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CHAPTER I
Introduction: Tales of Brave Ellipses

Like Homer's *Odyssey* before it, Joyce's *Ulysses* is--among the other things it is--the story of a son and a father. In the *Odyssey*, Telemachus, speaking of the Odysseus he has never seen, comments on the ultimate indeterminacy of paternity: "My mother says I am his son, but none / can know for sure the seed from which he's sprung" (*Odyssey* 1.270-271); in *Ulysses*, Joyce elaborates this theme. While the degree to which *Ulysses* is a "Homeric" work has of course been the subject of much debate, the association evoked by its title alone suggests that Joyce's novel can be read at least on some levels as a son's search for his father, and a father's search for home. Stephen Dedalus is to some degree a Telemachus figure, and Leopold Bloom is a latter-day Odysseus.

But just as the nature and degree of the relationship between the *Odyssey* and *Ulysses* is still disputed in spite of Stuart Gilbert's Joyce-approved exposition of the Homeric parallels, the nature of the father-son relationship shared by Bloom and Stephen--if indeed there is such a thing in *Ulysses*--has been a perennial subject of controversy among
Joyce critics. Its final "yes" notwithstanding, the novel ends on a note of ambiguity; the effect of the union between Bloom and Stephen--or the failure of such a union to occur--is unclear (and is in any case subordinated to Molly's dreamlike interior monologue). This dissertation is intended to participate in the ongoing psychoanalytic dialogue about paternity in Joyce; instead of concentrating only on the relationship between Stephen and Bloom, however, this study looks first at family relationships in Dubliners, and then at the families of Stephen and Bloom as they are portrayed in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Ulysses, locating them within the system of family interactions which Dubliners comprises.

Specifically, I will explore the nature of repression as a theme and as a narrative device in Dubliners, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Ulysses and, in the process of doing so, to answer these questions: first, if Stephen Dedalus is in some manner fatherless in Ulysses, why is Simon Dedalus such a prominent and even engaging character throughout the novel? The portrayal of Simon seems all the more remarkable after his steady decline in station (and in Stephen's--though not, as we shall see, in the narrator's--sympathy) in Portrait. Similarly, why is Milly Bloom kept entirely offstage in Ulysses? Why is Bloom perceived to be effectively childless when one of his first acts on June 16, 1904, is to read a letter from his
daughter? The answers to these questions, as well as to the broader question of Joyce's perspective on the significance of the family in the destiny of the individual, can shed much light on Joyce's oeuvre, from the realism of *Dubliners* to the dream poetry which concludes *Ulysses* and points to *Finnegans Wake*. The repressed family anxiety of *Dubliners*, suggested largely through the ellipses and omissions which characterize these stories, becomes the more overt subject of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, a novel about coming to terms with family, Church, and state. In *Ulysses* two of the protagonists are tempted, during the psychologically climactic "Circe" episode, to behold their repressed, forgotten fears; and *Finnegans Wake*, finally, turns repression fully into a literary device.¹

Without trying unduly to psychoanalyze the historical James Joyce, this study follows the development of repression and forgetting as devices in his fiction. Freudian psychoanalytic theories--particularly the discussion of parapraxes which constitutes the bulk of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*--are used to trace the connection between families, repression, and forgetting in Joyce's prose work through *Ulysses*. Freud's *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* and *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious* are also used to shed light on some of Joyce's protean narrative strategies.
The idea of applying the principles of psychoanalytic literary criticism to the works of James Joyce is not a new one; early reviewers connected Joyce and Freud almost immediately, and facets of psychoanalytic theory have been applied to Joyce's works with varying degrees of rigor and success at least since 1930, when C.G. Jung was invited to write an introduction for the German translation of Stuart Gilbert's study, *James Joyce's Ulysses*. Early Freudian studies of Joyce's work include Frederick J. Hoffman's 1945 "Infroyce," which discusses Joyce's exposure to psychoanalytic theory between the writing of *Portrait* and *Ulysses*. All of this is not to suggest, of course, that the subject of psychoanalytic interpretation is closed as far as Joyce's critics are concerned. Within the last two decades, in fact, there have appeared no fewer than seven book-length treatments of the intersections of Joyce with (most commonly) Freud, Jung, and more recently, Lacan. Each of these books has its merits; none, however, treats fully the portrayal of families in Joyce's works prior to *Finnegans Wake*, and none discusses in detail the linked phenomena of repression and forgetting as they are depicted in and enacted by *Dubliners, Stephen Hero, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, and *Ulysses*. The critical studies represent in microcosm (if belatedly) the evolution of psychoanalytic criticism itself, from the generally simplistic, shocking, and self-consciously iconoclastic
Freudian efforts of Edmund L. Epstein (1971), Mark Shechner (1974), and Sheldon Brivic (1980), to the critically more cautious post-structuralist studies by Colin MacCabe (1978), Patrick McGee (1988), Frances L. Restuccia (1989), and again, Sheldon Brivic (1991). In order to provide some background into the state of current psychoanalytic criticisms of Joyce—and to show where the present study is intended to fit into the existing body of critical effort—it will perhaps be beneficial to examine briefly each of these books in turn.

Edmund L. Epstein’s 1971 *The Ordeal of Stephen Dedalus: The Conflict of the Generations in James Joyce’s A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is something of an oddity in the realm of psychoanalytic criticism, for in it the author never invokes Freud, neither in approbation nor censure. For Epstein, the "conflict of the generations," the struggle between father and son, is less a battle between a son and his "real" biological father than an ongoing war between the son and a series of father-figures. This approach is by no means inconsistent with Freudian thought; from *Oedipus Rex* through *Totem and Taboo*, much supposed father-son conflict takes place between people who are not biologically related. Often, as in Sophocles or Homer, the protagonist's inner conflict is grounded in his ignorance of his father's identity, and often, as in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, the surrogate father is not a person at all, but
an entity, such as the Church or the state: "... it is important to note that in Joyce it is symbolic fathers by whom the artist is threatened, not real ones" (Epstein 4).

The emphasis Epstein places on symbolic fathers is certainly justified; one of the unions and reunions toward which all of *Ulysses* points, after all, is the union of the somehow fatherless Stephen with the spuriously childless Bloom. Since the two are unrelated, Bloom’s fatherhood can only be symbolic. Unfortunately, Epstein places too much credence in the theories Stephen articulates in the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode in connection with Shakespeare:

--A father, Stephen said, battling against hopelessness, is a necessary evil. . . . Fatherhood, in the sense of conscious begetting, is unknown to man. It is a mystical estate, an apostolic succession, from only begetter to only begotten. . . . *Amor matris*, subjective and objective genitive, may be the only true thing in life. Paternity may be a legal fiction. Who is the father of any son that any son should love him or he any son? (9.828-845)

It should go without saying that Joyce need not have subscribed wholly to these theories in order to give them voice through Stephen; indeed, there are facets of Stephen’s theory of Shakespeare that even he does not wholly believe.5 And while Epstein vigorously (and rightly) asserts the importance of fatherhood and family in Joyce’s own life—as manifested by Joyce’s loyalty to both his father and his own troubled children—he prematurely dismisses Simon Dedalus as
an important factor in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. We need not join Stephen and Epstein in downplaying the significance of the father in the destiny of the individual, as Stephen does in his discussion of Shakespeare; given the very vehemence of his protestations, in fact, we can hardly help but to take further notice of Simon Dedalus and of the other actual, biological parent-child relationships in Joyce’s works.

Epstein, however, goes on to trace in great detail the threads of symbolic fatherhood through each chapter of Joyce’s *Portrait*; his treatment of *Ulysses*, in contrast, is strictly focused on the "Circe" episode, and specifically upon Stephen’s dance, which he discusses in terms of its Wagnerian overtones. For Epstein this scene is the climax of the novel, at least as far as Stephen is concerned. Can it be assumed, since he does not discuss Bloom--or the relationship between Stephen and Bloom--in any detail, that he reads *Ulysses* as little more than an extension of *A Portrait of the Artist*? His allusions to *Finnegans Wake*, which he consults to corroborate his findings from the earlier works, seem to suggest that even that manifold text is primarily or largely about the development of the artist. Admittedly, all of Joyce’s works, including *Dubliners*, are to some degree about the nature of art and the state of being an artist; but while *Portrait* brings these concerns to the fore, they are much more implicit in Joyce’s later
works--though perhaps no less important. In fairness, the stated goal of *The Ordeal of Stephen Dedalus* is to examine the character of Stephen, not to offer a comprehensive reading of fatherhood in *Ulysses*; still, Epstein's focus on the young artist figure to the exclusion of the other characters, even the other protagonist in *Ulysses*, seems extreme.

Mark Shechner's *Joyce in Nighttown: A Psychoanalytic Inquiry into Ulysses*, gives a much more balanced discussion of the novel's two protagonists, though obviously it touches only briefly on the family dynamics of *A Portrait of the Artist*. It is "an essay on art as gesture," the assumptions of which follow, as did Epstein's, "the remarkably Freudian lesson delivered by Stephen Dedalus in the 'Scylla and Charybdis' chapter of *Ulysses*" (3). Shechner's study claims for itself the label of psychoanalytic criticism as fervently as Epstein's (tacitly) eschewed it. His approach is Freudian, and he does discuss in detail many of the complicated interrelations between characters in *Ulysses*--biological relationships as well as symbolic. The focus of *Joyce in Nighttown* is not exclusively or even primarily the oedipal implications of Stephen's relationship with his parents or with symbolic parental entities, though Stephen's lecture on paternity and Shakespeare is the basis for much analysis:
It may be that Stephen Dedalus on Shakespeare is our ideal model for psychoanalytic criticism. Stephen has no formal theory of the unconscious, but he knows something about jealousy, castration, repressed anger, betrayal, retribution, and most important, about how the family ramifies itself into every thought, act, gesture, and creation of the obsessed artist. (9)

Instead of limiting himself to Stephen's embattled psyche, Shechner focuses on these themes--jealousy, castration, and betrayal--as they impact Stephen and Bloom, in connection with family (Simon and May Dedalus, Molly and Rudy Bloom) and associates (Cranly, Lynch, Mulligan). He also discusses the cognates of these relationships in Joyce's own life.

Ultimately, for Shechner, the aim of psychoanalytic criticism is not only the analysis of characters insofar as they resemble real life, but the analysis of the author himself as reflected in--and in the creation of--these characters: "What are we to make of the image of Nora in Molly Bloom, of John Joyce in Simon Dedalus, of the dead mother, May Murray Joyce, in the ghost of May Dedalus?" (6). In answering this question, Shechner logically examines in considerable detail the available biographical evidence, including Joyce's letters to Nora during his visit to Ireland in 1909, which reflect his reaction to Nora's supposed affair with Vincent Cosgrave: 6

That Ulysses is an act of continuous confession is, I hope, self-evident. But what is confessed is so hedged by wit and qualified by style
(talent) that few of those who have written about the book have been able to agree on what it is. (55)

In echoing brother Stanislaus's comment on the nature of young James' confession, Shechner recognizes and admits the dangers of indulgence in biographical speculation, even with a novel that "solicits our prying" (54); finally, however, he insists on the necessity of such conjecture. While Joyce's letters "are not a complete guide to *Ulysses* . . . one must read and understand them in order to properly understand some of the deepest currents of human feeling in the book" (97).

The value of biographical speculation notwithstanding, to treat *Ulysses* as a revelation of Joyce's unconscious seems to me dangerous, because of the novel's deceptively autobiographical nature. Occasionally, Shechner takes his inferences too far:

Joyce's main audience for his show of daring was always himself. In "Circe" he undertook to make a show of his power as an artist to overcome repression and to face down insanity, and it appears that to some considerable degree he succeeded in doing just that. (104)

In spite of a penchant for overstatement, Shechner's "Five Essays on 'Circe'" attempts with general success to make sense of the multitude of unconscious currents that pervade the chapter. His analysis of the dreamlike and "daringly
confessional" Nighttown episode--which "displays ... the most anxiety-producing aspects of Joyce's psychosexual nature" (101)--differs from Epstein's in that it treats more fully of the entire episode, including Bloom's masochism: "The chapter was apparently meant to be a showcase for both Bloom's psychosexual weakness and his psychological strength" (119).

It makes sense to discuss "Circe" in terms of the Freudian unconscious; in fact, given the dreamlike nature of the episode, it seems rather difficult not to apply some kind of psychological framework to the episode. To move from there to an analysis of the mind of James Joyce, however, is a leap we should be very cautious of making. As the first avowedly psychoanalytic book-length reading of Ulysses, Joyce in Nighttown successfully brings to the fore much of the psychological content of Joyce's novel. Occasionally, however, Shechner succumbs to the temptation to treat Ulysses as a symptom of Joyce's psychosis, and that is where many of the psychoanalytic critics who write after Shechner part company with him.

Sheldon Brivic, in his 1980 Joyce Between Freud and Jung, also spends some time investigating the lives of Joyce and Nora and stimulating dialogue between their lives and Joyce's art: "Assuming that there is a mind behind the works and that it is Joyce's, my purpose is to understand the development of that mind as it went into and came out of
the works" (4). The assumption that Joyce's mind is behind his works is a fair one, provided Shechner's caveats, quoted above, remain intact. Brivic admits:

... the use of facts from the life to explain the work is questionable. We can't be sure Stephen is influenced by details of Joyce's life not in Portrait, but we can be sure everything in Portrait comes from or is selected by Joyce's mind. (18)

On the whole, Brivic's use of biography is more restrained and therefore less problematic than was Shechner's; if critics refuse to even speculate about authors, and if they refuse to treat characters even provisionally as human, "it actually becomes impossible to detect a full-fledged human consciousness anywhere in any work, thus reducing literature to a level of humanity near that of crossword puzzles" (18). Thus the human psyche of Joyce and of his characters is the subject of much speculation in this, Brivic's first book on Joyce.9

As his title suggests, Brivic locates Joyce's view of the human psyche somewhere "between" Freud's and Jung's; or, more exactly, he attempts to show how Joyce, throughout his career, moves from a Freudian view of the unconscious--or at least a preoccupation with Freud's preoccupations--to a Jungian perspective on humanity and human affairs. To accomplish this he provides a detailed reading of the whole of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, tracing
Stephen's oedipal cycle, concentrating on the young man's ambivalent feelings toward his mother. Of Simon Dedalus, Brivic says comparatively little: "Portrait usually presents Simon Dedalus in an affectionate, nostalgic light, though Stephen is exposed to an isolated spot of paternal bile and emasculation when Simon calls him a 'lazy bitch'" (29).

For Brivic, May Dedalus is by far the stronger parental influence; Simon is important and conspicuous only in his absence and ineffectuality. Brivic astutely points out the complex and pervasive patterns of image and allusion that join the parents with the parental entities which continually challenge Stephen's progress. This he does with a typically Freudian attention to unconscious detail along with the occasional (and stereotypically Freudian) leer; of the conclusion of the Christmas dinner scene in the first chapter, Brivic comments: "... Simon weeps in anguish at having his Parnell cut off" (31).

"Stephen's major solution," Brivic also says, "relinquishes the reality of mother to construct an artificial mother in the stasis of art" (67). Yet this Freudian model of sublimation constitutes for Stephen a submission to "the neurotic antiworld of artifice" (82). Brivic suggests that "a more positive view of our artist's progress may be framed from the perspective of Jung" for whom neurosis is "an affliction which can lead to a higher
state of development" through Stephen's realization of his own unconscious (82).

It is thus the Jungian perspective which allows Brivic to find affirmation in the imperfect unions and missed connections of *Ulysses*. Though the Stephen of *Ulysses* is still fixated, in textbook Freudian fashion, on false motherhood, "feminine betrayal and menace" (Brivic 127), Bloom looks at women from a different perspective: "While Stephen tends to view women with loathing throughout *Ulysses*, Bloom tends to adore and deify them" (137). This deification manifests itself in Bloom's masochistic, fetishistic fantasies and behavior throughout the work and primarily in "Circe."

In Jungian fashion, Brivic finds a multitude of dualities in *Ulysses*, the greatest being that of body (Bloom) and spirit (Stephen). Between these polar opposites no overt reconciliation takes place in the plot of the novel; Stephen does not, for instance, move in with Leopold and Molly Bloom. There is, however, a reconciliation in *Ulysses*, a novel "built on meaningful coincidences, though finished over with irony" (170):

Union between the two men is also suggested by a network of supernatural signs which includes every detail of the Homeric and Shakespearian parallels insofar as they imply father and son brought together in art and joined in the act of creation. (172)
Ultimately Jung, "psychologist of transcendence" (169), fleshes out the hollow affirmation of the novel's conclusion. Brivic's attempt to make sense of *Ulysses* by applying Jungian principles is valuable in its attention to the dualities which distinguish and define Bloom and Stephen; in suggesting the possibility of a transcendent, even extra-textual, resolution to the conflicts between the two men, however, Brivic seems to be searching for something that isn't there. *Ulysses* is simply not about June 17, 1904 and beyond.

Oddly, Brivic seems to pass quickly over a viable solution to the apparent absence of resolution in *Ulysses*; *Joyce Between Freud and Jung* spends comparatively little space effort on the "Penelope" episode, which is, after all, the concluding chapter of *Ulysses*. It is possible that the resolution that Brivic insists upon can be found in Molly's soliloquy--and even if it is not, it seems artificial to present a Jungian argument about *Ulysses* without confronting "Penelope" in detail, especially since it stylistically prefigures *Finnegans Wake*, which we have been encouraged almost from the time of its publication to read with attention to Jungian archetypes.¹⁰

The critical works discussed thus far have taken what might be called the traditional psychoanalytic approach to Joyce's work; they have concentrated upon the unconscious motivations of characters and author and in fact have
provided ample justification for doing so—and indeed this dissertation joins them in this endeavor. With the appearance of Colin MacCabe's *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* in 1978, however, psychoanalytic criticism of Joyce turns from a generally Freudian model (Shechner's *Joyce in Nighttown* follows resolutely in the footsteps of Ernest Jones' 1949 *Hamlet and Oedipus* in terms of method, as does even Sheldon Brivic's *Joyce Between Freud and Jung*) toward various criticisms which constitute massive revisions or refutations of Freudian literary criticism. These studies consciously reflect, even constitute, the current state of psychoanalytic criticism of Joyce, and while the present analysis will perhaps resemble the former group more than the latter in its concentration on character, it does take current psychoanalytic theory into account.

*James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* is the first book-length Lacanian treatment of Joyce's work, and the first psychoanalytic criticism of Joyce to explicitly confront Joyce's use of language and its political implications. The "revolution" of MacCabe's title is a political revolution at the level of language itself: "Joyce's writing produces a change in the relations between reader and text, a change which has profound revolutionary implications" (1). The goal of MacCabe's study is not the interpretation of Joyce's work—an enterprise which he
argues must always, ultimately fail—but a demonstration of
the very impossibility of such interpretation:

The reason for the failure of the critics to give
an account of Joyce's texts is not some congenital
inability on their part but that literary
criticism itself cannot cope with Joyce’s texts
because those texts refuse to reproduce the
relation between reader and text on which literary
criticism is predicated. (3)

Literary criticism depends on a "divorce between language
and experience" which "seems implausible in the light of the
discoveries of Freud" (8). As a replacement for traditional
literary criticism, MacCabe suggests a new discipline which
would "concern itself with the changing relation of the body
to language (more exactly, of the body in language) through
time" and offers *Finnegans Wake* as "a primer for this new
discipline" (2). While we might balk at any discipline
which takes *Finnegans Wake* as its primer, MacCabe's reading
(a term to which MacCabe himself might object) of selected
portions of Joyce's works demonstrates this new emphasis on
the disjuncture of language and meaning, a disjuncture upon
which, MacCabe argues, Joyce's writing is predicated.

Though he insists on the revolutionary qualities of
Joyce's work (and implicitly through such insistence on the
revolutionary qualities of his own), MacCabe's intention is
less to sever completely current literary psychoanalysis
from the practices of earlier critics than to qualify these
practices. He runs no risk of "reducing literature to a
level of humanity near that of crossword puzzles" (Brivic, *Joyce Between Freud and Jung*, 18):

What one can attempt to study is how the work relates to the forms in which it is written and how those forms can be understood in relation to fantasy—to the figuration of desire and sexuality. One will also, inevitably, study a life but it will be in the process of analysing the movement across narrative, plot, character, language. For it is that movement, that interweaving of forms, which constitutes the text. (MacCabe 12)

MacCabe's treatment of Joyce begins with an extended contrast between George Eliot's works and Joyce's; they differ in that Joyce's texts "lack any final and privileged discourse within them which dominates the others through its claim of access to the real" (27). This absence of a "meta-language" defines even Joyce's earliest works. The short stories of *Dubliners* "function as collections of stereotypes without any discourse that will contain or resolve them" (30). Although this constant "forging" of positions is evident in Joyce's earlier work, his approach to this practice does evolve, and MacCabe's chapter on *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* focuses on the "rupture" between them (52). The former is a classic realist text within narration, "written at the limit of . . . temporal organisation" (57); the latter is a "rhythmic destruction (deconstruction) of the previous economy of discourse" (53).12
MacCabe's analysis of *Ulysses* begins with a lengthy discussion of the language of the "Sirens" episode, during which "we leave the world of the sign and are confronted with the materiality of the signifier: the barrage of letters that are sprinkled through the closing lines of the section" (88). It ends with an account of the "Penelope" episode, which MacCabe calls a "persistent refusal to close up the text" (131), a refusal linked (perhaps too tacitly) to gender: "No Gerty MacDowell, Molly refuses to conform to the wishes of men and as such she is fatal to a fetishism predicated on a denial of female desire" (132). MacCabe's move from the psychological to the political is a subtle one--so subtle that he would perhaps argue that there is no move, that the two are inseparable. As the discussion turns to *Finnegans Wake*, however, the concentration is increasingly upon politics, even in the vernacular sense of the word.

The political is also a prime concern of Patrick McGee's *Paperspace: Style as Ideology in Ulysses* (1988). While McGee's study is not, strictly speaking, a psychoanalytic reading of Joyce's work, its methodology is informed by Lacanian theory (as well as deconstruction, feminism, and Marxist theory), and it continues the inquiry into many of the issues and concerns which MacCabe's *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* introduced.
McGee describes the act of the postmodern reader as the attempt to read the "eccentric text," a reading that "misses the center to follow the margins of a book," a process which risks "a fall into the frivolous in order to follow the trajectory of the missing" (182). The "paperspace" of McGee's title is the resulting "space of history, the process of time within the book, the gaps that emerge only retrospectively through the elaborations of historical subjects who experience the text as radically other" (183).

The above apology notwithstanding, McGee's discussion of *Ulysses* never falls into the frivolous. His examination of language as gesture and of the relationship between language and power in the opening chapters of *Ulysses* unfolds the tensions between Stephen, Buck Mulligan, and the specter of the mother. May Dedalus's dying wish, McGee argues, asks Stephen to submit to the patriarchal order that destroyed her:

Had Stephen obeyed her, he would have betrayed her, though in not obeying her he still betrays her by depriving her life of its meaning and its justification; he makes her die a double death, both of the letter and of the spirit, by pushing aside the only means both she and he have of resolving the relation between life and death symbolically. (15)

In refusing to kneel at his mother's bedside, Stephen "refuses to endorse her symbolic rape by the Irish church and patriarchy"; but in the riddle of the fox which he poses
to his young students, he "finds himself compelled to violate her in death" (17).

While earlier psychoanalytic critics discussed Bloom primarily in regard to the later chapters of *Ulysses* (Shechner) or ignored him altogether (Epstein), McGee’s emphasis on the process of reading *Ulysses* allows him to take full account of Bloom’s day as well as Stephen’s, and to maintain a balance between the novel’s protagonists. "Leopold Bloom," he proclaims, "is the Ulysses of the postal era. . . . As a post, a register, a trace in the system of linguistic exchanges, Bloom is a symptom of the modern symbolic" (25). Of Bloom’s correspondences, his letters, McGee argues:

> What matters in *Ulysses* (as the matter of *Ulysses*) is not the word but the letter of the word—the configuration of letters in an open frame, for each of these letters is like the letter Bloom receives from Milly. Their significance does not lie in the meaning but in the writing, the style. (26)

The word known to all men is not "a single, particular signifier but . . . the whole sequence of signifiers that we call a discourse." Thus Stephen’s question in "Proteus"—"What is that word known to all men?" (3.435)—becomes "What is the essential value and meaning of that discourse known to all men?" (McGee 22).

After laying out the framework of his study in considering the early chapters of *Ulysses*, McGee confronts
the play of mythological fathers in "Scylla and Charybdis."
At this point in the novel McGee sees Stephen's ambivalence
toward his mother compounded and exacerbated by his
ambivalence toward his fathers, both biological and
symbolic. Stephen "oscillates between his real mythological
fathers (not to mention his author)" (53) and "writes his
abjection":

. . . he subverts the law of the father not by
standing in the place of its imaginary opposition
but by standing on the edge of the symbolic, by
pushing the law to its limit, where it displays
the folds in which we glimpse not the void but the
infinite series of other possibilities. (68)

These other possibilities become increasingly important in
the middle chapters of Ulysses, in which "the force of style
in the margin of the early episodes moves to the center and
subverts (without eliminating) narrative consistency" (184-
185). For McGee, Joyce the author "exists in the space
between styles" (85). Beginning with "Wandering Rocks,"
McGee shows how each of the middle chapters (through "Oxen
of the Sun") highlights an essential disunion between form
and content: "... the narrative strategies continue to
operate even though their messages are rendered problematic
(and their meanings undecidable) by the disruptions of the
stylistic surface" (186).

This history of style collapses into "Circe," the
"premature climax" of Ulysses (186). This chapter
constitutes a different fictive space, the book's unconscious: "Style in this space corresponds to the technique of writing as hallucination--in other words, a groundless, objectless writing" (186). McGee's citation of the chapter's climax contrasts with Epstein's:

Stephen reaches a true crisis not when he shatters a lamp fixture in the bordello but when he falls to the earth in response to the blow of an English soldier. He falls into the place of the absent mother or the hole in the real, and we hear the resolution of his crisis in the murmuring of the unconscious. For Bloom, crisis and resolution are identical: he becomes an imaginary mother and gives birth to the image of the son who died. (186)

Following these premature climaxes comes the nostos, the anticlimax, marking the book's drift "into the night of history." In Molly's soliloquy "the book ends in uncertainty, in the folds of a discourse whose very concreteness and particularity seem to generate an interminable, inconclusive commentary" (187). This discourse forces the reader into a marginal space, "the void into which Ulysses falls, into which the reader falls: the void of temporality, of the backward glance with its endless retrospective rearranging" (187).

McGee's Paperspace is a workable poststructuralist reading of Ulysses that does not attempt to render Joyce's novel unreadable; it proposes a hypothesis for every question it poses. Although it makes use of Freudian
concepts and terminology, McGee’s study cannot properly be characterized as psychoanalytic criticism in the same sense as Epstein’s book, or Shechner’s. While the concept of the "law of the Father" surely has its roots in Freud’s *Totem and Taboo*, it is clear that neither McGee nor Frances L. Restuccia, in her 1989 *Joyce and the Law of the Father*, is speaking strictly of the Oedipus complex as Freud knew it. Restuccia’s book focuses on the Law of the Father in Joyce’s works, and the lifelong process of masochism by which, she argues, Joyce worked to subvert that law, equated here with Church law.

For Restuccia, father-son conflicts--between both biological and symbolic fathers and sons, though particularly the latter in the form of the Catholic Church--are more than just subjects of Joyce’s fiction. The conflict with the patriarchal is a conflict with patriarchy itself, and as such determines the form of Joyce’s fiction and its reason for being: "... the shift in Joyce away from patriarchy and toward poststructuralist strategies is predicated on a desire to break his allegiance to the Church" (xiii). Restuccia’s statement of purpose, almost a manifesto of antipatriarchist reading, situates *Joyce and the Law of the Father* outside the tradition of Joycean psychoanalytic criticism (itself historically patriarchal):

While Mark Shechner comments in *Joyce in Nighttown* that "the problem of the father in *Ulysses* is that
he is missing" and decades of Joyce scholarship have insisted on Joyce's/Stephen's craving for union with a spiritual father, it seems to me that Joyce had a surplus of fathers and surrogate fathers, that their presumed authority was the problem, and that Joyce exhausted himself in attempting to subvert the law of the father/Father to achieve the pleasure of Nora, Molly, Mary, and "Penelope." Women and their use of language were both Joyce’s escape route and, in a way, his destination. (3)

Restuccia’s Deleuzian reading of the Joyce oeuvre investigates Joyce’s "textualization and demystification of biblical motifs and structures and dominant Church Mysteries--the Eucharist, Incarnation, and Trinity--as he strives to achieve the pleasure of the Text" (19), revealing a career-long flight from patriarchy, particularly as it is manifested in the Catholic church. The first chapter, "From Whip To Reed," shows how Joyce found the power and inspiration to write by subverting his oppressive surroundings, transmuting "the stick, the emasculating implement of whipping, into the magical wand of the artist" (13), and how the power to effect this transmutation derives from the feminine. Joyce, chronicling in Dubliners a succession of abusive, child-beating father figures, "shows that the Dublin male’s preoccupation with phallic power is the sign of its lack" (6). These "castrated castrators," priest and pederast alike, pervade Dubliners and figure prominently in Joyce’s depiction of the Church.
Early in *A Portrait of the Artist As A Young Man* Joyce makes evident Stephen's dread of patriarchal authority in depicting the boy's horror at being punished by Father Dolan. Later in *Portrait* and throughout *Ulysses*, however, Stephen's attitude toward such power is complicated by an attraction to it, as Restuccia observes: "In *Ulysses*, we even watch Stephen beginning to imitate Father Dolan's punitive pedagogic method" (11). Thus the transmutation from whip to reed, allegorized in the Clongowes pandybat scene, is by no means irreversible: "The stick/ashplant seems to oscillate between being destructive/punishing and creative/liberating, and it is possible that Joyce never fully calmed the oscillation" (14). This state of oscillation seems, for Restuccia, to be as true for Joyce the author as for Stephen the character.

The second chapter, "From Typology to Typography," places *Ulysses* in the tradition of Christian figural realism, a tradition, according to Erich Auerbach, which takes the Bible as its paradigm and reaches its apex in Dante, affecting the writing of Rabelais, Montaigne, and Shakespeare.14

Modeled on the principles of typology, *Ulysses* not only aligns itself with Christian figural realism by virtue of its referential language that is simultaneously self-referential, thus producing an "anagogic" level hovering over a literal base; but it specifically, architectonically, imitates the Bible . . . (23)
The imitation of the Bible goes as far as the conceit of associating both Bloom and Stephen with Christ, associations which "are not serious yet just as certainly not negligible" (36).

Joyce's motive in emulating the Bible, Restuccia observes, is duplicitous: he raises the typology "to an excessive level that bespeaks his utter complicity in the reading practices of the Church Fathers" even as "such excessiveness and the meticulous as well as facetious nature of his literary cooptation prove to be ultimately reductive, even destructive" (34). Thus Joyce's homage becomes parody: "What appears at first glance to be a tribute to the Fathers evolves into a means of casting them off" (73).

Even as the patriarchal structure of the Church is replaced by a feminine, secular one, the theological significance of the Eucharist dwindles by sheer repetition of imagery, to be replaced by a host somehow more palatable to Joyce:

Once we recognize woman's blood and flowers as secular eucharistic signs, *Ulysses* . . . may appear as an enormous spiritualized female body. All three of the main female characters--Martha, Gerty, and Molly--menstruate during the book. (82)

Ironically, Restuccia notes, Joyce's flight from Catholicism is itself a form of Mariolatry (99).

Having established that Joyce's wordplay in *Ulysses* "constitutes the most radical element of a master plan--
whose mistress is Molly—designed to situate Joyce to fly by Stephen's nets" (125), Restuccia inquires into the Deleuzian ramifications of such a plan, concluding that "the Masochian/Deleuzian masochistic model accounts for both the feminine and literary nature of the rebellion" (137). Joyce's own masochistic tendencies are demonstrated by a reading of his letters, Bloom's from the revelations of his unconscious desires in "Circe." The torturess of the Nighttown episode is created to punish the Fathers within. Subsequently the whip, the "pen/penis/phallus" (143), is turned over to Penelope, bringing about a kind of reconciliation: "'Penelope' is Mary's chapter, but Mary is Eve is Molly is Venus is femininity is textuality: Catholicism through Mary blesses Joyce's textual rebellion" (168). With the benediction of the feminine, Joyce is able to go "beyond the referential, beyond the Father" (176).

In its focus on the effects of the patriarchal nature of the Church on Joyce and Stephen (or, as Restuccia would have it, Joyce/Stephen), *Joyce and the Law of the Father* attempts to refute many of the tenets of earlier, Freud-based readings of Joyce. In eschewing Freud, however, Restuccia necessarily elects not to account for much of what seems central to the Bloom-Stephen relationship (to the degree that it exists). 15 Such focus is not a fault, though it does allow a dangerously easy equation of author and protagonist, from which her study suffers. As an attempt to
psychoanalyze Joyce, Restuccia's study falls short, as it
must; but within its own limited scope, it presents an
interesting alternative to the traditional Freudian and
(more or less Freud-based) Lacanian readings.

Perhaps because his *Joyce Between Freud and Jung* is one
of the implied targets of Restuccia's criticism of
patrilinear analyses of Joyce, and because *Joyce and the Law
of the Father* refutes explicitly the idea of the author-god
discussed in his *Joyce The Creator*, Sheldon Brivic, in his
responds directly to the implications of Restuccia's study.
Although Restuccia argues that in the second half of *Ulysses*
referentiality is replaced by pure wordplay, Brivic argues
rightly that the narrative never actually stops. In
accepting the Deleuzian argument that masochism offers an
escape from the law of the Father, Brivic says, "Restuccia
leaves both Freud and reality behind" (21). This review of
*Joyce and the Law of the Father*, though out of place in
Brivic's work, serves to highlight some of the major
differences between Restuccia's book and most of the other
psychoanalytic studies of Joyce to appear in the last twenty
years.

Brivic's Lacanian reading of Joyce supports his
supposition that "the process of outgoing and return in the
field of the Other that constitutes the subject is central
to Joyce's work" (30). The veil of Brivic's title is a
Lacanian metaphor, certainly, but it is also literal throughout *Ulysses*; there are many fortuitous appearances of veils in the novel: "... *Ulysses* features a series of scenes involving the process of seemingly penetrating the veil to catch a glimpse of something that vanishes, and I hope to show that these are stages in the development of a Joycean subject" (30).

*The Veil of Signs* begins its study of Joyce's novels with a return to one of Brivic's favorite subjects: the cycles of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, the "rites of sundering and reconciliation based on the pattern of sin" (37). At the beginning of chapter, "Stephen finds himself in a new world in which he strives to move toward a maternal goal around which this world is organized" (41). While he has covered this ground before, in *Joyce Between Freud and Jung*, Brivic now uses Lacanian terminology to represent the relationship of each part of that novel to those that surround it:

Stephen moves toward clarification of himself by expanding into language, multiplying the words in which he is expressed—and he does so by falling, by going wrong, by being threatened. One can trace this development of self-language through self-division from the start of the book as Stephen learns about things through words and learns words by being uncertain about them. (38)

Brivic's reading of *Portrait* discusses many of the family relationships which concern the traditional Freudian
critics, as well as the symbolic relationships of Stephen with Ireland and the Catholic church. Rather than recanting his earlier, largely Freudian reading of Joyce's first novel, he augments it by looking at Stephen's protean relationship with language, which is portrayed throughout Portrait: "From the first page of the novel, where Stephen creates the image of the green rose, he is driven to create his own dynamic language by focusing on displacements of the existing structure" (40).

In Portrait and Ulysses, Brivic suggests, Stephen is struggling to become aware of Joyce the creator and to merge with him:

No matter what relatives, friends, enemies, spirits, abstractions, or self-images the characters may address in their minds, they are always ultimately talking to Joyce, trying to explain themselves to him. He represents the power of the unconscious that hears what they say to themselves (and what we say to ourselves). (65)

Stephen's cyclical odyssey of self- and Other-awareness leads him through oscillations of allegiance to mother and father, and through them to the maternal and paternal; he begins each chapter in submission to the law of the Father "by filling a definite place, so the male threat of castration that arises always represents the fixation of the word" (68). But he "strives to keep both his soul and his mother alive by presenting language in the process of
issuing forth, language that has not yet been finished or even really heard" (68). Thus Brivic's reading of Portrait establishes a Lacanian dichotomy between maternal and paternal language:

The "paternal and symbolic" is the aspect of language that involves the definite meanings of words, while the "maternal, having to do with the drive" involves the shifting of signification in the dynamic of feeling. (74)

The ensuing reading of Ulysses begins with "Proteus" and demonstrates that, from the first sentence of that chapter, language is the unconscious of sight: "Ineluctable modality of the visible: at least that if no more, thought through my eyes" (Ulysses 3.1-2). Brivic develops in this, his third chapter, the concept of the gaze as it can be applied to and found in Ulysses. In his fourth chapter he discusses how Bloom and Stephen both define each other through the medium of the gaze:

It is hard to deny that the protagonists are created for the purpose of meeting, though it may be said that their meeting is ironic, in which case their purpose is. Insofar as they are created to meet, each is the source of creation for the other. (104-105)

Brivic locates the climax of their anticlimactic meeting in the sharing of cocoa in the "Ithaca" episode: "The cocoa communion is based on shared alienation, but it constitutes
their first cause, the mature artist who creates them, and who will result from Bloom's influence on Stephen" (109).

Stephen and Bloom continually "flirt with" the veil, penetrating to see new possibilities of language, slipping back to "consolidate" another veil that must also be broken through: "The process of their experience revolves in a fort/da movement that loops into and out of contact with the author" (124). As the third protagonist of Ulysses, Molly's function is to weave the veil seen by Stephen and Bloom "because the movement of her thought as woman is the object of their perception through desire" (30). But Brivic does not ignore the problems in positing Molly as the novel's ego-ideal:

Joyce portrays serious deficiencies resulting from the specialization of part of Molly as the Other. Her visionary power is inseparable from a loss of consciousness imposed on her as a woman. She is half asleep not only in "Penelope" but also in "Calypso," the other time we see her directly. The area of her mind that connects with Bloom and Stephen is below the surface. (137)

Molly is perhaps more purely or obviously a linguistic function than the other characters in Ulysses: "The Other, to whom Molly says yes, is the opposing narrative agency that constitutes her discourse" (145).

On the whole, Brivic's latest book seems to mediate between the old and new schools of psychoanalytic Joyce criticism in much the same way as his first book mediated
between Freudian and Jungian thought. His reading of *Finnegans Wake*, concentrating on section I.4 (75-106), demonstrates the manifestation of the feminine as a result of male conflict, which, he claims, "is such a common pattern in works and parts of works by Joyce that it may be called a prototypical structural unit of his canon" (10). *Finnegans Wake* concludes, Brivic argues, with the loss of author as Other, "the great loss in Joyce's work from which all other losses are derived" (11).

His occasionally daunting use of post-structuralist terminology notwithstanding, many of the same questions that concerned Brivic in *Joyce Between Freud and Jung* still concern him in *The Veil of Signs*; it is still possible to discuss characters in Joyce's works, to speculate about their motivations, and Joyce's. Furthermore, there are many questions that have yet to be asked, much less answered: questions about the relationship between repression and forgetting in Joyce, about the return of the repressed, and about two characters in *Ulysses* more mysterious than the man in the mackintosh, Simon Dedalus and Milly Bloom, and how they influence the psychological action of the novel.

To answer these questions, my reading of Joyce will commence with a brief examination of the family as it is portrayed in *Dubliners* (which, with *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, forms the context into which *Ulysses* is placed). This second chapter also examines the parallel
phenomena of epiphany and the return of the repressed, in order to arrive at a provisional understanding of Joyce's understanding of the function of memory and repression—perhaps independent of, but cognate to that of Sigmund Freud. As I indicated above, I treat *Dubliners* and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as contexts for the events of *Ulysses* as well as mature works in their own rights. Many characters from the first two works reappear in the third; clearly connections exist between *Ulysses* and its predecessors. Because of this relation, both earlier works prove essential for a study of *Ulysses,* *Dubliners* because it shows many fragmented families in vignette and establishes Joyce's epiphanic style, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* because it presents a full portrait of the artist's family, the Dedalus family, so important in *Ulysses* as well. In the second chapter I examine *Dubliners* and the way the young narrators of the early stories seem to be isolated from their families. The father-figures in "The Sisters" and "Araby" are "uncles" with whom the protagonists almost never speak. In "Eveline" a father-daughter relationship is portrayed for the first time, and it is clearly not a healthy one. This story offers a context, and not entirely a contrastive one, for the Bloom-Milly relationship in *Ulysses.* In "The Boarding House," Mrs Mooney provides an unflattering portrait of motherhood, as does Mrs Kearney in "A Mother." Fatherhood fares even worse
in "A Little Cloud" and "Counterparts." Against this backdrop of Dublin family relationships Joyce placed A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Ulysses.

The third chapter looks first in some detail at the revision that turned Stephen Hero into A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man—a re-vision characterized by the exclusion of the artist's family, and one which, I argue, is portrayed dramatically in the final version of the novel. One of the most startling plot differences between the Stephen Hero fragment and the novel it became is the ruthless elimination of the character Maurice, Stephen's brother and confidante in the earlier version. Maurice is mentioned only once by name in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and seems to play a quite minor role in the life of Stephen Dedalus. Joyce's act of revisionary fratricide is dramatized in the novel, in Stephen's rejection of family.

In spite of the almost total exorcism of Maurice, however, the Stephen of A Portrait of the Artist is, as many critics have noted, far from free of his familiar obligations—even at the novel's end, as his mother packs his bags for his trip to Paris. The second section of this chapter treats A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man in greater detail, looking particularly at the character of Simon Dedalus and at his son's evolving attitudes toward him.
Chapter four continues the examination of the Dedalus family. It is ironic that Stephen muses and discourses on the nature of paternity throughout June 16, 1904 with only occasional thoughts of his actual father, Simon Dedalus. What makes this gap in Stephen's extended homily so unusual is the very richness of Joyce's representation of Stephen's father. The elder Dedalus is one of the most engaging and alive members of the Dublin community--as seen through the eyes of Bloom--yet Stephen dismisses his father in "Proteus" (in a telling reversal of generations) as "the man with my voice and my eyes" (38). It is an odd and important characteristic of the novel that the reader is led to feel an extreme ambivalence toward Simon Dedalus, while Stephen manifests little more than vague apathy toward him. The discrepancy between the reader's perception of Simon Dedalus and Stephen's frequently serves to further qualify the portrayal of Stephen, as, I believe, the discrepancy between Stephen's point of view and Bloom's works to undercut first one protagonist, then the other. Stephen's search for some vague, artificial father, ostensibly a central theme in the novel, is thus complicated by the highly visible presence of his actual, biological father--outrageously depicted with wings in "Circe"--throughout the novel and most notably in "Hades," "Wandering Rocks," and "Sirens." Stephen tries to eliminate his father from his consciousness in a gesture
analogous to Joyce's elimination of Maurice from *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*--but with much less success.

But Stephen is not the only protagonist in *Ulysses* to practice this selective memory. The second part of this chapter focuses on Leopold Bloom, who throughout the novel demonstrates his imperfect ability to avoid thinking about such unpleasant things as Molly's adultery, and spends surprisingly little time thinking consciously about his only child Milly.

The character of Milly Bloom constitutes a pervasive absence in *Ulysses*. Though as yet unidentified, she is alluded to in the first chapter, and one of Bloom's first acts in "Calypso" is to read a letter from her. Yet following this introduction, which raises the expectation that Milly will be a major character in the novel, she never appears and is all but forgotten by characters, narrators, and readers alike. Bloom is obviously fond of his daughter, but in spite of his fondness, he considers himself to be not merely sonless, but in some sense childless. This is, of course, a cultural phenomenon not specific to *Ulysses*; in fact in itself it is barely worth noticing. But if the narrative, by thrusting Simon Dedalus into the spotlight, continually betrays Stephen's unwillingness to recognize his father, it is more than willing to accommodate Bloom's implicit denial of Milly. Rudy, Bloom's long-dead son, is more real and alive in the conscious world of *Ulysses* than
is his living sister Milly—whom Bloom only remembers in the most revealing of contexts. Bloom’s deflected anxiety about Milly gives Rudy his after death.

I will argue that Bloom forgets his daughter by the same psychological process and for the same reasons as Stephen forgets his father, and that these acts of forgetting, undercut as they are by the narrative’s continual reminders to the reader, represent a kind of creative act of which Joyce’s conscious forgetting of Maurice in the revision of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man is an obvious example. The characters seem to need to forget in order to create—Stephen artistically, Bloom sexually. To truly forget, however, they must first forgive, to accept the repressed impulses that drive their guilt and repression. The novel underscores the protagonists’ separate (but equally imperfect) acts of forgetting, by presenting Simon Dedalus in a comparatively rich, full, and engaging portrait, and by mentioning Milly Bloom in the valorized introductory section of Bloom’s narrative. Both characters are conspicuously absent from the conscious minds of their relatives, often as the reader is led to remember them (as in "Nausicaa," for instance: while Bloom is looking at Gerty MacDowell, the reader is thinking also of Milly, even before Bloom consciously does).

What, then, do Simon and Milly have to do with the oft-discussed paternity theme in Ulysses? They are nothing less
than the missing elements in the narrative; they offer, or ought to offer, the fulfillment Stephen and Bloom are both ostensibly searching for, and what they ultimately fail to find in each other. It is precisely because of the constant presence of Simon and Milly—in spite of being unconsciously wished away—that the closest Stephen and Bloom come to any kind of union is their shared act of urination in "Ithaca" marked by a falling star, and their subsequent handshake, punctuated by the "sound of the peal of the hour of the night by the chime of the bells in the church of Saint George" (Ulysses 17.1226-1227). What emerges from this relation of Stephen's and Bloom's family situations, as detailed in the earlier chapters, is the frustrated drive toward union that they share and that constitutes the plot of Ulysses. In various forms, the question has been asked, "Why does the union between Stephen and Bloom ultimately fail?" To answer this question, the question of Ulysses, we must first ask, Why does the union between Stephen and Simon fail? Why does the union between Milly and Bloom fail?
1 For two recent (and divergent) discussions of repression in Finnegans Wake, see Joyce’s Book of the Dark by John Bishop (1986) and Wandering and Return in Finnegans Wake: An Integrative Approach to Joyce’s Fictions by Kim Devlin (1991).

2 James Douglas, in a review of Ulysses appearing in the Sunday London Express, May 28, 1922, refers to psychoanalysis as the "dirty and degraded cult" (quoted in Gorman, James Joyce, 296).

3 Unflattering as it was to Joyce’s novel, Jung’s essay "Ulysses: A Monologue" was ultimately excluded from Gilbert’s study; Jung revised it and published it separately in 1932. See Ellmann, James Joyce, 628-629.

4 The article is reprinted in James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism, ed. Seon Givens, 1948. The question of Joyce’s familiarity with psychoanalytic theory has often been debated; the most comprehensive recent discussion of the subject appears in Brivic, Joyce Between Freud and Jung.

5 As William M. Schutte points out in Joyce And Shakespeare, Stephen consciously distorts historical fact, omitting a vital detail from his picture of Shakespeare "returning from Shottery and from her arms," contemplating the "firedrake" star that appeared at his birth: "Don’t tell them he was nine years old when it was quenched" (Ulysses 210). Schutte continues:

Stephen’s silent admission that he has here distorted the facts as he knows them serves to cast doubt over all of his "facts." Had Joyce not intended it to do so, he would hardly have introduced into the narrative the sentence in which Stephen makes the admission. (Schutte 53)

The significance of Stephen’s reading of Shakespeare is discussed more fully in chapter four, below.

6 The Cosgrave incident is discussed by Ellmann (James Joyce 279-284). Joyce’s letters to Nora on the subject can be found in Selected Letters (157-160).

7 Stanislaus writes: "Jim is thought to be very frank about himself, but his style is such that it might be contended that he confesses in a foreign language— an easier confession than in the common tongue" (Dublin Diary 110).
In a footnote to the passage quoted above, Shechner adds: "Since completing this chapter, I have come to believe that the significant threat that is faced down in "Circe" is no less than insanity. That, however, is another study entirely, and for now it must be passed over" (104). It is unclear from the context--intentionally unclear, I believe--whether the insanity being "faced down" is Stephen's, Bloom's, or Joyce's. Elsewhere, he sets forth, albeit sheepishly, the hypothesis that Gerty MacDowell is a working prostitute (165). He attributes this observation to Sheldon Brivic (who denies it in Joyce Between Freud and Jung), and later, he backpedals, admitting that there is no positive evidence that Gerty is a prostitute.

His second, Joyce The Creator, develops his theory of the creating narrative consciousness in Joyce's works. While his argument there is tacitly founded on psychoanalytic principles, the focus of the book is not particularly relevant to the present questions. Brivic's most recent book, The Veil of Signs: Joyce, Lacan, and Perception, is discussed later in this chapter.

A Skeleton Key To Finnegans Wake, the landmark study by Joseph Campbell and Henry Morton Robinson, is largely paraphrase, but where it attempts in-depth readings of passages, it encourages--as indeed Finnegans Wake itself seems to encourage--an "archetypal" reading.


My own third chapter, below, will examine other facets of Joyce's revision of his life into and from Stephen Hero.

Here, as throughout Joyce and the Law of the Father, Restuccia displays with the construction "Joyce/Stephen" a dangerous (because unacknowledged) penchant for conflating author and character.

Christian figural realism is based on the tenet that "an occurrence on earth signifies not only itself but at the same time another, which it predicts or confirms, without prejudice to the power of its concrete reality here and now" (Auerbach 555).

This excessively narrow focus also precludes discussion of the relationship between Simon Dedalus and Stephen, one which is certainly fraught with religious significance.
CHAPTER II

Dubliners: Suppression, Oppression and the Return of the Repressed

--Imagine my glimpses at that clock as the gropings of a spiritual eye which seeks to adjust its vision to an exact focus. The moment the focus is reached the object is epiphanised. (Stephen Hero 211)

In his 1970 *Epiphany in the Modern Novel*, Morris Beja suggests a connection between epiphany--"a sudden spiritual manifestation, whether from some object, scene, event, or memorable phase of the mind--the manifestation being out of proportion to the significance or strictly logical relevance of whatever produces it" (18)--and memory; indeed two of the categories he offers, "retrospective" epiphanies and epiphanies "of the past recaptured," classify incidents of the phenomenon according to their position relative to memory. The former type of epiphany is triggered by the recollection of a past event of no apparent intrinsic significance, while the latter type, as its Proustian title suggests, comprises "the remembrance of things past," and more specifically events "relived and recreated, with all their physical and mental associations" (61). Beja quotes Proust: "the result is 'not strictly speaking memory at
all, but the transmutation of memory into a reality directly felt' (Jean Santeuil, p. 408)." In the writings of James Joyce, whose Stephen Daedalus originally applied the sacred term "epiphany" to these somehow secular "spiritual" manifestations, it is the retrospective epiphany that performs, as Beja's study shows in detail, the essential structural and "unifying or integrating" function:

... far more important [than the recapture of the past] in Joyce's fiction--as we shall see--are what I call retrospective epiphanies, those occasions when an event seems trivial while it occurs and assumes importance only long after it has passed. Originally, it provides no illumination at all, but for some reason it lingers in the mind, perhaps consciously forgotten, until one day, even if many years later, it is remembered and produces a revelation--but only in retrospect. (77)

Implicit in both of Beja's memory-based models of epiphany is an unavoidable prerequisite: an act of forgetting. Because the subject of Epiphany in the Modern Novel is not the defensive, secretive process of repression but the sudden burst of uncanny illumination, Beja does not treat the act of forgetting in great detail, nor does he comment extensively on the unconscious process of selective memory, by which some past details and events are remembered while others, inexplicably, are forgotten. It seems important, however, to question this process, to inquire briefly into Freud's theories of forgetting, since they
complement Joyce's depiction of the epiphany, so often an occurrence of uncanny remembering. This chapter examines the stories of Dubliners in light of Freud's theories of repression and forgetting in order to establish parallels between the analyst and the novelist, to show how Joyce's use of forgetting and epiphany in Dubliners provides a context for his method in Ulysses.

Freud first published The Psychopathology of Everyday Life in 1901, and it has since become one of his widest-known, most popular works—possibly because it allows Freud to apply his findings regarding neuroses to everyday occurrences, answering objections that his generalizations about human behavior were derived solely from observing the mentally ill and from self-observation.² While Joyce's works (and Ulysses in particular) could almost have been written with the intent to provide specific dramatizations of many of the parapraxes Freud discusses in Psychopathology, one chapter of Freud's study is of particular importance to the epiphanies of the first few stories of Dubliners, the chapter in which Freud begins to explore many of the unconscious motives for forgetting to be found in the psyches of "everyday" people like those in Joyce's works.

Freud begins his fourth chapter, "Childhood Memories and Screen Memories," by observing that
a person's earliest childhood memories seem frequently to have preserved what is indifferent and unimportant, whereas (frequently, though certainly not universally) no trace is found in an adult's memory of impressions dating from that time which are important, impressive and rich in affect.³ (43)

He dismisses as unnecessary the suggestion that the selection of material for memory is based on different principles for children than for adults, arguing that these memories are actually substitutes for the truly significant impressions, and that while the psychically important impressions can be revealed by analysis, "a resistance prevents them from being directly reproduced" (43). The memories which owe their existence not to intrinsic content but to hidden associations Freud calls "screen memories."

Having begun his book with an anecdotal examination of the possible motives behind the forgetting of proper names, Freud associates the creation of screen memories with the substitution of incorrect names for forgotten ones. Freud makes an important distinction between the processes, though, when he observes that "with the forgetting of names we know that the substitute names are false: with screen memories we are surprised that we possess them at all" (45, Freud's italics).

In his 1919 essay "The Uncanny," Freud continues his inquiry into the return of the repressed, this time from an explicitly literary point of view. His analysis of E.T.A.
Hoffmann’s story "The Sand-Man" provides an early working example of how applicable Freud’s theories of repression and return are to literary texts, and can serve as a model of how these theories might be applied to the stories of *Dubliners*.² Freud begins by defining the uncanny as "that class of the terrifying which leads back to something long known to us, once very familiar" (369-370). This apparent paradox is explained by an analysis of the words *unheimlich* (literally "unhomely," translated throughout the essay as "uncanny") and *heimlich*, which can mean "familiar," "native," or "belonging to the home" (370).⁵ Freud demonstrates that "among its different shades of meaning the word *heimlich* exhibits one which is identical with its opposite, *unheimlich*:

> In general we are reminded that the word *heimlich* is not unambiguous, but belongs to two sets of ideas, which without being contradictory are yet very different: on the one hand, it means that which is familiar and congenial, and on the other, that which is concealed and kept out of sight. (375)

Freud follows the psychologist E. Jentsch in classifying as examples of the uncanny the question of whether an apparently animate being is really alive, or whether an apparently inanimate object really is dead or artificial:

> "[Jentsch] refers in this connection to the impression made by wax-work figurines. . . . epileptic seizures and the manifestations of insanity," these last because they "excite
in the mind of the spectator the feeling that automatic, mechanical processes are at work" (378).

In the ensuing discussion of Hoffmann's "The Sand-Man," Freud links the uncanny effect of a living doll, the automaton Olympia, to the young protagonist's anxiety over the Sand-Man himself, a figure used to chase the children to bed with the threat of blindness. Freud's summary of the story emphasizes this connection: the boy comes first to associate the mythical Sand-Man with the lawyer Coppelius, who threatens to blind the boy with coal, and who eventually is responsible for the death of the boy's father. Later, Nathanael (like the boy in "Araby") falls in love with the girl across the street; when Nathanael discovers, however, that the girl Olympia is an automaton, her creator throws her bloody eyeballs at him, and Nathanael goes mad, recollecting his own father's death. Eventually, upon sighting Coppelius through a spy-glass sold to him by Coppola (the evil lawyer's double), Nathanael throws himself from a parapet, and the Sand-Man disappears into the crowd.

The uncanny nature of the automaton Olympia is, Freud argues, a screen, secondary in importance to the uncanny threat of blindness in the story, which is in turn a screen for the real, repressed fear of castration: "In blinding himself, Oedipus, that mythical law-breaker, was simply carrying out a mitigated form of the punishment of castration" (383). The relationship between the surface of
Hoffmann's story and the hidden anxieties underlying it are thus illuminated by Freud's focus on the associations the boy perceives between his father, the Sand-Man, and the threat of blindness/castration. From here Freud's essay moves on to consider other instances of the uncanny, including the theme of the double, which leads him to redefine the uncanny as that which reminds us of the uncanny compulsion to repeat (which is, in turn the subject of Beyond the Pleasure Principle).

Freud's essay provides a model for the interpretation of the epiphanies of Dubliners, in which the connection of screen memories to repressed content is sometimes overt and sometimes obscure. The epiphanic conclusions to the stories generally depict the belated apprehension of what was known but forgotten, the uncanny return of the repressed--even if it is impossible for the reader to fully understand what the repressed content actually comprises. The first three stories exemplify one way in which Freud's theories of the motives behind infantile amnesia are borne out in Joyce's works. As Dubliners progresses and the protagonists of the stories become steadily older, the methods by which the repressed content is revealed changes, as does the very nature of that content. In "The Uncanny" Freud concludes:

Concerning the factors of silence, solitude, and darkness, we can only say that they are actually elements in the production of the infantile morbid
anxiety from which the majority of human beings have never become quite free. (407)

The more mature characters and narrators of the later stories rely on euphemism and silence as their primary strategies for the suppression of their anxieties, but for the unnamed protagonist of "The Sisters," "An Encounter," and "Araby," the process of forgetting/repression is inextricably linked with his notions of family and sexual identity. As with all the characters of Dubliners, however, his repression fails, and the insight from which he has been hiding ultimately finds him.


In a 1905 letter to his brother Stanislaus, Joyce grouped these first three stories of Dubliners together under the heading of "stories of my childhood" (Letters II, 111). Regardless of their supposed autobiographical nature, and regardless of whether the protagonists are all the same child, these stories do constitute a kind of triptych: they are similar in subject and first-person narrative voice. The development of character, and the awakening of a mature awareness, begun in these first stories reaches its adolescent zenith in the third. The realization on the part of the boy that constitutes the climax of "Araby"
provides a satisfying culmination as well for "The Sisters" and "An Encounter," in both of which, while the adult narrator is necessarily aware of the significance of the story he has told, there is, I would argue, no epiphany on the part of the child protagonist during the course of the story. "Araby" provides an overall sense of conclusion which—though they are by no means incomplete—"The Sisters" and "An Encounter" lack. Because these "stories of childhood" are so clearly (and, in Dubliners, uniquely) related, because the whole of the triptych is greater than the sum of its parts, and because the three protagonists have so much in common, it will be logical and helpful, in looking at the relationship between families, forgetting, and repression in Dubliners, to begin with these stories and to treat them as a unit.

In reviewing the publishing history of Dubliners, and specifically those seven years Joyce spent fighting with his publishers over questions of libel and propriety, readers in this enlightened latter portion of the century can only marvel at how much is still left out of Dubliners.8 Joyce's method in the book is primarily one of implication, particularly in these stories of childhood. Clerical misconduct does not explicitly take place in "The Sisters," nor are the adventurous boys physically molested by the pederast in "An Encounter"; indeed, the improprieties that are threatened in these stories, the sins that are
ostensibly committed, are only suggested. It is telling that of all the dangerous content the printers and publisher objected to in Dubliners, some of the least savory and most obvious elements escaped their notice. In his impatience, Joyce wrote to Grant Richards on May 5, 1906:

I have come to the conclusion that I cannot write without offending people. The printer denounces Two Gallants and Counterparts. A Dubliner would denounce Ivy Day in the Committee Room. The more subtle inquisitor will denounce An Encounter, the enormity of which the printer cannot see because he is, as I said, a plain blunt man. The Irish priest will denounce The Sisters. The Irish boarding-house keeper will denounce The Boarding House. Do not let the printer imagine, for goodness' sake, that he is going to have all the barking to himself. (Letters II 134)

It is probably this quality of indirectness in Joyce's early art, which allows the ill-defined atrocities to take place only in the imagination of its readers, that makes his portrait of Ireland's capitol so bleak, even, at times, horrible. Like the protagonist of "The Sisters" and "An Encounter," who is unwittingly implicated in sins and crimes he cannot fully understand, readers of Dubliners are made to conceptualize for themselves the moral decay of dear dirty Dublin, and in doing so participate in its creation.

Critics have made much note of the silences and elisions in Dubliners. Jean-Michel Rabaté discusses speech, silence, and interpretation in "Silence in Dubliners," paying special attention to "The Sisters":
'The Sisters' offers the real starting-point, for it is more than just the first story in the collection, but provides an elaborate introduction to the discourses of *Dubliners*. What strikes one from the first page is the deliberate suspension of a number of terms: the identity of the dead priest is disclosed through a series of hesitating, unfinished sentences, and even the 'now' of the initial paragraph is not related to a precise chronology . . .

Rabaté's subject is the disjunction of words and meanings in *Dubliners*, the paralytic failure of discourse—a failure which, he argues, is portrayed dramatically throughout the book and especially in "The Sisters." In fact, words divorced from meaning figure prominently in the opening paragraph of the story:

> Every night as I gazed up at the window I said softly to myself the word paralysis. It had always sounded strangely in my ears, like the word gnomon in the Euclid and the word simony in the Catechism. But now it sounded to me like the name of some maleficent and sinful being. It filled me with fear, and yet I longed to be nearer to it and to look upon its deadly work. (9)

From the opening paragraph of "The Sisters," it is clear that the unnamed narrator is ambivalent toward knowledge and understanding, and particularly toward the kind of keen perception that would shed light on his puzzling relationship with Father Flynn (even as he is ambivalent toward the memory of the paralytic priest himself). The three words the boy mentions at the outset of
the story, apparently related to each other only by their strange sound in his ears, are generally assumed by scholars to have a greater significance in "The Sisters," in *Dubliners* as a whole, and perhaps in Joyce's work in general. Paralysis is at once the priest's affliction (though perhaps, as has been noted, it is more accurately *paresis*, a symptom of syphilis) and Dublin's affliction, even Ireland's; we "look upon its deadly work" with morbid fascination as we read the stories of *Dubliners*. Simony, perhaps, is the priest's unspecified crime; it is at least a piece of generally anticlerical ammunition the boy may have picked up from the adult conversation surrounding him (much as Stephen Dedalus hears at his first Christmas dinner with his father Simon and family), and it finds its way into the boy's nightmare about the priest's confession. Gnomon, finally, has been offered (by Phillip Herring in "Structure and Meaning in Joyce's 'The Sisters'") as a skeleton key to the story, and to Joyce's fiction as a whole. In his discussion of "'gnomonic' language: ellipses, hiatuses in meaning, significant silences, empty, ritualistic dialogue" (135), Herring calls gnomon the primary negating force in *Dubliners*, which is why there is continual emphasis on emptiness, incompletion, solitude, loneliness, shadow, darkness, and failure, which so affect the lives of the characters . . . (135)
Some vital piece of "The Sisters" is missing: "a mystery is there to be uncovered, but boy and reader will be frustrated by language in their attempts to solve it" (Herring 132). It has been noted, by Herring and others, that speech in "The Sisters" is curiously marked by ellipses and imprecision, that failed communication, the suppression of information, is the story's method and, as shall be seen, its subject.

From the opening of "The Sisters," the characters' speech consists largely of silences: "--No, I wouldn't say he was exactly . . . but there was something queer . . . there was something uncanny about him. I'll tell you my opinion . . . " (Dubliners 9-10, Joyce's ellipses). The first ellipsis is perhaps the most curious: "wouldn't say he was exactly . . ." what? Mad? Perverted? At this point in the story not even the nature of the unnamed man's profession has been specified, much less his crime. It is known only that he has suffered three strokes. Old Cotter's next remark, in which he elaborates his "opinion," is hardly more enlightening: "--I have my own theory about it, he said. I think it was one of those . . . peculiar cases. . . . But it's hard to say" (10). "His endless stories about the distillery" notwithstanding, Old Cotter certainly is finding his theory "hard to say," as the boy seems to notice with impatience and irritation. Though no more articulate or verbose himself, the boy expresses his
ideas effectively enough, bluntly, without hesitation or ellipsis: "--Is he dead?" (10). Upon learning of the boy's friendship with the dead priest, old Cotter--who never addresses the boy directly--passes another partial judgment: "--What I mean is, said old Cotter, it's bad for children. My idea is: let a young lad run about and play with young lads of his own age and not be . . . Am I right, Jack?" (10). The omitted content of old Cotter's admonition would answer the question his silence poses the boy and the reader: What should the young lad "not be"? What does old Cotter suspect has transpired between boy and priest? "--It's bad for children, said old Cotter, because their minds are so impressionable. When young children see things like that, you know, it has an effect. . . ." (11). The boy and the reader share an anger, though perhaps for different reasons; the boy may be angry because he has some hint of what kind of impropriety old Cotter is referring to--because he knows what he has seen--while the reader must feel some kind of frustration at the characters' and narrator's unwillingness to reveal more about the priest's uncanny nature.

In bed that night, the boy "puzzle[s] his head to extract meaning from his [Cotter's] unfinished sentences" and suffers a waking vision of "the heavy grey face of the paralytic":
I drew the blankets over my head and tried to think of Christmas. But the grey face still followed me. It murmured; and I understood that it desired to confess something. I felt my soul receding into some pleasant and vicious region; and there again I found it waiting for me. It began to confess to me in a murmuring voice and I wondered why it smiled continually and why the lips were so moist with spittle. But then I remembered that it had died of paralysis and I felt that I too was smiling feebly as if to absolve the simoniac of his sin. (11)

Though the narrator insinuates that the priest's sin is simony (as is suggested by the prominent placement of the word in the story's opening paragraph and by the priest's penchant for tempting the boy with Church mysteries), and though the narrator, as an adult, seems--understandably--to enjoy a greater sense of perception than does the boy he is describing, it would be dangerous, I think, to take the dreamer's interpretation of the dream at face value. Furthermore, it must be remembered that there is no indication that the dream is intended to constitute a supernatural visitation from the priest; it is more likely to be taken as a product of the boy's psyche. It can provide insight into his state of mind, but not into the dead priest's. It is not clear that the boy actually hears the apparition's murmured words; rather he simply comes to know that the priest wishes to make a confession. The inarticulate murmuring is another manifestation of the
failure to communicate—in every sense of the word—that haunts "The Sisters."

The dream episode is further complicated by a startling reversal of roles between the boy and the apparition of the priest. Though he tries to will the fear away by thinking of the celebration of the birth of Christ when the vision first comes to him, the boy's actions, in contrast, mimic death: he draws the blankets over his head, shrouding himself like a corpse. Then, his soul having receded "into some pleasant and vicious region" (like the deceased priest's?), the boy hears the priest's wordless confession. As he does so, he too becomes implicated in the sin, whatever its nature, by "smiling feebly as if to absolve the simoniac of his sin." In his dream the boy has become indistinguishable from the apparition, itself a product of his own distressed unconscious. Later, the boy will be unable to recall the details of his dream, though he will remember old Cotter's sketchy warnings of the day before. It will seem to him that he has been "very far away, in some land where the customs were strange—in Persia, I thought" (13-14). His own involvement in the sins of the Father has been forgotten, repressed into the depths of his unconscious.

The next day, after passing by Father Flynn's home, the boy is surprised, as he walks "slowly along the sunny side of the street," by his own traitorous cheerfulness: "I
found it strange that neither I nor the day seemed in a mourning mood and I felt even annoyed at discovering in myself a sensation of freedom as if I had been freed from something by his death" (12). This admission might be taken to suggest that the relationship between the priest and the boy was somehow abusive, but the narrator, reporting his vivid memories of the time he spent at Father Flynn's side (and providing the only lengthy description of the priest in the story), gives no further hint of it. What stands out as disturbing is the fact that Father Flynn's reaction to the boy is the same, whether the boy is offering "a very foolish and halting" answer to the priest's "difficult questions" or pattering "through the responses of the Mass which he had made me learn by heart":

... as I pattered, he used to smile pensively and nod his head, now and then pushing huge pinches of snuff up each nostril alternately. When he smiled he used to uncover his big discoloured teeth and let his tongue lie upon his lower lip—a habit which had made me feel uneasy in the beginning of our acquaintance before I knew him well. (13)

The unpleasant description of the snuff-covered greenish-black priest and his leering smile is devoid of affection, and its unforgiving clarity duplicates in the reader the sense of uneasiness the adults in the story felt toward Father Flynn while he lived.
Visiting the corpse and its sisters that evening, the boy cannot pray: "I pretended to pray but I could not gather my thoughts because the old woman's mutterings distracted me" (14). The sounds she makes are reminiscent of the apparition's confession in the dream, and the boy's aunt speaks with old Cotter's ellipses: "--Did he . . . peacefully? she asked" (15). Here the omitted word is easily identified as "die" (her inability to utter the word accords with Freud's concept of the taboo upon the dead). "--And everything . . . ?" she goes on to inquire delicately. These elisions are almost parodies of old Cotter's speech, as are Eliza's malapropisms ("Freeman's General" for "Freeman's Journal" and "rheumatic wheels" for "pneumatic wheels"). The inability to communicate is being exaggerated, taken to extremes.

Ultimately, in fact, the priest's problems seem to have stemmed from a failure to "communicate" in the religious sense of the word--as is first hinted when the boy refuses to take crackers and sherry in what must be a parody of the Eucharist. Eliza eulogizes her brother: "--He was too scrupulous always, she said. The duties of the priesthood was too much for him. And then his life was, you might say, crossed." She clarifies herself: "--It was that chalice he broke. That was the beginning of it. Of course, they say it was all right, that it contained nothing, I mean. But still. . . ." (17). The sister's final description of the
priest found sitting in his darkened confession-box solidifies his portrayal as a degenerate: "--Wide-awake and laughing-like to himself. . . . So then, of course, when they saw that, that made them think that there was something gone wrong with him" (18).

What, finally, has "gone wrong" with the priest? In his analysis of the symbolism which unifies Dubliners, Brewster Ghiselin points out the similarity between the coloring of the paralytic's clothing--"It may have been these constant showers of snuff which gave his ancient priestly garments their green faded look . . . " (12)--and the pederast's in "An Encounter," who is "shabbily dressed in a suit of greenish-black" (24). But as Edward Brandabur (perhaps naively) argues, "There is little evidence that Joyce wants them [the priest and the boy] to be thought of as engaging in overt sexuality; the physical disability of the priest and the social context probably preclude such an affair" (340). Yet, as he also notes:

There is about this particular relationship an odor of perversity because in his role as spiritual father and teacher the priest seduces the boy away from the enthusiasms of childhood into an attachment to the pleasantly vicious sweets of spiritual perversity, which is never overt. (339)

Joyce was aware of the confusion the story arouses in its readers; in a letter to his brother Stanislaus, he relates the suspicions of a prospective publisher: "Roberts I saw
again. He asked me very narrowly was there sodomy also in
*The Sisters* and what was 'simony' and if the priest was
suspended only for the breaking of the chalice" (Letters II
305-306). Even in the letter to Stanislaus, the author does
not clarify the point.

Ultimately, any revelation of the priest's supposed
perversion is excluded from the text, and the conclusion of
"The Sisters" fails to produce any concrete understanding of
the boy's relationship with the priest, either on the boy's
part or the reader's. In fact the action has moved away
from the boy by this time, and the story's final image, its
epiphany perhaps, is articulated by one of the sisters of
the title. The subject of this story is one that the
protagonist is not permitted to understand: the failure of
language, of communication. Thus in this story of his
childhood the adult narrator of the triptych cannot tip his
hand--only when the boy himself gains supernatural
understanding (at the conclusion of "Araby") does the
narrator offer any substantial external explication of the
boy's thoughts. At the end of "The Sisters," the reader is
left in the dark: did the priest suffer from a failure of
religious faith, or were even more sinister details left out
of the story, suppressed (or repressed) by the childish
narrator? All that is clear is the suppression itself--the
suppression that is the point of the story and an
introduction to the theme and method of *Dubliners* and, as we shall see, to the rest of Joyce's prose work.

The second story of *Dubliners* concludes with a similarly incomplete epiphany; yet in "An Encounter," as in "The Sisters," the failure of the boy to realize the significance of the events in the story does not in any way detract from the story's climax. That is, the story itself is not incomplete, but the boy's understanding, his self-awareness, is. In accepting the premise that "An Encounter" is a story of the narrator's childhood, the reader also accepts that the narrator means something by the telling of it and is aware of its significance in his own development—but the protagonist's acquisition of this insight does not fully take place during the course of the narrated events.

The perspective of this story differs notably from that of the first. From its opening paragraph, "An Encounter" is clearly a distant and completed memory in a way that "The Sisters" was not. "The Sisters," though it is told in the past tense, immediately thrusts the reader into the center of the action: "There was no hope for him this time: it was the third stroke" (9). The opening of "An Encounter," in contrast, sets the action solidly in the remote past and prepares the reader for a warm reminiscence of the narrator's lost youth: "It was Joe Dillon who introduced the Wild West to us" (19). The reader is not permitted to forget that the action of "An Encounter" is long over, that
the narrator knows how the story will end, as is evident in some almost incidental remarks which establish the narrator's authority. He is capable, for instance, of telling what has happened to Joe Dillon since childhood: "Everyone was incredulous when it was reported that he had a vocation for the priesthood. Nevertheless it was true" (19).

The narrator at the beginning of "An Encounter" is obviously an adult looking back on his distant past, describing in increasingly vivid detail an event which has laid dormant in his unconscious since childhood. The narrative moves the reader from the present (his own adulthood) into the fearful and vivid past; the story is not so much related as relived, and it ends not with a return to the present, but in the bleak, fearful time of the event itself. What began as a nostalgic reminiscence has turned into a horrible "remembrance of things past."

As noted above, the man with whom the boys have their encounter is related by description to the priest in "The Sisters." With his green eyes, he is also--again like Father Flynn--associated with the mysterious East: "I went to the stern and tried to decipher the legend upon it but, failing to do so, I came back and examined the foreign sailors to see had any of them green eyes for I had some confused notion. . . ." (23). The ellipsis leaves the reader to wonder what notion the boy has about green eyes.
The pederast, interrupting the boys' "jaded thoughts" (24), stuns the boy with his own jade eyes: "I was surprised at this sentiment and involuntarily glanced up at his face. As I did so I met the gaze of a pair of bottle-green eyes peering at me from under a twitching forehead" (27).\footnote{4}

The pederast's twitching forehead is perhaps an outward manifestation of his twisted thoughts, "his mind . . . slowly circling round and round in the same orbit" (26). It might also suggest a difficulty with muscular control, perhaps an early symptom of the priest's paralysis or paresis. Further evidence that the priest and the pederast somehow serve similar functions in these stories can be found in the latter's sermonic monologue, which the boy relates indirectly:

After an interval the man spoke to me. He said that my friend was a very rough boy and asked did he get whipped often at school. . . . He began to speak on the subject of chastising boys. His mind, as if magnetised again by his speech, seemed to circle slowly round and round its new centre. He said that when boys were that kind they ought to whipped and well whipped. When a boy was rough and unruly there was nothing would do him but a good sound whipping. A slap on the hand or a box on the ear was no good: what he wanted was to get a nice warm whipping. (27)

Mesmerized, the protagonist listens as the pederast unfolds the "elaborate mystery" of whipping a boy who has lied about having a sweetheart:
He would love that, he said, better than anything in this world; and his voice, as he led me monotonously through the mystery, grew almost affectionate and seemed to plead with me that I should understand him. (27)

With this small insight the enormous horror of "An Encounter" is at last revealed, and it is more horrible to the boy than the possibility of being whipped: the pederast finds in the young boy not a potential victim but a kindred spirit. Like the priest in "The Sisters," the pervert dangles before the boy the lure of forbidden knowledge, the "elaborate mystery." What he asks for in return is merely understanding and absolution, understanding which the boy, who has learned more about the world on his "day's miching" than he would have in school, is powerless to deny him. He cannot unlearn what he has learned; as he "calmly" flees his perverted teacher, afraid of being seized by the ankles, he can only envy the innocence of his compatriot Mahony: "How my heart beat as he came running across the field to me! He ran as if to bring me aid. And I was penitent; for in my heart I had always despised him a little" (28).

Although the boy seems disturbed by the pederast's frank speech, the narrator is not himself totally frank; his proposed subterfuge, by which he and Mahony become "Smith" and "Murphy," highlights the fact that his own name is never given, even to the reader. Also, in spite of his vivid memory, the narrator can relate the strange man's sermon of
chastisement only indirectly—though most of the other
dialogue in the story is quoted directly. And the most
telling instance of censorship, however, is one which I
would argue is an exercise of the narrator's prerogative and
not some publisher's. The omission/repression takes place
just after the man broaches the subject of girls, "saying
what nice soft hair they had and how soft their hands were
and how all girls were not so good as they seemed to be if
one only knew" (26). The man excuses himself:

We remained silent when he had gone. After a
silence of a few minutes I heard Mahony exclaim:
--I say! Look what he's doing!
As I neither answered nor raised my eyes
Mahony exclaimed again:
--I say . . . he's a queer old josser! (26)

In his silent refusal to join Mahony in censuring the old
josser's queer—but undescribed, undefined—behavior, the
narrator admits a complicity with the pederast, a complicity
which the old man seems able to sense and which prompts him
to ask for understanding and absolution. Though he can
express envy for Mahony's apparent innocence at the end of
"An Encounter," the boy is still largely unaware of the
connection between him and the priest/pederast, but in
retrospect, the narrator is able to present it to the
reader.

"An Encounter" is the first story of the Joyce oeuvre
to describe a failed journey outward to an imagined position
of power—the boys never reach their goal of the Pigeon House, Dublin's literal source of power (electricity). A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man will end with Stephen setting out on another such journey, this time to Paris, from whence he will be called back, Icarus-like, by his father's telegram. In "Araby," however, the boy reaches the goal of his journey, only to find that the mysterious East he has imagined (and which is intertwined with his romantic, childish notions of love and sexuality) is as mundane as everyday Dublin. In contrast to the epiphanies of both of the previous stories in this triptych, the conclusion of "Araby" is to some degree the conclusion of the protagonist's boyhood. The isolation and embarrassment which the boy feels in the story are the rites of passage into and from adolescence, and much of the story's appeal lies in its very universality and humanity.15

Freud, I suspect, would agree with this proposition; but like Freud, we must insist on asking more questions about the story and about the nature of the humanity to which it appeals. For to wrest the story from its context in Dubliners is to divorce it from much of its psychic import. If the protagonist in "Araby" is the protagonist of "The Sisters" and/or the protagonist of "An Encounter," the significance of the epiphanic moment which concludes "Araby" reaches beyond the story itself to provide a closure to the
first three stories of *Dubliners* and to the epoch of childhood in this biography of Dublin itself.

Thus much of the description with which the story begins takes on added significance in the context of the two stories previous to it. For instance, the fact that "the former tenant of our house, a priest, had died in the back drawing room" (29) is clearly significant in light of "The Sisters"; though it renders problematic the actual identification of the boy protagonists (if this dead priest were indeed Father Flynn), it reinforces their identification on an associative level. The romantic books which the priest left behind—"The Abbot, by Walter Scott . . . and *The Memoirs of Vidocq*" (29)—furthermore suggest the adventure magazines with which the boys occupy themselves at the beginning of "An Encounter." And there is a further association with "The Sisters" in the fact that the "Araby" protagonist likes "the last best" not because of its contents but "because its leaves were yellow" (29): the narrator of the first story repeats the words *paralysis*, *gnomon*, and *simony* to himself not because of their meanings, but because they sound "strangely" in his ears. The divorce of signifier from signified is emphasized in both cases. Just as strict identification of words with meanings is not possible to the boy, the conclusive identification of characters and settings in the first three stories is not possible for readers; yet the associations remain.
As in the first two stories and throughout *Dubliners*, the narrative of "Araby" is characterized by odd but telling omissions. The first name of the neighbor girl is never mentioned, though it is "like a summons" to the boy's "foolish blood" (30) and "sprang to my lips at moments in strange prayers and praises which I myself did not understand" (31); she is merely "Mangan's sister." Her features never fully described, her "brown figure" is identifiable only by her clothing and hair: "Her dress swung as she moved her body and the soft rope of her hair tossed from side to side" (30). At first she is categorized as an adult by her association with the protagonist's uncle, both authority figures who call the children in from playing, but it soon becomes clear that she may in fact be only slightly older than her brother and his peers.

The protagonist's crush on Mangan's sister is characterized by wildly romantic notions rife with religious associations; as he is jostled in marketplace, the "noises converged in a single sensation of life for me: I imagined that I bore my chalice safely through a throng of foes" (31). At home, in "the back drawing room in which the priest had died," he nearly swoons, "murmuring: O love! O love! many times" (31).

The conversation which finally takes place between the boy and Mangan's sister is, in contrast, prosaic. It is typical of the conversations throughout these first three
stories of *Dubliners* in that much of it is related indirectly, and the import of it lies less in what is said than in what is not. In fact the boy seems hardly to be listening to Mangan's sister at all, and still her face is not clearly seen:

The light from the lamp opposite our door caught the white curve of her neck, lit up her hair that rested there and, falling, lit up the hand upon the railing. It fell over one side of her dress and caught the white border of a petticoat, just visible as she stood at ease. (32)

Whether the boy's gaze is continually deflected from what he wants to be looking at in a psychological strategy analogous to the screen memory, or whether the narrator's description of the event is in fact an example of the screen memory at work, the effect of the narrative strategy is the same: to emphasize not the girl—who could in fact be anybody—but the boy. By not looking at the girl's face, the boy denies the part of her that could look back at him. At this point the subjective experience of the crush is all that matters, and prior to the story's conclusion, it is all that the boy knows.

The event that spurs the boy into greater understanding, the epiphany, is triggered by an overheard conversation between a "young lady" in a stall at Araby and "two young gentlemen" with English accents. The vulgarity of the speech of flirtation and courtship, contrasting to
his own childish notions of romance, combines with the young woman's patronizing tone toward him to demonstrate the error of his view of himself and the outside world—a context into which he is being placed for the first time.

When the boy at the story's conclusion sees himself as he believes others—and especially Mangan's sister—see him, and realizes his apparent folly, he is undergoing a trauma analogous—though not equal—to the end of the "mirror stage" as described by Lacan:

This moment in which the mirror-stage comes to an end inaugurates, by the identification with the imago of the counterpart and the drama of primordial jealousy . . . the dialectic that will henceforth link the I to socially elaborated situations.

It is this moment that decisively tips the whole of human knowledge into mediatization through the desire of the other, constitutes its objects in an abstract equivalence by the cooperation of others, and turns the I into that apparatus for which every instinctual thrust constitutes a danger, even though it should correspond to a natural maturation . . . (Lacan, "The mirror stage," 5)

Thus the epiphany the boy experiences (or suffers) in "Araby" results in nothing less than the transition from one kind of narcissistic perception to another—equally narcissistic, perhaps, but certainly more complicated. Though the protagonist of "The Sisters" and "An Encounter" seems to have been able to retain some sense of innocence, the boy in "Araby" will apparently never see things (or
himself) the same way again. The impact of this epiphany is great; it is not only this particular event that the boy comes to understand in some new way, but his entire life up to that point, including the events and relationships described in the first two stories, which must be revised and reinterpreted.

In "The Sisters" and "An Encounter," not enough details are provided about the events described to allow the reader to accurately gauge the psychological effect of the event on the protagonist; it is the very totality of the suppression which allows, even demands, speculation into the nature and degree of the priest's sins, or the pederast's. Certainly the boy protagonist/narrator, with his own incomplete understanding of the situations in which he finds himself, cannot contribute much to the reader's understanding--except in what he does not say. It is evident that a version of repression is being depicted in these three stories, as throughout Dubliners, but the repressed content is largely hidden from the reader, even as it is understood on some mystical level by the protagonist of "Araby": "Gazing up into the darkness I saw myself as a creature driven and derided by vanity; and my eyes burned with anguish and anger" (35). Here the narrator interprets, albeit imperfectly, the realization for the reader, essentially providing a conclusion and a context for understanding the trilogy. This passage also insists on a historical distance
between the narrator and the protagonist; where in the first two stories the reader is abandoned in the past, in "Araby" the narrator invites the reader to join him in looking back upon a remembered impression, not to relive it.

How, then, do these stories of childhood fit into the context of the whole of *Dubliners*? Here the reader witnesses the decline and fall of the solipsistic perception of childhood; yet what replaces it is not objectivity, but a more complicated, qualified solipsism. Throughout *Dubliners* the story's protagonists, even the adult ones, continually experience epiphanic revisions of their world views—and as we shall see, the last, most mature epiphany (the return of the repressed in "The Dead"), while most resembling the boy's in "Araby," is also the most devastating.

The cyclical process of enlightenment in *Dubliners*, which allows for a continual growth toward (but never to) maturity, is also, as Sheldon Brivic notes, the method of *Portrait*, toward which these first three stories point in many ways. Even though he is apparently an orphan, the protagonist seems to have much in common with the young Stephen Dedalus, whose "family romance" complex causes him, in *Portrait* (and even in *Ulysses*) to speculate on his own true father, whom he imagines to be the artificer Daedalus. *Portrait* is full of false father figures, less immediately menacing perhaps than the priest and pederast of *Dubliners*, but just as significant in the destiny of the artist.
Certainly the introspective isolation from family and peers which is evident in these three stories is shared by young Stephen. In Portrait, however, as the next chapter demonstrates, the objects of suppression and the reasons for it are explored with more clarity, and a much more detailed psychological understanding of Stephen is possible.

II. Contexts for Milly Bloom: "Eveline" and "The Boarding House"

In contrast to the detailed portrait of Stephen which Joyce provides, the young artist's closest contemporary in the Bloom family never even appears "on stage" in Ulysses. Milly Bloom is, however, very much a part of the novel, and to understand her role in (or not in) Ulysses is, as I argue in chapter four, to understand not only Leopold and Molly Bloom but also the narrative method of repression Joyce develops in Ulysses and throughout his career. Since she is almost completely denied an overt voice in that novel, though, it will be helpful to examine her counterparts in Dubliners; while neither Eveline nor Polly Mooney is precisely a Milly Bloom, "Eveline" and "The Boarding House" do, I think, provide a useful context for understanding the family relationships suggested by Ulysses.

Although the plot of "Eveline" is narrowly focused upon its protagonist, this story introduces to Dubliners a third-
person narrative which necessarily widens the gap between the reader and the story. The moral history of Dublin becomes less personal and local; the extended contemplation of one protagonist or situation which constitutes the first three stories will not be repeated. Nor will the almost wistful affection with which the narrator of "Araby" looks at his past be repeated (until Gabriel Conroy's after-supper speech in "The Dead," which prefigures his fall into knowledge). The incidental seediness of Dublin is brought increasingly to the fore in the later stories; the apparently drunken but kindly uncle/father of "Araby" is replaced by the obviously abusive, threatening father from whom Eveline finally cannot escape.

Yet, like most children in Joyce, Eveline does not precisely hate her father. Her feelings toward him are ambivalent and confused, a mixture of fear, pity, and even love. The perversely dependent relationship between Eveline and her father is not presented as an unusual one for Dublin; it seems intended to be emblematic, to suggest a more general state of unhealthiness. The reader, though, is denied the opportunity to see Mr Hill as anything but a phallus-wielding threat. A sentence after telling how "her father used often to hunt them in out of the field with his blackthorn stick" (36), the narrator rationalizes: "her father was not so bad then; and besides, her mother was
alive"--to bear her share of the abuse that probably contributed to her early death.

Even now, though she was over nineteen, she sometimes felt herself in danger of her father's violence. She knew it was that that had given her the palpitations. When they were growing up he had never gone for her, like he used to go for Harry and Ernest, because she was a girl; but latterly he had begun to threaten her and say what he would do to her only for her dead mother's sake. (37-38)

The threat her father poses Eveline is perhaps not explicitly sexual, but it is phrased by the narrator in terms that suggest an incestual undercurrent, whether she is consciously aware of it or not; thus Eveline's nostalgia for her current way of life, which extends even to pity for her father, seems all the more pathetic: "It was hard work--a hard life--but now that she was about to leave it she did not find it a wholly undesirable life" (38).

The physical description of the home Eveline is preparing to leave is dominated by the dusty, yellowing photograph of the priest, who continues the line of ineffectual, absent, or dead church fathers begun with James Flynn in "The Sisters." Also prominently displayed for symbolic effect is a "coloured print of the promises made to Blessed Margaret Mary Alacoque" (37), promises which ironically include the bestowal of "peace in their homes" and "abundant blessings on all their undertakings" (Gifford,
Consistent with the rest of Dubliners, "Eveline" emphasizes the hollow solace of religious salvation—yet no other, earthly alternative is offered to the promises of a self-mutilating, paralytic saint.²⁰

As Eveline debates within herself the wisdom of leaving her home, it becomes clear to the reader, even as it ostensibly becomes clear to Eveline herself, that she has no alternatives, that she is, like her home’s patron saint, truly paralyzed. She imagines that in leaving home and father she will avoid being "treated as her mother had been," even as she avoids contemplating the exact nature of the abuse she fears from her father (37). But of her savior, Frank, she thinks (and thus the reader learns) comparatively little, aside from the "pleasantly confused" feeling she gets when he sings to her (39). There is no reason to assume that Eveline’s life would be appreciably better if she accompanied Frank to a strange land where she knows no one and cannot even speak the language.

As her departure time nears, her thoughts pass from Frank, and the life he offers her, to return to her father and the life she would be leaving behind:

Her father was becoming old lately, she noticed; he would miss her. Sometimes he could be very nice. Not long before, when she had been laid up for a day, he had read her out a ghost story and made toast for her at the fire. Another day, when their mother was alive, they had all gone for a
picnic to the Hill of Howth. She remembered her father putting on her mother's bonnet to make the children laugh. (39)

In suppressing the apparent majority of uglier memories of her childhood in favor of these few happy ones, and in reviewing the promise she made to her dying mother, Eveline is clearly leaning toward staying. But it is the memory of her mother's deathbed babbling, "--Derevaun Seraun! Derevaun Seraun!" which finally, inexplicably, compels her toward Frank's waiting arms.21

The first and most passive of Joyce's "seaside girls," Eveline suffers a paralysis at the conclusion of the story that is not merely philosophical or psychological, but debilitatingly physical. Her prayer to God apparently goes unheard or unanswered, except by the boat, which blows "a long mournful whistle into the mist" (40). Finally unable to take the step toward Frank which would ostensibly grant her salvation, she sees him off "like a helpless animal. Her eyes gave him no sign of love or farewell or recognition" (41). Thus her departure, which she contemplated for reasons she was unable to fully articulate, is aborted, and this failure is likewise marked by an inability to communicate. She has become a passive animal, and not even her eyes can convey her reasons to Frank.

The connection of Eveline's ultimate paralysis with the memory of her mother's deathbed ravings is clearly relevant
to the situation of Stephen Dedalus at the outset of *Ulysses*. He, like Eveline, is troubled by the memory of a mother's deathbed wish; but unlike her, he is constricted by the guilt of denying that wish—even though he is refusing to kneel to the patriarchal authority that destroyed her.\(^{22}\) Today's readers might suspect that Eveline would best serve her mother's memory by leaving her brutal father to take care of himself, but that would be an exceptional decision on her part, and Eveline is not presented as an exceptional young woman. She suffers from the paralysis that is general all over Ireland.

Though her promise to her dying mother connects her thematically to Stephen in *Ulysses*, Eveline prefigures Milly Bloom as well. As a daughter, as a young lover, as a "seaside girl," Eveline is the first of many such silent young women in the Joyce oeuvre; and like Polly Mooney, Catherine Kearney, the swan-girl of *Portrait*, Milly Bloom, and even Gerty MacDowell after her, she is not seen from within, as a subject, but through the distancing, interpreting gaze of the male spectator--here the narrator, but in other cases a character. This narrative distance reaches its extreme with Milly Bloom in *Ulysses*, in which, as has been noted, she does not technically appear at all. While Milly Bloom is, as we shall see, spared the household responsibilities and the threats of violence with which Eveline must suffer, she shares with Eveline a suppressive
narrative presentation which leaves to implication the details of their relationships with their fathers and families.

The oppressive influence of patriarchy is represented in "Eveline" by the father (logically enough), but the cause of Eveline's paralysis is much more universal; it is the patriarchal structure itself, of which Eveline and her father are only pawns. It seems history is to blame for Eveline's dearth of choices. In "The Boarding House" Joyce explores this history, the perpetuation of oppression in Dublin, and the lack of distinction between the instruments and victims of that oppression. Is Polly, the story's apparent protagonist, a victim, an instrument, or a perpetrator? The same question can be asked of any of the three main characters of "The Boarding House."

The blurring of the lines between oppressor and oppressed begins in the story's opening line: "Mrs Mooney was a butcher's daughter" (61). While "The Boarding House" generally portrays Mrs Mooney as a schemer and manipulator who might not have her daughter's best interests in mind, she is introduced not as a mother but as a daughter, one who married an employee of her father's in what sounds like an arranged marriage of convenience comparable to the one she forges for her daughter. Thus the reader who views Mrs Mooney as a schemer must also see her as a victim of the machinations of her parents before her, which resulted in
her marriage to "a shabby stooped little drunkard with a white face and a white moustache and white eyebrows, pencilled above his little eyes, which were pink-veined and raw"; her (now estranged) husband "drank, plundered the till, ran headlong into debt," ruining the business and eventually attacking her with a cleaver (61). She is herself a victim of a cycle of paralysis.

Given her experience with a marriage which was apparently "arranged" to some degree, it is doubly distressing that "the Madame" wants to do the same thing for her daughter. Yet her motives are not initially presented as entirely self-centered. She governs her house "cunningly and firmly," knowing "when to be stern and when to let things pass" (62), and this astute business sense extends to matters of her daughter's heart as well. In fact, rather than forcing her daughter to choose one particularly respectable candidate, Mrs Mooney allows her "the run of the young men," looking for the one who means "business" (63). But only later is it made clear that Mrs Mooney's only goal is to get her daughter off her hands (65).

Since the story opens from Mrs Mooney's perspective, it is notable that Polly is initially presented at some distance; there is little open communication between mother and daughter, only a kind of understanding (which ultimately even Polly herself does not understand). Described in what might be the mother's indirect voice as looking "like a
little perverse madonna" (62-63) Polly introduces herself in such a way that the reader can perhaps get a sense of the urgency the mother feels in getting the daughter safely married off: "I'm a . . . naughty girl. / You needn't sham: / You know I am" (62, Joyce's italics and ellipses). As the relationship between Polly and Bob Doran (who goes on to become, in Ulysses, an occasional drunkard) develops, Mrs Mooney does not intervene until she notices (in the euphemistic language of understatement and un-statement that Joyce has established in Dubliners) that "Polly began to grow a little strange in her manner and the young man was evidently perturbed" (63); until Polly is pregnant, in other words. Though she is technically blameless, the Madame--who "dealt with moral problems as a cleaver deals with meat" (63)--has indirectly offered her daughter for sale as a piece of meat, allowing the young woman to entrap herself and Doran in a necessary--and necessarily strained--marriage.

Only now in the story is any real insight given into Polly, whom the conclusion will reveal to be the story's protagonist--and even this insight is second-hand. The content of the conversation between Polly and Mrs Mooney, which might have been a climactic episode, is presented only indirectly, as a memory of the night before. The suppression of the actual conversation allows greater insight into Mrs Mooney's attitude toward her daughter's
family situation, but keeps the reader at arm’s length from Polly herself. The conversation is not replayed verbatim; even the content of it is not directly stated, only that both participants "had been made awkward," the mother "by not wishing to receive the news in too cavalier a fashion or to seem to have connived," and the daughter not merely because allusions of that kind always made her awkward but also because she did not wish it to be thought that in her wise innocence she had divined the intention behind her mother’s tolerance. (64)

Mother and daughter tacitly understand that they both know each other’s motives, but nothing is stated outright. Though Polly and her mother have been "frank" in their questions and answers, their conversation about Polly’s condition takes place only under the protective veil of "allusion."

The confrontation between Mrs Mooney and Bob Doran is presented even less directly; it is related to the reader entirely through the characters’ anticipation of the conversation, Mrs Mooney as she rehearses her air of self-righteous dignity, Bob Doran as he weighs his options and replays the event that led up to the situation in which he finds himself. By the time the conversation actually takes place, the point of view will have been passed on to Polly herself. The reader can only piece the episode together as Mrs Mooney relishes the conversation to come:
She was sure she would win. To begin with she had all the weight of social opinion on her side: she was an outraged mother. She had allowed him to live beneath her roof, assuming that he was a man of honour, and he had simply abused her hospitality. He was thirty-four or thirty-five years of age, so that youth could not be pleaded as his excuse; nor could ignorance be his excuse since he was a man who had seen something of the world. He had simply taken advantage of Polly's youth and inexperience. The question was: What reparation would he make? (64)

Presumably this line of reasoning takes place in the mind of Mrs Mooney, as she thinks "of some mothers who could not get their daughters off their hands" (65); the reader can only speculate whether it also constitutes her lecture to Doran.

While Mrs Mooney arms herself rhetorically in preparation for the battle with her daughter's defiler, the reader is shown Bob Doran's perspective on the predicament. Too nervous even to shave, upbraided by his priest, he imagines being censured by his employer should his indiscretion be found out. He believes the Mooneys to be beneath him socially, and has "a notion that he was being had." His instinct tells him: "Once you are married you are done for" (66). As he waits for the summons to Mrs Mooney, he reviews his first assignation with Polly, painting himself in the role of the seduced innocent, and as he descends the stair he envisions the censuring, parental faces of "his employer and of the Madam" staring "upon his discomfiture" (68). Passing the ruffian Jack Mooney, his
future brother-in-law, on the steps, he recalls Mooney's threat to knock the teeth out of anyone who took liberties with his sister, and it is clear that no matter how much he perceives himself to be the victim, he will make an honest woman of Polly.  

       After the indirectly-related internal thoughts of the other two principal players in "The Boarding House," and during what has been foreshadowed as the climactic confrontation between them, the story's actual conclusion is left to the enigmatic Polly, the little perverse madonna of whom the reader has so far learned little. The structure of the story seems ultimately to make her the protagonist, yet Joyce's elliptical method has kept her thoughts secret even while offering her as the story's main character. Her behavior as she waits for her mother to finish with Bob Doran is still ambiguous: does the fact that she stops crying and begins to tend her hair when Doran leaves the room suggest that she was crying only to maintain pressure upon him to comply with her mother's wishes? Her thoughts, as she contemplates the pillows on which she has lain with Doran, offer no clue:  

       She waited on patiently, almost cheerfully, without alarm, her memories gradually giving place to hopes and visions of the future. Her hopes and visions were so intricate that she no longer saw the white pillows on which her gaze was fixed or remembered that she was waiting for anything. (68)
Her mind is blissfully blank, and it is only in the last line of the story that she remembers "what she had been waiting for" (69). Whether she reacts to this memory, this return of repressed content, as Eveline reacted to her crisis-epiphany, is beyond the scope of the story. She may be quite happy with the way events have played out; she may realize that she has been deceived and trapped even as Doran feels that he has been trapped, even as her mother was trapped before her.

The euphemistic method of "The Boarding House," by which much is implied through very little actual conversation or explication, must make the reader of Ulysses pay careful attention to the allusions to Milly Bloom when they are explicitly made in that novel, and (especially) when they are not. For nowhere in Ulysses is euphemism used to greater effect than in the rendering of "girlish" language in "Nausicaa," a chapter which tells more about Leopold and Milly Bloom than all the rest of the novel, the first half of which bears close resemblance to the close of "The Boarding House" in syntax. It is initially surprising to the reader of Dubliners that the closing words of "The Boarding House" are reserved for Polly Mooney, who has been almost entirely silent throughout, that she becomes the story’s protagonist, perpetrator and victim; similarly, Milly becomes, even in her absence from Dublin, an important figure in the house of Bloom.
III. Unhappy Returns: "Clay," "A Painful Case," "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" and "The Dead"

Ghosts haunt Dublin. In "Clay," the ghost is Maria herself. Her life is essentially over, has been over for years; the prophetic clay which she chooses in the children's divination game merely confirms her state of living death. The apparent cause of her grief, like the clay which is its uncanny manifestation, is never mentioned overtly in the story, but is suggested by a verse she omits from a song:

I dreamt that suitors sought my hand,
That knights on bended knee,
And with vows no maiden heart could withstand,
They pledged their faith to me. (Gifford, Joyce Annotated 80)

As literal and figurative ghosts become increasingly the subject of *Dubliners*, Joyce seems to be drawing a correlation between supernatural or uncanny phenomena and repression, a correlation which further links the Joycean concept of epiphany with the Freudian concept of the return of the repressed.

Freud discusses ghosts and haunting at great length in his 1913 *Totem and Taboo*, which was originally published in four essays under its present subtitle, "Some Points of Agreement between the Mental Lives of Savages and
Neurotics." After establishing these points of agreement in "The Horror of Incest," Freud constructs in "Taboo and Emotional Ambivalence" a comparison between various taboos on the treatment of enemies, rulers, and the dead. In primitive societies, all three groups are treated with special care which reflects ambivalent attitudes toward them. Respect toward the vanquished enemy is often demonstrated by complicated rituals of appeasement. Beloved rulers are treated with distrust and must be both guarded and guarded against. The dead are remembered with a mixture of reverence and fear.

Latter-day manifestations of all of these "primitive" or "neurotic" behaviors can be found throughout Dubliners (consider for instance the boy's confused attitude toward the dead priest in "The Sisters"), and it becomes evident that, for Joyce as well as for Freud, all of these categories of taboo are related. For Freud, the survivor's guilt over feelings of hatred for the dead (primarily the dead father, but, by association, any dead associate) results in the repression of this ambivalence, which in turn can manifest itself as a fear of being haunted by the deceased. The primitive or neurotic survivor can transmute this return of the repressed into a return from the dead by the object of ambivalence:

The process is dealt with . . . by the special psychical mechanism known in psycho-analysis, as I
have said, by the name of 'projection'. The hostility of which the survivors know nothing and moreover wish to know nothing, is ejected from internal perception into the external world, and thus detached from them and pushed on to someone else. (*Totem and Taboo* 62-63)

Thus the ambivalent treatment of the dead becomes the most important aspect of Freudian theory in the later stories of *Dubliners*--although such ambivalence is manifested, as noted above, as early as the first story, in which the boy prefers not to reflect consciously on his feelings toward the priest. In "A Painful Case," James Duffy's ambivalent treatment of Mrs Sinico during her life is perhaps a contributing cause of her death, and his feelings of guilt are certainly understandable, if unjustified. Certainly his feeling of responsibility is unmitigated by the newspaper's assessment that "No blame attached to anyone" (115). The realization toward which her tragedy leads him has directly to do with his view of himself as a subject, and he is haunted, finally, not by her ghost, but by its absence.

Duffy, who "abhorred anything which betokened physical or mental disorder" (108) tends to see only in black and white; even the furnishings of his room, of which "he had bought every article" (107), are lacking in color. His idea of order causes him to arrange the books on his shelf not by author or subject but by size (an impulse that links him to the boy of "Araby," who values the dead priest's books for
their yellowing leaves rather than for the stories they contain). Yet James Duffy's face reveals a contradiction, the essential conflict upon which "A Painful Case" is predicated:

His cheekbones also gave his face a harsh character; but there was no harshness in the eyes which, looking at the world from under their tawny eyebrows, gave the impression of a man ever alert to greet a redeeming instinct in others but often disappointed. (108)

While the description of the room and its occupant seems objective enough at the outset, the narrator provides an essential detail of Duffy's personality which casts in a different light the entire third-person assessment of the protagonist, even the entire story: "He had an odd autobiographical habit which led him to compose in his mind from time to time a short sentence about himself containing a subject in the third person and a predicate in the past tense" (108). This insight into Duffy's personality is an insight into the narrative of "A Painful Case"; which of these descriptive sentences were composed by Duffy himself? What, finally, is the relationship of this self-narrating character whose "life rolled out evenly--an adventureless tale" (109) to the narrator of this tale, in which the character actively eschews adventure?

By seizing so eagerly upon the opportunity to get to know Mrs Sinico, Duffy contradicts the narrator's--and
perhaps his own--assessment of his solitary personality. His ambivalence toward her and toward human contact in general can be expressed in Freudian terminology as a conflict between the "ego" or death instinct and the sexual instinct; Duffy has lived his life according to the "pleasure principle," avoiding unnecessary excitation of any kind. Yet Mrs Sinico attracts him, and the description of the early stages of their relationship suggests that, at least after she first addresses him, Duffy himself makes the necessary overtures.

But as suddenly as he initiated contact with Mrs Sinico, Duffy terminates it upon being forced to acknowledge her interest in him, which constitutes a violation of his narcissistic construction of self: "He thought that in her eyes he would ascend to an angelical stature . . ." She takes up his hand as if to console his professed "soul's incurable loneliness." Though the narrator says that "her interpretation of his words disillusioned him" (111), the reader has no reason to favor Duffy's interpretation of events over Mrs Sinico's; in fact, having already questioned the objectivity of the narrator, the reader may well suspect that Duffy's disillusionment is caused less by Mrs Sinico's failure to understand him than by the beginning of the demise of Duffy's own misconceptions. Duffy tries to stave off his epiphany of self-understanding by breaking off his
friendship with Mrs Sinico, but the damage has been done; Duffy, like Oedipus, is fated to know.

Duffy’s first thoughts upon reading the news of Emily Sinico’s death are perhaps surprising: "The whole narrative of her death revolted him and it revolted him to think that he had ever spoken to her of what he held sacred." He believes that he has been wronged, his confidence violated by her "commonplace vulgar death" (115). Duffy’s feeling of betrayal has its cognate in Freudian theory, which would argue that it originates in his own feeling of responsibility for her decline and eventual fall. The anger and hostility he demonstrates toward Emily Sinico is Duffy’s tool for suppressing the grief and guilt he might feel about her death: "He remembered her outburst of that night and interpreted it in a harsher sense than he had ever done. He had no difficulty now in approving of the course he had taken" (115-116).

Even as Duffy reaffirms the rightness of his own attitudes, however, he experiences an uncanny manifestation that exposes his doubt: "As the light failed and his memory began to wander he thought her hand touched his. The shock which had first attacked his stomach was now attacking his nerves" (116). Duffy and the narrator astutely attribute the ghostly touch to a psychological origin rather than to a supernatural one, but the shock of the news itself is only partly responsible for the somatic hallucination; the fact
of Duffy's feeling of loss and guilt is making itself manifest to him. In textbook fashion, Duffy is being haunted by a Freudian ghost: "At moments he seemed to feel her voice touch his ear, her hand touch his. He stood still to listen" (117).

Though Duffy puzzles over his responsibility to Mrs Sinico, wondering "what else could he have done" and "How was he to blame?" (116), this ghost has not returned simply to torment or identify its killer. He asks himself: "Why had he withheld life from her? Why had he sentenced her to death?" (117). But this is not the crime of which the ghost has returned to accuse him; its message instead is one of despair, as Duffy comes to realize: "He gnawed the rectitude of his life; he felt that he had been outcast from life's feast" (117). His victim, finally, is not Emily Sinico but James Duffy himself, whom he condemned to loneliness years ago, when he cast his companion away from him. The cost of adhering to the pleasure principle is high--so high that many people risk "life's feast," engagement in human interaction, even though it brings with it the risk--even the inevitability--of pain and loss. Duffy's ultimate loss, his repressed fear of loneliness, is a ghost that cannot be exorcised because it does not even properly exist. The supernatural train which passes him "like a worm with a fiery head winding through the darkness
reiterating the syllables of her name" (117) takes with it every last trace of Emily Sinico:

He halted under a tree and allowed the rhythm to die away. He could not feel her near him in the darkness nor her voice touch his ear. He waited for some minutes listening. He could hear nothing: the night was perfectly silent. He listened again: perfectly silent. He felt that he was alone. (117)

Thus the ghost of "A Painful Case," the repressed idea which returns to haunt James Duffy upon Mrs Sinico's violent death, is itself an absence. The personification of this return of the repressed is abortive; Duffy has enough insight into his own psyche to realize that the touch on his hand is the product of his own mind, even of his guilt. He understands his crime, but until the story's closing paragraph, fails to identify the real victim. As my fourth chapter will show, Stephen in Ulysses punishes himself in a similar way with his mother's ghost, though the haunting takes place on a more unconscious level.

In "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," a very different kind of haunting takes place, but it is a spiritual manifestation that will also take place throughout A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Ulysses. The ghost of Parnell, Simon Dedalus's "dead king" (Portrait 39) looms large over the men of Dublin, and may even be one of the main contributors to the paralysis from which all of Joyce's Dubliners suffer. For Stephen, the ghost of Parnell
(whom he dreams of while lying sick in the Clongowes infirmary) is linked inextricably with the father-imago he has constructed, and his ambivalence toward his father, Parnell, and Irish nationalism becomes a tangled net he must eventually try to clear in his flight from Ireland.

Joyce's preoccupation with Parnell, and with his ill-treatment by the people of Ireland, is introduced in "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," which illustrates the taboo against monarchs documented by James G. Frazer and discussed by Freud in Totem and Taboo. The ambivalent attitude with which Frazer's primitive subjects viewed their rulers—that they must be both guarded and guarded against—is shared by most of the occupants of the committee room who, while they speak with longing of the past, would not wish Parnell alive again.

Even in this early story, the ambivalence toward the dead king Parnell is presented in the context of ambivalence toward fathers in general, and Parnell is presented as a sort of surrogate father who is alternately hated, feared and loved. The context for discussing Parnell as a murdered father-king is provided by the story's opening paragraph, which, with its shadowy descriptions and sense of foreboding on a rainy night, recalls the opening scene of Hamlet:

Old Jack raked the cinders together with a piece of cardboard and spread them judiciously over the whitening dome of coals. When the dome was thinly covered his face lapsed into darkness but, as he
set himself to fan the fire again, his crouching shadow ascended the opposite wall and his face slowly re-emerged into light. (118)

There is no strict verbal correspondence between "Ivy Day" and Hamlet; rather the whole story parallels the situation at the start of Shakespeare's play (the discussion of which in "Scylla and Charybdis" provokes Stephen's extended meditation on paternity). In "Ivy Day," however, the sentinels of Elsinore are replaced by an old caretaker and a handful of damp canvassers, and the dead king, with no spiritual son to avenge him--or candidate worthy to carry on his work--will not walk on this anniversary of his death.

That Parnell is a dead father as well as a dead king is suggested by the various failed or failing father-son relationships suggested throughout "Ivy Day." Old Jack, the caretaker of the committee room, complains about his drunkard son, whom he is no longer strong enough to beat: "Only I'm an old man now I'd change his tune for him. I'd take the stick to his back and beat him while I could stand over him--as I done many a time before" (120). Throughout Dubliners, and indeed throughout his entire oeuvre, Joyce illustrates the horror and ineffectuality of child abuse and corporal punishment; bad fathers are generally also abusive fathers. 26

The candidates and canvassers themselves are assessed in terms of their fathers and lineage. Richard J. Tierney,
the candidate for whom most of the assembled canvassers are working, is himself of questionable parentage, as Henchy points out: "Mean little shoeboy of hell! I suppose he forgets the time his little old father kept the hand-me-down shop in Mary's Lane" (123), a shop in which he sold after-hours liquor. Joe Hynes, whose poem brings the story to its conclusion, though he is the son of "a decent respectable man" is not himself "nineteen carat" (124). Neither the candidate Tierney nor the poet Hynes is a worthy son/successor to the dead Parnell.

The false fatherhood of the Catholic church is represented by Father Keon, who may or may not be a priest. The discussion of his exact nature which takes place after he leaves sounds much like the speculation about Father James Flynn in "The Sisters," and associates him indirectly with the order of dead, missing, or ineffectual priests that presides over Joyce's Dublin:

--Tell me, John, said Mr O'Connor, lighting his cigarette with another pasteboard card.
--Hm?
--What is he exactly?
--Ask me an easier one, said Mr Henchy.
--Fanning and himself seem to me very thick. They're often in Kavanagh's together. Is he a priest at all?
--'Mmyes, I believe so. . . . I think he's what you call a black sheep. We haven't many of them, thank God! but we have a few. . . . He's an unfortunate man of some kind. . . . (126, Joyce's ellipses)
Thus nearly all of the biological and symbolic father-son relationships with which Joyce concerns himself in *Portrait* and *Ulysses* are present in "Ivy Day in the Committee Room" (the association of patriarchy and nationalism being even older than the word "patriot" itself). When the discussion of fatherhood in its various guises turns to the memory of Parnell, it becomes clear that he is looked at as a father figure, a dead king without issue worthy ascending his impossibly lofty throne. The canvassers' obsession with money over ideals, their debate over whether the British king should be officially welcomed on Irish soil, their empty political rhetoric: all combine to highlight the differences between Parnell's day and their own. "--This is Parnell's anniversary, said Mr O'Connor, and don't let us stir up any bad blood. We all respect him now that he's dead and gone--even the Conservatives" (132). O'Connor's ambiguous profession of posthumous respect is punctuated ironically by the popping of the cork from the conservative Crofton's bottle of stout.

Eventually the assembled canvassers, who would rather drink in peace than debate politics, agree to hear Joe Hynes's poem about Parnell, since they can all agree that the loss of Parnell was a tragedy, even if only "because he was a gentleman" (133). The poem is romantic in its presentation of Ireland and of Parnell himself, and the reading of it prefigures the quotation of the windy
political speech in the "Aeolus" episode of *Ulysses*. However the reception of Hynes's poem seems uniformly positive; Hynes himself is so moved that he forgets to drink from his bottle of stout, the uncorking of which punctuates his final stanza. It is unclear whether Mr Crofton's judgment—"that it was a very fine piece of writing"—is intended to damn the poem with faint praise, but it, with the popping cork, seems an ironic epitaph for the poem and its dead king/subject. Regardless of the poem's quality, though, it has conjured the dead king, brought about a return of the repressed, and the gathered mourners must face their own inadequacy to fill his shoes.

The failure of the present to live up to the standards of the past is a theme that is continued in "The Dead." The impact of the last story of *Dubliners*, however, is at once more localized and more general than that of "Ivy Day in the Committee Room," though in both stories suppressed memories of the past return, bearing guilt, to remind the living of their shortcomings. In "Ivy Day," the failure is specifically political and historical, and the burden of failure is borne by an entire country. The subject of "The Dead," in contrast, is what Gabriel comes to believe is his own utter failure to understand his relationship to Gretta and, by extension, to the world around him. In this regard the conclusion of "The Dead" bears great resemblance to that of "Araby." Gabriel's realization of his misreading of
Gretta brings about a much greater epiphany about life and
death, one that cannot be expressed in words, when like his
young counterpart he sees himself "as a creature driven and
derided by vanity" (35). And just as "Araby" provides an
epiphanic conclusion to the opening trilogy of stories, "The
Dead" brings closure to the whole of Dubliners.

Thematically, all of "The Dead"--and indeed all of
Dubliners--points toward Gabriel's final misreading of his
wife's agitation. First, he accidentally offends the
servant Lily with his playful banter, and then he stumbles
further when he offers her a Christmas tip in compensation.
This misunderstanding foreshadows his miscommunication with
Gretta. And though Gabriel will not learn of Michael
Furey's existence until the end of the evening, the
essential difference between them is suggested soon after he
and Gretta arrive at the party:

--Goloshes! said Mrs Conroy. That's the latest.
Whenever it's wet underfoot I must put on my
goloshes. To-night even he wanted me to put them
on, but I wouldn't. The next thing he'll buy me
will be a diving suit. (180)

Gabriel is a careful man, a believer in goloshes. He will
not die of exposure professing his passion for Gretta, who
would herself "walk home in the snow if she were let" (180).
His wife's teasing seems aimed as much at Gabriel's
continental affectations as on his hypochondria, but it
makes him sound more like his solicitous aunts than he would probably like.

After Miss Ivors embarrasses Gabriel by calling him a "West Briton," he snaps rudely at Gretta, who has urged him to do as Miss Ivors suggested and travel to Galway; later he will erroneously attribute her eagerness to return there to her desire to see Michael Furey. Now, though, he is merely displacing his frustration with Miss Ivors upon his wife in the style of Farrington in "Counterparts." After this spat with Gretta, Gabriel looks out the window and reflects, foreshadowing the story's conclusion and casting himself (though he does not know it) in the role of the ghost that will haunt him later on that night:

Gabriel's warm trembling fingers tapped the cold pane of the window. How cool it must be outside! How pleasant it would be to walk out alone, first along by the river and then through the park! The snow would be lying on the branches of the trees and forming a bright cap on the top of the Wellington Monument. (192)

Miss Ivors has touched a sore spot with Gabriel because she has challenged his view of himself as an Irishman; her words carry weight because she has read his review of Browning, and the first description of her suggests that Gabriel finds her attractive: "She was a frank-mannered talkative young lady, with a freckled face and prominent brown eyes" (187). She represents, in fact, a kind of ironic counterpart for Michael Furey in his own life: a
path not followed, with ties to the wild west of Ireland. Just as Michael Furey leaves Gretta prematurely by dying, Miss Ivors leaves the party before supper, before Gabriel can compose a response to her accusations; but unlike Michael Furey, who died for Gretta, Miss Ivors leaves on a cheerful note. She doesn't seem to be angry at him; in fact her early departure seems to have nothing to do with him at all, and she refuses his offer of an escort home: "Gabriel asked himself was he the cause of her abrupt departure. But she did not seem to be in ill humour: she had gone away laughing" (196). Gabriel is disappointed that Miss Ivors is less agitated about their conversation than he is.

Though he subsequently tries to settle himself before delivering his after-supper toast, he is still preoccupied with the ghostly vision he experienced earlier at the window. Only late that night will he understand its full significance:

People, perhaps, were standing in the snow on the quay outside, gazing up at the lighted windows and listening to the waltz music. The air was pure there. In the distance lay the park where the trees were weighted with snow. the Wellington Monument wore a gleaming cap of snow that flashed westward over the white field of Fifteen Acres. (202)

Still unaware of the importance—even of the existence—of Michael Furey, Gabriel is already seeing the world from the point of view of the ghost. And his after-supper speech,
which dwells strongly on the lost, forgotten past, highlights this connection, even as it must highlight for Gretta the loss of Furey, one of those "dead and gone great ones whose fame the world will not willingly let die" (203). While the rhetorically adept Gabriel is able to redirect his speech about the superiority of things past into a congratulatory speech about the hostesses, Gretta is left in the past he has conjured, mourning Michael Furey.

As they are getting ready to leave, and Gretta is listening to Bartell D'Arcy, who further reminds her of Furey, Gabriel unfortunately misreads her agitation as ardor for him: "... Gabriel saw that there was colour on her cheeks and that her eyes were shining. A sudden tide of joy went leaping out of his heart" (212). He works himself into a frenzy of desire for her, as "moments of their secret life together burst like stars upon his memory" (213). But Gretta's mind is upon another secret life, one that has been long buried; the return of the repressed Michael Furey is imminent.

It is important from a psychological perspective to clarify what happens when Gretta reveals to Gabriel what is upsetting her. While he is momentarily jealous about "this delicate boy" (219), it is not the repressed content (the former existence of Michael Furey, and Gretta's love for him) that brings about Gabriel's epiphany; it is the fact of the suppression itself:
While he had been full of memories of their secret life together, full of tenderness and joy and desire, she had been comparing him in her mind with another. A shameful consciousness of his own person assailed him. He saw himself as a ludicrous figure, acting as a pennyboy for his aunts, a nervous well-meaning sentimentalist, orating to vulgarians and idealising his own clownish lusts, the pitiable fatuous fellow he had caught a glimpse of in the mirror. (219-220)

When he asks whether she loved Michael Furey, Gabriel’s voice is "humble and indifferent"; what saddens him is not her love for the dead boy, but the repression and return of it. He is sympathetic about her loss to a certain degree, but the ghost that keeps him awake in the night is the ghost of his own loss.

His epiphany, like those of many of the protagonists of *Dubliners*, is out of proportion to the events that evoke it. Gretta’s confession about Michael Furey brings about a complete change in Gabriel’s view of the world, forcing him to follow to their conclusions thoughts about death and about his life with Gretta, as he beholds the literal apparition of Michael Furey:

The tears gathered more thickly in his eyes and in the partial darkness he imagined he saw the form of a young man standing under a dripping tree. Other forms were near. His soul had approached that region where dwell the vast hosts of the dead. He was conscious of, but could not apprehend, their wayward and flickering existence. His own identity was fading out into a grey impalpable world: the solid world itself which
these dead had one time reared and lived in was
dissolving and dwindling. (223)

This haunting revery is concluded by "a few light taps on
the pane," which might almost be the ghost coming for him.
Or perhaps it is Death tapping on the pane, the snow which
is "general all over Ireland": His soul swooned slowly as
he heard the snow falling faintly through the universe and
faintly falling, like the descent of their last end, upon
all the living and the dead" (224).

As the story that brings **Dubliners** together, "The Dead"
underscores Joyce's use of repression and epiphany. Set on
the feast of the Epiphany, it is, among other things, a
Christmas ghost story in the tradition of Dickens's
"Christmas Carol"; Michael Furey is as much as an external
manifestation of repressed guilt and loss as is Jacob Marley
himself. But Michael Furey has not returned to warn Gabriel
that there is time to change his ways; his message is the
ineluctable passage of time, which Gabriel can see in
Gretta's face, in his Aunt Julia's face, and in his own.

Where repression occurs in **Dubliners**, it prefigures
return and epiphany. In his later novels, however, Joyce
foregrounds the repression itself more and more, until it
becomes the entire narrative method of **Finnegans Wake**--and
the epiphanies, when they do take place, are qualified in
effect. Throughout the stories of **Dubliners** repression and
epiphany are linked in various ways with notions of false
fatherhood and paternity, and with the challenges to identity that such figures necessarily pose. This concern with fatherhood, false or symbolic, will become a central theme in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, *Ulysses*, and *Finnegans Wake*; meanwhile, Joyce will refine the repression as a technique from a motif to a literary style of its own.
1. Beja derives his definition of epiphany from Stephen's, as related in *Stephen Hero*:

By an epiphany he [Stephen] meant a sudden spiritual manifestation, whether in the vulgarity of speech or of a gesture or in a memorable phase of the mind itself. He believed that it was for the man of letters to record these epiphanies with extreme care, seeing that they themselves are the most delicate and evanescent of moments. (211)

2. This is a quality *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* shares with *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1900) and *Jokes and Their Relation to the Unconscious* (1905). While it is not my concern to demonstrate that Joyce was directly influenced by Freudian thought (the first English translation of *Dreams* appeared in 1913, and *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* followed in 1914), it is, I think, relevant that Freud's ideas about parapraxes were generally available to the intellectual community Joyce was a part of. As James Strachey notes in his introduction to the Norton edition, *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* has passed through more German editions and has been translated into more languages than any of Freud's works except for his *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, a healthy portion of which is also devoted to "the psychopathology of everyday life."

3. Most of this chapter was not included in *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* until the 1907 German edition.

4. In Neil Hertz's seminal essay "Freud and the Sandman," Freud's reading of "The Sand-Man" is analyzed in light of *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, which Freud was working on during the composition of "The Uncanny." By reading the gaps in Freud's analysis of Hoffmann's story, Hertz finds insight into Freud's theories of repression and return.

5. Among the other meanings Freud cites for *unheimlich* are "terrifying" and "bloodcurdling." He provides several dozen different usages of the word in literature.
The opening of "Araby" underscores the theme of blindness:

North Richmond Street, being blind, was a quiet street except at the hour when the Christian Brothers' School set the boys free. An uninhabited house of two storeys stood at the blind end, detached from its neighbors in a square ground. (Dubliners 29)

I use the term "adolescent" cautiously; according to Joyce's categories, "Eveline," "After the Race," "Two Gallants," and "The Boarding House" are the "stories of adolescence." I would argue that "Araby" marks the transition between childhood and adolescence.

Much of Joyce's correspondence with publisher Grant Richards relevant to the rejection, proposed bowdlerization, burning, and eventual publication of Dubliners can be found in the Viking Critical Library edition, edited by Robert Scholes and A. Walton Litz.

Ironically, Richards later asked that "An Encounter" be omitted from the book.

"The Sisters," in addition to being the first story in the collection, was also the first in order of composition, according to Gifford's Joyce Annotated (29).

In the second section of Totem and Taboo, "Taboo and Emotional Ambivalence," Freud discusses in detail the creation of supernatural visitations such as this, especially guilt-motivated manifestations of the dead father. The same phenomenon is evident, as we shall see, in Ulysses.

This compulsion toward the east is seen by Brewster Ghiselin as a unifying force in Dubliners:

In the development of the tendency to eastward movement among the characters of Dubliners, and in its successive modifications, throughout the book, something of . . . a system is manifest. It may be characterized briefly as an eastward trend, at first vague, quickly becoming dominant, then wavering, weakening, and at last reversed. (320)
This ambivalence toward the dead, along with the accompanying guilt, is discussed in the second part of *Totem and Taboo*.

Don Gifford's *Joyce Annotated* is not particularly helpful on this point:

> In medieval tradition Odysseus was said to have had green eyes—the eyes of a vigorous, youthful man, the ultimate adventurer. Green eyes are also the sign of innocence or inexperience and, conversely, of a shifty and undependable person. (39)

The possible allusion to Odysseus suggests a connection between the pederast and Leopold Bloom, who engineers a more complicated and climactic waterside encounter in the "Nausicaa" episode of *Ulysses*.

The frequency with which "Araby" is excerpted and anthologized suggests, perhaps, a universality of the experience in the story which is less true of many of the other stories in *Dubliners* ("Ivy Day in the Committee Room," for example, does not appear in many general literature anthologies). I do not have statistics for how frequently the various stories of *Dubliners* appear in anthologies, but an unscientific poll revealed that "Araby" is the most popular, followed by "The Dead" and "Eveline."

This sensual affection for books, regardless of their contents, is also shared by Gabriel Conroy of "The Dead":

> The books he received for review were almost more welcome than the paltry cheque. He loved to feel the covers and turn over the pages of newly printed books. Nearly every day when his teaching in the college was ended he used to wander down the quays to the second-hand booksellers ... (188)

This particular epiphany does not have a cognate in the surviving epiphanies collected by Robert Scholes and Richard M. Kain in *The Workshop of Daedalus*, but it seems to me to bear a resemblance to the epiphany on *Stephen Hero* 211.

Ellmann cites a North Richmond Street neighbor of the Joyces as a source for Eveline's father (James Joyce 43). However, Joyce's description of Nora's home life in a letter to Stanislaus dated 3 December 1904 bears a resemblance to the situation suggested in "Eveline":

> When she came in [from going out with a proscribed Protestant boyfriend] uncle was there before her. Her mother was ordered out of the room (Papa of course was away) and uncle proceeded to thrash her with a big walking-stick. She fell on the floor fainting and clinging about his knees. At this time she was nineteen! Pretty little story, eh? (Letters II, 73)

Because "Eveline" was originally published in the Irish Homestead on September 10, 1904, it is not clear whether Nora (whom Joyce met only that June) could have influenced its composition; yet this one letter contains two other correspondences between Joyce's love and fiction, the first a possibility and the second a certainty: Nora's father, a baker who used to have his own shop "but drank all the buns and loaves like a man" (72) is away "of course" because he has been banished by his wife, like Polly Mooney's estranged father in "The Boarding House"; and the same letter also mentions Nora's affair with "a boy who died," the boy who will become Michael Furey in "The Dead."

The editors of the Viking Critical Library edition of Dubliners point out that Saint Margaret-Mary Alacoque suffered from paralysis and rheumatism during her teens and "inflicted bizarre punishments upon herself, once carving the name 'Jesus' on her breast with a penknife" (Dubliners 470).

Gifford, in Joyce Annotated (51-52), cites two possible translations of this utterance, neither of them conclusive: "the end of pleasure is pain" (from Tindall, A Reader's Guide to James Joyce) and "the end of song is raving madness" (from Brandabur, A Scrupulous Meanness). The editors of the Viking Critical Library edition of Dubliners speculate that Joyce "may have intended it as delirious gibberish" (472).

Patrick McGee discusses Stephen's denial of his mother's last wish in Paperspace (17).
The threat of losing one's teeth or of having them knocked out, terrifying enough in its own right, is also a common dream image which Freud associates in The Interpretation of Dreams with castration--but the impact of Jack Mooney's threat doesn't rely solely on its unconscious associations.

Here, as throughout much of Totem and Taboo, Freud uses the third edition of Frazer's The Golden Bough as his source for information about tribal practices. Frazer's observations about taboos on the treatment of rulers can be found in Part II of that edition, or on pp. 235-238 of the one-volume abridged edition of 1922.

The conflict between the ego instinct and the libido is in part the subject of Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle (1920).

See, for instance, "Eveline" and "Counterparts." See also Restuccia's Joyce and the Law of the Father, which discusses in detail Joyce's attitude toward such forms of discipline.
Chapter III

Stephen Hero and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man:
The Significance of the Father in the Destiny of the Individual

Stephen began to enumerate glibly his father's attributes.
--A medical student, an oarsman, a tenor, an amateur actor, a shouting politician, a small landlord, a small investor, a drinker, a good fellow, a storyteller, somebody's secretary, something in a distillery, a taxgatherer, a bankrupt and at present a praiser of his own past. (Portrait 241)

I. Repressive Revision in Stephen Hero

In his introduction to Stephen Hero, Theodore Spencer speculates that Joyce composed the autobiographical fragment that became the early draft of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man between 1904 and 1906--during the time he was writing the stories of Dubliners (9).¹ Those few critics who choose to discuss Stephen Hero generally remark on the fact that it differs stylistically not only from Portrait (which is not surprising) but also from Dubliners. The polish and concision of Dubliners is seemingly lacking in Stephen Hero, and this is presumably what led Joyce to
abandon the incomplete manuscript and undertake a wholesale revision. In general, the early portrait of the artist is more ingenuous than the portrait of his fellow Dubliners. It is not, however, entirely uncritical of its protagonist, portraying him as "emotionally and intellectually a cruder and more youthful figure" than the Stephen of Portrait, "on the whole a more sympathetic person, proud and arrogant as he may be" (Spencer 13).

The distance between any author and an autobiographical protagonist is always difficult, if not impossible, to gauge. In Stephen Hero and Portrait the issue is further complicated by the fact that Joyce, while working on the first version of his autobiographical fiction, was simultaneously publishing his first stories in the Irish Homestead--above the name of his character, Stephen Daedalus. Biographers have explored at length Joyce's transmutation of life into art, his meticulous and often merciless reproduction of conversations, exchanges, even personalities, in his fiction; but while Joyce's practice invites speculation into the relation between character and historical author, it also thwarts any attempt at conclusive identification.

If the difficulties of mediating the tensions among author, narrator, and protagonist in Stephen Hero and A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man prove daunting, the relationship of the fragment to the final novel is just as
Stephen Hero is generally considered an "early draft" of Portrait, but some critics, Thomas E. Connolly among them, maintain that it is not itself even the fragment of an aborted novel: "Stephen Hero should not be considered as a fragment of a novel, nor even as the first draft of a novel, because it does not fit into the genre of novel at all" (232). Elsewhere, he warns: "Stephen Hero should be approached with caution. It should be taken for what it is, not for what it is not. It is a sketchbook, not a first draft of a novel" (248). However, the very unity of the surviving fragments argues against such a "sketchbook" reading; the term seems better suited to the "epiphanies" themselves as Joyce collected them, or perhaps to Giacomo Joyce, than to any of Joyce's other writings. Knowing that it was eventually revised into Portrait, Connolly can safely assert that "Joyce was right in never having submitted Stephen Hero to a publisher" (248); but the early draft of Portrait--what survives of it--is more novel than notebook.

This novelistic quality notwithstanding, the fragment's main value lies--as Connolly correctly asserts--in the light it can shed on the composition of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. While it is perhaps true that Stephen Hero must not be taken "for what it is not," the surviving fragment illuminates precisely what Portrait is not. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man is not a bildungsroman in the traditional sense. It is not an external history of
the artist's life and times. It is not even--primarily--a manifesto on the artist's aesthetics. *Stephen Hero* is, or would have been, all of these things.

Joyce's conception of his portrait of the artist must have changed radically between the abandonment of the earlier version and the commencement of the final one; *Stephen Hero* is rife with detail about Stephen's friends, family, and surroundings, while *Portrait* is characterized by a careful economy of detail. This economy extends even to which events are included in the narrative and which are relegated to hearsay or excised altogether. Theodore Spencer cites specifically the general portrayal of the Daedalus family, the central roles of siblings Maurice and Isabel, and Stephen's refusal to perform his Easter duty as victims of Joyce's ruthless foregrounding of Stephen in the final version of the novel:

> He was aiming at economy, and he was trying to place his center of action as much as possible inside the consciousness of his hero. To do this he evidently decided to sacrifice the method—which is, after all, the method of *Dubliners* rather than that of the *Portrait*—of objectively presenting one episode or character after another. As a result the *Portrait* has more intensity and concentration, a more controlled focus, than the earlier version. (11-12)

Was this the only motive behind the elimination of the family from the narrative: the desire to foreground the protagonist? No. A close examination of the elements of
Stephen Hero that were lost in the translation to *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* reveals an artist or creative consciousness trying to fly by the very nets he is writing about, and trying to write about the oppressive, paralytic world he is struggling to escape. The narrative method of *Portrait* has more in common with *Dubliners* than does *Stephen Hero*, and in revising the early version of his *bildungsroman* into its final state, Joyce enacts many of the repressive strategies he highlighted in the characters of *Dubliners* in an effort to escape paralysis. In *Ulysses*, Joyce will cause his artist-protagonist to use many of the same repressive strategies to achieve the same goal.

As many critics have noted, one of the most interesting qualities of *Stephen Hero* is that it depicts dramatically events only alluded to in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Emma Clery, for instance, is presented in the fragment as an autonomous character; in *Portrait* she becomes (like Mangan’s sister in "Araby") a partially-glimpsed figure and an incomplete name, Emma or E.C.⁷ Similarly, the confrontation between Stephen and his mother over the performance of his Easter duty, only alluded to in *Portrait* in Stephen’s conversation with Cranly (238 ff.), is fully presented in *Stephen Hero* in dialogue:

--Tell me, mother, said Stephen between mouthfuls, do you mean to tell me you believe that our friend went up off the mountain as they say he did?
--I do.
--I don't.
--What are you saying, Stephen?
--It's absurd: it's Barnum. He comes into the world God knows how, walks on the water, gets out of his grave and goes up off the Hill of Howth. What drivel is this? (133)

This is, in fact, one of the most dramatic scenes in the fragment. Its importance in the life of Stephen Dedalus is, of course, indicated in Ulysses by Stephen's guilty brooding upon his refusal to kneel and pray at his dying mother's bedside. A further connection between that (indirectly presented) scene and Stephen's earlier refusal to perform his Easter duty is revealed only in Stephen Hero:

--I have made my Easter duty already--on Holy Thursday--but I'm going to the altar in the morning. I am making a novena and I want you to offer up your communion for a special intention of mine.
--What special intention?
--Well, dear, I'm very much concerned about Isabel . . . I don't know what to think. (131)

May Daedalus's "special intention" is to preempt Stephen's refusal to make his Easter duty by equating his rejection of faith with a rejection of family, an abandonment of Isabel to fate. He cannot deny Catholicism without denying his dying sister, as he will later deny his dying mother's last request.

The confrontation between mother and son in Stephen Hero is handled delicately and impartially. May Daedalus is
undeniably manipulative, though certainly sincere; Stephen is presented as sincere but sophomoric, uncomfortable at having upset his mother: "--Mother, said Stephen from the threshold, I don't see what you're crying for. I'm young, healthy, happy. What is the crying for? . . . It's too silly . . . " (135, Joyce's ellipses). Stephen's eagerness to "narrate his latest conflict with orthodoxy" to Cranly notwithstanding (136), his victory in this skirmish is a pyrrhic one at best: another such victory, as the hindsight of *Ulysses* reveals, and he is done for.

The tragedy that is linked to Stephen's refusal to make his Easter communion is, of course, the death of his sister Isabel. That episode, another of the central scenes of *Stephen Hero*, has no cognate in the final *Portrait*; it does, however, originate in one of the surviving autobiographical epiphanies, in which Mrs Joyce asks her son about "some matter coming away from the hole in Georgie's stomach" (Scholes and Kain 29). In the epiphany, as in life, the sick child was not a sister but a brother, Georgie, who died of peritonitis in 1902. The linking of the sibling's death with the rejection of religious faith is suggested in another surviving epiphany:

They are all asleep. I will go up now .... He lies on my bed where I lay last night: they have covered him with a sheet and closed his eyes with pennies.... Poor little fellow! We have often laughed together--he bore his body very lightly .... I am very sorry he died. I cannot pray for
him as the others do ..... Poor little fellow!
Everything else is so uncertain! (Scholes and Kain 30)

The epiphany is described by its editors as "almost
taglessly direct" (30). It does, however, convey the grief
Joyce would not allow himself to express in prayers of
lament.

Though Stephen reflects on how little he knows about
Isabel, he is not without feeling for her: "Stephen felt
very acutely the futility of his sister's life. He would
have done many things for her and, though she was almost a
stranger to him, he was sorry to see her lying dead" (165).
The mourning of the parents and family is portrayed as
ineffectual; Mr Daedalus's drunken weeping and Mrs
Daedalus's feeble assurances of heavenly reward both ring
hollow. Stephen protests the "inexpressibly mean way in
which his sister had been buried" by drinking a pint with
the carriage drivers rather than joining the men of his
family in a more genteel toast (168).

Joyce's decision in *Portrait* to relegate to an after-
the-fact report the argument between Stephen and his mother
over Stephen's loss of faith suggests one difference between
the first draft and the final novel. In *Portrait* the
emphasis is clearly placed not on the dramatic conflict
between mother and son, but on Stephen's subsequent
narration of the event to Cranly. At that point in the
novel Stephen is already rhetorically arming himself with his "dagger definitions" (Ulysses 9.84). And by distancing the narrator (and thus the reader) from the actual conversation, Joyce divorces it from any direct emotional impact.

The decision to omit the death of Isabel entirely from A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man is emblematic of the difference in method between the novel and its first draft. To present the family through narration and direct dialogue (which would at least seem to be objective) is to bestow upon it an independent existence, and this is something the narrator of Portrait is apparently unwilling to do. The almost complete excision of Maurice from the finished Portrait is another clear indicator of the primary difference between the fragment and the novel. While Maurice is mentioned only in passing in Portrait (only enough to let the reader know that he exists, but not enough to give a sense of his personality), he was apparently accorded a much greater role in Stephen Hero; he is certainly an independent presence in the surviving episodes. In Ulysses Joyce may be acknowledging this omission when Stephen says, "A brother is as easily forgotten as an umbrella" (9.974-975).

The memoirs of Stanislaus Joyce, the real-life model for Maurice, suggest that the close relationship between the brothers in Stephen Hero is similar to the relationship that
Stanislaus shared with James Joyce. While My Brother's Keeper is concerned explicitly with contextualizing the autobiographical elements of Joyce's fiction, the Complete Dublin Diary of Stanislaus Joyce gives a much more immediate representation of Stanislaus' relationship with his brother:

Now that I think of it, I suggest I may have been irritated by the demands which, quite unknown to me, Jim's presence made on my character; but more than all this, the idea of affection between characters so distrustful and mutually so little affectionate repelled me as it does now. I think I understand Jim, however, and like him in the way of admiration. As for my interest in Jim, it has become chronic, for it has always been my habit to try to live Jim's intellectual life as well as my own. (143-144)

Ellmann, in his biography, comments on the importance of Stanislaus's diary to James's fiction: "[Stanislaus's] main effort was expended in keeping a diary, but James read it and said that it was dull except when it dealt with him, and that Stanislaus would never write prose" (Ellmann 133). But Joyce seems to have secretly placed a much greater value on Stanislaus's prose, for Stanislaus, aside from being the primary model for at least two diarists among Joyce's fictional characters (Maurice Daedalus of Stephen Hero and James Duffy of "A Painful Case"), also recorded in his diary many of the events Joyce was later to transmute into fiction:
He was content to use Stanislaus as what he called a 'whetstone,' and kept in his mind Stanislaus's sarcastic account, sent him a few months before in a letter to Paris, of serving with their father on an election committee. This gave James the core of "Ivy Day in the Committee Room." (Ellmann 133)

Yet James Joyce does not seem to have been eager to acknowledge Stanislaus's contributions to his writing, even as he would later come to depend upon his brother for unacknowledged material gifts and loans as well. And while the removal of Maurice from the life of Stephen Dedalus may indeed have been motivated in part by a simple change in focus away from the protagonist's circumstances toward the protagonist himself, sibling rivalry--and Joyce's unwillingness to acknowledge his sources--must also have played some part: after all, the titles of both versions of the novel, *Stephen Hero* and *A Portrait of the Artist*, were proposed by Stanislaus (*Dublin Diary* 12). This sibling rivalry need not have been unconscious on Joyce's part; the Shem and Shaun in all their incarnations act out a multileveled sibling rivalry throughout *Finnegans Wake*.

The first mention of Maurice in *Stephen Hero* gives some indication of his function in the fragment:

Verse to be read according to its rhythm should be read according to the stresses; that is, neither strictly according to the feet nor yet with complete disregard of them. All this theory he set himself to explain to Maurice and Maurice, when he had understood the meanings of the terms and had put these meanings carefully together,
agreed that Stephen's theory was the right one.... The two brothers tried this theory on all the verse they could remember and it yielded wonderful results. (25-26)

Maurice is apparently a willing, even eager whetstone for the young scholar who will become, in *Ulysses*, Kinch, the knifeblade. It is immediately evident, however, that Stephen does not much respect Maurice's aesthetic abilities:

The burgher notion of the poet Byron in undress pouring out verses just as a city fountain pours out water seemed to him characteristic of most popular judgments on esthetic matters and he combated the notion at its root by saying solemnly to Maurice--Isolation is the first principle of artistic economy. (33)

That Joyce can have his narrator present ironically Stephen's decision to combat such "burgher" notions at their "root" by broaching them with Maurice suggests that he has isolated himself from his earliest and most faithful audience, Stanislaus. Even as the narrator seems to be gently mocking the sophomoric protagonist, he enacts the aesthetic principle of isolation the character sets forth.

The first mention of Maurice's diary, which must have served as a sometime source for *Stephen Hero* itself, appears shortly after this passage, along with another ironic allusion to the innocent, adolescent sophomoricism of Stephen and his brother:
Neither of the youths had the least suspicion of themselves; they both looked upon life with frank curious eyes (Maurice naturally serving himself with Stephen's vision when his own was deficient) and they both felt that it was possible to arrive at a sane understanding of so-called mysteries if one only had patience enough. (36)

The narrator's irony, tempered perhaps by affection, seems directed here, via the condescending mention of Maurice's deficient vision, more toward Stephen than toward the younger brother. Yet the prosaic Maurice's function is definitely a subordinate one: he aids "bravely" Stephen's construction of "an entire science of esthetic," and Stephen finds Maurice "very useful for raising objections." When Stephen shows Maurice "the first-fruits of his verse" (36), the pragmatic Maurice asks only who the woman is.

In the next chapter, further congress between Stephen and Maurice is temporarily prohibited by the parents due to the corrupting influence Stephen is ostensibly exerting over his younger brother. But while Maurice accepts the prohibition "with bad grace" and must be "restrained by his brother from overt disobedience" (49), Stephen willingly looks elsewhere for an audience. This begins the transference of filial feelings onto other objects that can be marked throughout Portrait and Ulysses; Cranly, Lynch, and Buck Mulligan all serve as surrogate brothers for Stephen at various times, both as sounding boards and, as we
shall see below, as enemies against whom the father must be defended.  

As the narrative of Stephen Hero progresses, however, Maurice's own feelings of rebellion are shown to blossom independently of Stephen's encouragement:

His sombre gravity, his careful cleansing of his much-worn clothes, and the premature disillusionment of his manner all suggested the human vesture of some spiritual or philosophic problem transplanted from Holland. Stephen did not know in what stage the problem was and he thought it wiser to allow it its own path of solution. (57)

Although Stephen's apprehension of Maurice as the physical embodiment of a philosophical problem constitutes a refusal to see him as an individual, he does allow his brother the space to reveal his thoughts in his own time. When Stephen admits to missing Mass, he does so without encouraging Maurice to do likewise. Maurice offers his self-mocking, though vaguely sacrilegious, deadpan rendering of the retreat sermon to Stephen of his own accord; and while Stephen, who has ostensibly lost his faith, rewards it by laughing almost until he cries, he probably could not mock the priest's story the way Maurice does.  

Maurice's ongoing differentiation from Stephen, begun here by exceeding him in sacrilege, is reflected later, when Stephen relates the story of his "battle" with the President of his college. When Maurice refuses to serve as his foil
and Stephen asks what is distracting him, the younger brother replies:

--I have found out why I feel different this evening. Why, do you think?
--I don't know. Tell us.
--I have been walking from the ball of my left foot. I usually walk from the ball of my right foot.

Stephen looked sideways at the speaker's solemn face to see if there were any signs thereon of a satirical mood but, finding only steadfast self-analysis, he said:
--Indeed? That's damned interesting. (100)

Stephen cannot quite believe that Maurice is speaking without derision, and neither, finally, can the reader. Though Maurice still supports and aids his brother, he is showing signs of rebellion against the church, the family, and even against Stephen himself.

The next stage in the evolution of the character of Maurice is seen through the mother's eyes during the extended illness of the sister Isabel:

As for her sons, one was a freethinker, the other surly. Maurice ate dry bread, muttered maledictions against his father and his father's creditors, practised pushing a heavy flat stone in the garden and raising and lowering a broken dumbbell, and trudged to the Bull every day that the tide served. (151)

The surly Maurice lives a routine of ascetic atheism, apart even from Stephen: "One dusky summer evening they walked into each other very gravely at a corner and both burst out
laughing: and after that they sometimes went for walks together and discussed the art of literature" (151).

Maurice leads his brother in blaming their father for their family's fallen state, and though *Stephen Hero* presents Simon Daedalus in a largely negative light, Stephen's disgust with "his father and his father's creditors" can never approach Maurice's own:

... even when all seemed peaceful Maurice's first questions [sic] to his mother when she opened the door was "Is he in?" When the answer was "No" they both went down to the kitchen together but when the answer was "Yes" Stephen only went down, Maurice listening over the banisters to judge from his father's tones whether he was sober or not. If his father was drunk Maurice retired to his bedroom ... (231)

This passage, along with the evidence offered by Stanislaus Joyce's own writings (which we may imagine to be cognate to the diaries of Maurice Daedalus), suggests two of Joyce's possible motives in eliminating Maurice from his fictional self-portrait. The first is simply the elimination of competition. As Joyce revised Stephen into a figure largely independent of his family, he might have decided that the loner Maurice was complicating the figure of the solitary artist. Furthermore, the Maurice of *Stephen Hero* has many of the other characteristics that Joyce would eventually prefer to reserve for Stephen, among them silence, exile, and cunning.
There is, however, also another reason for the elimination from *Portrait* of the character of Maurice, one that is tied directly to the system of repression and suppression Joyce explored in *Dubliners* and *Ulysses*. The hostility toward the father which is manifested by Maurice in *Stephen Hero* becomes in *Portrait* Stephen's complicated ambivalence. Similarly, the Simon Daedalus of *Stephen Hero*, portrayed as a foolish burgher and a drunkard, becomes in *Portrait* an occasionally sympathetic character (perhaps because of Stephen's apparent lack of feeling for him). The revision and repression which relegates Maurice to a couple of sentences in *Portrait* concurrently renders Simon Dedalus a much more interesting and altogether more respectable figure—for similar reasons.

*The Complete Dublin Diary of Stanislaus Joyce*, to which *Stephen Hero* remains largely faithful, shows in much greater detail the difference between James's opinion of John Joyce and Stanislaus's; it also suggests that Stephen's feelings of fatherlessness in *A Portrait of the Artist* and *Ulysses* were borrowed from the character of Maurice in *Stephen Hero*. In his introduction to the diary, editor George H. Healey observes: "It is hard to believe that the same man, the same father, stands behind both James's portrayal of Simon Dedalus and Stanislaus' portrayal of 'Pappie'" (vii). Stanislaus's "Pappie" is indeed a very different figure from
Simon Dedalus, the father in Portrait; but the Simon
Daedalus of Stephen Hero owes much to Stanislaus’s diary:

He is lying and hypocritical. He regards himself
as the victim of circumstances and pays himself
with words. His will is dissipated, and his
intellect besotted, and he has become a crazy
drunkard. He is spiteful like all drunkards who
are thwarted, and invents the most cowardly
insults that a scandalous mind and a naturally
derisive tongue can suggest. He undoubtedly
hastened Mother’s death. He was an insulting son,
and as a husband, a household bully and a better
in money matters. For his children he has no love
or care but a peculiar sense of duty arising out
of his worship of respectability. (Dublin Diary
6)

Yet even Stanislaus, a scant few sentences later, has room
for respect, if not affection: "He is generous, however,
and when he claims to have 'some ideas of a gentleman' he
does not seem to be ridiculous," he allows. And: "He has
the remains of the best tenor of the light English style I
have ever heard. His range was unusual and he sings with
taste" (6).14

This is the John Joyce who becomes the Simon Dedalus of
Ulysses as seen through the eyes of Leopold Bloom. But
later in the diary, Stanislaus runs out of patience for his
wayward father, and much of the extant diary is a diatribe
against him. Many of his judgments against his father have
their cognates in his brother’s fictions. On March 29,
1904, he alludes to John Joyce’s violence and unknowingly
draws a parallel between his father and Eveline’s: "We--
Jim, Charlie, and I—relieve one another in the house like policemen as the girls are not safe in it with Pappie” (24). And like Stephen Dedalus in the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode of Ulysses, Stanislaus muses on the harmful side-effects of paternity:

Many fathers I know do not know the names of their children. Perhaps there is something we should be thankful for in this ignorance of us when we are at the difficult age, for we want no favours from those secretly unconverted whores who are our fathers. In fine, their fathers are generally the greatest obstacles in children’s young life, and the first thing a child has to do on coming to years of discretion is to forget the lies he has been taught. (118-119)

Given the context in which he was created, it is not surprising that the Simon Daedalus of Stephen Hero is a much more two-dimensional figure than most other members of the Daedalus family. The characters of Maurice and May Daedalus are fully developed and have already been examined here at some length; the sister Isabel, whose tragic death prevents her from becoming much of an individual in Stephen Hero, is utterly eliminated from the Dedalus brood of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, along with any suggestion of a tragic death in the family. But while the rest of Stephen’s family become in the final novel mere shadows of their Stephen Hero personae, Simon Daedalus, in becoming Simon Dedalus, undergoes a transformation: in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, as he is seen only through the eyes
of Stephen, he is presented as a steadily declining figure, initially adored and subsequently rejected, but always more vividly and sympathetically portrayed than his *Stephen Hero* counterpart.

The first mention of Simon Daedalus in the surviving chapters of *Stephen Hero* underscores his ineffectuality as a provider, as it is expected that Stephen would "follow the path of remunerative respectability and save the situation" of the family—a task beyond the father's ability (49). Mr Daedalus threatens to withdraw Stephen from the University, but Stephen is "not greatly troubled by this warning for he knew that his fate was, in this respect, with his godfather and not with his father" (48). By this seventeenth chapter, Simon Daedalus's position as the head of the family and as Stephen's provider has already been usurped by a generous godfather, Mr Fulham: not a real Daedalus, perhaps, not an artificer, but a generous provider who will indulge to a certain extent Stephen's flights of youthful extravagance.15

Simon Daedalus does not, in *Stephen Hero*, seem to be the sentimental Parnellite he is in *Portrait*. When Stephen decides to study Irish, only Mr Casey is openly supportive; Daedalus merely says "that he did not mind his son's learning the language so long as it did not keep from his legitimate work" (56). Stephen's interest in the Gaelic League has more to do with Emma Cleary than with the Irish language, however, and he and his father have different
ideas of what Stephen's legitimate work is, as May Daedalus suggests:

--Well, you see, Stephen, your father is not like you: he takes no interest in that sort of thing . . . When he was young he told me he used to spend all his time out after the hounds or rowing on the Lee. He went in for athletics.

--I suspect what he went in for, said Stephen irreverently. I know he doesn't care a jack straw about what I think or what I write.

--He wants to see you make your way, get on in life, said his mother defensively. That's his ambition. You shouldn't blame him for that.

--No, no, no. But it may not be my ambition. That kind of life I often loathe: I find it ugly and cowardly. (85)

As an oppressive father figure, Simon Daedalus is flat, almost a stock figure of the bildungsroman; he lacks the engaging qualities of his counterparts in Portrait and Ulysses. When his wife defends Stephen's inquiries into Ibsen, Daedalus resents that she should be able . . . to act as intermediary between him and his son. He condemned as inopportune but not discredited his son's wayward researches into strange literature and, though a similar taste was not discoverable in him, he was prepared to commit that most pious of heroisms namely the the extension of one's sympathies late in life in deference to the advocacies of a junior. (87)

The narrator's description of Simon Daedalus deciding to read a play by Ibsen is derisive: "He chose the League of Youth in which he hoped to find the reminiscences of like-
minded roysterers'; Stephen's gloating is discernible in the narrator's admission that Daedalus, "after reading through two acts of provincial intrigue, abandoned the enterprise as tedious" (88).

Isabel's illness, and the subsequent eviction of the Daedalus family, combine to show Simon Daedalus in an unremittingly negative light: "Stephen's father did not like the prospect of another inhabitant in his house, particularly a daughter for whom he had little affection" (109). Though Stephen himself has no real affection for Isabel, the father's attitude toward the daughter's return is actively negative, and he is judged by it:

The reflection that his daughter, instead of being a help to him would be a hindrance, and the suspicion that the burden of responsibility which he had piously imposed on his eldest son's shoulders was beginning to irk that young man troubled his vision of the future. (109)

Stephen has been flattered by his father's high hopes for him, but the "slight threat of union between father and son had been worn away by the usages of daily life and . . . it bore fewer and feebleer messages along it" (110). Daedalus, "quite capable of talking himself into believing what he knew to be untrue," has "his son's distaste for responsibility without his son's courage" (110). This description of the father's personality in terms of the son's is a reversal of the usual construction of such
comparisons; the effect is more an ironic indictment of Stephen's short-sightedness than an apology for his father's dissipation.

Upon their relocation to Mr Wilkinson's house, the Daedalus family deteriorates even further, the father in particular, encouraged as he is by the one-eyed, cyclopean Wilkinson's similar habits (Wilkinson can afford the fifteen-room house only because his landlord died without heir; he therefore pays no rent): "When Stephen turned the corner of the avenue he could often hear his father's voice shouting or his father's fist banging the table" (161).

Isabel's death separates Simon from Stephen, who is appalled at "the inexpressibly mean way in which his sister had been buried" (168). Simon's grief is shown to be insincere in comparison with Stephen's own; he is often drunk, even as Isabel is dying, and more concerned with appearances than with his daughter's life. After this episode, Simon Daedalus ceases to be visibly important to Stephen: "He avoided his father sedulously because he now regarded his father's presumptions as the most deadly part of a tyranny, internal and external, which he determined to combat with might and main" (209). He remains unperturbed in the face of his father's anger over his poor performance in exams:

--Reasonable be damned. Don't I know the set he has got into--lousy-looking patriots and that
football chap in the knickerbockers. To tell you the God's truth, Stephen, I thought you'd have more pride than to associate with such canaille. (216)

Ironically, Simon threatens Stephen with the destitute conditions into which he has almost allowed his own family to descend. Later he resorts to a higher authority, Mr Fulham, Stephen's godfather: "With the help of God I won't be long till I let him know what a bloody nice atheist this fellow has turned out" (228). Stephen responds by making Maurice laugh; but while Maurice avoids their father, as noted above, Stephen goes out of his way to discourse "gaily" with him (231). His father has ceased to matter to Stephen--at least consciously. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* reveals much more fully, however, how Stephen's anxieties toward his father are displaced onto other patriarchal institutions; by revising the rest of the family out of his self-portrait and foregrounding the protagonist and the father, Joyce provides a much more coherent study of the significance of the father in the destiny of Stephen Dedalus.
II. Paternoster, Patria, and Paterfamilias: Simon Dedalus in Portrait

Stephen Hero, as we have seen, is—or would have been, had it survived—to some degree a story of family and public life; but in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, readers are not encouraged to direct their attention toward anyone but Stephen or, occasionally, toward the subject of his attention. Thus other characters, including even Simon Dedalus, exist in the novel only insofar as they interact with Stephen; none has much body or depth independent of him. Joyce’s goal here, finally, is neither to depict life in the protagonist’s socioeconomic situation nor to present a multi-generational portrait of the protagonist’s family. Rather, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* is what it claims in its title to be, an introspective portrait of the artist as a young man, with equal emphases placed upon "artist" and "young man," a portrait of Stephen Dedalus with Dublin, the Dedalus family, and the Catholic church all looming in the background.

In *Joyce the Creator*, Sheldon Brivic describes the portrayal of Stephen Dedalus: "*A Portrait of the Artist* shows a young man growing aware of the controls of society and using his knowledge to develop an individual mind" (5). Doing so required Joyce to eliminate the family from his self-portrait, a Luciferan act of rebellion to which he
alludes during the retreat sermon in the third chapter of
\textit{Portrait}:

\begin{quote}
Friend is torn apart from friend, children are
torn from their parents, husbands from their
wives. The poor sinner holds out his arms to
those who were dear to him in this earthly world,
to those whose simple piety perhaps he made a mock
of, to those who counselled him and tried to lead
him on the right path, to a kind brother, to a
loving sister, to the mother and father who loved
him so dearly. (114)
\end{quote}

Joyce himself does not ignore the Dedalus family; he
carefully shows Stephen trying to ignore them, at his own
peril. For Stephen, the controls of society are represented
by, or embodied in, his father, Simon Dedalus--and to a
lesser degree in his mother, who receives a much less
sympathetic treatment here than in \textit{Stephen Hero}. But the
significance of Simon Dedalus in the development of Stephen
is not just as a straw-man representative of patriarchal
oppression.

Ellmann's biography shows a generally more cordial
relationship between John Joyce and his eldest son than is
related in either \textit{Stephen Hero} or \textit{A Portrait of the Artist
as a Young Man}. James, Ellmann tells us, was clearly John
Joyce's favorite, and the son listened attentively to "the
most savory details of Dublin's private life," many of which
found their way into \textit{Ulysses} (Ellmann 44). But John Joyce
the gossip and master storyteller was also John Joyce the
insolvent, occasionally abusive, failed provider: in later life Joyce's confidences went, Ellmann maintains, "to his mother, not to his father, a man (as his sister May remembered) impossible to confide in" (293). Yet after Joyce's self-imposed exile from Ireland, absence seems to have made John and James Joyce fonder of each other:

John Joyce, largely neglected by the other children who could still remember the mistreatment they had suffered from him, loved James more and more with the years, and made out a will leaving everything (if there was anything) to him as the only child who was faithful. (610)

After John Joyce died late in 1931, Joyce commented upon his father's influence in a letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver:

He was the silliest man I ever knew and yet cruelly shrewd. . . . I was very fond of him always, being a sinner myself, and even liked his faults. Hundreds of pages and scores of characters in my books came from him. . . . I got from him his portraits, a waistcoat, a good tenor voice, and an extravagant licentious disposition (out of which, however, the greater part of any talent I may have springs) but, apart from these, something else I cannot define. (Letters I 312)

In A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man the father's influence on the son/artist is a negative one; Simon Dedalus embodies and represents for Stephen, as John Joyce must have for James, all of the repressive institutions that threaten his Icarus-like flight. Furthermore, these institutions are the threats they are to Stephen's priesthood of art
precisely because they are patriarchal: Simon Dedalus is, in addition to being Stephen's biological father, the embodiment of a trinity, the emissary of church and state; Church and State oppress Stephen because they are linked psychologically to the father--paternoster, patria, and paterfamilias. As the most vividly painted member of Stephen's family, Simon Dedalus represents the demands of family, church and state, and is in turn represented by them. The failure of Stephen's repressive strategies of overcoming these false fathers is in large part the subject of the novel.

The narrator's exclusive concentration upon Stephen Dedalus in A Portrait of the Artist presents an initial barrier to the study of the biological father of the protagonist; there is, simply, an absence of the kind of overt, detailed exposition about the family that one finds, for instance, in D. H. Lawrence's Sons and Lovers (or even, for that matter, in Stephen Hero). A further obstacle is the difficulty one encounters in deciding which father of Stephen Dedalus one wants to study, for figurative or surrogate fatherhood is a dominant theme in A Portrait of the Artist and, as will be seen in the next chapter, in Ulysses as well. In A Portrait of the Artist, the figurative cast of fathers arguably includes, in addition to Simon Dedalus, the artificer Daedalus, Lucifer, Byron, the Count of Monte Cristo, the church as represented by the
Jesuits, and the ghost of Parnell. In *Ulysses*, more possible fathers will join the roster, including, most importantly, Shakespeare and Leopold Bloom; the issue will be further complicated by Bloom's own anxieties about paternity; his own dead father and dead son haunt his memory throughout 16 June 1904.

In spite of—or because of—the concentration on false fathers (both in the text and in most of the criticism surrounding it), it may prove enlightening to focus this examination of *A Portrait of the Artist* upon the biological father Simon Dedalus and his influence upon the young artist Stephen. Due to its overriding emphasis on Stephen's role as a potential artist, Joyce's first novel provides fewer details about the protagonist's family and friends than might be expected; nonetheless, readers interested in the portrayal of the biological father are able to formulate concrete impressions about Simon Dedalus without looking back to *Stephen Hero* or forward to *Ulysses*. Stephen's reaction to his biological father is fully detailed in *A Portrait of the Artist*, though, for reasons that will become apparent, Simon Dedalus appears more frequently and fully in *Ulysses*, as a character of Bloom's Dublin, not Stephen's. *A Portrait of the Artist* details Stephen's profound feelings of ambivalence toward the father and, as shall be seen, a compulsion on the part of the artist to sublimate emotional impulses toward the father by transferring them to (and
from) a series of surrogate fathers. *A Portrait of the Artist* is largely the story of Stephen's courtship of and subsequent attempts to reject a series of authorities, including his father and the institutions with which his father is psychologically associated.

Joyce's narrator does not demand that the reader pass immediate judgment on Simon Dedalus and see him purely as a threat, a castrating father. Yet the ambivalence toward the father which permeates Stephen's disposition throughout this novel (as well as *Ulysses*) is already present in the opening paragraphs of *A Portrait of the Artist*. Simon Dedalus has "a hairy face"; this sexually symbolic and perhaps mildly threatening detail, coupled with the fact that the father does not smell as nice as the mother, tempers the otherwise positive impression of the father in the opening of chapter one.

Simon Dedalus's hairy face is first seen in *A Portrait of the Artist" through a glass" (7) and through the eyes of the child Stephen. Dedalus is presented as a storyteller, a mundane artificer, and Stephen, in casting himself as the story's "baby tuckoo," sees himself manifestly as his father's creation. The scene, described impressionistically in emulation of the selective memory of childhood, ends with Stephen responding to the threat of symbolic castration with composition of a poem:
When they were grown up he was going to marry Eileen. He hid under the table. His mother said:
--0, Stephen will apologise.
Dante said:
--0, if not, the eagles will come and pull out his eyes.

Pull out his eyes,
Apologise,
Apologise,
Pull out his eyes.

Apologise,
Pull out his eyes,
Pull out his eyes,
Apologise. (8)

It is notable that, in spite of the mildly threatening description of the father in earlier paragraphs, the threat of castration here comes from Stephen's mother and Dante Riordan. The scene, apparently recalled from Stephen's childhood with remarkable clarity, has all the earmarks of a Freudian "screen memory." While the repressed or screened content is not here revealed, this opening scene broaches many of the themes of Portrait, which, Hugh Kenner argues, "opens amid elaborate counterpoint" (418). Chief among these themes is the threat of blindness and/or castration, linked to the "the father with the hairy face ... the Freudian infantile analogue of God the Father" (Kenner 419). Stephen's desire to marry the protestant Eileen is not only a violation of the laws of God but an infantile usurpation of the father's position of head of family.
Stephen is sent away to school at a young age, and as much as it terrifies him to be divorced from his family, he will never comfortably return to it. Prior to surrendering Stephen to another father--the rector at Clongowes--Simon Dedalus behaves in the expected, fatherly way, slipping Stephen some pocket money and offering some manly advice: "And his father had told him if he wanted anything to write to him and, whatever he did, never to peach on a fellow" (9). The value of Dedalus' advice notwithstanding, it is easy to sympathize if Stephen resents his abandonment; it is also apparent that the child's homesick longing, as he watches his parents drive away, is reserved for his mother, "a nice mother but . . . not so nice when she cried" (9). Her advice to Stephen works at cross-purposes to Simon's, which seems aimed at keeping his son in good graces with his peers: "His mother had told him not to speak with the rough boys in the college. Nice mother!" (9). Stephen does not yet consciously hate or even resent his father, though he is not mentioned in connection with the boy's homesickness; when Stephen is teased about his father's name and station, he feels "sorry for him that he was not a magistrate like the other boys' fathers" (26). But he obviously does not feel the affection for Simon Dedalus that he feels for his mother: "He longed to be at home and lay his head on his mother's lap" (13).
True to the nature of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (and in contrast to *Stephen Hero*), the figure of Stephen’s mother grows more important only in her absence from the action, when she dominates Stephen’s thoughts. Having been removed at a young age from the daily life of his family and thrust into the larger and more threatening world of Clongowes Wood College, Stephen is confronted early on with the possible impropriety of demonstrating affection toward his mother:

--Tell us, Dedalus, do you kiss your mother before you go to bed?  
Stephen answered:  
--I do.  
Wells turned to the other fellows and said:  
--Oh, I say, here’s a fellow says he kisses his mother every night before he goes to bed.  
The other fellows stopped their game and turned round, laughing. Stephen blushed under their eyes and said:  
--I do not.  
Wells said:  
--O, I say, here’s a fellow says he doesn’t kiss his mother before he goes to bed.  
They all laughed again. Stephen tried to laugh with them. He felt his whole body hot and confused in a moment. What was the right answer to the question? (14)

The riddle continues to haunt Stephen: "He still tried to think what was the right answer. Was it right to kiss his mother or wrong to kiss his mother? What did that mean, to kiss?" (15). Stephen’s response to the riddle underscores the Oedipal implications of his confusion: "He tried to
think of Wells's mother but he did not dare to raise his eyes to Wells's face" (14). Wells thus becomes the first and youngest of the father-surrogates who will challenge Stephen throughout *Portrait* and *Ulysses*; he cannot face down the elder boy in a competition over the mother.¹⁹

Stephen's confusion and discomfort over the implications of *amor matris*, a theme which persists into *Ulysses*, is rekindled late in *Portrait* in the form of a startling instance of physical intimacy: Stephen "allow[s] his mother to scrub his neck and root into the folds of his ears and into the interstices at the wings of his nose," because, he says, "it gives [her] pleasure" (175).²⁰

As we have seen in *Stephen Hero*, Stephen, in spite of his love for his mother, will not for long be obsessed with pleasing her; indeed, it seems that, in eventually refusing to do his Easter duty, he goes out of his way to disappoint her. The fact that the mother is more substantial in *Ulysses*, where she is only a ghost haunting Stephen's memory, than she is in *A Portrait of the Artist*, in which she has at least some initial physical reality, suggests that Stephen loves the idea or ideal of his mother more than he loves Mary Dedalus herself—and that this love is tempered by feelings of apprehension.²¹ Even in this first chapter Stephen's thoughts of mother are tinged with a fear of entrapment:
... there were little cottages there and he had seen a woman standing at the halfdoor of a cottage with a child in her arms, as the cars had come past from Sallins. It would be lovely to sleep for one night in that cottage before the fire of smoking turf, in the dark lit by the fire, in the warm dark ... But, O, the road there between the trees was dark! You would be lost in the dark. It made him afraid to think of how it was. (18)

This passage, with its unconscious suggestions of punishment for those who would sleep in the womblike "warm dark," prefigures Davin's story of stopping at a similar cottage in the final chapter; by then, Stephen's negative conception of Irish womanhood is merely reinforced by the story, which nonetheless makes a great impression on him:

The last words of Davin's story sang in his memory and the figure of the woman in the story stood forth, reflected in other figures of the peasant women whom he had seen standing in the doorways at Clane as the college cars drove by, as a type of her race and his own, a batlike soul waking to the consciousness of itself in darkness and secrecy and loneliness and, through the eyes and voice and gesture of a woman without guile, calling the stranger to her bed. (183)

Though he does not explicitly connect his mother with either of these peasant women, the imagery with which they are described does connect them: the young mother of his boyhood revery with his own beloved, living mother, the "batlike soul" with the wraithlike guilt-ghost-mother of Ulysses.
While Mary Dedalus is almost from the outset as insubstantial a presence in _A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man_ as she is in _Ulysses_, the father in _Portrait_ is presented early as an important, three-dimensional character, though he will eventually dwindle in apparent magnitude and significance as the novel's action progresses and the protagonist matures. Mary Dedalus seems to dominate young Stephen's conscious thoughts in the first chapter of _Portrait_, but his dreams and fantasies are peopled with supernatural father-figures, the ghosts that haunt Clongowes and all of Ireland. His dread of "the black dog that walked there at night with eyes as big as carriagelamps," the ghost of a murderer, passes into consideration of another Clongowes ghost, the former owner of Clongowes Wood:

A figure came up the staircase from the hall. He wore the white cloak of a marshal; his face was pale and strange; he held his hand pressed to his side. He looked out of strange eyes at the old servants. They looked at him and saw their master's face and cloak and knew that he had received his deathwound. (19)

The ghost is Maximilian Ulysses, Count von Browne, but it is also Parnell, and in Stephen's fantasy of homecoming, his father as well: "His father was a marshal now, higher than a magistrate" (20). Stephen's dream fulfills two different wishes according to the Freudian model: it elevates his own father above the station of the fathers of his schoolmates, and, by association with the ghostly
marshal, kills him off. Later, in the infirmary, he dreams of the "dead king" Parnell, whom he associates with his father and with himself.

The first chapter of *Portrait of the Artist* is dominated by the Simon Dedalus, and the climactic episode displays his personality in all its complexity. The opening paragraphs depict him in what will prove to be his most attractive aspect; he is a satisfied, cheerful, middle-class nationalist, a slightly pompous gentleman, a father young Stephen can admire. Simon Dedalus pays little attention to Stephen before and during the meal, but he is generally affectionate toward his son. At one point before the meal actually begins, when Stephen laughs nervously at a joke of his father's which he only partially understands, Simon Dedalus's reply, though benevolent, carries the hint of a threat:

> Mr Dedalus put up his eyeglass and, staring down at him, said quietly and kindly:  
> --What are you laughing at, you little puppy, you?  
> (29)

Once again the monocle, associated with Simon Dedalus in the opening paragraphs of the novel even as blindness is associated with castration in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and in Freud, separates the father and the son. Each can view the other only through a glass, and the
father's stare through the glass unconsciously belies the kindness of his words.

As the Christmas dinner commences, there is no doubt that Simon Dedalus is the host and the head of this household. Idolized by his young son and depicted by the narrator in an essentially positive light, Dedalus is talkative, boisterous, and amicable as he passes the gravy. In his son's eyes and the reader's, Dedalus is respectable and likable. Granted, it is he who rekindles the conversation about Parnell which eventually ends in bitter argument, but when Mrs Dedalus attempts to intervene, he is willing to let the matter pass in the name of family peace:

"--Now then, who's for more turkey?" (31).

Ultimately, however, none of the combatants, Simon Dedalus included, proves capable of letting the matter of the Church's betrayal of Parnell pass, and when Mrs Riordan quotes "the language of the Holy Ghost," Dedalus replies, "--And very bad language if you ask me" (32). Sitting quietly and in awe, Stephen has been ignored by the narrator and forgotten by the characters, until uncle Charles cautions Simon Dedalus to mind his words:

--Simon! Simon! said uncle Charles. The boy.

--Yes, yes, said Mr Dedalus. I meant about the . . . I was thinking about the bad language of that railway porter. Well now, that's all right. Here Stephen, show me your plate, old chap. Eat away now. Here. (32)
If Simon Dedalus expects Stephen to forget the sacrilege he has heard at the dinner table this Christmas, he is wrong, as Dante predicts. Stephen, confused and "terrorstricken" (39), is seeing for the first time his unified conception of omnipotent fatherhood divided and turned against itself, biological father against Holy Father, Church against State. The boy has already begun to identify himself with Parnell, as has his father, unknowingly when he associates Parnell's betayers with the rats Stephen fears:

--Sons of bitches! cried Mr Dedalus. When he was down they turned on him to betray him and rend him like rats in a sewer. Lowlived dogs! And they look it! By Christ, they look it! (34)

Stephen's fever-dream of Parnell's death came about as a result of being shoved by Wells into the "square ditch" or sewer, where "a fellow had once seen a big rat jump plop into the scum" (14). Though Stephen will never be more of a Parnellite than he is in the first chapter of Portrait, the treatment the statesman received from Ireland and the Catholic church will help to fuel his passionate (if ultimately ineffectual) rejection of the trinity of paternoster, patria, and paterfamilias. Dante is correct when she warns that "he'll remember all this when he grows up ... the language he heard against God and religion and priests in his own home" (33).
Predictably, young Stephen's political stance is, in the first chapter of *A Portrait of the Artist*, identical to his father's: "He was for Ireland and Parnell and so was his father" (37). As he matures, Stephen will lose patience with his father and with Ireland, "the old sow that eats her farrow" (203); he will try to fly by the net of nationality, to exempt himself from the influence of Ireland. But he can neither forget nor forgive the schism between Ireland and Rome which he has discovered during his first Christmas dinner with the adult members of his family; he is made aware for the first time, too, of his father's emotional vulnerability:

Mr Casey, freeing his arms from his holders, suddenly bowed his head on his hands with a sob of pain.

--Poor Parnell! he cried loudly. My dead king!

He sobbed loudly and bitterly.

Stephen, raising his terrorstricken face, saw that his father's eye's were full of tears. (39)

For Stephen, Simon Dedalus *is* Ireland; when Stephen declares himself "for Ireland and Parnell" (37) he declares his fealty likewise to his father, though he later will repudiate this oath when he vows to become a priest of the eternal imagination.

It must be emphasized that even though Simon Dedalus has grievances against the Catholic church, its patriarchal nature remains intact for Stephen; his victorious act of
rebellion against Father Dolan is also a rebellion against his father's advice "never to peach on a fellow."
Throughout the chapter the instruments of sight--eyes and monocles--have been associated with the instrument of fatherhood, so it is no coincidence that Stephen is punished because his glasses have been broken. The vulnerable, unprotected nakedness of his eyes is emphasized in the scene of confrontation between him and Father Dolan:

Stephen lifted his eyes in wonder and saw for a moment Father Dolan's whitegrey not young face, his baldy whitegrey head with fluff at the sides of it, the steel rims of his spectacles and his nocoloured eyes looking through the glasses. (50)

The punishment doled out by the prefect of studies is described in terms clearly connotative of castration: "A hot burning stinging tingling blow like the loud crack of a broken stick made his trembling hand crumple together like a leaf in the fire" (50).²⁶

Father Dolan's misjudgment of the situation causes another conflict in Stephen's mind; it is paradoxical to him that Dolan could punish him wrongly: "The prefect of studies was a priest but that was cruel and unfair" (52). His initial reaction is to wish for a looking-glass to see if perhaps "there was something in his face which made him look like a schemer" (53); it would be easier to believe that he is guilty than to believe Father Dolan is wrong. Finally, however, he listens to his historical, mythological
fathers from "Richmal Magnall’s Questions" and "Peter Parley’s Tales about Greece and Rome" and defies the more immediate Father Dolan—and in doing so, he defies also his father’s command to never peach on a fellow.

In the first chapter, thus, Simon Dedalus introduces his son to Ireland, his homeland, one of the patriarchal institutions Stephen must eventually defeat if he is to become an artist. Although the presence of the Catholic church begins to be felt in this chapter, the unpleasant atmosphere at Clongowes is due as much to Stephen’s homesickness and awkwardness as to any disagreement with orthodox Catholic doctrine. Already, however, the impossibility of Stephen serving all of his contradictory fathers has become apparent. He has learned from Simon Dedalus that the priests are fallible, yet to defend himself against them (as even Parnell could not), he must defy another of his father’s strictures. Stephen’s appeal to his literary fathers is, though he does not know it, an appeal to Daedalus, the father of his family romance. In the early chapters of *Portrait*, he finds his guidance in the characters of history and romance; beginning in the fourth chapter, he will look to the artificer Daedalus himself.

In the second chapter, Stephen becomes personally aware for the first time of the oppressive nature of the doctrine of the Catholic church itself (as opposed to the tyranny of individual priests within it), another patriarchal body
which, like the Irish nation, stands as a barrier to the
development of his artistic temperament; again, it is his
father who introduces him to the new influence, after
Stephen has been removed from Clongowes because "his father
was in trouble" financially (64):

One evening his father came home full of news
which kept his tongue busy all through dinner.
Stephen had been waiting his father's return for
there had been mutton hash that day and he knew
that his father would make him dip his bread in
the gravy. (71)

The action of dipping the bread into the gravy brings to
mind the sacrament of Holy Communion; it is appropriate that
Dedalus "makes" his son partake of this mock sacrament,
because his exciting news is that he has found Stephen a
place in Belvedere, another Jesuit school. Already, Stephen
has distanced himself from devout Catholicism; during visits
to the chapel with uncle Charles "Stephen knelt at his side
respecting, though he did not share, his piety" (62). After
announcing his news about Belvedere to Stephen and his
brother Maurice, Dedalus once again screws his monocle into
his eye and peers through it, performing for the third time
in the novel the one-eyed, paternal gesture which
anticipates the monocular theme of the Cyclops chapter in
Ulysses. 27

At this point in the story, Simon Dedalus' ever-growing
insolvency is evidenced by the family's removal to cheaper
quarters, though they apparently have not yet descended completely into poverty. The father's drunkenness is also suggested:

Stephen sat on a footstool beside his father listening to along and incoherent monologue. He understood little or nothing of it at first but he became slowly aware that his father had enemies and that some fight was going to take place. He felt too that he was being enlisted for the fight, that some duty was being laid upon his shoulders. (66)

The frequent relocation, each time to a shabbier dwelling, is analogous to the dwindling of Simon Dedalus as a significant figure in Stephen's life, and, therefore, as a character in A Portrait of the Artist. Simon Dedalus' influence as a father decreases, as does the respect he receives from his children, in direct proportion to his ability to provide for his family. Even as early as the passage quoted here, Stephen senses that Simon is passing onto him the responsibility for maintaining the family.

At school Stephen is painfully aware of his father's poverty and lack of title; Stephen's embarrassment surfaces early in chapter one, when Nasty Roche interrogates him about his name:

--What is your father?
Stephen had answered:
--A gentleman.
Then Nasty Roche had asked:
--Is he a magistrate? (9)
He may not be a magistrate, and he may not be a provider for his family, but he is, in his own words, "not dead yet, sonny. No, by the Lord Jesus (God forgive me) nor half dead" (66). Indeed he is still capable of robbing Stephen of his victory over Father Dolan by joking about it at the table:

"Mr Dedalus imitated the mincing nasal tone of the provincial:

--Father Dolan and I, when I told them all at dinner, Father Dolan and I had a great laugh over it. You better mind yourself, Father Dolan, said I, or young Dedalus will send you up for twice nine. We had a famous laugh together over it. Ha! Ha! Ha! (72)"

The section ends with the repetition of Dedalus's words, giving the passage the feeling of an epiphany: it is at this moment, arguably, that Stephen separates finally from his father.²⁸

Upon Stephen's return to school, "any allusion made to his father by a fellow or by a master put his calm to rout in a moment" (76). Now more aware of the family's difficult financial situation, Stephen has begun to blame his father. Heron's observation that Simon Dedalus, who has attended the pageant with the girl young Stephen is interested in, "was staring at her through that eyeglass of his for all he was worth" (77) also suggests that Stephen might see his father as romantic rival for the affections of the girl, E.C. The passage shows Stephen's personality attempting to assert
itself apart from his father's, and it demonstrates likewise that he no longer stands in awe of him. He knows that he must free himself from the influence of his father and whatever patriarchal social entities he represents:

. . . he had heard about him the constant voices of his father and of his masters, urging him to be a gentleman above all things and urging him to be a good catholic above all things. . . . and when the movement towards national revival had begun to be felt in the college yet another voice had bidden him to be true to his country and help to raise up her fallen language and tradition. In the profane world, as he foresaw, a worldly voice would bid him raise up his father's fallen state by his labours . . . . He gave [the voices] ear only for a time but he was happy only when he was far from them, beyond their call, alone or in the company of phantasmal comrades. (83-84)

Already aware, at least unconsciously, that he must eventually choose between the mundane concerns of Catholic Ireland and the higher calling of art, Stephen is feeling the tugs of the various nets which would keep him from soaring with the imagined real father of his family romance, the artificer Daedalus. The voices which call him back, the superego--his family's voice, his country's voice and his church's voice--all speak through the mouth of Simon Dedalus. The "likeness between his father's mind and that of this smiling well-dressed priest" makes Stephen "aware of some desecration of the priest's office" (84). This insight underscores the complex relationship between the actual
father and the institutions in Stephen's psyche; one person of the Trinity cannot be separated from the others.

The father-and-son trip to Cork accentuates Stephen's loss of sympathy and patience with his father. Stephen seems newly distrustful of any demonstration of sentimentality or affection from his father; he listens coldly and "without sympathy to his father's evocation of Cork and of scenes of his youth" (87). For the first time in the novel, Simon Dedalus is clearly seen to be a heavy drinker; during the train ride he drinks frequently from his pocketflask. Insobriety seems to be indicative of Dedalus's failure as a husband and father, and it is significant that this first elucidation of Simon Dedalus's alcohol problem occurs as he is preparing to sell some of his family assets.

Probably for the first time, Stephen is seeing his father neither in the context of the Dedalus family, where he is the authority, nor in the context of Dublin, where he is still respected. Dedalus now stands alone before his son within the context of the world at large; he is a man like other men. Though Stephen cannot help but respect his father's voice--"That's much prettier than any of your other come-all-yous," he says of his father's song (88)--the sense of disillusionment and embarrassment with Simon which was first suggested in the pageant scene is reinforced during the Cork trip. "He wondered how his father, whom he knew
for a shrewd suspicious man, could be duped by the servile manners of the porter" (89).

When Dedalus, Stephen, and the porter visit the anatomy theatre to look for the father's (and thus the son's) initials carved in a desk, Stephen seems to fully realize for the first time yet another aspect of his father. "The word Foetus cut several times in the dark stained wood" summons to Stephen's mind a "vision of their life, which his father's words had been powerless to evoke": "he seemed to feel the absent students of the college about him and to shrink from their company" (89). The juvenile carnality of the carved "Foetus" jogs Stephen into a fuller awareness of his father's sexuality, and it distresses him: "He hurried down the steps of the theatre so as to be as far away from the vision as he could be and, peering closely at his father's initials, hid his flushed face" (90). Stephen's epiphany, his disproportionate reaction to the association between his father and the dirty-minded students (and therefore himself) bears the earmarks of a violated taboo, a primal scene. He has seen his father exposed.29

If Stephen's earlier conversation with Heron and his friend ("Your governor was staring at her through that eyeglass of his for all he was worth") is Stephen's initial realization of the sexual rival his father could represent, his suspicions are reinforced by what he learns about Simon Dedalus on their trip to Cork. Although Mary Dedalus is not
explicitly mentioned as the object of a competition between father and son for the mother's affection in *A Portrait of the Artist*, an oedipal rivalry is implied in the passages which illustrate Stephen's growing adolescent preoccupation with his father's sexuality.

Simon Dedalus's flippant remark that he doesn't know whether Stephen is "his father's son" and Johnny Cashman's statement to Stephen that his father "was the boldest flirt in the city of Cork in his day" (94) reinforce Stephen's growing awareness of his father's sexual aspect and suggest the possibility of promiscuity on the part of both of his parents--even, perhaps, as they suggest to Stephen for the first time the reality of his parents' sexual relationship. "Wearyed and dejected by his father's voice" (92), Stephen is disoriented; his very identity has been called into question:

---I am Stephen Dedalus. I am walking beside my father whose name is Simon Dedalus. We are in Cork, in Ireland. Cork is a city. Our room is in the Victoria hotel. Victoria and Stephen and Simon. Simon and Stephen and Victoria. Names. (92)

The threat of oedipal competition between father and son, implied by suggestions of Simon Dedalus's onetime virility, is amplified by a virtual challenge from the elder Dedalus:

There's that son of mine not half my age and I'm a better man than he is any day of the week.
--Draw it mild now, Dedalus. I think it's time for you to take a back seat, said the gentleman who had spoken before.

--No, by God! asserted Mr Dedalus. I'll sing a tenor song against him or I'll vault a fivebarred gate against him or I'll run with him after the hounds across the country . . .

--But he'll beat you here, said the little old man, tapping his forehead and raising his glass to drain it.

--Well, I hope he'll be as good a man as his father. That's all I can say, said Mr Dedalus. (95)

Watching his father and his father's friends toast their glorious past, Stephen sees himself almost as a member of a different species: "No life or youth stirred in him as it had stirred in them. He had known neither the pleasure of companionship with others nor the vigour of rude male health nor filial piety" (95-96). The qualities Stephen perceives to be present in his father and his father's cronies, camaraderie and youthful abandon, are absent in him. Stephen is becoming conscious of himself as separate from the rest of mankind, and he uses his father as a ruler against which he may measure his own humanity and manhood.

As the Corkman predicts, Stephen is in at least one sense able to "beat" his father using his brain. The essay prize he wins constitutes, for a time, the Dedalus family's chief income; thus Stephen takes the place his father has long since vacated as his family's main provider. This episode is the last in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man in which Simon Dedalus is a significant participant, but
signs of his failure to provide for his family abound in the latter chapters as well. Stephen, pondering the possibility of entering the priesthood, returns to his squalid home to find his family preparing to move again, because, as his sister (unnamed here) informs him, "the boro landboro lordboro willboro putboro usboro outboro" (163). Stephen, the would-be son of Daedalus, believes himself to be separate from his mother and siblings, "hardly of the one blood with them" but related "rather in the mystical kinship of fosterage, fosterchild and fosterbrother" (98). Yet, like it or not, Stephen is still his father's son: he quickly squanders his essay prize, and the second chapter closes with him yielding to the temptations of the flesh, the carnal pleasures that revolted him in connection with his father and mother.

After the Cork episode, Simon Dedalus all but disappears from the visible, external action of Portrait. But fatherhood is an important concept in the third chapter, most of which is occupied by the retreat sermon. God the father, pater noster, becomes for Stephen an agent of punishment, an externalization of Stephen's guilt over his repeated sins with the prostitutes; he appeals to, but ultimately has no faith in, the intercessory powers of Mary. Towards the paternal God Stephen feels not love, but fear:

A certain pride, a certain awe, withheld him from offering to God even one prayer at night though he
knew it was in God's power to take away his life while he slept and hurl his soul hellward ere he could beg for mercy. His pride in his own sin, his loveless awe of God, told him that his offence was too grievous to be atoned for in whole or in part by a false homage to the Allseeing and Allknowing. (104)

His attitude toward Mary, his mother's namesake, is quite different; to her he can make his devotions: "The falsehood of his position did not pain him" (104). His attraction to Mary is romantic in its conception (in apparent contrast to his attraction to the prostitutes he frequents):

The glories of Mary held his soul captive: spikenard and myrrh and frankincense, symbolising the preciousness of God's gifts to her soul, rich garments, the preciousness of God's gifts to her soul, rich garments, symbolising her royal lineage, her emblems, the lateflowering plant and lateblossoming tree, symbolising the agelong gradual growth of her cultus among men. (104)

It is not coincidental that the description of Mary and Stephen's devotion to her is, like the description of E.C. in the previous chapter and the description of Mangan's sister in "Araby," only partial: it focuses on the peripheral trappings and vestments. Stephen does not permit himself to consider Mary's "glories"--only the veils that hide them, the symbols that represent them. When he reads the lesson about her, he does so "in a veiled voice, lulling his conscience to its music" (105). The unconscious motivation behind this particular taboo, the desire which is
being resisted, is evident: "His sin, which had covered him from the sight of God, had led him nearer to the refuge of sinners," meaning Mary (105). Throughout *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* as throughout Catholicism, Mary is associated with motherhood; Stephen’s sins, fornication chief among them, lead him closer to Mary:

If ever his soul, reentering her dwelling shyly after the frenzy of his body’s lust had spent itself, was turned towards her whose emblem is the morning star, bright and musical, telling of heaven and-infusing peace, it was when her names were murmured softly by lips whereon there still lingered foul and shameful words, the savour itself of a lewd kiss. (105)

Unconsciously, then, the sin of which Stephen is guilty is a kind of incest by association; he seems to be at least partially aware of it himself as it pertains to Mary, but he stops short of associating his sin consciously with his own mother. The punishment with which sinners are threatened during the retreat sermon, however, makes clear the oedipal nature of sin itself as a crime against the Father:

Lucifer, we are told, was a son of the morning, a radiant and mighty angel; yet he fell: he fell and there fell with him a third part of the host of heaven: he fell and was hurled with his rebellious angels into hell. What his sin was we cannot say. Theologians consider that it was the sin of pride, the sinful thought conceived in an instant: *non serviam*: *I will not serve*. (117)
This is precisely why the sermon has such an effect on Stephen; he fully expects his sins with/against the Mother to be punished by the Father. He has been the bad son Lucifer (in contrast to the good son Adam, whom the serpent eventually subverts with temptations of the flesh). When Stephen admits his guilt, he begs Mary, not God the father, for mercy: "O Mary, refuge of sinners, intercede for him! O Virgin undefiled, save him from the gulf of death!" (125).

Stephen's confession to the priest/father is the confession of a prodigal son, and he is joyously grateful that God has allowed him to return to a state of grace. He believes himself capable of obeying the Law of the Father, of ignoring the call of his "old father, old artificer," Daedalus: "Another life! A life of grace and virtue and happiness! It was true. It was not a dream from which he would wake. The past was past" (146). In the next chapter, however, the negative effects of repression upon the artistic temperament are explored, and Stephen ultimately eschews the repressive lifestyle of Roman Catholic priesthood and attempts to embrace his vocation to the secular priesthood of art.

The fourth chapter begins with an exploration of the psychological process of repression; the carnal excesses of lust which Stephen confessed in the previous chapter have become spiritual "ejaculations and prayers" by means of which "he stored up ungrudgingly for the souls in purgatory
centuries of days and quarantines and years" (147). His procreative urges thus suppressed, he now questions his spiritual virility, fearful that "his penance might avail no more than a drop of moisture" (147). Stephen even attempts to mortify his senses, subjecting himself to unpleasant sounds, tastes, and smells: "His eyes shunned every encounter with the eyes of women" (150).

Although the narrator says that Stephen "had no temptations to sin mortally," the side-effects of such repressive self-control are predictable enough:

It surprised him however to find that at the end of his course of intricate piety and self-restraint he was so easily at the mercy of childish and unworthy imperfections. His prayers and fasts availed him little for the suppression of anger at hearing his mother sneeze or at being disturbed in his devotions. (151)

In this irritation Stephen detects the irrational behavior of his schoolmasters, the fathers of his youth. The attraction such piety holds for Stephen is clearly that of control, for he tempts himself with failure:

This idea of surrender had a perilous attraction for his mind now that he felt his soul beset once again by the insistent voices of the flesh which began to murmur to him again during his prayers and meditations. It gave him an intense sense of power to know that he could by a single act of consent, in a moment of thought, undo all that he had done. (152)
During Stephen's interview with the director of his school, the noose-wielding priest tempts him further with the mysterious powers of the priesthood: "No angel or archangel in heaven, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself has the power of a priest of God. . . . What an awful power, Stephen!" (158). The priest echoes Stephen's own fantasies of holy Fatherhood, in which he considers the influences of his spiritual fathers: "In that dim life which had lived through his musings he had assumed the voices and gestures which he had noted with various priests" (158).

But the line of reasoning which the priest has introduced to Stephen eventually reveals itself for the false promise that it is. The "secret knowledge" Stephen so craves includes "the sin of Simon Magus" and the "sinful longings . . . murmured into his ears in the confessional under the shame of a darkened chapel by the lips of women and of girls" (159). Sinless, Stephen will have power over the sins of the father ("Simony") and the sins of women--more power, even, than Mary herself.32

But hardly has Stephen, bridelike, tried out a new name--"The Reverend Stephen Dedalus, S.J." (161)--before he realizes that he cannot live up to the moral rigours of the priesthood: "His destiny was to be elusive of social or religious orders. . . . He was destined to learn his own wisdom apart from others or to learn the wisdom of others himself wandering among the snares of the world" (162).
Surprisingly, the awareness that he will fall, that he is not equal to the priest's challenge, comes to Stephen easily and does not much bother him: "He smiled to think that it was this disorder, the misrule and confusion of his father's house and the stagnation of vegetable life, which was to win the day in his soul" (162).

Stephen's reaction to his decision against the priesthood does not, however, seem to be an immediate cause for celebration, because upon arriving home he learns that once again his family is being evicted; "his father's house," which "won the day" in keeping him out of the clergy, is truly not his father's at all, and Stephen pities his unnamed siblings in their poverty. If Simon Dedalus seems to neglect his other children, though, he still does what he can to help his eldest son get an education; in the next section he uses his connections to "find out for him something about the university" (164). Stephen, meanwhile, paces back and forth between Byron's publichouse, suggestive of a Luciferian aspiration toward art, and Clontarf Chapel and the towering social edifice it represents. He times the fall of his steps "to the fall of verses"--presumably secular verses, not the verses of hymns--and sets off "abruptly for the Bull, walking rapidly lest his father's shrill whistle might call him back" from what will prove to be the climactic epiphany of the novel (164).
Having escaped Simon for the moment, Stephen turns his thoughts to his mother and her jealous hostility—perhaps etymologically motivated—to the idea of his matriculation. Stephen's extreme devotion to his mother, introduced as a theme in the first chapter, now apparently dissipates:

A dim antagonism gathered force within him and darkened his mind as a cloud against her disloyalty: and when it passed, cloudlike, leaving his mind serene and dutiful towards her again, he was made aware dimly and without regret of a first noiseless sundering of their lives.

On the surface, Stephen's escape from maternal influence seems painless—but as will be seen in Ulysses, this first sundering of Stephen's life from his mother's will by no means be permanent. That he can even perceive her to have been disloyal to him is, of course, indicative of his change in attitude: he is casting himself in a position of some power. Unconsciously he is Parnell, and she, like Dante Riordan in the Christmas dinner scene, is the disenchanted follower, the female betrayer.

Having put his mother's aspirations behind him at least temporarily, Stephen considers his decision to pursue his secular vocation to the priesthood of art. This new direction seems to have taken him by surprise: "All through his boyhood he had mused upon that which he had so often thought to be his destiny and when the moment had come for
him to obey the call he had turned aside, obeying a wayward instinct" (165). This wayward instinct—the inclination toward the secular, even profane, life—in fact has its origin in the very fervence with which Stephen has attempted to repress his instincts after his Pauline conversion. The concluding section of the chapter portrays almost allegorically the process by which Stephen attempts to understand and justify his decision to pursue a secular life. When he passes the "squad of christian brothers" he begins to feel shame, but he rejects his sympathy with them as "idle" (166) and immediately recalls aloud (albeit incorrectly) a line of verse: "—A day of dappled seaborne clouds" (166). He is waiting for a supernatural voice to beckon him, but so far he waits in vain. Then, contemplating further the clouds' westward march, he hears first a receding music, "and from each receding trail of nebulous music there fell always one longdrawn calling note, piercing like a star the dusk of silence. Again! Again! Again! A voice from beyond the world was calling" (167).

Unfortunately the supernatural voice Stephen strains to hear is drowned out by the voices of Stephen's wet, naked friends as they decline his name. Even as he earlier realized his separation from his mother, and from the christian brothers, he now comes to believe that he is fundamentally different from his peers: "Perhaps they had taken refuge in number and noise from the secret dread in
their souls. But he, apart from them and in silence, remembered in what dread he stood of the mystery of his own body" (168). As they pun upon his "strange name," Stephen realizes that it is itself a prophecy:

Now, at the name of the fabulous artificer, he seemed to hear the noise of dim waves and to see a winged form flying above the waves and slowly climbing the air. What did it mean? Was it a quaint device opening a page of some medieval book of prophecies and symbols, a hawklike man flying sunward above the sea, a prophecy of the end he had been born to serve and had been following through the mists of childhood and boyhood, a symbol of the artist forging anew in his workshop out of the sluggish matter of the earth a new soaring impalpable imperishable being? (168-169)

This apparent realization of his destiny is truly epiphanic; there is little apparent reason for Stephen to interpret the banter of his bathing friends as a supernatural sign that he is the son of Daedalus. Psychologically, however, the epiphany is in keeping with Stephen's personality. Even as he proclaims freedom from his family and from the church, he wants to subject himself to another father-imago, Daedalus—a spiritual father of his own conception, perhaps, but one which he imagines to have external reality and authority. His will to reject Pater, patria, and paterfamilias needs Daedalus, the father of his family romance, to support it.

When, at the novel's climax, he espies the wading swan-girl on the strand, he responds immediately—but inwardly--to her invitation:
Her eyes had called to him and his soul had leaped at the call. To live, to err, to fall, to triumph, to recreate life out of life! A wild angel had appeared to him, the angel of mortal youth and beauty, an envoy from the fair courts of life, to throw open before him in an instant of ecstasy the gates of all the ways of error and glory. On and on and on and on! (172)

But what, exactly, is he responding to? Certainly profane desire plays a significant part in his celebration of the anonymous girl; she somehow represents his reward for obeying the call of his spiritual father, even as he ignores the "shrill whistle" of Simon Dedalus. Ultimately, this apparent change in Stephen's life is nothing more than a rephrasing of the conflict which has driven his entire life, the conflict of generations. In the previous chapter, the conflict was couched in the metaphor of the Holy family, and here it is presented in more primitive terms: "He felt above him the vast indifferent dome and the calm processes of the heavenly bodies; and the earth beneath him, the earth that had borne him, had taken him to her breast" (172). In both cases, though, the conflict is borne out of a desire to merge with the maternal in defiance of the father, here the "vast indifferent dome" of the sky.

In the fifth chapter, resolute, Stephen prepares to fly forever past the nets of nationality, language, and religion; as he readies himself for emigration to the continent, he demonstrates his apparent immunity to the grip of the patriarchal social constructs which once oppressed
him. Simon Dedalus, who loomed so large in chapter one, has been reduced to a whistle and a shout from the head of the stairs (just as Stephen will describe God, in *Ulysses*, as "a shout in the street"). Stephen also shrugs off Mary Dedalus's Dante-Riordanesque warning that he will "live to rue the day" he enrolled in the university as he leaves, "smiling and kissing the tips of his fingers in adieu" (175).

"His father's whistle, his mother's mutterings, the screech of an unseen maniac were to him now so many voices offending and threatening to humble the pride of his youth" (176). These are the same voices upon which Stephen reflected after his school's pageant in the second chapter, the patriarchal urgings of manhood, Catholicism, and nationalism; added to these are the mother's protestations and their parodic exaggerations, the screams of the mad nuns. Conventional psychoanalytical readings of *Portrait* observe--correctly--that Stephen transfers the oedipal ambivalence he feels toward his father onto these patriarchal institutions; but in doing so they downplay or ignore altogether the subsequent importance of Simon Dedalus in the novel. The biological father, they suggest, is significant only insofar as he represents barriers to the maturation of Stephen's aesthetic sensibilities: "When the soul of a man is born in this country there are nets flung at it to hold it back from flight. You talk to me of
nationality, language, religion. I shall try to fly by those nets" (203). It can be argued, however, that Stephen's "nets" are as significant as they are to him and to Portrait precisely because they are where Stephen has stored the ambivalence and anxiety his father has excited in him. The relationship between the repressed material and the "screen" material is complicated and reciprocal. The connections among the trinity of Pater, patria, and paterfamilias is as intricate as the relationship among the persons of the Holy Trinity; Stephen's attitude toward one affects and is affected by his feelings toward the other two. This complex relationship is evidenced in the fifth chapter by Stephen's confrontations with his teacher and friends--themselves false fathers and brothers--and the oppressive entities he makes them represent.

Having convinced himself that he has outgrown the influence of his actual mother and father, Stephen sets out consciously to confront representatives of nationality, language, and religion and to defeat them in a sort of ritual assertion of self-assurance. The nationalist Davin, judged approvingly by Simon Dedalus to have "a good honest eye" (250), champions patriotism. Stephen remains unmoved by his friend's peasant fervor and points out to Davin the hypocrisy inherent in swearing his allegiance simultaneously to the Fenians and the pacifists. Perhaps because of Davin's provincial ways, Stephen seems less confrontational
with him than with his other friends. An outsider like Stephen, Davin seems also to share Stephen's confusions about relations with real and symbolic mothers. It is he who tells the story of the forward countrywoman (whom Stephen, as we have seen, associates unconsciously with his own mother); and his ignorance of the ways of the university is expressed in terms of mothers and fathers. Stephen recalls:

The first morning we met you asked me to show you the way to the matriculation class, putting a very strong stress on the first syllable. You remember? Then you used to address the jesuits as father, you remember? I ask myself about you: Is he as innocent as his speech? (202)

Stephen is kind to the nationalist Davin, but he must, with silence, exile, and cunning, demonstrate his superiority to nationalism.

As throughout Portrait, Stephen is still wrestling with issues of paternity; now, however, the battlefield is aesthetics. His dominion over language is demonstrated in his conversation with the dean of studies, during which he confuses the dean by his use of the words "detain" and "tundish." The significance of this event is underscored by Stephen's diary entry of 13 April:

That tundish has been on my mind for a long time. I looked it up and find it English and good old blunt English too. Damn the dean of studies and his funnel! What did he come here for to teach us
Stephen's anger at the dean of studies seems disproportionate to the jesuit's offense; to what, exactly, is Stephen reacting so violently? First, the dean of studies is English; even though Stephen mocks Sinn Fein, his sympathies are resolutely anti-imperialist— in *Ulysses* he is knocked down for resolving to "kill the priest and the king" (15.4437). Second, Stephen is disappointed in the dean's failure to understand Stephen's ideas; he listens with less attention than do most of Stephen's other auditors in this chapter.

Though the climax of chapter four suggested that Stephen had put behind him once and for all the net of religion, he also takes up the subject again with Cranly, offering him an after-the-fact account of the confrontation with his mother over his refusal to make his Easter duty. It should be noted here that although we have examined the scene in *Stephen Hero* in which Stephen tells his mother he is no longer a believer, we cannot assume that Stephen alludes to a conversation which ran exactly as did the one in the first-draft version; all the reader knows is what Stephen tells Cranly (though nothing in Stephen's retelling of the incident substantially contradicts the version in *Stephen Hero*). Stephen stresses to Cranly that he refuses to communicate, not because he does not believe the truth of
his religion, but precisely because he does feel and fear "that the host ... may be the body and blood of the son of God and not a wafer of bread" (243). In his refusal to prostrate himself before the Catholic God which he actually suspects may exist in some form, Stephen explains his reason for trying to avoid the influences of his father and his nationality as well as his religion: "I fear . . . the chemical action which would be set up in my soul by a false homage to a symbol behind which are massed twenty centuries of authority and veneration" (243). Stephen is trying to be Lucifer, and he repeats Lucifer's words: "--I will not serve" (239).

Cranly's initial response is an appeal not to Stephen's religious sensibilities, but to his loyalty to his mother--the appeal of the paterfamilias. In fact Stephen seems to take a more prudish attitude toward religion than Cranly does: "You cannot discuss this question with your mouth full of chewed fig" (239). But Stephen cannot answer a simple question, a question quite similar to the one Wells put to him at Clongowes. When Cranly asks "Do you love your mother?" Stephen can only reply: "--I don't know what your words mean" (240). By quitting the Church Stephen is in some sense sacrificing a socially acceptable medium for amor matris.

The vows Stephen makes as he enlists in the priesthood of the eternal imagination are largely vows of negation.
Remembering "the language with which the priests and the priest's pawns broke Parnell's heart and hounded him into his grave" (33-34), Stephen ultimately rejects language, priests, and even Ireland, the sod into which Parnell was laid:

You have asked me what I would do and what I would not do. I will tell you what I will do and what I will not do. I will not serve that in which I no longer believe whether it call itself my home, my fatherland or my church: and I will try to express myself in some of life or art as freely as I can and as wholly as I can, using for my defence the only arms I allow myself to use—silence, exile, and cunning. (246-247)

Cranly's next appeal is even more personal. He asks Stephen if he is truly willing to give up all intimate human contact: "--Alone, quite alone. You have no fear of that. And you know what that word means? Not only to be separate from all others but to have not even one friend" (247). It becomes evident that Cranly is daring Stephen to reject him as a friend, and Stephen declares his willingness to "take the risk." Cranly continues:

--And not to have any one person, Cranly said, who would be more than a friend, more even than the noblest and truest friend a man ever had. His words seemed to have struck some deep chord in his own nature. Had he spoken of himself, of himself as he was or wished to be? Stephen watched his face for some moments in silence. A cold sadness was there. He had spoken of himself, of his own loneliness which he feared.
--Of whom are you speaking? Stephen asked at length. Cranly did not answer. (247)

This is the last "noiseless sundering" of the novel, in which Stephen rejects Cranly's frank offer of love; it is also the end of third-person narration. The rest of the story is told through Stephen's diary. The change in perspective reveals that Stephen is not as cold and resolute as he would have Cranly, his mother, or even himself believe. Stephen summarizes the above exchange: "Attacked me on the score of love for one's mother. Tried to imagine his mother: cannot" (247-248). While Stephen relates the conversation in a matter-of-fact way, his attempt to imagine Cranly's mother is, in fact, a self-empowering strategy—the same one he employed to get the best of the bully Wells in the first chapter. Cranly's father Stephen casts as a latter-day John the Baptist. That Stephen dwells so much on Cranly's objections is indicative of the difficulty he is experiencing in breaking away from the last representatives of Pater, patria, and paterfamilias; his failure to record the end of their conversation, in which Cranly seems to offer to be "more than a friend," is likewise a telling suppression. Stephen suspects a relationship between Cranly and Emma; the object of his jealousy is unclear.

* A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* shows the aspiring artist attempting to free himself from the father
as well as the patriarchal social and political institutions which he believes threaten to keep him from maturing as an artist. The ending, however, leaves the success of Stephen's flight unresolved. Eschewing for the moment the hindsight afforded by *Ulysses*, there is still an abundance of evidence within the novel pointing to an ironic reading of the ending. As Philip F. Herring observes in *Joyce's Uncertainty Principle*, each chapter ends with a resolution on Stephen's part, a resolution which is nullified early in the next chapter (172). This cycle, Herring asserts, reinforces the irony of the fifth chapter, an irony which is also apparent in the very exuberance of the language of the final paragraphs:

Welcome, O life! I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race.

... Old father, old artificer, stand me now and ever in good stead. (253)

Stephen, having ostensibly escaped the influence of his biological father and the suffocating social institutions he represents and is represented by, now surrenders himself to the "old artificer" Daedalus, in part the incarnation of his formidable literary precursors. But deciding to ignore by force of will the influence of *Pater, patria, and paterfamilias* is not enough, as the Icarus-like failure of Stephen's flight in *Ulysses* demonstrates. His father-imago
Daedalus is just that--a self-constructed ideal. Simon Dedalus is an important figure in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in part because of his association with the entities that seem to want Stephen to fail as an artist. But these entities--Church, State, and family--owe their power over Stephen to their patriarchal nature. In *Ulysses*, we will see the degree to which Simon Dedalus and the concept of paternity still matter to Stephen and to his creator Joyce. For although the focus moves from Stephen to Bloom, the issue of paternity--and the unconscious acts of repression which surround paternity throughout Joyce's works--remains central.
"The Sisters," "Eveline," and "After the Race" were published in the *Irish Homestead* late in 1904. "The Dead," the last story in order of composition as well as the last in *Dubliners*, was completed in 1907.

In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* Joyce shortened his character's surname to the less improbable "Dedalus." I will use that form when discussing the completed novel, and "Daedalus" when discussing *Stephen Hero*.

John Paul Riquelme states the problem well in "Stephen Hero, *Dubliners*, and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*: Styles of Realism and Fantasy":

Joyce's frequent intimate renderings of his characters' thinking . . . also make it hard to distinguish the narrator's perspective from the character's thoughts even though the narration occurs in the third person. Since Joyce is writing fiction and not pure autobiography, it is important not to identify the real author in any absolute way with the young artist character; nevertheless, the texts frequently encourage us to consider the alignment (104).


For discussions of the place of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* in the history of the *bildungsroman*, see Maurice Beebe, *Ivory Towers and Sacred Founts: The Artist as Hero in Fiction from Goethe to Joyce*; see also Jerome Hamilton Buckley, *Season of Youth: The Bildungsroman from Dickens to Golding*.

The fragment, which is cognate to parts of two chapters of *Portrait*, is in fact longer than the entire finished novel.

In *Portrait*, Stephen thinks about Emma in the audience of his school pageant, sitting next to his father. His suppression of her actual face is almost fetishistic:

She was sitting there among the others perhaps waiting for him to appear. He tried to recall her
appearance but could not. He could remember only that she had worn a shawl about her head like a cowl and that her dark eyes had invited him and unnerved him. (82)

8 Aside from changing the names of the characters and adding some brief narrative links, Joyce preserved the exact text of the epiphany in Stephen Hero. In his Complete Dublin Diary, Stanislaus Joyce describes Georgie in affectionate detail; likewise James Joyce, who named his son Giorgio, was apparently much closer to his younger brother than is Stephen to his sister Isabel in Stephen Hero.

9 A minor, though suggestive, instance of James Joyce’s unacknowledged literary borrowing from his brother is mentioned in Ellmann’s biography:

Stanislaus describes how one day, passing a photographer’s studio with his brother and noting the embonpoint of the ladies pictured in the window, he remarked, "It’s like the briskets hanging in a butcher’s shop." James made the remark to Cosgrave the next day as if it were his own. (134)

10 Stanislaus proposed this title when Joyce was composing his autobiographical essay, "A Portrait of the Artist." According to Ellmann, Joyce wrote the essay in one day: January 7, 1904. It was rejected by the editors of the journal Dana and subsequently rewritten as Stephen Hero and—ten years later—as A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man (Ellmann 144).


12 The Dublin Diary chronicles Stanislaus’s occasionally vocal rebellion against the Catholic church. In an entry dated 31 July 1904, he writes:

I think all my confessions when in the Church must have been bad, as in none of them was I ever revealed to myself.

I am trying to be spiritually free. (47)
By December, his fledgling apostasy has apparently matured:

I can answer them no questions, but I do not believe their blessed fable of Jesus Christ nor in the Church they have built out of it, and though I am quite without principles and accuse myself of inconsistency, a personal honour will not let me try to believe for policy's sake. The enlivening of my faith in unbelief seems to me not unworthy. (139)

13 Ironically, Stanislaus was named after his father; his full name was John Stanislaus Joyce, as was "Pappie's."

14 Even as the Daedalus family of Stephen Hero, including the deathly ill Isabel, is forced to move to Mr Wilkinson's house a day ahead of eviction, Stephen can remark on his father's voice: "... through the clear air Stephen heard his father's voice like a muffled flute singing a love-song. He made his mother stop to listen and they both leaned on the heavy picture-frames and listened" (160).

15 The benevolence of Stephen's godfather should not be overstated; in the Mullingar episode contained in the "Additional Manuscript Pages" retained by Stanislaus Joyce, the godfather is portrayed in terms which ally him with the threateningly interrogative father figures in Dubliners and Stephen Hero, among them Father Butt and the pederast of "An Encounter":

He greeted Stephen very warmly and made the usual polite enquiries. ... Mr. Fulham asked a great many questions about Stephen's studies and tastes while Miss Howard stood beside his chair in silence. At a pause in the interrogation she took up the tray and carried it into the house. ... Stephen had found his godfather's questions a somewhat severe ordeal and he revenged himself on Miss Howard by a counter-fire of questions concerning the names and seasons and prospects of her plants. (240)

16 Stephen's self-consciousness upon interrupting the discussions between Wilkinson and his father bear great resemblance to the narrator's discomfort under old Cotter's gaze in "The Sisters":
When he came in the two disputants would ask him for his opinion but he always ate what supper there was without remark and retired to his room and as he went up the stair he could hear his father say to Mr Wilkinson "Queer chap, you know, queer chap!" and he could imagine the heavy stare of Mr Wilkinson’s eyes. (161)

The incident does in fact have its immediate origin in Joyce’s own memory of childhood, preserved in the first epiphany (Scholes and Kain 11). Psychologically the event originates from the same impulse and symbolism as *Oedipus Rex* and *Prometheus*.

That Stephen blames his father for abandoning him is suggested by his reaction to his father’s advice. While he refuses to "peach on" his abusive classmates, he does lodge a grievance with the rector about Father Dolan, the pandybat-wielding prefect of studies and discipline who punishes Stephen for having broken his glasses.

When Stephen becomes feverish from his fall into the square ditch, Wells reminds Stephen of his promise to his father:

```
--Dedalus, don’t spy on us, sure you won’t?
Wells’s face was there. He looked at it and saw that Wells was afraid.
--I didn’t mean to. Sure you won’t.
His father had told him, whatever he did, never to peach on a fellow. He shook his head and answered no and felt glad. (21)
```

Stephen’s gladness is caused, paradoxically, by his manly adherence to his father’s orders and the power he now holds over his false father Wells.

In fairness, however, it must be supposed that this intimacy is as much a symptom of unhealthy living conditions as of repressed incestuous desire, since Stephen "is so dirty that his mother has to wash him" (*Portrait* 175).

This theme is discussed fully below in connection with the third chapter of *Portrait*.

It is notable, given Stephen’s later misadventure with Father Dolan, that Joyce’s conception of the "uncanny," coincidental to Freud’s, includes a prominent reference to
eyes. The phrase "great eyes like carriagelamps" is repeated in the next paragraph in connection with "the ghosts of murderers, the figures of marshals"—all of whom, like Father Flynn in the boy's dream in "The Sisters," are trying to speak to the dreamer.

Don Gifford relates the story of Count von Browne, the ghost of Clongowes Wood, in *Joyce Annotated* (140).

In his *Seasons of Youth: The Bildungsroman from Dickens to Golding*, Jerome Hamilton Buckley describes the character of Simon Dedalus in this scene, before his subsequent decline:

At the Christmas dinner, the father defending Parnell is a fine clear Irish voice to be admired by his listening son; but before long he becomes a stage Celt full of blarney, and then just a shapeless symbol of embarrassing improvidence.

(232)

Dante's rudeness to Dedalus when he tries to discuss the weather with her suggests that the argument at the table is the continuation of an earlier conflict.

When Stephen is confronted at Belvedere with the heresy in his essay, Mr Tate, digging "with his hand between his crossed thighs," evokes from Stephen a reaction reminiscent of the pandying by Dolan, complicated by reminders of his poverty:

It was a raw spring morning and his eyes were still smarting and weak. He was conscious of failure and of detection, of the squalor of his own mind and home, and felt against his neck the raw edge of his turned and jagged collar.

(Portrait 79)

This, the only mention by name of Maurice in *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, incidentally makes evident the connection between forgetting and the repression of the family in the novel:

---O, I'm sure he'll work very hard now, said Mrs Dedalus, especially when he has Maurice with him.

---O, Holy Paul, I forgot about Maurice, said Mr Dedalus. (Portrait 71)
If so, it takes place earlier and even more silently than the "first noiseless sundering" of Stephen's life from his mother's (Portrait 165).

Stephen's epiphanic realization of his drunken father's sexuality compares overtly to the Biblical story of Noah:

And Noah began to be a farmer; and he planted a vineyard. And he drank of the wine, and became drunk; and he was uncovered within his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren outside. And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father's nakedness. (Genesis 9:20-23)

For having committed the taboo act of viewing his father's nakedness, Ham receives Noah's curse. Blessed Shem, of course, is one of the archetypal brothers in Finnegans Wake, and Buck Mulligan associates Stephen with Japheth in the "Telemachus" episode of Ulysses: "--0, shade of Kinch the elder! Japhet in search of a father!" (1.561).

This passage alludes to Stephen's earlier litany of identity, with which he attempted to orient himself at Clongowes (15).

In the second chapter of Ulysses, Stephen recognizes that the past is more present than he had hoped. The dream has become a nightmare: "--History, Stephen said, is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake" (2.377).

The priest's temptation, and Stephen's reaction to it, parallel the situation between Father Flynn and the boy in "The Sisters."

Stephen alludes to the etymological connection between motherhood, alma mater, and matriculation in conversation with Davin, as discussed below.

The line actually reads "a day of dappled, breeze-borne clouds" and is taken, significantly, from The Testimony of the Rocks; or, Geology in Its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed by Hugh Miller (1857). Miller attempts to reconcile then-new geological evidence of the origin of the world with the Biblical accounts of the
Creation. As Gifford notes in *Joyce Annotated*, Miller specifically cites the Irish as examples of the fallen state of mankind.
Chapter IV

_Ulysses:_ Repression Revisited

_Ulysses_ has been called "a paternity suit in the name of all sons against all fathers" (Vogel 111). Joyce's novel, like the _Odyssey_ before it, is about a son's search for a father, and a father's search for a home. And like the _Odyssey_, _Ulysses_ contains multitudes, layers of intricacies, plots within plots; the telling becomes the tale. Karen Lawrence writes: "The book does not abandon its interest in the characters and their stories, but one can locate a shift of attention from the dramatic action of the plot to the drama of the writing" (12). She centers this shift in the "Aeolus" episode, in which the paragraphs are suddenly titled with headlines, newspaper style, though she notes that challenges to conventional narrative styles are present even in the opening chapters of the novel. Throughout the progress of _Ulysses_, the style, or succession of styles, moves to the fore, and the actions of the characters become progressively more difficult to determine--though no less important.¹ While useful in clarifying some of the more obscure aspects of the story of _Ulysses_, paraphrases like _The Bloomsday Book_ by Harry Blamires and _The Chronicle of Leopold and Molly Bloom:_
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Ulysses as Narrative by John Henry Raleigh also serve to highlight the ultimate impossibility of paraphrase. The narrative is inseparable from the narration. But whatever else is going on in Ulysses, it is still a novel; readers are permitted to interest themselves in the fictional lives of the characters, even to care about them and the outcome of the story. If speculation about the events of 17 June 1904, the morning after, is doomed to be fruitless, it is nonetheless encouraged by the ambiguity and qualifications surrounding Molly's final "Yes."

It is not my intent to ascertain whether or not Molly will serve Bloom breakfast in bed on Friday, June 17--though I will conclude with a reading of the ending of Ulysses. Rather, this chapter will examine in detail Stephen's outlook on paternity in Ulysses, and Bloom's; the word "outlook" is particularly apt because while both characters boast full inner lives, neither allows himself much reflection on the problems closest to him, preferring to look at external substitute or "screen" problems and solutions. In the schema Joyce provided to his early explicators Stuart Gilbert and Carlo Linati, a "technic" was listed for every episode: "Incubism" is the technic of the "Hades" episode, for instance, and "Dialectic" is the technic of "Scylla and Charybdis."² I maintain that repression is the unacknowledged technique of Ulysses.
The way to the union of Stephen and Bloom toward the end of the novel is paved by this repression, but their ironic meeting, and Molly's famous last words, are severely qualified by these suppressive thought processes. In "Scylla and Charybdis" Stephen poses the question which is the essential problem of *Ulysses*: "Well: if the father who has not a son be not a father can the son who has not a father be a son?" (9.864-865). Leopold Bloom has no son, yet he is a father; and Stephen, the son who would not be a son, has a father.

I. Stephen and Simon: *Telemachiad*, the Library, and Beyond

--Tell us a story, sir.
--O, do, sir. A ghoststory. (2.54-55)

*Ulysses* itself is a ghost story; the living protagonists are haunted by their dead—or rather, as Joyce makes clear, by manifestations of their guilt. Stephen is haunted by his mother, first in his dreams, and finally by an apparition that is apparently as real as anything else in the Nighttown episode. Stephen is aware of the ghost, and of its psychological connection to his guilt over his mother's death; there is much, however, that he is still hiding from himself. Stephen's preoccupation with his mother's death is, I will maintain, a screen for an unresolved problem of hostility for and identification with
the father: not the father-imago Daedalus nor the
father-surrogate Bloom, but the biological *paterfamilias*
Simon Dedalus. Simon Dedalus is not a ghost Stephen must
exorcise but a father he must kill, a real entity whom
Stephen tries unconsciously to will out of existence by
refusing to name him, almost even to think of him.

*Ulysses* opens with Buck Mulligan's lampoon of the
priesthood, a state of false fatherhood which attracted
Stephen throughout *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.*
The partially-clad Mulligan speaks the words of the Mass and
calls Stephen a "fearful jesuit" (1.8), but if Stephen is
fearful, it is neither God nor the Jesuits whom he fears.
God has become for Stephen "a shout in the street" (2.386).
But when Mulligan whistles to signal God to perform the
transubstantiation, the "two strong shrill whistles" that
answer "through the calm" (1.26) recall Simon Dedalus's
"earsplitting whistle" from upstairs in the fifth chapter of
*Portrait* (175). God's importance to Stephen Dedalus is
founded on his aspect as Father.

In the first chapter of *Ulysses,* as throughout the
novel, Simon Dedalus is surprisingly absent from Stephen's
thoughts. Stephen presents his dissertation on paternity in
the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode, but he considers his own
King Hamlet only long enough to dismiss him as an important
figure in his own life. Bloom will see Simon Dedalus
repeatedly throughout the day, and even envy him, but
Stephen suppresses all thoughts of his father almost as soon as they arise. Joyce paints Simon vividly enough that Stephen’s willful forgetting of him is striking; Stephen, still unconsciously entertaining his family romance, casts himself as fatherless even as Joyce, through Bloom, presents a full and vivid portrait of the young man’s father.

If Stephen unconsciously forgets his father, he is haunted throughout the day by memories of his mother, and even by her apparition in "Circe." Stephen’s ambivalence toward his mother’s ghost and memory is compounded by guilt over his complicity in her death. "--The aunt thinks you killed your mother," Mulligan tells Stephen (1.88). Though Stephen replies "--Someone killed her" (1.90), referring perhaps to Simon Dedalus, it is not clear whom Stephen holds most responsible for May Dedalus’s death. In fact, Stephen seems largely to agree with Mulligan’s aunt. The apparition of Stephen’s mother, 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 odour of wetted ashes" (1.270-272) is textbook Freud, clearly a manifestation of Stephen’s own guilt per Totem and Taboo. His protestations of innocence, addressed to the ghost, the creation of his own unconscious, bespeak his guilt: "No, mother! Let me be and let me live" (1.279). In "Circe," confronted again with the ghost, Stephen protests: "They say I killed you, mother. He offended your
memory. Cancer did it, not I. Destiny" (15.4186-4187). His refusal to kneel and pray at his mother's deathbed may have added to her grief, but it could not have caused or even hastened her death. Stephen spends the greater part of Ulysses trying to convince himself that the "someone" who killed May Dedalus was not her first-born son.

Stephen's preoccupation with his mother complicates his passing encounter in "Telemachus" with the milkwoman, whom he associates through the epithets "Silk of the kine and poor old woman, names given her in olden times" (1.403-404) with Ireland and motherhood (Gifford, Ulysses Annotated 21). Though he views the milkwoman without affection and "scorns to beg her favour" (1.407), he displays brotherly jealousy at Mulligan's familiarity with her (just as he resents Mulligan's free speech about his mother's death): "She bows her old head to a voice that speaks to her loudly, her bonesetter, her medicineman: me she slights" (1.418-419). The ambivalence Stephen feels toward her is underscored by her manifestation in "Circe" as Old Gummy Granny (15.4578 ff.).

Stephen's preoccupation with his mother's death similarly affects his interaction with his students in the "Nestor" episode. When his students encourage him to tell them a ghost story, Stephen turns their attention from history to literature, directing a recitation from Milton's Lycidas. The poem, an elegy on the death of a young man who
drowned while sailing to Dublin, is not exactly a ghost story itself, but it is suggestive of Stephen’s mother—associated in "Telemachus" with the sea, "a great sweet mother" (1.77)—and also of the drowned man whom Stephen will imagine finding in the "Proteus" episode. The corpse is expected to surface soon, as Stephen learned in "Telemachus":

The boatman nodded towards the north of the bay with some disdain.
--There’s five fathoms out there, he said. It’ll be swept up that way when the tide comes in about one. It’s nine days today.

The man that was drowned. A sail veering about the blank bay waiting for a swollen bundle to bob up, roll over to the sun a puffy face, saltwhite. Here I am. (1.672-677)

The quoted lines of Milton offer solace to the living, assurance of eternal life: "—Weep no more, woful shepherds, weep no more / For Lycidas, your sorrow, is not dead, / Sunk though he be beneath the watery floor" (2.64-66). While Stephen’s mind wanders back to the Paris library, and to Aristotle, the boy presumably continues, aided by covert glances at his open book:

So sinks the day-star in the Ocean bed,
And yet anon repairs his drooping head,
And tricks his beams, and with new-spangled Ore,
Flames in the forehead of the morning sky:
So Lycidas, sunk low, but mounted high,
Through the dear might of him that walk’d the waves ... (168-172)
The diversion of Stephen's attention from these lines is not accidental, and indeed offers a clue to the repressed content behind the screen preoccupation with his mother's death. Stephen can take no solace in the assurance that the drowned Lycidas will, like the sun, rise again from the sea. The resurrection of the drowned man which Milton predicts represents for Stephen an uncanny return of the repressed.

What is being repressed is at this point unclear, a riddle, but as will be seen in "Proteus," it involves Stephen's father-imago Daedalus and indeed his own submerged identity as Icarus or Lucifer. The first riddle which occurs to Stephen when the boys demand one raises the issue of paternity and inheritance which will be seen increasingly to preoccupy him throughout the day: "Riddle me, riddle me, randy ro. / My father gave me seeds to sow" (2.88-89). Now, however, he does not permit himself to dwell on thoughts of his biological father, who has passed on to him "seeds to sow" in a children's rhyme as a substitute for manhood. Stephen's internal censor substitutes a riddle about matricide for the censored one about patriarchal succession:

The cock crew,
The sky was blue:
The bells in heaven
Were striking eleven.
'Tis time for this poor soul
To go to heaven. (2.102-107)
The riddle frustrates the children because it is answerable only if one already knows the answer, as Stephen does: "--The fox burying his grandmother under a hollybush" (2.115). Though Stephen distances himself from the guilty fox by changing the victim from "mother" to "grandmother" (Gifford, *Ulysses Annotated* 33), his interior monologue as he contemplates "Amor matris: subjective and objective genitive" (2.165) shows him to be aware of the connection:

She had saved him from being trampled underfoot and had gone, scarcely having been. A poor soul gone to heaven: and on a heath beneath winking stars a fox, red reek of rapine in his fur, with merciless bright eyes scraped in the earth, listened, scraped up the earth, listened, scraped and scraped. (2.146-150)

And behind his fantasy of violation and his guilty remembrance of his mother, there lies still the memory of a deeper suppression, one which he seems to share with the awkward student Sargent: "Secrets, silent, stony sit in the dark palaces of both our hearts: secrets weary of their tyranny: tyrants, willing to be dethroned" (2.170-172). Stephen is aware of his tyrant secret, the drowned man he has repressed within himself, and he knows that his tyrant is willing to be dethroned, that the drowned man must eventually rise.

This awareness continues to occupy his thoughts as he walks along the strand in "Proteus"; here, the hidden content is clearly associated with paternity. The maternal
is seen to be threatening: the sea Stephen so fears, the midwives with their baggage: "One of her sisterhood lugged me squealing into life. Creation from nothing. What has she in the bag? A misbirth with a trailing navelcord, hushed in ruddy wool" (3.35-37). Stephen contemplates the circumstances of his own conception:

Wombed in sin darkness I was too, made not begotten. By them, the man with my voice and my eyes and a ghostwoman with ashes on her breath. They clasped and sundered, did the coupler’s will. From before the ages He willed me and now may not will me away or ever. A lex eterna stays about Him. Is that then the divine substance wherein Father and Son are consubstantial? (3.45-50)

This passage suggests through irony that Stephen is aware that his mother’s ghost is his own creation. He considers also the lex eterna that connects father and son, earthly as well as divine. Significantly, Stephen underscores his distance from his parents even at his conception (and his ambivalence at conjuring the primal scene) by refusing to name them; his father he calls "the man with my voice and my eyes" in a reversal of the more common saying, "He has his father’s eyes." At once Stephen denies any meaningful connection with his father and usurps the position of progenitor: his father has Stephen’s eyes.7

Walking further, Stephen considers Buck Mulligan, who once saved a man from drowning, and wonders if he himself would have the courage to do the same:
Would you or would you not? The man that was drowned nine days ago off Maiden's rock. They are waiting for him now. The truth, spit it out. I would want to. I would try. I am not a strong swimmer. Water cold soft. When I put my face into it in the basin at Clongowes. Can't see! Who's behind me? Out quickly, quickly! Do you see the tide flowing quickly in on all sides, sheeting the lows of sand quickly, shellcocoa-coloured? I want his life still to be his, mine to be mine. A drowning man. His human eyes scream to me out of horror of his death. I ... With him together down .... I could not save her. Waters: bitter death: lost. (3.321-330, Joyce's ellipses)

Stephen can no more save the drowned man than he could save his mother as she drowned in bile. Why, however, does Stephen feel such compassion for a drowned stranger--more than he seems to feel for anybody he knows? The answer becomes apparent later in the chapter, when Stephen makes explicit (for the reader, if not for himself) the association of the drowned man with his father, and indeed with himself:

Five fathoms out there. Full fathom five thy father lies. At one, he said. Found drowned. High water at Dublin bar. Driving before it a loose drift of rubble, fanshoals of fishes, silly shells. ... There he is. Hook it quick. Pull. Sunk though he be beneath the watery floor. (3.470-474, my ellipses)

Stephen's surname suggests the drowned man's connection with Icarus, the son of Daedalus who drowns after a failed flight, and the association is reinforced by Stephen's
musings on Icarus in "Scylla and Charybdis." The allusions here to Shakespeare's *Tempest* strengthen the anonymous dead man's psychological connection to the father in Stephen's unconscious. The associations are further complicated at the end of the episode by Stephen's consideration of "Old Father Ocean," perhaps Proteus himself (3.483), and by the final image of a seaborne Golgotha which Stephen glimpses as he looks behind him after a premonition of Bloom:

Behind. Perhaps there is someone.  
He turned his face over a shoulder, rere regardant. Moving through the air high spars of a threemaster, her sails brailed up on the crosstrees, homing, upstream, silently moving, a silent ship. (3.502-505)²

Who, then, is the drowned man intended to represent? Is it Stephen, or Simon, or Bloom? Lycidas, Lucifer, or Jesus? Icarus or Daedalus? There is no simple answer to this question; all are associated with each other and with the phenomenon of repression as it is manifested in Stephen. The drowned man (or more exactly the threat of his inevitable return) is somehow cognate to Stephen's vision of the wading girl in *Portrait* and Bloom's vision of Gerty in *Nausicaa.* Stephen's preoccupation with the drowned man is a symptom of the guilt attached to his attempt to will his father out of existence.

History may be the nightmare from which Stephen Dedalus is trying to awake (2.377), but the history that haunts him
is not primarily Catholic or Irish history, or even the aesthetic or literary history that is foregrounded in "Scylla and Charybdis" and "Oxen of the Sun." It is, rather, personal or family history. His preoccupation with the details of Shakespeare's biography as he "proves by algebra that Hamlet's grandson is Shakespeare's grandfather and that he himself is the ghost of his own father" (1.555-557) reveals that he is unconsciously wrestling with guilt—guilt not only for his role in his mother's death, but also for his attempted usurpation of his father's procreative power. Haines's confusion over Mulligan's jest—"What? Haines said, beginning to point at Stephen. He himself?" (1.558) is the reader's confusion, and Stephen's. Stephen takes Hamlet personally.

The challenge Hamlet poses for Stephen is expressed early in the "Scylla and Charybdis" chapter as he enters the National Library, the home territory of the false fathers of Irish literature: "--Our young Irish bards, John Eglinton censured, have yet to create a figure which the world will set beside Saxon Shakespeare's Hamlet though I admire him, as old Ben did, on this side idolatry" (9.43-45). Eglinton, who warns Stephen that "if you want to shake my belief that Shakespeare is Hamlet you have a stern task before you" (9.370-371), manifests the same willingness to conflate author and character that plagues all the critics of Hamlet in this episode (along with many critics of
Stephen Dedalus). Stephen’s theory of *Hamlet* does, however, have its origins in Joyce’s own interpretation of the play, which he delivered in a series of lectures in Trieste in the winter of 1912.11

In response to this challenge, and to Eglinton’s disparagement of Aristotle ("a model schoolboy with his diploma under his arm" 9.59), Stephen as Kinch the knifeblade unsheathes his "dagger definitions" (9.84) and recreates an Elizabethan performance of *Hamlet* with as much detail as Father Arnall’s creation of hell in chapter three of *Portrait*. In Stephen’s theater, the role of the dead king’s ghost is played by the author:

---The play begins. A player comes on under the shadow, made up in the castoff mail of a court buck, a wellset man with a bass voice. It is the ghost, the king, a king and no king, and the player is Shakespeare who has studied *Hamlet* all the years of his life which were not vanity in order to play the part of the spectre. (9.164-168)

Stephen’s reading of the play is comparable to that of Freud’s "new Viennese school" (9.780) as set forth initially in *The Interpretation of Dreams* and developed by Ernest Jones in *Hamlet and Oedipus*. Stephen’s focus, however, is less upon Hamlet’s guilt for his unconscious role in his father’s death (wishing his father dead) than upon the father, dead king Hamlet himself: "--He will have it that *Hamlet* is a ghoststory" (9.141). For Stephen the central
The question is, "Who is the ghost from limbo patrum, returning to the world that has forgotten him? Who is King Hamlet?"

(9.150-151):

Is it possible that that player Shakespeare, a ghost by absence, and in the vesture of buried Denmark, a ghost by death, speaking his own words to his own son's name (had Hamnet Shakespeare lived he would have been prince Hamlet's twin), is it possible, I want to know, or probable that he did not draw or foresee the logical conclusion of those premises: you are the dispossessed son; I am the murdered father: your mother is the guilty queen, Ann Shakespeare, born Hathaway?

(9.174-180)

The relevance to the whole of Ulysses of Stephen's criticism of Hamlet is apparent; Bloom's preoccupation with his lost son provides a parallel to Shakespeare's own loss, and Hamlet's obsessions and paralysis prefigure Stephen's own. Stephen, hinting at Ann Hathaway's alleged infidelity, thinks immediately of his mother: "Mother's deathbed. Candle. The sheeted mirror. Who brought me into this world lies there, bronzelidded, under a few cheap flowers"

(9.221-222). Once again, Stephen is able to consciously consider his attachment to his mother and his guilt over her death; still, all thoughts of his father are suppressed almost before they surface. The emphasis of Stephen's reading of Hamlet is not Hamlet's guilt over unconsciously wishing the father dead, but Stephen's own guilt toward the father. "Sufflaminandus sum," Stephen thinks, in the midst
of his biographical reading of Shakespeare: "I ought to be repressed" (9.765). What has been repressed is Stephen's oedipal impulse and its attendant guilt; the drowned man is coming to the surface.

As William M. Schutte explains in *Joyce and Shakespeare*, Stephen's theories are founded upon a few carefully chosen bits of biographical evidence (little is known about Shakespeare's life) and buttressed by selective readings of Shakespeare's plays. When Stephen pictures Shakespeare "returning from Shottery and from her arms" (9.933) under the firedrake which first appeared in the sky at the time of his birth, he consciously omits one detail which would invalidate this facet of his argument: "Don't tell them he was nine years old when it was quenched" (9.936).

The point that he is trying to make when he brings in the firedrake is that Shakespeare was very conscious of names and their significance. . . . Stephen's silent admission that he has here distorted the facts as he knows them serves to cast doubt over all of his "facts." Had Joyce not intended it do so, he would hardly introduced into the narrative the sentence in which Stephen makes the admission. (Schutte 53).

Elsewhere Stephen likens his act of disseminating his theory to the murder of Hamlet's father: "They list. And in the porches of their ears I pour" (9.465). When Eglinton asks Stephen whether he believes in the theory he has just put
forth, Stephen tells him "promptly" that he does not
(9.1067). The value of Stephen’s theory lies more, then, in
what it tells about Stephen than in the interpretation of
Shakespeare itself. In fact Stephen’s preoccupation with
fatherhood, spoken and unspoken throughout "Scylla and
Charybdis," brings Ulysses together thematically and lays
the groundwork for the consummation of the Stephen-Bloom
relationship in "Circe" and afterward. He cannot know it,
but when Stephen thinks, "He is in my father. I am in his
son" (9.390), he is describing his supernatural connection
with Leopold Bloom. And when Bloom passes near Stephen,
Buck Mulligan jokingly observes an affinity between them:
"--He knows you. He knows your old fellow" (9.614).

Although Bloom offers him his services as a surrogate
father later in Ulysses, the "old fellow" on Stephen’s mind
in the library episode is his biological father, Simon
Dedalus, Stephen’s local reincarnation of King Hamlet and
John Shakespeare:

Fatherhood, in the sense of conscious begetting,
is unknown to man. It is a mystical estate, an
apostolic succession, from only begetter to only
begotten. On that mystery and not on the madonna
which the cunning Italian intellect flung to the
mob of Europe the church is founded and founded
irremovably because founded, like the world, macro
and microcosm, upon the void. Upon incertitude,
upon unlikelihood. Amor matris, subjective and
objective genitive, may be the only true thing in
life. Paternity may be a legal fiction. Who is
the father of any son that any son should love him
or he any son? (9.837-845)
If Stephen’s insistence on the ultimate disjuncture between father and son seems puzzling or revealing to his listeners or to the reader, it is remarkable also to himself: "What the hell are you driving at?" he asks; "Are you condemned to do this?" (9.846, 849). The son, Stephen argues, is ultimately responsible for the father’s demise: "his growth is his father’s decline, his youth his father’s envy, his friend his father’s enemy" (9.855-857). These allegations have been borne out both in Portrait and Ulysses: Simon obviously envies Stephen’s youth during their trip to Cork in the second chapter of Portrait, and Simon is clearly no friend of Stephen’s friend Buck Mulligan.

Throughout the episode Stephen avoids thinking specifically of his own father, either by name or by explicit allusion. He does, however, give thought to the family romance which occupied him throughout Portrait: the "old father, old artificer" Daedalus, whom he invokes in the final entry of his diary. "What’s in a name? That is what we ask ourselves in childhood when we write the name that we are told is ours" (9.927-928). In answer, Stephen internally considers how he and his supernatural father Daedalus have failed each other:

Stephen’s spiritual father Daedalus has not helped him to escape the mundane Dublin of Simon Dedalus. The drowned man, the symbol of Stephen’s unconscious patricidal impulses, is the drowned Icarus, Stephen himself.

We have seen how Stephen is influenced at the outset of *Ulysses* by his guilt regarding his mother and father, how he dwells on his mother’s death while refusing even to think of Simon Dedalus in any meaningful way. Simon Dedalus’s absence from Stephen’s thoughts would be unremarkable were it not for his colorful presence throughout much of the rest of the novel. Stephen’s almost superstitious suppression of thoughts of his father is underscored by Bloom’s frequent encounters with Simon, and by his admiration, even envy, for him. Indeed, of the minor characters in *Ulysses*, only Buck Mulligan is portrayed as vividly as Simon Dedalus. This vividness serves to highlight Stephen’s avoidance of his father in thought, word, or deed.

Simon Dedalus is first encountered by Bloom and the reader at the outset of the "Hades" episode, among memories of the dead. Bloom is reminded of his dead son Rudy and the laying out of his body: "Wash and shampoo. I believe they clip the nails and the hair" (6.19). Bloom’s thoughts of his own son are diverted by a glimpse of Simon’s:

> Mr Bloom at gaze saw a lithe young man, clad in mourning, a wide hat. 
> --There’s a friend of yours gone by, Dedalus, he said.
--Who is that?
--Your son and heir.
--Where is he, Mr Dedalus said, stretching over across. (6.39-44)

But Stephen's suppression of Simon is apparently effective enough that Simon is unable to lay eyes on his son, and he must ask Bloom if Mulligan, "a contaminated bloody doubledyed ruffian by all accounts" (6.64), accompanies him. There is some supernatural communication between Simon and Stephen, however; Simon assumes that Stephen has been to visit "the Goulding faction, the drunken little costdrawer and Crissie, papa's little lump of dung, the wise child that knows her own father" (6.53). Meanwhile Stephen, contemplating such a visit in "Proteus," seems to hear his father's voice: "The drunken little costdrawer and his brother, the cornet player" (3.66). He even intuits Simon's allegation of incest: "Papa's little bedpal. Lump of love" (3.88).

Simon's coarse suggestion of father-daughter incest causes Bloom, whose unconscious is, as we shall see, no stranger to such longings, to smile "joylessly" (6.54) and to pay unwarranted attention to the route of the funeral procession, suppressing any thought of his own daughter Milly. Just as Stephen allows himself to contemplate the loss of his mother as he suppresses thoughts of his father, Bloom allows Simon's tirade in his son's defense to turn his thoughts to his lost son, Rudy:
Noisy selfwilled man. Full of his son. He is right. Something to hand on. If little Rudy had lived. See him grow up. Hear his voice in the house. Walking beside Molly in an Eton suit. My son. Me in his eyes. Strange feeling it would be. From me. Just a chance. (6.74-77)

As shall be seen below, Bloom's own failed fatherhood is repeatedly contrasted with Simon's supposed success. It is significant what is not suppressed in this passage: the chance that Rudy's ill-health may have come from Bloom himself.

Certainly the Simon we have seen throughout Portrait cannot be considered a model father; it is ironic that Bloom, not fully a father because he has no son, envies him.\textsuperscript{14} In comparison to Reuben J. Dodd, however, Simon seems a doting father, and it is in part for this reason that Simon takes such pleasure in hearing Bloom's story of Dodd and his son.\textsuperscript{15} His listeners do not permit Bloom to finish even a sentence of his story, however, and Martin Cunningham rudely interrupts, telling about how the lovesick son attempted to drown himself in the Liffey:

--For God' sake! Mr Dedalus exclaimed in fright. Is he dead?
--Dead! Martin Cunningham cried. Not he! A boatman got a pole and fished him out by the slack of the breeches and he was landed up to the father on the quay more dead than alive. Half the town was there.
--Yes, Mr Bloom said. But the funny part is....
--And Reuben J, Martin Cunningham said, gave the boatman a florin for saving his son's life. (6.281-287)
Bloom's motive for telling the story seems to be to ingratiate himself with his fellow mourners, but when his role as narrator is usurped, he becomes almost a butt of the joke himself. For Simon's part, he is momentarily frightened by the idea that Dodd's son is dead, though he has just cursed the father ("--The devil break the hasp of your back! 6.256), but he recovers--upon hearing that Dodd tipped his son's savior a florin--to deliver the punchline: "--One and eightpence too much, Mr Dedalus said drily" (6.291). Throughout the day Bloom muses over Simon's ability to deliver the punchline, something Bloom can never quite manage: "Burst sideways like a sheep in clover Dedalus says he will. With a belly on him like a poisoned pup. Most amusing expressions that man finds. Hhnn: burst sideways" (6.597-600).¹⁶

Thus Simon as Bloom sees him is a good companion, admirable in some ways. At the mention of "the "broken hearts" buried here, Simon mourns the loss of his wife (in a manner Stephen would undoubtedly find offensive):

--Her grave is over there, Jack, Mr Dedalus said. I'll soon be stretched beside her. Let Him take me whenever he likes.

Breaking down, he began to weep to himself quietly, stumbling a little in his walk. Mr Power took his arm.
--She's better where she is, he said kindly.
--I suppose so, Mr Dedalus said with a weak gasp. I suppose she is in heaven if there is a heaven. (6.645-651).
Simon's behavior reveals a trace of superstition (he does not mention his wife by name) and also his frailty and dissipation; he needs Power's help to walk away from his wife's grave.

In spite of his apparent failing health, the Simon Dedalus of Bloom's Dublin bears little resemblance to the shout at the top of the stairs that was Stephen's father at the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Even as Stephen tries to reduce his father to just that voice, Bloom sees Simon in a more idealized light. Just as Joyce teases the reader by bringing Stephen and Bloom close together but not allowing them to meet until "Oxen of the Sun," Stephen and Simon never meet in the flesh during *Ulysses*. The ever-tolerant Bloom, in a sense, provides a link between the father and son.

In the office of the *Evening Telegraph*, Simon Dedalus has apparently recovered from the grief he suffered at the cemetery as he participates briefly in the lampoon of Dan Dawson's speech: "--O! Mr Dedalus cried, giving vent to a hopeless groan. Shite and onions! That'll do, Ned. Life is too short" (7.329-330). He excuses himself for a drink with some of the others--who pointedly do not invite Bloom--shortly before his son enters: "--How do you do? the editor said, holding out a hand. Come in. Your governor is just gone" (7.510-511). Though Stephen's governor is gone, he is yet present in Stephen himself, as
the editor later notes: "--Chip of the old block! the editor cried, clapping Stephen on the shoulder" (7.899).17

The text picks up the meanderings of the unemployed Simon Dedalus in the "Wandering Rocks" episode, shortly after Stephen’s dissertation on paternity and Shakespeare in the "Scylla and Charybdis" episode. Seen without the filter of Bloom’s generally benevolent, generally admiring attitude toward him, Simon is less engaging here than earlier, more like the (at least verbally) abusive father of Portrait, or of Stanislaus Joyce’s memoirs. Upon encountering his daughter outside Dillon’s auctionrooms, he immediately begins berating her about her poor posture. When she asks for money, he hesitates, then finally gives her a shilling:

--See if you can do anything with that, he said.
--I suppose you got five, Dilly said. Give me more than that.
--Wait awhile, Mr Dedalus said threateningly. You’re like the rest of them, are you? An insolent pack of little bitches since your poor mother died. But wait awhile. You’ll all get a short shrift and a long day from me. Low blackguardism! I’m going to get rid of you. Wouldn’t care if I was stretched out stiff. He’s dead. The man upstairs is dead. (10.679-685)

If Simon Dedalus was a failure as a provider while his wife was alive, he seems to have sunk even lower since her death. What money he manages to scrape together he tries to withhold from his family, begrudging them money for food and upkeep, drinking it away.18 When Dilly prods him for more,
Simon continues in the same bitter vein, but eventually he relents:

--I'm going to show you a little trick, Mr Dedalus said. I'll leave you all where Jesus left the Jews. Look, there's all I have. I got two shillings from Jack Power and I spent twopence for a shave for the funeral.

He drew forth a handful of copper coins, nervously.

--Can't you look for money somewhere? Dilly said. Mr Dedalus thought and nodded.
--I will, he said gravely. I looked all along the gutter in O'Connell street. I'll try this one now.
--You're very funny, Dilly said, grinning.
--Here, Mr Dedalus said, handing her two pennies. Get a glass of milk for yourself and a bun or a something. I'll be home shortly. (10.697-707)

This passage shows Simon Dedalus at the two extremes of his character: bitter and cruel one moment, charming the next. The Dubliners he is seen interacting with, including Bloom, seem to think rather highly of him, and even the daughter he berates and threatens (and whom he has left responsible for the maintenance of what remains of the Dedalus household) finds his charm irresistible.

The unconscious connection between Simon and his eldest son, noted above, is reinforced later on in the "Wandering Rocks" episode when Stephen also encounters Dilly. Stephen has been brooding on "fallen archangels" and womanhood:

She dances in a foul gloom where gum burns with garlic. A sailorman, rustbearded, sips from a beaker rum and eyes her. A long and seafed silent
rut. She dances, capers, wagging her sowish haunches and her hips, on her gross belly flapping a ruby egg. (10.808-811)

The description of the dancing woman connects her with Ireland, "the old sow who eats her farrow" (Portrait 203); the sailor, who suggests Odysseus and Murphy of "Eumaeus," is another figure of Stephen's pantheon: "I fear his redrimmed horny eyes" (Portrait 252). Stephen also suffers another teasing premonition of Bloom; again he has narrowly missed him: "Seal of King David. Thumbed pages: read and read. Who has passed here before me? How to soften chapped hands. Recipe for white wine vinegar. How to win a woman's love" (Ulysses 10.845-847).

Along with the star of David, Stephen's question, "Who has passed here before me?" suggests Bloom, who has also been browsing for books (albeit at a different bookseller's). The question also continues the inquest into paternity which has been occupying his thoughts all day; indeed, in talking to Dilly, Stephen has been preceded by Simon. Their encounters with the eldest daughter (and most responsible member of the Dedalus family) are markedly similar, and point up more similarities between father and son than either is consciously aware of. Stephen contemplates her poverty and their familial bond: "My eyes they say she has. Do others see me so? Quick, far and daring. Shadow of my mind" (10.865-866). As he examines
the French primer she has spent her penny on, Stephen feels again the "agenbite of inwit":

She is drowning. Agenbite. Save her. Agenbite. All against us. She will drown me with her, eyes and hair. Lank coils of seaweed hair around me, my heart, my soul. Salt green death. We. Agenbite of inwit. Inwit's agenbite. Misery! Misery! (10.875-880)

Stephen casts her as the drowned, fatherless Ophelia. Ironically, though he laments her poverty and her pathetic attempts to better herself, he does not offer her any of the money he has in his pocket, money which is earmarked for tonight's drinking. In this he resembles his father--except, of course, that Simon Dedalus eventually gave her some cash, while Stephen gives only silent sympathy.19

In the "Sirens" episode, the portrayal of Simon Dedalus in Ulysses is complicated even further, as Bloom watches Simon sing and feels an affinity with him. Ruminating on the virgin Mary, Bloom remembers seeing Stephen at the library, thinking of him as "Dedalus' son" (11.153). Simon Dedalus himself enters the Ormond Hotel before Bloom arrives: "Into their bar strolled Mr Dedalus. Chips, picking chips off one of his rocky thumbnails. Chips. He strolled" (11.192-193). Simon's nervous chipping of his thumbnail may be a symptom of his unslaked thirst, but it also harkens back to Stephen's nosepicking in "Proteus." Further, the sound of the sentence suggests "chip off the
old block" (see 7.899) and "a ship on the rocks"—the narrator thus connects Simon with Stephen’s earlier meditation on the drowned man (the connection has already been made, via The Tempest, in 1.673: "--There’s five fathoms out there").

Simon Dedalus flirts politely with the barmaid, whom he welcomes back from a holiday at the seaside in Rostrevor, where she has been "a holy show . . . lying out on the strand all day" (11.201-202):

--That was exceedingly naughty of you, Mr Dedalus told her and pressed her hand indulgently. Tempting poor simple males.
Miss Douce of satin douced her arm away.
--O go away! she said. You’re very simple, I don’t think.
He was.
--Well now I am, he mused. I looked so simple in the cradle they christened me simple Simon.
--You must have been a doaty, miss Douce made answer. And what did the doctor order today?
--Well now, he mused, whatever you say yourself. I think I’ll trouble you for some fresh water and a half glass of whisky. (11.201-211)

This is the Simon Dedalus Stephen cannot allow himself to know; his conception of his father is anything but "simple." Yet the narrative of Ulysses suggests that most of the Dubliners who associate with Simon Dedalus—including even Dilly Dedalus, who is a victim of his neglect—see him with some affection and do not condemn him for his faults. Ulysses seems to view Simon Dedalus much as Joyce viewed his own father, not ignorant of his flaws, but tolerant.
Bloom's assessment of Simon reveals his awareness of Simon's irresponsibility, but admits that it is "hard to tell" what actually goes on in someone else's home:


Stephen, whose voice will excite Bloom's entrepreneurial instincts later in the day, plays only a minor role in the "Sirens" episode, since he is not present in the Ormond Hotel bar; the episode has more to do with the connection between Simon Dedalus and Leopold Bloom. Dedalus's conversation with Miss Douce suggests Bloom's recurrent fantasy of "seaside girls" which begins with Molly and Milly and reaches its climax with Gerty MacDowell in "Nausicaa"; the passage prefigures the fleeting, supernatural merging of the two fathers which will take place later in this episode.

When the annoying Lenehan mentions Stephen to Simon, the father seems ready to deny his son:

--Greetings from the famous son of a famous father.
--Who may he be? Mr Dedalus asked.
        Lenehan opened most genial arms. Who?
--Who may he be? he asked. Can you ask?
Stephen, the youthful bard.
--I see, he said. I didn't recognise him for the moment. I hear he is keeping very select company. Have you seen him lately? (11.254-261)

As he revealed in "Hades," Simon Dedalus disapproves of his son's association with the "contaminated bloody doubledyed ruffian" Buck Mulligan (6.64). He listens to Lenehan's account of his earlier meeting with Stephen and drinks "with faraway mourning mountain eye" (11.273). In describing O'Madden Burke as "that minstrel boy of the wild wet west" (11.269-270), Lenehan alludes to a song called "The Minstrel Boy" from Thomas Moore's Irish Melodies (Ulysses Annotated 297). In heroic terms, the song may describe the struggle for artistic autonomy that is a part of Stephen's conflict with his father:

The Minstrel Boy to the war is gone,
In the ranks of death you'll find him;
His father's sword he has girded on,
And his wild harp slung behind him.
"Land of song!" said the warrior bard,
"Though all the world betrays thee,
One sword, at least, thy rights shall guard,
One faithful harp shall praise thee!" (Bauerle 389-390)

It is possible that Simon unconsciously connects the minstrel boy with his poet son. Simon, like Stephen, like Bloom, is reflecting on paternity and heritage, perhaps thinking of Cork, his fatherland: "God be with old times" is his toast (11.459). Later, Bloom continues the theme as
he listens to Dedalus, Dollard, and Cowley at the piano:
"We are their harps. I. He. Old. Young" (11.582-583).
Thus the phallic sword of the song is not the only
instrument passed from father to son.

Simon Dedalus, as seen through Bloom’s eyes, seems to
be longing for an impossible connection with his son; for
both him and Bloom, a daughter is but a poor substitute.
Even as he unconsciously mourns the impossibility of getting
too close to his daughter, Bloom displays affection for her;
Simon’s dissatisfaction with his daughters, however, is
manifested in "Wandering Rocks" as hostility. Sitting
across from Richie Goulding, Simon’s brother-in-law, Bloom
reflects on Simon’s earlier comment on that particular
father-daughter relationship: "Still harping on his
daughter. Wise child that knows her father, Dedalus said.
Me?" (11.644-645). Simon seems critical of other fathers of
daughters, and Bloom feels his incestuous impulses toward
Milly enough to be at least partially conscious of them, to
wonder if he is the father the wise child knows; from Simon,
however, there is no evidence of such disturbing
inclinations.22 Bloom’s impulses, as we shall see below,
are masterfully suppressed and sublimated.

"Sirens" is, of course, an episode of songs; its "art,"
according to Stuart Gilbert’s schema, is music, and the most
prominent songs performed in the episode underscore the
themes of Ulysses most pertinent to Bloom and Stephen.
First, Simon Dedalus sings "M’appari" from the opera Martha. In the opera, the air is sung by Lionel; the parallel to Leopold Bloom, whose thoughts keep returning to his correspondent Martha Clifford, is obvious even to Bloom himself: "Martha it is. Coincidence. Just going to write. Lionel’s song. Lovely name you have. Can’t write. . . . Still the name: Martha. How strange! Today" (11.713-716). Eventually Bloom is overcome, consumed by Simon’s art:

--Come . . .!

It soared, a bird, it held its flight, a swift pure cry, soar silver orb it leaped serene, speeding, sustained, to come, don’t spin it out too long long breath he breath long life, soaring high, high resplendent, aflame, crowned, high in the effulgence symbolistic, high, of the ethereal bosom, high, of the high vast irradiation everywhere all soaring all around about the all, the endlessnessnessness . . . .

--To me!

Siopold!
Consumed. (11.744-753)

Bloom, whose consciousness is momentarily taken over by Dedalus’s singing, unknowingly achieves a temporary bond with him. It should be noted that Simon’s talent exists largely in Bloom’s perception, because Ben Dollard is not overwhelmed by his rendition of "M’appari": "--Seven days in jail, Ben Dollard said, on bread and water. Then you’d sing, Simon, like a garden thrush" (11.772-773). The performance which the narrative has described is in some mystical way a collaboration between the singer Dedalus and
the listener Bloom: "Lionel Simon, singer, laughed" (11.774). The conjunction of Dedalus and Bloom doesn't last long: "But Bloom sang dumb" (11.776). His silent participation in the song ultimately stresses the differences between them.

The other song featured in the episode is "The Croppy Boy"; Ben Dollard's rendition of it is first mentioned by Martin Cunningham during the carriage ride to the cemetery in "Hades." Though little of the text of the song actually appears in Ulysses, it is highly relevant to the themes of paternity and false fatherhood. The song is about a young patriot of the Rebellion of 1798 who goes to confess his sins. Significantly, he begins his confession by mentioning his fallen father and brothers:

At the siege of Ross did my father fall,
And at Gorey my loving brothers all,
I alone am left of my name and race,
I will go to Wexford and take their place.
(Bauerle 270)

Thus the singing of the song in "Sirens" brings Stephen Dedalus into the picture, even though he is not present. In fact, one of the sins the Croppy Boy confesses is also Stephen Dedalus's sin, the decision for which he now suffers: "I passed the churchyard one day in haste / And forgot to pray for my mother's rest" (Bauerle 270). Meanwhile, Bloom divides his attention between paying attention to Dollard's rendering of the song and brooding on
Molly, Milly, and his dead infant son Rudy; he, like the croppy boy, is the "last of his name and race" (11.1064).

II. Dearest Papli: Leopold and Milly Bloom

--Marina, Stephen said, a child of storm, Miranda, a wonder, Perdita, that which was lost. . . . My dearest wife, Pericles says, was like this maid. Will any man love the daughter if he has not loved the mother? (9.421-424)

Although Bloom has no male heir to carry on his name, he is obviously not childless. The "Calypso" episode introduces Milly Bloom by mail, and her existence was revealed in the "Telemachus" episode, when a swimmer tells Buck Mulligan that he "got a card from Bannon. Says he found a sweet young thing down there [in Mullingar]. Photo girl he calls her" (1.684-685). Mulligan’s reply foreshadows Bloom’s semiconscious association of his daughter Milly with Gerty MacDowell in the "Nausicaa" episode: "--Snapshot, eh? Brief exposure" (1.686). Though Milly does not quite appear as a character in Ulysses, she is an important figure in the drama of the novel, more important than many characters who are portrayed more vividly.

Just as Joyce’s portrayal of Simon Dedalus owed much to his father John Joyce, it is generally accepted by
contemporary biographers that Joyce's troubled daughter Lucia served as the model for Milly Bloom. In Nora: A Biography of Nora Joyce, Brenda Maddox elaborates:

More difficult to disentangle [than the identification of Joyce with Bloom] are the entwined images of Milly Bloom, the Blooms' fifteen-year-old daughter, and Lucia Joyce. Scholarly forays into this thicket have discovered, not too deeply buried, the theme of incest, and textual evidence has been produced to suggest that Milly has been sent away from home (she is in Mullingar as a photographer's apprentice) because Bloom has three times committed sexual improprieties with her. (205)

Neither this passage nor its larger context explains how the incest theme in Ulysses necessarily links Lucia with Milly; elsewhere Maddox writes: "Probing Bloom's guilty, incestuous impulses toward his adolescent daughter, Milly (deflected onto the figure of Gerty MacDowell) Joyce must have been acutely sensitive to his own arousal by his daughter's approaching puberty" (170-171). The "textual evidence" of physical sexual activity between Bloom and Milly (discussed in detail below) is actually scant, but the impulse is there--along with the guilt.23

At the outset of Ulysses Bloom's relationship with his daughter seems in no way unusual or unsavory, particularly since she is not even living with her parents. Apprenticed to a photographer in Mullingar, Milly's tangible presence in Dublin of Ulysses consists chiefly of two correspondences:
a card to her mother and a letter to her father. Milly seems generally to be more affectionate to Bloom than to Molly; the card to her mother is a brief note of thanks:
"--She got the things," Molly tells Bloom (4.260). Milly's letter to her father is much more substantial, and provides for the reader a surprisingly colorful portrait of the young woman:

. . . . There is a young student comes here some evenings named Bannon his cousins or something are big swells and he sings Boylan's (I was on the pop of writing Blazes Boylan's) song about those seaside girls. Tell him silly Milly sends my best respects. I must now close with fondest love

Your fond daughter

Milly

P.S. Excuse bad writing am in hurry. Byby.

M. (4.406-414)

Aside from what is revealed in this letter, all description of Milly's personality comes to the reader through Bloom or Molly. The letter is indicative of Milly's temperament and suggests a close, trusting, affectionate relationship with her father. Milly's mention of Blazes Boylan in connection with the suitor Bannon begins, however, an unpleasant chain of associations for Bloom, who is aware that Molly is about to enter into an affair with Boylan. Bloom is ambivalent about the similarity of the daughter to the mother, and
about the possibility of Milly being one of Boylan’s (or his surrogate Bannon’s) "seaside girls."  

Like Bloom, Molly also recognizes the similarities between herself and her daughter—"they all look at her like me when I was her age" (18.1036)—as she reveals in her monologue toward the end of the novel:

my mother whoever she was might have given me a nicer name the Lord knows after the lovely one she had Lunita Laredo the fun we had running along Williss road to Europa point twisting in and out all round the other side of Jersey they were shaking and dancing about in my blouse like Milly’s little ones now when she runs up the stairs (18.846-851)

Molly envies Milly’s youth, and she envies as well Bloom’s close relationship with their daughter. The difference between a card and a letter is not lost upon her: "only his letter and the card from Milly this morning see she wrote a letter to him who did I get the last letter from O Mrs Dwenn" (18.717-719).  

Elsewhere in her monologue, Molly’s thoughts of Milly are tinged with ambivalence and jealousy. She dwells on the pain of childbirth and nursing: "nice invention they made for women for him to get all the pleasure but if someone gave them a touch of it themselves theyd know what I went through with Milly nobody would believe cutting her teeth too" (18.157-159). This resentment for her daughter is coupled with pride, however; in comparing herself to younger
singers, Molly lists her accomplishments: "Let them get a husband first thats fit to be looked at and a daughter like mine" (892-893).

Molly has mixed feelings about Milly's banishment to Mullingar; she misses Milly and thinks she should have been sent to a business school, but she believes that she understands Bloom's motives: "all the same on account of me and Boylan thats why he did it Im certain the way he plots and plans everything" (18.1007-1008). Still, she is glad on some level to have Milly out of the house: "its as well he sent her where she is she was just getting out of bounds" (18.1027). "I couldnt turn round with her in the place lately unless I bolted the door first" (18.1009-1010). She is jealous also of the attention Milly has been getting from Bloom:

.... I noticed he was always talking to her lately at the table explaining things in the paper and she pretending to understand sly of course that comes from his side of the house he cant say I pretend things can he Im too honest as a matter of fact and helping her into her coat but if there was anything wrong with her its me shed tell not him .... (18.1017-1021)

In spite of Molly's assertion that she is closer to Milly than her husband is, the relationship between Bloom and his daughter is a close one; as Brenda Maddox suggests, some critics would say it is abnormally, even dangerously, close. In arguing for the importance of Milly Bloom to the
action of *Ulysses*, Tilly Eggers allows that "Bloom's relationship with Milly has incestuous overtones, which are inherent in the mother-daughter identification" (392). Ultimately, however, she is tolerant of these overtones: "Through his identification of Milly with Molly and Gerty, Bloom experiences what may be called 'immaculate intercourse' with his daughter, achieving in her a love which is virginal, sexual, and maternal" (393). Milly, for Eggers, "is the realization of Molly's and Bloom's love, the spirit made flesh"; she is "their means of seeing themselves in the future, their reconciliation and rebirth, their hope" (394).

This interpretation of Bloom's incestuous desire seems almost willfully benign, as Jane Ford suggests two years later: "In a novel viewed by many as a tribute to man's ability to endure, the twin motifs of incest and suicide continue to surface throughout" ("Mullingar" 436). Ford's reading of the incest motif in *Ulysses* links it to the themes of sin and guilt which she believes permeate the novel. Bloom's "skillful repression of his 'evil memories' has largely escaped critical recognition for over fifty years" (436). Ford cites information provided by the speaker of "Ithaca":

... inasmuch as complete mental intercourse between himself and the listener [Molly] had not taken place since the consummation of puberty, indicated by catamenic hemorrhage, of the female
issue of narrator and listener, 15 September 1903, there remained a period of 9 months and 1 day during which, in consequence of a preestablished natural comprehension in incomprehension between the consummated females (listener and issue), complete corporal liberty of action had been circumscribed. (17.2285-2292)

Ford argues that "Joyce has here telescoped the consummation of puberty with a sexual consummation" (438)--that Bloom has had intercourse with Milly: "since it is nine months and one day since Milly's 'consummation of puberty,' it is also possibly, in Alice's words, 'an un-birthday,' the day on which Bloom's and Milly's son might have been born, but is not" (441). Along with such textual hints and evidence from Joyce's emendations to the Ulysses typescript, Ford finds the "essential components of the incest theme, both in psychoanalytic literature and in the literary tradition" present in the novel: an absent mother, exile, and "the suitor as means of resolution"--in this case Stephen Dedalus (446).

Ford's argument for the importance of the incest motif in Ulysses is persuasive; Bloom's preoccupation with Milly throughout the novel is linked with obvious suppressions of thought, and his real, imagined, or remembered encounters with other young women--beginning with the "nextdoor girl" at Dlugacz's butchershop (4.156)--all underscore the awareness that Bloom's "Silly Milly" is becoming a woman:
"Sex breaking out even then. Pert little piece she was" (4.295).27

The repression that accompanies Bloom's semi-conscious longings is evident in the what he does not think, in the sentences he does not finish. As he runs his errands before attending Dignam's funeral, he considers stopping for a bath: "Time to get a bath round the corner. Hammam. Turkish. Massage. Dirt gets rolled up in your navel. Nicer if a nice girl did it. Also I think I. Yes I. Do it in the bath. Curious longing I. Water to water" (5.502-504). Bloom, aroused perhaps by the letter he has received from Martha Clifford and by the thought of being bathed by a "nice girl," longs to masturbate in the bath, but he cannot allow himself even to name the action in his thoughts.28 Bloom's longing here is linked retroactively to the "seaside girl" Milly via her connection with Gerty MacDowell, before whom Bloom masturbates in the evening.29

When Simon Dedalus speaks in "Hades" of his wife's family as "the drunken little costdrawer and Crissie, papa's little lump of dung, the wise child that knows her own father" (6.52-53), Bloom smiles "joylessly" and thinks of nothing: "Wallace Bros: the bottleworks: Dodder Bridge" (6.54-55). It would not be surprising if Simon's allusion to Richie Goulding's daughter had made him think of his own daughter; it is more surprising--and more revealing--that it
does not. Soon after, thinking about Molly’s pregnancy, Bloom allows Milly into her thoughts:


These lines, which follow closely upon his thoughts about Molly’s sexuality, are about as close as Bloom’s unconscious will allow him to get to consciously thinking Milly as a sex object. Later in the episode he considers and then reconceives paying his daughter a surprise visit: "She mightn’t like me to come that way without letting her know. Must be careful about women. Catch them once with their pants down. Never forgive you after. Fifteen" (6.483-485). Bloom seems to be accustoming himself to the idea of his daughter being a woman. Fifteen is for Bloom the magic number of adulthood ("I begin to like them at that age," he muses in "Nausicaa"); at that age girls become women, but boys become men who can be romantic rivals: "I often thought it would be better to have boy servants. Up to fifteen or so. After that, of course ..." (6.619-620).^{30}

As if Bloom’s confused thoughts of losing Molly and Milly to other men were not enough to keep him occupied, he is also reminded repeatedly of the family members he has lost to death: his infant son and his aged father. During
the carriage ride to the funeral, Bloom remembers his son's body prepared for burial:


Bloom's sense of failure and loss is based on his feelings of genetic responsibility for his son's ill health. From these unhappy memories Bloom turns to the memory of his father's suicide:

That afternoon of the inquest. The redlabelled bottle on the table. The room in the hotel with hunting pictures. Stuffy it was. Sunlight through the slats of the Venetian blind. The coroner's sunlit ears, big and hairy. Boots giving evidence. Thought he was asleep first. Then saw like yellow streaks on his face. Had slipped down to the foot of the bed. Verdict: overdose. Death by misadventure. The letter. For my son Leopold. (359-364)

His pain is compounded by the ignorant remarks of his fellow travelers:

--But the worst of all, Mr Power said, is the man who takes his own life.
    Martin Cunningham drew out his watch briskly, coughed and put it back.
--The greatest disgrace to have in the family, Mr Power added.
--Temporary insanity, of course, Martin Cunningham said decisively. We must take a charitable view of it.
--They say a man who does it is a coward, Mr Dedalus said.
--It is not for us to judge, Martin Cunningham said. (6.335-342)

Although Bloom is haunted throughout the day by these ghosts (most vividly, as we shall, in "Circe"), his internal censor permits him to think of them, as Stephen is capable of thinking consciously of May Dedalus. The presence of all these ghosts serves to emphasize the ghosts that are absent: Simon Dedalus and Milly Bloom.

Just as "Scylla and Charybdis" showcases Stephen's repressive strategies, the "Lestrygonians" episode showcases Bloom's. Joyce's "technique" in this episode is "peristaltic" (Gifford, Notes for Ulysses 156), but it might more accurately be labelled parapraxis; the episode is full of misreadings and misrememberings. Chester G. Anderson uses Bloom's frequent Freudian slips (he cites forty of them) to argue that Joyce is intentionally alluding to--and mocking--The Psychopathology of Everyday Life. Bloom is consciously trying to avoid thinking about Molly's impending meeting with Blazes Boylan, and unconsciously suppressing unacceptable thoughts of his daughter. Some ideas are better left unthought, as Bloom is aware: "Well, of course, if we knew all the things" (8.50). The thought that Boylan might have "a dose burning in him" (8.101), that he might infect Molly with a venereal disease, can be voiced only by
omission in a series of suppressed thoughts that disrupt the flow of Bloom's interior monologue:

If he ....? 
O! 
Eh? 
No ...... No. 
No, no. I don’t believe it. He wouldn’t surely? 
No, no. 
Mr Bloom moved forward, raising his troubled eyes. Think no more about that. (8.102-109)

Interior monologue gives the reader the illusion that the character's innermost thoughts are exposed; Bloom's withholding of his thoughts and fears during key moments is thus all the more enlightening from a psychoanalytic perspective. Frequently Bloom is able to deflect emotion with pragmatism, as when he imagines owning a luminous crucifix and "Waking up in the dead of night and see him on the wall, hanging" (8.19-20). Rather than associate Christ with his lost son Rudy (whom he names below), Bloom allows his scientific mind to distract him: "Phosphorus it must be done with" (8.21).

Reminders of Molly's assignation with Boylan appear repeatedly during this episode, in spite of Bloom's best efforts to avoid them. He will not allow himself to name his rival, however: "They are not Boyl: no, M'Glade's men" (8.130). The disturbance these thoughts are causing him is manifest:
Wait. The full moon was the night we were Sunday fortnight exactly there is a new moon. Walking down by the Tolka. Not bad for a Fairview moon. She was humming. The young May moon she’s beaming, love. He other side of her. Elbow, arm. He. Glowworm’s la-amp is gleaming, love. Touch. Fingers. Asking. Answer. Yes. Stop. Stop. If it was it was. Must. (8.587-592)

Toward the end of the episode Bloom nearly runs into his nemesis--"Straw hat in the sunlight. Tan shoes. Turnedup trousers. It is. It is" (8.1168)--but hides breathlessly at the museum. He is torn by the strong desires to look at Boylan and not to look: "Is it? Almost certain. Won’t look. Wine in my face. Why did I. Too heady. Yes, it is. The walk. Not see. Get on" (8.1170-1171).

Clearly Bloom’s desire to avoid Boylan and all thoughts of him is a conscious one. His preoccupation with being cuckolded masks the deeper suppression of more disturbing thoughts. Daughters crop up repeatedly in the "Lestrygonians" episode: "Dedalus’ daughter" outside Dillon’s auctionrooms (8.29), "Smart girls writing something" (8.133), the pawnbroker’s daughter (8.153), "Turnkey’s daughter" (8.460), a farmer’s daughter (8.569), and Milly of course. Joyce listed "the seductive daughter" as one of the "Persons" of the episode (Gifford 156), and in suppressing thoughts of his wife’s appointment with Boylan--whom he cannot even allow himself to name--he almost allows deeper impulses toward his daughter to surface.
Bloom thinks of Milly in the bath, "Funny she looked soaped all over. Shapely too" (8.173). The daydream is innocent enough by itself, but coupled with Bloom's association of Milly with the "seaside girls" and his later behavior on the strand before Gerty MacDowell, the thought reveals an undercurrent of incestuous desire. In a conversation shortly after this memory, Bloom uses news of Milly's position in Mullingar to derail Mrs Breen's inquiries about Molly. The episode closes in an atmosphere of helpless regret (punctuated, of course, by Bloom's flight from Boylan). Bloom wears black to mourn Paddy Dignam, and he mourns also his apparent loss of Molly. Embedded within his regrets over Molly, however, is the regret over the loss of his daughter. As he excuses himself from his meal, the inevitability of this sundering occurs to him in mid-stride: "A man and ready he drained his glass to the lees and walked, to men too they gave themselves, manly conscious, lay with men lovers, a youth enjoyed her, to the yard" (8.934-936).

In "Nausicaa," Bloom is able to assert himself over a surrogate for Milly; though a youth, Alec Bannon, may have "enjoyed" Milly whom Bloom cannot enjoy, he is able at least to temporarily assuage his incestuous impulse with a substitute seaside girl, Gerty MacDowell. Richard Ellmann writes: "For the first time in literature masturbation becomes heroic. It is a way of joining ideal and real, and
while simplistic or vulgar, it is not negligible" (Ulysses on the Liffey 133). Certainly Bloom's attraction to Gerty represents a compromise between the real and the ideal, a way of attaining, at least momentarily, the unattainable.

Just what is real in the "Nausicaa" episode is the subject of ongoing critical debate. Taking a cue from an offhand remark of Joyce's that "it all took place in Bloom's imagination" (Power 32), some critics have read Gerty as nothing more (or less) than Bloom's masturbatory fantasy. According to this school of thought, "Nausicaa" is "The Mystery Man on the Beach, prize titbit story by Mr Leopold Bloom" (13.1060), and Gerty's internal thoughts are the products of Bloom's sexual fantasies. Whether Gerty is written by Bloom or by Joyce, however, the role she plays in Ulysses is that of daughter-surrogate for Bloom, an acceptable object of desire; acceptable (though ultimately unsatisfactory) because she is not his daughter and perhaps also because she is older than Milly--"Gerty would never see seventeen again" (13.172).

The psychic father-daughter aspect relationship between Gerty and Bloom is established early in the episode. Gerty's own father is a victim of "the demon drink" (13.290), and like Eveline and Dilly Dedalus, she seems to be an abused Dublin daughter:

But the vile decoction which has ruined so many hearths and homes had cast its shadow over her
childhood days. Nay, she had even witnessed in the home circle deeds of violence caused by intemperance and had seen her own father, a prey to the fumes of intoxication, forget himself completely for if there was one thing of all things that Gerty knew it was that the man who lifts his hand to a woman save in the way of kindness, deserves to be branded as the lowest of the low. (13.296-302)

Though she describes her father as abusive, it is not clear that Gerty has actually been sexually abused by her father, or that she is the victim of his violence at all. Just as Eveline is tortured by happy memories of her father, Gerty, "a sterling good daughter" (13.325) cannot hold a grudge against hers: "Poor father! With all his faults she loved him still when he sang Tell me, Mary, how to woo thee or My love and cottage near Rochelle" (13.311-313).

Between the negative and positive memories of her own father, Gerty considers the merits of having Bloom (or perhaps another man taking a walk, a "man that was so like himself") as a father: "You never saw him in any way screwed but still and for all that she would not like him for a father because he was too old or something or on account of his face" (307-309). Gerty and Bloom enact a father-daughter ritual of throwing, catching and kicking a ball. This wordless recreation prompts Gerty to lift her skirt for the first time, and looking for Bloom's reaction to her performance, she looks directly at him: "the face that met her gaze there in the twilight, wan and strangely
drawn, seemed to her the saddest she had ever seen" (13.368-370).

If the Gerty portrayed in "Nausicaa" is simply the heroine of Bloom's prize titbit story, if her thoughts are Bloom's fantasies, her return of his gaze reveals his fantasy of the daughter's desire and acceptance. It is phrased in the language of unconscious incest fantasy:

Here was that of which she had so often dreamed. It was he who mattered and there was joy on her face because she wanted him because she felt instinctively that he was like no-one else. The very heart of the girlwoman went out to him, her dreamhusband, because she knew on the instant it was him. (13.427-431)

If Gerty is not Bloom's fantasy, she is nonetheless connected to him: "Her every effort would be to share his thoughts" (13.654). Her ecstasy accompanies Bloom's climax:

She would fain have cried to him chokingly, held out her snowy slender arms to him to come, to feel his lips laid on her white brow, the cry of a young girl's love, a little strangled cry, wrung from her, that cry that has rung through the ages. (13.733-736)

Immediately after, the narration passes from being strictly Gerty's thoughts and becomes more apparently Bloom's conception of them: "Leopold Bloom (for it is he) stands silent, with bowed head before those young guileless eyes. What a brute he had been! At it again?" (744-746). Presumably Gerty could not know his name, since he does not
know hers. The accusation "At it again?" reinforces the possibility of sexual contact between Bloom and Milly, or at least between Bloom and another Milly-substitute. The narrator--Bloom, Gerty, or some combination of the two--quotes what might be called the rhetoric of incest: "Should a girl tell? No, a thousand times no. That was their secret, only theirs, alone in the hiding twilight and there was none to know or tell . . . " (13.750-751).

With Boylan's song about "those girls, those girls, those lovely seaside girls" running through his head (13.906), Bloom's thoughts turn revealingly to Milly, whom he compares favorably with Gerty:

Three years old she was in front of Molly's dressingtable, just before we left Lombard street west. *Me have a nice pace.* Mullingar. *Who knows?* Ways of the world. *Young student.* Straight pins on her anyway not like the other. *Still she was game.* Lord, I am wet. *Devil you are.* (13.925-929).

Bloom easily conflates Milly with the object of his masturbatory fantasy, and his mind's eye moves from Gerty's undergarments to Milly's: "Her first stays I remember. Made me laugh to see. Little paps to begin with. Left one is more sensitive, I think. Mine too. Nearer the heart?" (13.1199-1201).

The masturbation in "Nausicaa" is, I believe, as close to physical incest as Bloom gets. The physical and emotional distance Bloom maintains even from this daughter-
surrogate emphasizes the distance he maintains from conscious thoughts of incest with Milly. As Diana Arbin Ben-Merre argues, "Bloom's feelings of guilt are for imagined acts of incest" (439). The theme of incest remains subterranean in his final thoughts of Milly on June 16th, rendered explicitly in the "Ithaca" episode.

Stephen's recitation of the ballad titled either "Little Harry Hughes" or "The Jew's Daughter" brings Milly to the fore of Bloom's consciousness:

Little Harry Hughes and his schoolfellows all
Went out for to play ball.
And the very first ball little Harry Hughes played
He drove it o'er the jew's garden wall.
And the very second ball little Harry Hughes played
He broke the jew's windows all. (17.802-807)

Bloom, the "son of Rudolph" (17.809), receives this stanza "with unmixed feeling. Smiling, a jew, he heard with pleasure and saw the unbroken kitchen window" (17.810-811). The unbroken window can be read as a symbol for the daughter's virginity, as the rest of the ballad suggests; the daughter invites Harry Hughes inside, into "a room where none could hear him call," and then:

She took a penknife out of her pocket
And cut off his little head.
And now he'll play his ball no more
For he lies among the dead. (17.824-828)
Neither the anti-Semitism nor the crude symbolism of the ballad is lost on the "father of Millicent" (17.829); he hears its conclusion "with mixed feelings. Unsmiling, he heard and saw with wonder a jew's daughter, all dressed in green" (17.831-832).³⁴

If there were a history of incest in the Bloom household, "Ithaca" would be the logical site for its revelation; the fact that it is not revealed argues strongly for its existence only as Bloom's fantasy. In fact, Stephen's perhaps unwitting allusion to Milly in his ballad prompts in Bloom a series of reminiscences about Milly that seem willfully paternal and benevolent--they are revealing signs of the repression of incestuous impulses. Certainly his remembered somnambulism and Milly's childhood night terrors are suggestive of incest, as Jane Ford argues, but they are not the conclusive proof the reader might expect from the "Ithaca" episode. The innocent memories which almost immediately mask this line of revery are evidence of guilt; but Bloom need not have committed incest in order to feel guilty about his incestuous impulses. And the absence of the fact of incest makes it no less real.
III. Homecoming: Resolution in "Circe," "Eumaeus," and "Ithaca"

All of *Ulysses* points to the father-son union of Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus; apparently sonless Bloom and fatherless Stephen are quite literally made for each other—or more exactly, they *unconsciously make themselves for each other*. We have seen Stephen's and Bloom's separate strategies of repression and avoidance throughout *Ulysses* and the central role these strategies play in developing the plot of the novel. Stephen's suppression of Simon Dedalus, underscored by Simon's three-dimensional portrayal elsewhere in *Ulysses*, clears psychological space for Stephen's acceptance of Bloom as a spiritual father. Bloom suppresses thoughts of his living daughter by dwelling on the loss of his dead son, thus creating a void for Stephen Dedalus to fill.

All the circumstances are right for the union between Stephen and Bloom to take place; why then does this union, when it occurs in "Circe" and afterwards, have such little outward impact on the lives of the characters? What, ultimately, is the significance of the meeting of Stephen and Bloom and the time they spend together? What happens when Stephen leaves 7 Eccles Street?

In "Circe" each character is confronted with various manifestations of his own psyche, and perhaps of other
people's psyches. What is actually going on in the episode is impossible to discern, if by "actually" we mean "apparent to an outside viewer." Subjectivity is presented without even the mask of objectivity, and furthermore, the "subject" of the episode changes, or flows from character to character, without warning throughout the episode. The reader does not know whether a given apparition is visible just to Stephen, to both Stephen and Bloom, or to the assembled crowd. In some cases it is unclear whether a character is actually present, or whether he or she is merely an apparition or an unconscious association of one of the characters.

"Circe" is an episode in which the unconscious--or perhaps the semiconscious--takes on the appearance and immediacy of conscious reality for Stephen Dedalus and Leopold Bloom. It is, thus, an extremely important episode in an analysis of the forms and functions of repression in Ulysses. While the episode begins the union of Stephen and Bloom, it contains also the reasons for its ultimately unsatisfactory effect and its premature conclusion. Bloom and Stephen successfully fend off their nightmares and resist the return of the repressed, but in doing so, they reject the opportunity to come to terms with their ghosts and lay them to rest.

The surreality of the opening description of this garden of earthly delights sets the stage for the
psychological drama to come. Cissy Caffrey, friend to Gerty MacDowell, sings a bawdy song, and a drunken Stephen Dedalus "chants with the joy the introit for paschal time" (15.73-74):

    I have risen and now am I with you once more.
    Alleluia! You laid your hand upon me. Alleluia!
    You have shown how wonderful is your wisdom.
    Alleluia, alleluia! Lord, you have proved me, and
    you know me. You saw me when I went to my rest,
    and you saw me rise again. (Gifford, Ulysses
    Annotated 453)

Thought they are not quoted in Ulysses, these lines are obviously significant to the father-son theme of the novel. The language of ascension is relevant to Stephen's unconscious desire to fly with Daedalus, and to Bloom's desire to see his son rise again. It is also worth noting that Ulysses opens with another parodic Mass; Mulligan's Mass and Stephen's lend significance to each other.

    Following after Stephen to keep an eye on him, though not so closely that he cannot stop for a snack, Bloom is the first to be confronted by his dead. The suicide Rudolph Bloom appears, "a stooped bearded figure...garbed in the long caftan of an elder in Zion and a smokingcap with magenta tassels. Horned spectacles hang down at the wings of the nose. Yellow poison streaks are on the drawn face" (15.247-251). Rudolph Bloom's function as Bloom's superego is established immediately: "I told you not to go with drunken goy ever" (15.253). The apparition goes on to
upbraid Bloom: "Are you not my son Leopold, the grandson of
Leopold? Are you not my dear son Leopold who left the house of
his father and left the god of his fathers Abraham and
Jacob?" (15.260). 36

Bloom’s struggling with the ghosts of his father and
mother (Ellen Bloom, who appears shortly after) give a hint to
the futility of Stephen’s desire to be totally free of
his own ghosts. Bloom is an adult, and his parents are long
dead, yet he is still haunted by his father’s chiding
voice—haunted enough to stay hungry and feed the proscribed
"feetmeat" to a dog (15.672). It is probable that part of
Bloom’s desire to be truly a father is based in his
unconscious belief that fatherhood precludes sonhood, that
he will no longer be subject to his father’s commands. But
though the faces of his superego may change, Bloom will
still be haunted by his multifaceted guilt, as the
domineering apparition of Mrs Marion Bloom suggests.

Bloom’s guilt over wasting his money on food (and a
pig’s foot at that) is at any rate a screen for a deeper
guilt—-the guilt for his perceived responsibility for Rudy’s
death and for his incestuous impulses, brought to the
surface by the Bawd’s offer of "Ten shillings a maidenhead.
Fresh thing was never touched. Fifteen. There’s no-one in
it only her old father that’s dead drunk" (15.359). The
bawd gestures toward Bridie Kelly, but she quickly
metamorphoses: "Leering, Gerty MacDowell limps forward.
She draws from behind, ogling, and shows coyly her bloodied clout" (15.372-373). As she did in her own thoughts in "Nausicaa" (13.216-217) Gerty quotes the Catholic marriage service and turns immediately to accusation: "With all my worldly goods I thee and thou. (she murmurs) You did that. I hate you" (15.375-376).

The Gerty MacDowell of "Nausicaa" may not have existed solely in the imagination of Bloom, and her thoughts may not have been purely his fantasy; here, however, Gerty's words are clearly the expression of Bloom's ambivalence toward his incestuous impulses: "Dirty married man! I love you for doing that to me" (15.385). The Bawd accuses of Gerty of "writing the gentleman false letters" (15.380), thus associating her with Martha Clifford as well as Milly Bloom.

From his youthful daughter and her surrogates Bloom moves to his own youth, and his new accuser, Mrs Breen, quickly becomes complicit in his sexual misconduct. Bloom first argues that he is in Nighttown to rescue "fallen women" (15.402) and then decides, upon hearing that "there's someone in the house with Dina" (15.420), that his own flirtation with Mrs Breen is justified. He then proceeds with her down memory lane--which might be said to be the main street in Nighttown--to "the dear dead days beyond recall" (15.454). Even in flirting with Mrs Breen, Bloom uses Milly as a reference point: "Do you remember a long long time ago, years and years ago, just after Milly,
Marionette we called her, was weaned when we all went together to Fairyhouse races, was it?" (15.539-541). Mrs Breen's series of assents prefigures the end of the novel: "(eagerly) Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes" (15.576). The nature of their remembered encounter is never made clear.

Revealingly, Mrs Breen and Bloom are joined in mid-conversation (just before Bloom's offhand mention of Milly) by Richie Goulding, whom Simon Dedalus suggests in "Hades" to have had incestuous contact with his daughter. Goulding bears a bag marked with a Masonic symbol, which further connects him with his fellow Mason Bloom; he is quickly eliminated from the scene, however, by a torch-bearing laborer: "The navvy, lurching by, gores him with his flaming pronghorn" (513-514). The crude symbolism might suggest punishment in kind for his (and Bloom's) imagined sin of incest. Goulding makes an appearance again later in the episode, when Bloom is conversing with Bella's fan. Bloom is talking about the sciatica he has inherited from his father:

Poor dear papa, a widower, was a regular barometer from it. He believed in animal heat. A skin of tabby lined his winter waistcoat. Near the end, remembering king David and the Sunamite, he shared his bed with Athos, faithful after death. A dog's spittle as you probably .... (he winces) Ah!
Bloom's exclamations are at once a twinge of sciatica and a twinge of guilt, for Richie Goulding, symbol of the guilt of incest, is passing by the door.

The crime for which Bloom is harassed and tried in "Circe" is never clearly defined and is at any rate a screen for this real guilt; Martha Clifford, his illicit correspondent (and as such a potential stand-in for Milly in Bloom's unconscious) becomes one of his accusers. Bloom's alibis further confuse the situation and begin to confuse his gender: "I am a man misunderstood. I am being made a scapegoat of. I am a respectable married man, without a stain on my character. I live in Eccles street. My wife, I am the daughter of a most distinguished commander" (15.775-778). Philip Beaufoy, author of "Matcham's Masterstroke," accuses Bloom of plagiarism in terms that hint further at crimes in the home: "Why, look at the man's private life! Leading a quadruple existence! Street angel and house devil. Not fit to be mentioned in mixed society! The archconspirator of the age!" (15.853-855). Later, before a jury of his peers (including Simon Dedalus), Bloom is called "a wellknown dynamitard, forger, bigamist, bawd and cuckold and a public nuisance to the citizens of Dublin" (15.1158-1160).

Bloom's next accuser is Mary Driscoll, the servant to whom Bloom made "certain suggestions" (15.873). The connection between the servant and Milly has already been
established; later, Bloom admits that "there might have been the lapses of an erring father" (15.905). It is unclear whether he is apologizing for himself or for the "aged bedridden parent" who raised him. J. J. O'Molloy, the failed barrister of the "Aeolus" episode, argues in Bloom's defense that "There have been cases of shipwreck and somnambulism in my client's family" (15.950-951) and that "The young person was treated by defendant as if she were his very own daughter" (15.972-974). Neither argument seems designed to clear Bloom of the charges of incest that his unconscious is levying against him. Bloom attempts his own last-ditch defense:


Ultimately, only the voice of Paddy Dignam's ghost, paraphrasing dead king Hamlet, saves Bloom from execution. Later, after Bloom has ascended to the station of Leopold the First and "repudiated our former spouse and have bestowed our royal hand upon the princess Selene, the splendour of night" (15.1505-1507), the Man in the Macintosh appears through a trapdoor to accuse him again, but Bloom orders him shot, and women applaud him: "Little father! Little father!" (15.1591), a translation of Milly's "Dearest Papli."
Bloom’s sexual misdemeanors eventually catch up with him again, and he is once again accused. This time, however, his persecution is Christ’s, and he goes "cheerfully" to his doom: "Just like old times. Poor Bloom!" (15.1913). His punishment is not a dignified death befitting a savior, however, but humiliation at the hands (et cetera) of the metamorphosed Bello. "The sins of your past are rising against you. Many. Hundreds," Bello tells Bloom (15.3025). The Sins of the Past then rise to accuse him, but Bello interrupts:

BELLO

(whistles loudly) Say! What was the most revolting piece of obscenity in all your career of crime? Go the whole hog. Puke it out! Be candid for once.

(Mute inhuman faces throng forward, leering, vanishing, gibbering, Booloochoom, Poldy Kock, Bootlaces a penny, Cassidy's hag, blind stripling, Larry rhinoceros, the girl, the woman, the whore, the other the, lane the.)

BLOOM

Don’t ask me! Our mutual faith. Pleasants street. I only thought the half of the ... I swear on my sacred oath ....

BELLO

(peremptorily) Answer. Repugnant wretch! I insist on knowing. Tell me something to amuse me, smut or a bloody good ghoststory or a line of poetry, quick, quick, quick! Where? How? What time? With how many? I give you just three seconds. One! Two! Thr .....
BLOOM

(docile, gurgles) I rererepugnosed in rerererepugnant...

BELLO

(imperiously) O, get out, you skunk! Hold your tongue! Speak when you’re spoken to.

This is Bloom’s opportunity to confess, but he fails to do so. The stammering admission that Bello interrupts is no admission at all—it seems to be a repetition of a crime Bloom has already been accused of. His real crime remains unspeakable; even the most relevant of the "mute inhuman faces" that leer at him are unnamed. His punishment, however, fits his crime; he is made to behold his daughter, whom he initially mistakes for Molly: "I see her! It’s she! The first night at Mat Dillon’s! But that dress, the green! And her hair is dyed gold and he ...." (15.3162-3163). Milly is wearing the garb of the Jew’s daughter in the song Stephen will sing in "Ithaca":

BELLO

(laughs mockingly) That’s your daughter, you owl, with a Mullingar student.

(Milly Bloom, fairhaired, greenvested, slimsandalled, her blue scarf in the seawind simply swirling, breaks from the arms of her lover and calls, her young eyes wonderwide.)
But Milly's presence in Bloom's nightmare/fantasy is a little too close to Bloom's unconscious fantasy for comfort. She recedes quickly, to be replaced by a more acceptable surrogate--a nymph from a picture clipped from a magazine:

The Bath of the Nymph over the bed. Given away with the Easter number of Photo Bits: splendid masterpiece in art colours. tea before you put milk in. Not unlike her with her hair down: slimmer. Three and six I gave for the frame. She said it would look nice over the bed. naked nymphs: Greece: and for instance all the people that lived then. (4.369-373)

The nymph, a seaside girl first mentioned in the "Calypso" episode, is an ideal stand-in for the "photo girl" Milly in this rehearsal of Bloom's guilt, because she allows herself to be identified also with Molly, above whose bed she hangs. This conflation of love-objects permits Bloom to feel desire for the nymph without consciously admitting to his incestuous desire for his daughter. Even so, he censors the portrait of the nymph: "Unseen, one summer eve, you kissed me in four places. And with loving pencil you shaded my eyes, my bosom and my shame" (15.3264-3265). Alluding to Bloom's examination of the statues in the museum, the nymph further emphasizes her innocence and her similarity to a young girl, since immortals like her "have not such a place and no hair there either. We are stonecold and pure" (3392-3393).
The connection between somnambulism and incest, established earlier, is reiterated in Bloom’s confession that "Sleep reveals the worst side of everyone, children perhaps excepted. I know I fell out of bed or rather was pushed" (15.3272-3274). The nunlike nymph subsequently becomes the latest of Bloom’s daughter-surrogate accusers:

THE NYMPH

(her features hardening, gropes in the folds of her habit) Sacrilege! To attempt my virtue! (a large moist stain appears on her robe) Sully my innocence! You are not fit to touch the garment of a pure woman. (she clutches again her robe) Wait. Satan, you’ll sing no more lovesongs. Amen. Amen. Amen. Amen. (she draws a poniard and, clad in the sheathmail of an elected knight of nine, strikes at his loins) Nekum! (15.3456-3461)

Having fended off the confession of his guilt earlier, Bloom is now powerful enough to resist the nymph’s attack and its incestuous significance. He chases her away and is not challenged again. His subsequent humiliation by Blazes Boylan, who encourages him to engage in masochistic voyeurism—"You can apply your eye to the keyhole and play with yourself while I just go through her a few times" (15.3788-3789)—is less a serious challenge to his ego than another screen for the guilt that is really nagging him. In resisting Bello’s forced confession/acknowledgement of his guilt, Bloom is thus consigning it once more to his unconscious, where it can (and does) continue to haunt him.
What Bloom could have accomplished in this analysis-like episode has not happened; he has not been "cured."

Stephen, like Bloom, undergoes a trial in "Circe," and like Bloom, in surviving it he fails to benefit from it. At the beginning of the episode Stephen "flourishes his ashplant, shivering the lamp image, scattering light over the world" (15.99-100), prefiguring the violent rejection of his ghosts at the episode's--and perhaps the book's--climax. When Bloom and the reader catch up with him much later in the episode, Stephen the "spoiled priest" (15.2649) is delivering a sermon: "In the beginning was the word, in the end the world without end. Blessed be the eight beatitudes" (15.2236-2237). Though the beatitudes that Stephen summons appear in the persons of Stephen's peers, and speak in gibberish--"Beer beef battledog buybull businum barnum buggerum bishop" (15.2242)--the beatitudes to which he refers, from the Sermon on the Mount, give a clue to the nature of repression as it motivates the characters in this episode, and to why both Bloom and Stephen ultimately fail to conquer it:

Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted.
Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.
Blessed are they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.
Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy. 
Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God. 
Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the sons of God. 
Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. 
Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. 
Rejoice, and be exceedingly glad; for great is your reward in heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets who were before you. (Matthew 5:3-12)

In order to conquer their repressed anxieties and impulses, Stephen and Bloom must first submit to them, not by acting out these patricidal and incestuous desires, but by admitting that they exist at all. Bloom's and Stephen's various ghosts are temporarily dispelled in "Circe," but they are far from being laid to rest.

While Bloom is sparring verbally with his grandfather Virag, Stephen sits at the pianola, admonishing himself to "Imitate pa" (15.2495). Shortly thereafter a version of his father appears; when Florry insists that Stephen is a "spoiled priest," Lynch agrees: "He is. A cardinal's son" (15.2651).

His eminence Simon Stephen Cardinal Dedalus, primate of all Ireland, appears in the doorway, dressed in red soutane, sandals and socks. Seven dwarf simian acolytes, also in red, cardinal sins, uphold his train, peeping under it. He wears a battered silk hat sideways on his head. His
This first manifestation of Simon Dedalus is a drunken figure of ridicule; he recites nonsense rhymes favored by John Joyce (Gifford, *Ulysses Annotated* 499) and peers at the assembled crowd through one eye, as he does at Stephen in the opening paragraph of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. As he departs, singing, the "merciful male" dwindles to the size of his dwarf acolytes (15.2686). The version of Simon Dedalus that Stephen has conjured is ridiculous and negligible, an easy adversary in the conflict of the generations. He is dispelled as easily as Stephen dispensed with the idea of entering the priesthood in the fourth chapter of *Portrait*.

Upon hearing that it is after eleven o'clock, Stephen poses again the riddle he asked his students earlier in the day, but with some important variations:

```
The fox crew, the cocks flew,
The bells in heaven
Were striking eleven.
'Tis time for her poor soul
To get out of heaven. (15.3577-3581)
```

Indeed, Stephen's conception of his mother's soul will soon appear before him, bringing about the climax of the episode. No one asks for the answer to the riddle, but Stephen
provides it nonetheless: "Thirsty fox. (he laughs loudly)
Burying his grandmother. Probably he killed her" (15.3610-3611). Stephen is still insisting on the "grandmother" variation that distances the riddle from his own situation.

Hints throughout the episode suggest that a union between Stephen and Bloom is about to take place. Earlier, Zoe asked Bloom if he were Stephen's father, to which he replies, "Not I!" (15.1293). Now, Stephen remarks on their apparent bond, linking Bloom's scarred hand and his own broken glasses: "I am twentytwo. Sixteen years ago he was twentytwo too. Sixteen years ago I twentytwo tumbled. Twentytwo years ago he sixteen fell off his hobbyhorse. (he winces) Hurt my hand somewhere" (3718-3721). Finally, after Bloom watches Boylan and Molly, the union between him and Stephen appears to take place: "Stephen and Bloom gaze in the mirror. The face of William Shakespeare, beardless, appears there, rigid in facial paralysis, crowned by the reflection of the reindeer antlered hatrack in the hall" (15.3821-3824).

The blending of Stephen's face with Bloom's produces the paralyzed face of the bard, garnished with antlers suggestive of a cuckold's horns. The words Shakespeare utters "in dignified ventriloquy" are confused: "Iagogo! How my Oldfellow chokit his Thurdaymornun. Iagogogo!" (15.3828-3829). The words are relevant to Bloom's anguish as well as Stephen's: Othello is, of course, a play about
perceived infidelity, and it ends with Othello choking Desdemona. However, Stephen, who was born "Thursday. Today" (15.3685), is a Thursday's child who has "far to go" if he is to put behind him the Oedipal rivalry that keeps him in conflict with his "Oldfellow" Simon Dedalus. Thus the Shakespeare that results from the merging of the reflections of Stephen and Bloom is a Shakespearean reflection of their separate anxieties.

Stephen begins telling about the dream he apparently shared with Bloom the night before, but when Bloom approaches, Stephen reacts violently:

Break my spirit, will he? O merde alors! (he cries, his vulture talons sharpened) Holà! Hillyho!

(Simon Dedalus' voice hilloes in answer, somewhat sleepy but ready.) (15.3940-3944)

When Simon Dedalus appears again, wheeling uncertainly through the air "on strong ponderous buzzard wings" (15.3946), he is exposing Stephen's family romance about his "true father" Daedalus for the empty construct that it is. Combined with his earlier incarnation as a church father, this vision of a patriotic Simon Dedalus completes the trinity of paternoster, patria, and paterfamilias that he represented in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. He urges on the hounds after the "stout fox" that, "drawn from covert, brush pointed, having buried his grandmother, runs
swift for the open, brighteyed, seeking badger earth, under the leaves" (15.3952-3954). Though his father here is persecuting Stephen (in his role as the matricidal fox), this vision of Simon Dedalus is no less ridiculous than the first, and is symptomatic of Stephen's repression of his father's role in his development.

After Stephen dances his way through a succession of the prostitutes, Simon urges him to "Think of your mother's people!" (15.4137). Stephen begins a "dance of death" that ends when another ghost appears:

(Stephen's mother, emaciated, rises stark through the floor, in leper grey with a wreath of faded orangeblossoms and a torn bridal veil, her face worn and noseless, green with gravemould. Her hair is scant and lank. she fixes her bluecircled hollow eyesockets on Stephen and opens her toothless mouth uttering a silent word. A choir of virgins and confessors sing voicelessly.)

The "silent word," the word Stephen cannot bring himself to hear, is symbolic of the repression he cannot allow himself to face; though he asks her for "the word known to all men" (15.4192), he cannot allow her to respond. When she replies by urging him to repent his sins, he denies that the apparition is his mother at all: "The ghoul! Hyena!"

(15.4200). Once again he refuses to repent:
STEPHEN

No! No! No! Break my spirit, all of you, if you can! I'll bring you all to heel!

THE MOTHER

(in the agony of her deathrattle) Have mercy on Stephen, Lord, for my sake! Inexpressible was my anguish when expiring with love, grief and agony on Mount Calvary.

STEPHEN

Nothung!

(He lifts his ashplant high with both hands and smashes the chandelier. Time's livid final flame leaps and, in the following darkness, ruin of all space, shattered glass and toppling masonry.)

This passage is the dramatic climax of Ulysses; the episode, and indeed the whole novel, build to the point of Stephen's destruction of the lamp. Ultimately, though, what is accomplished by Stephen's "Non serviam," which has been uttered before, not just by Lucifer, but by Stephen himself?41

Though the scene is dramatic and climactic, there is no reason to believe that Stephen has gotten any closer to dispelling the repression-born ghosts that have kept him thus far paralyzed. When Bloom catches up with Stephen outside, Stephen is clearly fighting the same enemies he fought throughout Portrait: "But in here it is I must kill the priest and king" (15.4436). He continues, trying to
clarify himself to Private Carr: "But I say: Let my country die for me. Up to the present it has done so. I didn’t want it to die. Damn death. Long live life!" (15.4473-4474). This celebration of life ironically echoes the joyful benediction that closes the Portrait and suggests that Stephen has not grown much since then, that the visions that passed through his unconscious in "Circe" have not in any way changed or matured him. What he has repressed remains repressed, and when he passes out at the conclusion of the episode, he dreams again of the "Black panther. Vampire" (15.4930) that he has dreamt of before. And lest it be thought that Bloom has fared any better, the closing image of "Circe" shows him too to be haunted by the ghosts he brought with him into Nighttown:

Against the dark wall a figure appears slowly, a fairy boy of eleven, a changeling, kidnapped, dressed in an Eton suit with glass shoes and a little bronze helmet, holding a book in his hand. He reads from right to left inaudibly, smiling, kissing the page. (15.4956-4960)

It is Rudy, Bloom’s lost son. Bloom’s suppressive strategy is intact; his guardian angel has appeared to deflect his attentions away from the deepest impulses he so fears.

The "Eumaeus" and "Ithaca" chapters underscore the anticlimax of "Circe." Bloom’s attempts at meaningful communication with Stephen fail repeatedly; and what Stephen does say, Bloom misunderstands. Their discussion of the
existence of God is emblematic of this disjuncture: "On this knotty point however the views of the pair, poles apart as they were both in schooling and everything else with the marked differences in their respective ages, clashed" (16.774-776). This father-son relationship is no more adequate than the one Stephen has already eschewed with Simon Dedalus, whose house he has left "to seek misfortune," as he tells Bloom (16.253). Bloom speaks highly of Simon and suggests that Stephen return to his father’s home, but the memory conjured in Stephen’s head is an unsavory one: his sisters and the cat eating scraps of leftover food and garbage.

Having resisted the return of the repressed in "Circe," Stephen confronts in "Eumaeus" the drowned man whose return was foreshadowed earlier in the novel. But the portent of the three-masted ship he glimpsed over his shoulder in "Proteus" has been defused; instead of coming to terms with the symbolic drowned man who variously represented himself, his father, and Daedalus, Stephen enters into conversation with a sailor who came into Dublin that morning on the Rosevean, the ship Stephen saw in the bay. The "ancient mariner" (16.1679), who calls himself D. B. Murphy, singles Stephen out immediately as if to give him a special message, but it quickly becomes clear that his message is nonsense. Murphy asks Stephen if he knows Simon Dedalus, and when Stephen replies that he has heard of him (once again denying
a connection with his father), the sailor praises Simon
Dedalus's skill as a marksman with Hengler's Royal Circus. Though his facts are obviously confused, he accurately characterizes Simon's monocular squint: "He turned his body halfway round, shut up his right eye completely. Then he screwed his features up someway sideways and glared out into the night with an unprepossessing cast of countenance" (16.395-397).

The encounter between Stephen and Bloom and the lying sailor Murphy underscores the missed connection between repression and return in "Circe." The epiphany that would have allowed the protagonists to grow has not happened. Bloom, musing on the secrets which the sea must hold, consoles himself that "the odds were twenty to nil there was really no secret about it at all" (16.636-637). Rather, he has resisted the secret that part of his unconscious was trying to make known to him throughout "Circe." The cabmen might drink their coffee and hope for the return of Parnell, but ultimately no return is forthcoming. "Eumaeus" is punctuated with a satirical ellipsis:

The horse having reached the end of his tether, so to speak, halted and, rearing high a proud feathering tail, added his quota by letting fall on the floor which the brush would soon brush up and polish, three smoking globes of turds. (16.1874-1877)
The "Ithaca" episode, often seen to be the consummation of the union between Stephen and Bloom, presents that union in similarly ironic terms. The very style of the episode (like the intentionally wearisome style of the "Eumaeus" episode before it) precludes any dramatic union between Stephen and Bloom. The points upon which they agree and disagree are enumerated early in the episode; Bloom believes Stephen's collapse earlier in the evening to be the result of drunkenness and vigorous dancing, but Stephen blames it on "the reapparition of a matutinal cloud (perceived by both from two different points of observation, Sandycove and Dublin) at first no bigger than a woman's hand" (17.40-42). Stephen's attribution of significance to this cloud reflects his continued captivation by his mother's ghost; the "woman's hand" is his mother's, but he cannot read the message it brings.

The communion of Stephen and Bloom, to the degree that it takes place in "Ithaca," can be located in two ritualistic acts: the sharing of cocoa and their subsequent urination. It is telling that Bloom does not use his customary moustache cup, as it was given to him by Milly. Instead he uses a cup identical to Stephen's as they partake of their "massproduct" in an ironic sacrament:

Was the guest conscious of and did he acknowledge these marks of hospitality?
His attention was directed to them by his host jocosely, and he accepted them seriously as they drank in jocoserious silence Epps's massproduct, the creature cocoa. (17.366-370)

As noted above, Stephen is in "Ithaca" still haunted by the ghost of his mother; this haunting is, as I have suggested, in part a screen for his failure to come to terms with his father Simon Dedalus. Bloom, likewise, is still plagued in this episode by visions and memories of Rudy and the "irreparability of the past" and the "imprevidibility of the future":

The irreparability of the past: once at a performance of Albert Hengler's circus in the Rotunda, Rutland square, Dublin, an intuitive particoloured clown in quest of paternity had penetrated from the ring to a place in the auditorium where Bloom, solitary, was seated and had publicly declared to an exhilarated audience that he (Bloom) was his (the clown's) papa. The imprevidibility of the future: once in the summer of 1898 he (Bloom) had marked a florin (2/-) with three notches on the milled edge and tendered it . . . for circulation on the waters of civic finance, for possible, circuitous or direct, return. (17.975-984)

Bloom's pain and loss are evident in the uncharacteristically terse denouement of the stories:

Was the clown Bloom's son?
No.

Had Bloom's coin returned?
No. (17.985-988)
Neither Bloom nor Stephen, therefore, has laid his ghosts to rest at the end of the "ghoststory" *Ulysses*. Their ironic and ineffectual union, during which "each contemplates the other in both mirrors of the reciprocal flesh of their his no this fellowfaces" (17.1183-1184), concludes with a sacrament complementary to the ingestion of the cocoa:

At Stephen’s suggestion, at Bloom’s instigation both, first Stephen, then Bloom, in penumbra urinated, their sides contiguous, their organs of micturition reciprocally rendered invisible my manual circumposition, their gazes, first Bloom’s then Stephen’s elevated to the projected luminous and semiluminous shadow. (17.1186-1190)

Even in this intimate instant their minds are far apart: Bloom is thinking about the physiology of his own penis, and Stephen is thinking about the divinity of Christ’s foreskin. The falling star, the handshake, and "the sound of the peal of the hour of the night by the chime of the bells in the church of Saint George" (17.1226-1227) all celebrate the divine insignificance of the meeting of Leopold Bloom and Stephen Dedalus. *Ulysses* is an extraordinary novel about an unextraordinary day; Bloom will go to bed and Stephen will go off into the night, having met and communed, but without having confronted the problems each has repressed for so long. There is affirmation in Bloom’s will to survive, and even in Stephen’s; but the last words of *Ulysses*, the words of unqualified affirmation, are reserved for the remarkably unrepressed Molly Bloom.
Even in the pre-"Aeolus" episodes, Joyce's refusal to embed stage directions in his characters' dialogue and interior monologue makes their actions occasionally unclear; first-time readers may, for instance, be led to believe that Stephen actually visits his mother's people, the Gouldings, in the "Proteus" episode.

Both the Gilbert schema and the somewhat different Linati schema are widely reproduced; see Stuart Gilbert's James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

Stephen's guilt complex predates his mother's death, though it is attached both to her and to his father. In Paris, before Simon called him back for his mother's death, Stephen suffered from free-floating guilt: "Yes, used to carry punched tickets to prove an alibi if they arrested you for murder somewhere. Justice" (3.179-180).

Freud would explain Stephen's creation of his mother's ghost as a "projection," a displacement of suppressed hostility toward his mother:

The survivor thus denies that he has ever harboured any hostile feelings against the dead loved one; the soul of the dead harbours them instead and seeks to put them into action during the whole period of mourning. In spite of the successful defence which the survivor achieves by means of projection, his emotional reaction shows the characteristics of punishment and remorse, for he is the subject of fears and submits to renunciations and restrictions . . . (Totem and Taboo 61)

Stephen's adherence to the outmoded rules for mourning--"Etiquette is etiquette. He kills his mother but he can't wear grey trousers" (1.121-122)--is thus explainable as an attempt to appease the ghost. See Gifford, *Ulysses Annotated* (15) for a description of contemporary mourning customs.

The Random House edition of 1961 reads "No mother. Let me be and let me live" (10). The omission of the comma made it unclear whether Stephen was actually addressing the ghost, or whether he was simply expressing his state of motherlessness.
Don Gifford provides the rest of that riddle: "The seed was black and the ground was white. / Riddle me that and I'll give you a pipe (or pint)." Answer: writing a letter" (*Ulysses* Annotated 32-33). The imagery of the riddle suggests that artistic ability is passed from father to son, and the proffered reward for answering the riddle is similarly phallic in a crudely symbolic sense. The aborted riddle also prefigures Deasy's request that Stephen deliver his letter to the press and, more significantly, the many letters Bloom will handle throughout the day (for a discussion of the significance of Bloom's letters, see Patrick McGee's *Paperspace: Style as Ideology in Joyce's Ulysses*).

The psychological significance of eyes for Joyce and Freud (as well as for Sophocles and E.T.A. Hoffmann) has been discussed above. From Simon Dedalus's first appearance in *Portrait*, he has been associated with eyes and the threat of blindness and (through metonymy via Oedipus) with the threat of castration. Even in "Circe" his apparition is monocular.

Stephen’s discussion of paternity in "Scylla and Charybdis" takes place, of course, in the context of a discussion of another Shakespeare play, *Hamlet*, and of the broader relationship between the Bard’s art and life. In the *Tempest*, Ferdinand’s father has not drowned; the young man is deceived by the false father Prospero.

In "Scylla and Charybdis," Stephen senses Bloom: "About to pass through the doorway, feeling one behind, he stood aside" (9.1197). The ship Stephen senses behind him does in fact bear tidings of his father, albeit false tidings. In the hours before dawn Stephen and Bloom will meet a sailor who has returned home aboard this ship, the *Rosevean*.

As shall be seen below, Bloom’s voyeurism is itself a symptom of his own repression, a more acceptable release for his suppressed incestuous desire for his daughter Milly.

Giacomo Joyce gives a very personal and impressionistic view of this period of Joyce’s life:

I expound Shakespeare to docile Trieste: Hamlet, quoth I, who is most courteous to gentle and simple is rude only to Polonius. Perhaps, an embittered idealist, he can see in the parents of
his beloved only grotesque attempts on the part of nature to produce her image .......... Marked you that? (10)

In addressing the young student to whom he is attracted, Joyce identifies himself with Hamlet.

12 In Ulysses Annotated, Don Gifford explains that Ben Jonson applied this phrase (attributed to the emperor Augustus) to Shakespeare.

13 Much of Stephen's criticism of Shakespeare seems to herald his meeting with Bloom. Stephen draws Shakespeare as a cuckold, and finds in Hamlet an obsession with a dead son. Bloom's son Rudy would have been eleven in 1904, had he lived; Hamnet Shakespeare died at the age of eleven. After the literary debate is over, and just before nearly meeting Bloom, Stephen recalls more evidence he could have used in his argument: "And why no other children born? And his first child a girl?" (9.1135-1136). Thus the parallel between Bloom and Shakespeare is underscored; in "Circe," images of Stephen and Bloom merge in a mirror, and Shakespeare appears.

14 The irony is intensified because Simon Dedalus is not especially kind to Bloom; in fact he seems to put Bloom in much the same category as his own brother-in-law Richie Goulding. Bloom's reflection on the relationship between Dedalus and Goulding in the "Sirens" episode is true also of the friendship between Bloom and Dedalus: "Treats him with scorn. See. He admires him all the more" (11.790).

15 It is also implied that Simon owes Dodd money:

--We have all been there, Martin Cunningham said broadly.

His eyes met Mr Bloom's eyes. He caressed his beard, adding: --Well, nearly all of us.

(6.259-261)

Dodd, "of the tribe of Reuben" (6.251), is, like Bloom, Jewish; thus Bloom is associated with the bad father of his story. Bloom, however, denies the connection. In the "Lestrygonians" episode, thinking again about the incident, Bloom paraphrases or misquotes Dedalus: "The devil on moneylenders. Gave Reuben J a great strawcalling. Now he's really what they call a dirty jew" (1158-1159). In "Circe"
Dodd becomes a "blackbearded Iscariot, bad shepherd" (15.1918) and Reuben J Antichrist, wandering Jew (15.2144).

"One and eightpence too much. Hhhhm. It's the droll way he comes out with the things. Knows how too tell a story too" (8.53-55). Aside from this passage from "Lestrygonians," Dedalus's joke is remembered also in the "Sirens" episode (11.1180) and twice in "Circe" (15.658, 15.3098).

Immediately before, Mr O'Madden Burke has challenged "--Lay on, Macduff!" (7.898) underscoring the association of paternity and Shakespeare which will dominate Stephen's speech and thoughts in "Scylla and Charybdis."

Joyce has written before about this kind of father-daughter relationship; see the discussion of "Eveline," above.

Late that night, however, he generously lends Corley a halfcrown (16.195).

The allusion to ships on the rocks also reinforces the Homeric parallels of the "Sirens" chapter.

Gifford locates the source for this phrase in "The Mountains of Mourne," a song about an Irish laborer in London. (Ulysses Annotated 297).

"Nausicaa," as we shall see, is Bloom's fantasy of the wise child.

Maddox's penchant for biographical over-interpretation is suggested by the original subtitle to the American edition of Nora, to which she objected: The Real Life of Molly Bloom. The occasional bombastic inference or allegation notwithstanding, Nora provides more detail than any biography of James Joyce about his family life and its possible influence on his work; Maddox devotes several chapters to Lucia's illness. A suppressed final chapter, based largely on Lucia's unpublished memoirs, describes Lucia Joyce's life in a mental hospital from 1951 until her death in 1982.

Boylan's almost cartoonish behavior with the young store clerk as she prepares a basket for the "invalid" Molly in "Wandering Rocks" shows how charming he can be to a young girl very much like Milly:
Blazes Boylan looked into the cut of her blouse. A young pullet. He took a red carnation from the tall stemglass.
--This for me? He asked gallantly.

The blond girl glanced sideways at him, got up regardless, with his tie a bit crooked, blushing.
--Yes, sir, she said.

Bending archly she reckoned again fat pears and blushing peaches.

Blazes Boylan looked in her blouse with more favour, the stalk of the red flower between his smiling teeth.
--May I say a word to your telephone, missy? he asked roguishly. (10.327-336)

25 The pronoun "his" in "his letter" could refer either to Bloom or to Boylan. If it refers to Bloom (as the "him," below, obviously does) then it seems that Molly has conveniently forgotten about the letter she received from Boylan that morning.

26 Brenda Maddox offers an anecdote, dating from the early 1930's, that attributes a similar sentiment to Nora Joyce:

As they talked about Lucia, Nora objected to the detachment in Joyce's voice. "You have never really known your daughter," she said. "Allow me to say that I was present at her conception," Joyce retorted, as if that counterbalanced all the time that Nora had spent bringing up the difficult child. (264)


28 The censorship here is clearly from Bloom's internal censor and not a concession to Joyce's more tangible human censors.

29 In the "Lestrygonians" episode, Bloom remembers bathing his daughter: "Milly's tubbing night. American soap I bought: elderflower. Cosy smell of her bathwater. Funny she looked soaped all over. Shapely too" (8.171-173).
Bloom has, apparently, attempted to begin relations with servants in the past; in "Oxen of the Sun" it is revealed that he "did not scruple, oblivious of the ties of nature, to attempt illicit intercourse with a female domestic drawn from the lowest strata of society" (14.921-923). In "Circe" this servant, Mary Driscoll, becomes one of his accusers:

He surprised me in the rere of the premises, Your honour, when the missus was out shopping one morning with a request for a safety pin. He held me and I was discoloured in four places as a result. And he interfered twict my clothing. (15.885-888)

Early in her monologue Molly reveals that she was aware of something between Bloom and "that slut Mary we had in Ontario terrace padding out her false bottom to excite him" (18.56-57).

In "Leopold Bloom as Dr. Sigmund Freud" Anderson lists the parapraxes according to the chapter of *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* to which they "refer." The one parapraxis that he analyzes in detail, Bloom’s substitution of Beaufoy for Purefoy, is similar to an example from Freud, but, according to Anderson, goes beyond Freud: "[Joyce] is implying that Freud’s analysis is far too simplistic by providing Bloom’s parapraxis with some of the complexity of real life" (36-37).


According to Gifford, Bloom is apparently remembering and misremembering Shakespeare’s *Venus and Adonis* (183).

Bloom has already seen his daughter dressed in green, in a passage that will be discussed below (15.3167).

Mother Grogan, for instance, a character from Irish song, is discussed by Mulligan and Stephen in "Telemachus" (1.357 ff.); she appears as a character in Bloom’s fantasy in "Circe," when Stephen is not even present (15.1715).
Lipoti Virag makes his appearance later in the episode by sliding down the chimney and, far from chiding Bloom, discusses with him the merits of the various prostitutes.


The pain in Stephen's hand is in part sympathy for Bloom's scarred palm, but it also harkens back to his punishment for breaking his glasses (Portrait 50). The relationship between Stephen's age and Bloom's is worked out to tedious effect in "Ithaca" (17.447-461).

Shakespeare is, of course, one of the many false fathers that Stephen must defeat before attaining artistic adulthood. For more on this aspect of the father-son conflict, see Harold Bloom's introduction to James Joyce: Modern Critical Views.

It seems to me significant that while Simon Dedalus is known throughout the episode as "SIMON," Stephen's mother's lines are labeled "THE MOTHER," making her less an individual than a symbol of motherhood.

The following exchange takes place in the fifth chapter of A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man:

After a pause Cranly asked:
--What age is your mother?
--Not old, Stephen said. She wishes me to make my easter duty.
--And will you?
--I will not, Stephen said.
--Why not? Cranly said.
--I will not serve, answered Stephen.
--That remark was made before, Cranly said calmly.
--It is made behind now, said Stephen hotly.
(239)

The sailor's "greenish goggles" (16.1672) connect him, incidentally, to the longshoreman in "An Encounter" and the pederast in "An Encounter."

Bloom encounters a false son at the same circus; the episode is discussed below.
CONCLUSION

Fascinating little book that is of sir Robert Ball’s. Parallax. I never exactly understood. (Ulysses 8.108-112)

Keyless Leopold Bloom’s partial understanding of the word "parallax" provides the reader of Ulysses with a key to the conclusion of the novel. Bloom may not know that parallax refers to "the apparent displacement or the difference in apparent direction of an object as seen from two different points of view" (Gifford, Ulysses Annotated 160), but the successful union of Joyce’s latter-day Odysseus with his Telemachus and Penelope depends on successful celestial navigation. "Ithaca" begins with the question: "What parallel courses did Bloom and Stephen follow returning?" (17.1), and if we take the geometry literally (as indeed the reply to the question does), we must recognize that the defining quality of parallel lines is that they never meet. The "points of view" of Stephen and Bloom are not reconciled, and at the end of the episode, each goes his separate way.

Yet, readers of Ulysses insist, there is closure--even affirmation--in the novel; Ulysses is not about failure.
This is true, and the geometrical-navigational metaphor conjured by Bloom's musing on the subject of parallax (if not by his very role as a modern Odysseus) gives the novel closure even in the absence of any tangible union or agreement between Stephen and Bloom. For though the parallel lines of their lives will never cross, the existence of a third point of view in the novel provides a more affirmative perspective. Molly's monologue is the novel's morning horizon: the horizon on which these parallel lines can be seen to converge. The parallax provided by Molly's comparatively unrepressed monologue gives *Ulysses* its resolution and ultimately, its affirmation.

Throughout his career Freud inquired into the unconscious motives behind people's dreams, actions, and inactions. From his own perspective, Joyce explored the same uncharted waters of dreams, deeds, and paralysis, and though the parallel courses of Joyce and Freud (who even share a surname in translation) never quite cross, it is not hard to find a parallactic perspective from which to view their convergence. *Finnegans Wake*, with its dreams, repetitions and repressions, may well be the horizon at which Joyce and Freud finally meet on equal terms, but it is my hope that the preceding analysis has suggested some new ways in which Joyce and Freud can illuminate each other concerning the
characters and actions of Dubliners, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Ulysses.

Repression informs and affects each of these three books in different ways, but it is a central issue in all of them—if not the underlying principle which drives them and connects them. Epiphany, which may be said to be the technique of Dubliners, is essentially linked to the process of repression; often, in these stories, the concluding epiphany is quite literally "the return of the repressed." Joyce's use of epiphany is perhaps independent of Freud's hypotheses of repression and return, but they are cognate, parallel.

Further parallels between Joyce's depiction of human behavior and Freud's become evident in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, in which, as many critics have noted, Stephen Dedalus reflects and acts out his Oedipal anxieties and desires. While most of these critics concentrate on the father-figures and patriarchal institutions Stephen must confront—church, state, and family—I have demonstrated these to be screens for Stephen's real, repressed anxieties, which attach invariably to the "real" father, Simon Dedalus. This reading is more literally Freudian than most psychoanalytic interpretations of Portrait in its concentration on the literal father; the focus on repression, however, highlights Stephen's true preoccupations, and Joyce's.

In Ulysses, Joyce's depiction of repression reaches its peak—for the whole of Finnegans Wake, with its dramatic and
linguistic representation of repression and return, is more
an enactment of repression than a depiction. Both Stephen's
course and Bloom's are unconsciously plotted with the pur-
pose of avoiding unpleasant, repressed ideas: Stephen's
patricidal impulses and Bloom's incestuous desires. Joyce
highlights their repressions by foregrounding in various
ways the objects of their repressed desires, Simon Dedalus
and Milly Bloom. Dedalus is himself a major presence in the
novel, and Milly, though physically absent from Bloom's
Dublin, is nonetheless present in a variety of characters
and motifs encountered throughout Bloom's day.

Critics--and especially those critics who subscribe to
the various psychoanalytic schools of thought--have long
recognized that the theme of paternity is central in Joyce's
works. What I have attempted to do here is to suggest a
different way in which Freud's inquiries into the human
condition might be used to illuminate Joyce's own, and vice-
versa. The oedipus complex might be the element of Freudian
thought most familiar to literary critic and layperson
alike, but the theories of repression and return may speak
to Joyce's Dublin--and to his readers' myriad worlds--with
greater resonance.
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