the Citizen or the narrator of "Cyclops"--is willing to acknowledge any of this, except Bloom. He has a perspective of himself, founded on some pretty solid logic, that identifies him with the other citizens of Dublin, and it is when those other citizens are forced to confront his perspective instead of simply ignoring its existence that conflict must necessarily arise and, ultimately, Bloom must be ejected from the bar (on the literal level; from the country

on the metaphorical level) in order that the status quo and the dominant perspective be maintained unchallenged.

Bloom's final attempt at proving some line of comparison between himself and the Citizen constitutes the ultimate misunderstanding of Irish Catholic self-identity and Christian historical narrative. Bloom attempts to draw on what is, from a literal Biblical perspective, a truth:

And says he:

--Mendelssohn was a jew and Karl Marx and Mercadante and Spinoza. And the Saviour was a jew and his father was a jew. Your God.

--He had no father , says Martin. That'll do now. Drive ahead.

--Whose God? says the citizen.

--Well, his uncle was a jew, says he. Your God was a jew. Christ was a jew, like me. (342)

Unlike the traditional Wandering Jew, Bloom here willingly accepts the label of Judaism, and he attempts to embrace Jesus, rather than rejecting him. Still, the effect is the same--condemnation by Christians. Joyce's contemporary, and another adopter of the Wandering Jew mythology in his *The Flying Dutchman*, Richard Wagner professed a common anti-Semitic viewpoint when he declared that to say Christ was a Jew was "one of the most terrible derangements of world history" (Martin 55). Wagner (though he was not expressly Catholic himself) is mirrored in the Citizen of "Cyclops," and this ideology becomes a case study for how textbook historiographies can be ignored, repressed, and rejected to the point that they become invalid for certain societies. Bloom has not said

anything empirically wrong, but he has gone against the Irish Catholic historical narrative.

It seems appropriate to end the close analysis of Joyce's text on this note of how understood, promulgated, and popular historical narratives are often myopic--hence the cyclopic Citizen. These histories, while authenticated based on support and belief, do almost assuredly repress one or more perspectives, and therefore they cannot be viewed as wholly accurate. This brings my argument full circle from "Nestor" in the introduction, which illustrated the myopic and repressive tendencies of legitimized, dominant, "factual" historical narratives.

Conclusion

“It seems history is to blame”: A Multiplicity of Authentic, Yet Incomplete, Narratives

Perhaps the most definite assertion presented in this work is that *Ulysses* is a text that is highly referential to historicity, both for the ways in which Joyce deal with grand historical events, and also for the ways in which he ignores them. Larger historical narratives, both national and religious, are mere background material that peeks through Joyce's tale of a day in the life of a regular--though perhaps not entirely “typical”--pair of Dublin citizens: Stephen and Bloom. There is nothing particularly outstanding about either of these individuals, per se, nor about the business with which they concern themselves throughout the day described in the text. Joyce's novel as an entity primarily focused on the everyday exemplifies the process that I have ultimately come to call historical perspectivalism.

Though Joyce's title recalls the epic, the significant historical events of record present themselves throughout the work as so many passing references, and colored by so many (sometimes commingling and often contradictory) micro-narrative perspectives, inside a text comprised mostly of normal life events. Even when the events themselves are not direct objects of satire, their relegation to minimal roles in society as portrayed in *Ulysses* serves as mockery of the macro-historical tradition as a primary form of social and cultural meaning-making. This serves to prove just how inconsequential--or rather, how incomplete--the master historical narrative and the powers that author it (such as the Church) really are.

The definitive authority of the singular macro-historical narrative is attacked directly in "Nestor," when Cochrane is neither able to recall historical details about Pyrrhus nor willing to learn about them. Instead, history is satirized, mocked, and turned into a joke concerning what a "pier is." Though Stephen is the educator and the initiator of the history lesson, he does not attempt to reposition the historical narrative as a dominant force within the classroom--perhaps because he, like Bloom, is a pariah (though for very different reasons). Bloom's Jewish heritage relegates him to pariah status in a culturally and historically Catholic Dublin, despite the fact that he does not readily fit the sole terministic screen that is set upon him and irrespective of his obvious connection to several of the macro-perspectives that comprise the dominant discourse of Dublin society. Stephen, on the other hand, is a self-proclaimed exile. That he does not force the importance of the historical narrative in the moment that it would appear most important to do so indicates that he does not view history as important, "[f]or the pariah, excluded from formal society and with no desire to be embraced within it, turns to that which entertains and delights the common people" (Arendt 102-103). In the case of Stephen, this delight is shown through satire that presents a mockery of dominant historical ideology. For Bloom, it is a simple enjoyment of life that thwarts the terministic screens thrust upon him--from his non-kosher meal to his views on sex and religion that mirror the ones presented in by those in the dominant macro-narrative, but are still rejected based on his perspectival status as a micro-narrative voice within the culture.

Joyce, like Stephen, was exiled from Dublin society by his own accord. While Stephen makes jokes out of a history lesson to illustrate how the macro-historical

narrative propagated by textbook and religious education is not embodied in typical Dublin society, Joyce makes a mockery of Dublin society to show just how much of the macro-historical narrative *is* absorbed by it--and incorrectly or incompletely, at that. The "Cyclops" episode that I analyze at the end of Part Two is an exemplary illustration of this. The Citizen has absorbed Irish nationalism as an ideology to the point that he is unable to realize what how little difference there is between the perspectives of himself and Bloom--particularly in the fact that Bloom does not even really fit into the terministic screen that this ideology has thrust on him. Of course, if the Citizen is a satirical portrayal of extreme nationalism, even poor, sympathetic Bloom is himself a satirical figure--one who waivers all day on his stance with Catholicism, as when he freely enters a Church and then judges those who are engaged in worship there, tiptoeing around the edges of both the dominant macro-narrative and the radical micro-narrative. It cannot, therefore, be definitively declared that Bloom is in the right and the Citizen is entirely wrong in his position--nor, as the parameters of my argument have shown, should such a declaration ever be attempted. This refusal on Bloom's part to ascribe to either narrative definitively illustrates most clearly the hybrid view of historical perspectivalism that Joyce's implies comes closest to a valid, and more importantly *complete*, picture of historical narrative.

Joyce's relationship with history privileges the mundane over the grandiose, showing not the large historical events of record themselves, but how that historical narrative is (or in some cases, is not) absorbed by the society that records, studies, and remembers it. Joyce's preferences for this type of history are well documented by both Fairhall, discussed earlier in the introduction to this work, and also by J. M. George in his

work, *Ulysses Quotidianus*. George, in particular, focuses on Joyce's portrayals of what might be turned an "everyday" history to argue that society as a whole both lives with and ignores dominant historical narratives. George uses the historical allusions found buried deep inside the text of *Ulysses* to show that Joyce wanted point out how the historical narrative was marginalized inside the lived experience of contemporary Dublin.

It has been the endeavor of this work to show that, not only is dominant historical narrative only partially absorbed into society, as George suggests, but what is presented as macro-historical narrative is in itself only a partial understanding. I have argued that Joyce approaches representing dominant historical ideologies in *Ulysses* from a position of perspectivalism. *Ulysses* has multiple narrators and therefore the exposition of events is always subject to the perspective from which they are given, and in some cases, the reader is unable to identify the narrator of a particular passage, which further deepens the question of how to read and understand the events being related, as I discuss at the end of Part One relating to "Nausicaa" and "Ithaca." This work illustrates that Joyce's use of multiple perspectives (in some cases to relate or reference the same events) points to the recording of the historical narrative as a necessarily flawed and incomplete practice from the outset. This position on history serves the purpose of highlighting how historical narrative then becomes infinitely more skewed when it is employed in the service of ideology, whether religious or political (particularly as these two frameworks are nearly impossible to separate when discussing the history of Ireland). It has been my hope to draw attention to Joyce of the rhetorical device of satire as a means of bringing forward what ideologized history has suppressed, and illustrating how the acceptance of this

ideological historical narrative blinds people to the possibility--nay, the certainty--of a multiplicity of historical perspectives other than their own.

Works Cited

- Arendt, Hannah. "The Jew as Pariah: A Hidden Tradition." *Jewish Social Studies*, vol. 6, no. 2, April 1944, pp. 99-122.
- Blamires, Harry. *The New Bloomsday Book: A Guide Through Ulysses*, third edition. Routledge, 1996.
- Copland, R. A. & Turner, G. W. "The Nature of James Joyce's Parody in 'Ithaca'." *Modern Language Review*, vol. 64, no. 4, 1969, pp. 759-763.
- Gifford, Don and Robert Seidman. *Ulysses Annotated: Notes for James Joyce's Ulysses*, second edition. University of California Press, 1989.
- Fairhall, James. *James Joyce and the Question of History*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Fordham, Finn. "Between Theological and Cultural Modernism: The Vatican's *Oath Against Modernism*, September 1910." *Literature & History*, vol. 22, no. 1, Spring 2013, pp. 8-24.
- George, Jibu Mathew. *Ulysses Quotidiānus: James Joyce's Inverse Histories of the Everyday*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016.
- Harnack, Adolf. *What is Christianity?*. Fortress, 1986, Kindle Edition.
- Hart, Clive. "Gaps and Cracks in *Ulysses*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1993, pp. 427-437.

Heusal, Barbara. "Parallax as a Metaphor for the Structure of *Ulysses*." *Studies in the Novel*, vol.15, no. 2, Summer 1983, pp. 135-146.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. Vintage Books, 1961.

Kiremidjian, G. D. "The Aesthetics of Parody." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1969, pp. 231-242.

Lernout, Gert. *Help My Unbelief: James Joyce and Religion*. Continuum, 2010.

Lodge, David. "Mimesis and Diegesis in Modern Fiction." *Essentials of the Theory of Fiction*, 2nd ed., edited by Michael Hoffman and Patrick Murphy. Duke University Press, 1996.

Martin, Timothy. "Joyce, Wagner, and the Wandering Jew." *Comparative Literature*, vol. 42, no. 1, 1990, pp. 49-72.

McNelly, Willis. "Liturgical Deviations in *Ulysses*." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 4, Summer 1965, pp. 291-289.

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

Oates, Joyce Carol. "Jocoserious Joyce." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 2, no. 4, Summer 1976, pp. 677-688.

Platt, L. H. "The Buckeen and the Dogsboddy: Aspects of History and Culture in 'Telemachus'." *James Joyce Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 1, Fall 1989, pp. 77-86.

Renan, Ernest. *The Life of Jesus*. Watts, 1913, Kindle Edition.

Stob, Paul. "‘Terministic Screens,’ Social Constructionism, and the Language of Experience:

Kenneth Burke’s Utilization of William James." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, vol. 41, no. 2,

2008, pp. 130-152.

Taxil, Leo. *La Vie de Jésus*. P. Fort, 1900.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Johns Hopkins University

Press, 1985.

Woolf, Michael. "The Wandering Jew." *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*,

vol. 30, no. 1, January 2018, pp. 20-32.

Vita

Macey “Lauren” Coldiron spent much of her childhood in the foothills of North Carolina. At age 13, she moved with her family to Oklahoma, where she attended Carl Albert High School and graduated in 2012. Remembering fondly the area where she grew up, and where she still had family, Lauren was happy to return to North Carolina to attend Appalachian State University as an undergraduate student in August 2012. Originally a dance and theatre major, Lauren could not deny a love of writing and literature. In 2016, she declared a major in English, with a minor in Religious Studies, and she completed this degree in 2017. Lauren was again pleased to have the opportunity to stay at Appalachian State University for an additional two years to complete a Masters degree in English. During this time, she was privileged to work in various capacities at the university--including positions in the University Writing Center, Writing Across the Curriculum office, and Rhetoric and Composition department--where she solidified an interest in composition studies that she will continue to build upon with entry into a PhD program at Old Dominion University in August 2019.