

**JAMES JOYCE'S MYTHOGRAPHICAL RE-WRITING: THE
SUBVERSION OF MYTH IN ULYSSES**

**Pamukkale University
Social Sciences Institute
Phd Thesis
The Department of English Language and Literature**

Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN

Advisor of Thesis: Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat GÖÇ

**March 2015
DENİZLİ**

DOKTORA TEZİ ONAY FORMU

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı, Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bilim Dalı doktora programı öğrencisi Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN tarafından Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat GÖÇ yönetiminde hazırlanan “James Joyce’s Mythographical Re-writing: The Subversion of Myth in *Ulysses* (James Joyce’un Yeni Mitografik Yazımı: *Ulysses* Romanında Yeni Mitolojik Anlatım)”başlıklı tez aşağıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından 31/03/2015 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavında başarılı bulunmuş ve Doktora Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Jüri Başkanı
Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL



Jüri-Danışman
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat GÖÇ



Jüri
Doç. Dr. Çiğdem PALA MULL



Jüri
Doç. Dr. Meryem AYAN



Jüri
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Orkun KOCABIYIK



Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun
1/04/2015..tarih ve ...10/12... sayılı kararıyla onaylanmıştır.

Prof. Dr. Turhan KAÇAR
Müdür



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by these rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Signature:

Name, Last Name: Meltem UZUNOĞLU

for my son, Orhun Erten

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express my sincerest gratitude and thanks to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat GÖÇ for his guidance and helpful suggestions for my study. I also owe him thanks for his optimism and friendship. I would also like to express my thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL since this study was almost impossible without his support. I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çiğdem PALA MULL, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meryem AYAN and Assist. Prof. Dr. Orkun KOCABIYIK, who have spent time to read my chapters and thus have contributed to my study with their valuable comments.

I am deeply indebted to my parents Asuman and Tefvik UZUNOĞLU for their endless support and patience. I warmly thank my husband Research Assist. Hüseyin ERTEN for his academic and emotional support and our two family cats for turning our house into a peaceful home for the last five years.

My final thanks go to my little dear son Orhun ERTEN who gave me the strength I needed to continue.

ABSTRACT
JAMES JOYCE’S MYTHOGRAPHICAL RE-WRITING: THE SUBVERSION
OF MYTH IN ULYSSES

Uzunoğlu Erten, Meltem

Doctoral Thesis

Western Languages and Literatures Department

English Language and Literature Programme

Advisor of Thesis: Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat GÖÇ

March 2015, 108 pages

Myths have inspired interest in various ways throughout the history of mankind. Once a product of oral tradition, they were transferred into written form, which threatened the polyphonic and multifaceted nature of myths. Seeing the power of myths on societies and fixing their meaning into a single dimension, dominant worldviews of different ages imposed ideological characters on myths. 20th century literary theorist Roland Barthes broadened the meaning of the word “myth” by emphasizing its ideological aspect, open to manipulation, and regarded myths as the source of “metanarratives”, supporting the discourses of dominant ideologies.

Literature and myths have always had close connection. Employment of myths in literature became a rising trend once more at the beginning of the 20th century as a device for restoring order in reaction to the negative consequences of modernism both on the societies and individuals. T.S. Eliot introduced the “mythical method” and praised James Joyce’s Ulysses as a perfect literary example of it as it offers the timeless realm and authority of myth as an alternative to the chaos of history. However, this study aims to prove that Joyce’s employment of Homer’s *Odyssey* myth has a subversive attitude in contrast to Eliot’s understanding. Joyce subverts the great epic of the western world as well as political, religious and cultural “myths”, in a Barthesian sense, which are imposed on Ireland by the British Empire, the Catholic Church and the patriarchal western tradition. Joyce believes that the repression and limitations caused by these authorities over Ireland prevent both the country and its people from a peaceful atmosphere and any development that would move them towards a better future. Thus, he subverts and rewrites these myths in a parodical way so that he can create a national epic based on flexibility in matters related to religion, nationalism and cultural values, tolerance for diversity and celebration of human imperfection.

Key Words: myths, *Odyssey*, James Joyce, Ulysses, Roland Barthes, subversion

ÖZET

JAMES JOYCE'UN YENİ MİTOGRAFİK YAZIMI: ULYSSES ROMANINDA YENİ MİTOLOJİK ANLATIM

Uzunoğlu Erten, Meltem

Doktora Tezi

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Programı

Tez Danışmanı: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Murat GÖÇ

Mart 2015, 108 sayfa

Mitler insanlık tarihi boyunca pek çok açıdan ilgi çekici olmuşlardır. Bir zamanlar sözlü geleneğin parçası olan mitlerin yazılı hale getirilmeleriyle çoksesli ve çok boyutlu yapıları tehdit altına girmiştir. Mitlerin toplumlar üzerindeki etkisini gözlemleyen ve anlamlarını tek boyuta indirgemeyi hedefleyen, farklı çağlardaki egemen dünya görüşleri mitlere ideolojik bir karakter empoze etmiştir. 20.yy edebi eleştirmeni Roland Barthes manipülasyona açık ideolojik yönünü vurgulayarak “mit” kelimesinin anlamını genişletmiş ve mitleri egemen ideolojilerin söylemlerini destekleyen “üstanlatılar”ın kaynağı olarak görmüştür.

Edebiyat ve mitler daima yakın ilişki içinde olmuşlardır. Mitlerin edebiyat alanında yer bulması 20.yy başında yeniden artan bir eğilim olarak ortaya çıkmış ve modernizmin hem toplumlar hem de bireyler üzerinde oluşturduğu olumsuz sonuçlara tepki olarak düzeni yeniden sağlamak amacıyla bir yöntem olarak kullanılmışlardır. T.S. Eliot “mitsel yöntem” olarak adlandırdığı yöntemi öne sürmüş ve James Joyce’un Ulysses’ini bu yöntemin mükemmel bir edebi örneği olarak övmüştür. Eliot’a göre, Ulysses tarihin yarattığı karmaşaya alternatif olarak mitlerin zamansız ve otoriter dünyasını sunmaktadır. Ancak, bu çalışma Joyce’un Homer’e ait Odessa mitini Eliot’un iddia ettiğinin aksine, otoriteyi sağlamlaştırmaktansa yıkıcı bir anlayışla, ele aldığını kanıtlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Joyce Batı dünyasına ait bu epik metni ve İrlanda’ya Britanya İmparatorluğu, Katolik Kilisesi ve ataerkil batı geleneği tarafından empoze edilen politik, dini ve kültürel “mitleri” Barthes’ın anlayışıyla yıkıma uğratmayı hedeflemiştir. Joyce bu otoriteler tarafından İrlanda’ya uygulanan baskı ve sınırlandırmaların hem ülke hem de insanları için barışçıl bir ortama ve kendilerini daha iyi bir geleceğe taşıyacak tüm gelişmelere ulaşma imkanını engellediğine inanmaktadır. Bu nedenle, Joyce bu mitleri yıkıp kendi görüşleri doğrultusunda parodi yöntemiyle yeniden yazmıştır. Amacı dini, milli ve kültürel değerler bağlamında esnekliğe dayanan, çeşitliliği ve insani kusurları hoş gören bir ulusal destan yaratmaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: mitler, Odessa, James Joyce, Ulysses, Roland Barthes, yıkıcılık

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	i
DEDICATION.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1

CHAPTER I IDEOLOGICAL MANIPULATION OF MYTHS AND SUBVERSIVE JOYCE

1.1. Myths in 20 th Century Literature.....	8
1.2. Myths and Ideological Manipulation in History.....	12
1.3. Postmodern Approach to ‘Myths’ in 20 th Century and Joyce	20

CHAPTER II JOYCE’S MOTIVATION AND METHOD FOR ULYSSES

2.1 Religion and Nationalism in Joyce.....	29
2.2. Ulysses and Odyssey.....	31
2.3. Political and Historical Motivation of Joyce.....	36
2.4. Parody as a Subversive Method.....	43

CHAPTER III ANALYSIS OF ULYSSES

3.1. Religion and Politics.....	51
3.1.1. Stephen: Subversion of Telemachus.....	51
3.1.2. Stephen: Subversion of Hamlet.....	64
3.1.3. Bloom: Subversion of Odysseus.....	71
3.2. Gender Roles and Marriage: Bloom and Molly as Subversions of Odysseus and Penelope.....	89
CONCLUSION.....	99
REFERENCES	103
VITA.....	108

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze James Joyce's Ulysses in terms of Joyce's subversive attitude towards myths through parody with the aim of challenging the hegemonic authority of the British Empire and the Catholic Church as well as the patriarchal institutions of western civilization over Ireland. Joyce aims to rewrite an Irish epic and to create a new Irish identity as a result of his subversive attempt. The analysis of subversion in Ulysses is extended into Homer's Odyssey as well as Shakespearean tragedy Hamlet with a particular emphasis on Barthesian approach to myths and metanarratives.

Through his subversive approach towards myths and his rewriting process, Joyce believes that he would be able to lead "Irish people who are imprisoned by the twin captivity of history's labyrinth" (Schwarz, 1987: 121) and encourage them to "fly by those nets" (Joyce, 2011: 324) thrown over man by the authoritative imperial and religious values as well as blind nationalism and the established values and institutions that restrict Ireland by all means. T.S. Eliot suggested that myths promised the reestablishment of order in contrast to the chaos, fragmentation and alienation created by modern conditions especially in the first half of the 20th century, which caused distress both for the individual and the society. Myths became the object of endeavour for modern writers who hoped to find safety in the mythical territory. Joseph Frank similarly states that

"The objective historical imagination, on which modern man has prided himself, and which he has cultivated so carefully since the Renaissance, is transformed in these writers into the mythical imagination for which historical time does not exist—the imagination which sees the actions and events of a particular time merely as the bodying forth of eternal prototypes. These prototypes are created by transmuting the time-world of history into the timeless world of myth. And it is this timeless world of myth, forming the common content of modern literature, which finds its appropriate esthetic expression in spatial form." (1945: 653)

This shelter provided the modern writers with a steady, safe and solid world. M. Keith Booker states that "this model of a modernist escape from the messiness of history can

be associated most directly with the conservative Christian ideology of Eliot, who gave the mythic method its name (and reputation) in his reading of Joyce's *Ulysses*" (1997: 18). However, Joyce was not interested in the order and precision offered by myths but had the intention of trampling on them to break their closed world for creating a future for Ireland. That is to say, despite the parallelism between Homer's *Odyssey* and Joyce's *Ulysses*, it is clear that, "Joyce is not retelling Homer's myth, but using it for a story of his own" (Tindall, 1995: 129) because of his political and religious distress related to his homeland.

There are a number of reasons why this study focuses on Joyce's *Ulysses*. First of all, *Ulysses* is enriched by intertextual references to his previous novel *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and it is a reflection of his mature and decisive views on Ireland and Irish matters. Additionally, his purpose is to construct a national epic for Ireland by writing *Ulysses*. For his national epic, he adopts a subversive attitude towards the imposed and internalized values reinforced by myths in his society and country. His subversive attitude towards myths gives Joyce an outstanding place among his contemporaries since Joyce prefers to question and oppose authority rather than simply confirming it. Joyce raises questions about religious, national and cultural identity of his country, which are equally legitimate questions for many other nations including Turkey, which adds to the significance of this study. Although Ireland's problems are unique and mostly the outcome of its colonial past, similarities between the problems surrounding the Irish and Turkish national identities and the solutions suggested by Joyce are prominent. I believe that they may offer a way, which is based on diversity, plurality and polyphony, out of its own dead-ends for my country.

In addition to the abovementioned points, this thesis is important for putting forward a fresh reading of this work. Certainly, there are many studies on *Ulysses* both abroad and in Turkey, some of which also underlines issues about nationalism, post-colonialism, history and myths. For example, Hsing-chun Chou's PhD thesis (2002) entitled as "Joyce, Bakhtin, and Post-colonial Trialogue: History, Subjectivity, and the Nation in *Ulysses*" focuses on *Ulysses* as a post-colonial modernist text through the Bakhtinian concepts such as chronotope, dialogism and grotesque realism. Gülden Hatipoğlu's MA thesis (2004) entitled as "The Celtic Other: Ireland as Not England" emphasizes the political and ideological character of Joyce and analyzes his approach

towards British Imperialism and Irish nationalism. Hatipoğlu puts forth that Joyce aims to deconstruct centralized and monologic understandings of history, language and identity. Nicolas D. Prontka's MA thesis (2012) "Reconstructing the Homeric Heroic Archetype in James Joyce's *Ulysses*" mainly focuses on hero archetypes and masculinity both in *Odyssey* and *Ulysses* and makes a comparison based on the changing understandings of these concepts in antiquity and modernity. Although these three studies, and many others, are based on nationality, identity and myths, none of them deals with these points together and in relation to each other. Furthermore, similar studies on *Ulysses* in Turkey are either comparative studies or they deal with stylistics and literary techniques employed in the novel such as the stream of consciousness. Therefore, this study, which focuses on the subversion of myths, offers a new perspective for Joyce's magnum opus.

Joyce mainly employs parody in order to subvert widely accepted myths of the imperial, religious and patriarchal powers and aspires to prove that all myths are questionable and replaceable rather than representing absolute truth. Joyce believed that myths became ideological and manipulative tools which are in the service of authoritative institutions. Rather than the representations of reality, for Joyce, myths helped the construction of false realities. He suggested that myths about religious, national and cultural issues were forced on the Irish society, which, he considered, was the source of Ireland's unrest. Thus, he believed the necessity of a subversive approach towards myths through which he aimed to break the manipulative deceptions. In this sense, his understanding of myths is closer to Roland Barthes. Therefore, this study employs a Barthesian reading of Joyce's employment of myths which concludes that although Joyce is usually considered as a modern writer, reading *Ulysses* through Barthes' theory and from an ideological perspective suggest that he is rather a postmodern writer.

Finally, this study is composed of five chapters: an introduction, two theoretical chapters, an analytical chapter on *Ulysses* and a conclusion chapter that presents the results of the study. Chapter One focuses on the ideologically manipulative potential of myths besides discussing the Joyce's place in 20th century. It presents Joyce's *Ulysses* as work dealing with the problems of Ireland related to national identity. It introduces Joyce's personal ideas on the matter and his purpose of employment of myths in

Ulysses. The chapter also deals with modernism and literature and particularly the employment and manipulation of myths in modern literature as well as examples of the manipulative potential of myths throughout the centuries. The chapter focuses on the two contrasting 20th century views on myths: T.S. Eliot's mythical method and Roland Barthes' concept of myths and concludes that although he wrote in the modern period, James Joyce is closer to Barthes in his understanding of myths and thus he is a postmodern writer. In Chapter Two, the emphasis is totally placed upon Joyce's motivation and method for writing Ulysses. The chapter includes social, political and historical background of Ireland in terms of its relation to Britain and the Catholic Church as well as personal information about Joyce in order to make clear why Joyce wrote Ulysses and adopted a subversive attitude. Joyce's personal viewpoints about religion and nationalism are discussed besides the relation between Ulysses and Odyssey. Additionally, the chapter introduces parody as a literary device that most fits Joyce's subversive aims in Ulysses. Chapter Three is divided into two main sections both of which deal with a detailed analysis of Ulysses. The first section centres upon religion and politics in Ulysses. Stephen Dedalus as subversion of Homer's Telemachus and Shakespeare's Hamlet and Leopold Bloom as subversion of Odysseus are analyzed. The second section of the chapter particularly deals with gender roles and marriage and focuses on Leopold Bloom and his wife Molly as subversions of Homeric Odysseus and Penelope figures. In analytical sections, Joyce challenges the concepts of religion, imperial power and nationality via Stephen and Bloom. He criticizes and subverts political 'myths', which form imperial and nationalist metanarratives, and religious 'myths', which reinforce the Church's authority. Joyce's subversion also includes 'myths' that shape metanarratives about the cultural male and female gender roles and marriage as an institution in accordance with the patriarchal structure of the western tradition. Bloom and Molly's relationship stands out as the most powerful criticism towards the established values of the patriarchal western civilization. Finally, the conclusion chapter is designated for an overall look at the study and its outcomes. It also emphasizes Joyce's postmodernist approach in Ulysses in relation to the solutions he offers for Ireland. Hence, it puts forward one more time that Joyce is a 20th century writer who is far beyond his time and his impact on literature is great.

To summarize, Joyce focuses upon the political, social and religious problems in his homeland. For him, the solution for Ireland is connected neither with the hegemony

of Britain, which they indulged for centuries, nor with the Catholic Church, which was the source of the poverty and misery of Ireland. Even the Irish nationalism movement is not the answer in Joyce's opinion since although it seems like an awakening; it is no more than a romantic longing for a long lost history. Moreover, he finds nationalism in Ireland too narrow, radical and intolerant. Instead, Joyce offers a broader horizon for the future of Ireland in Ulysses by throwing off the pressure of the religious, political and cultural masters and defining nationalism anew around a more humanistic frame.

CHAPTER I

IDEOLOGICAL MANIPULATION OF MYTHS AND SUBVERSIVE JOYCE

James Joyce published Ulysses in 1922, which has become a widely debated literary work since then. In addition to Joyce's brave construction of his novel and the infamous complexity, Ulysses is outstanding thanks to Joyce's idiosyncratic interpretation of the modern world via handling the modern tendency towards the employment of myths in literature in his own way. Joyce not only became prominent among his contemporaries with his approach to myths but also stepped further the boundaries of modernism and paved the way for the postmodern reading of his works. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to analyze ideologically manipulative approaches to myths from the ancient world to modern age and to define Joyce's place in literature as a 20th century writer by focusing on his exceptional treatment of modern tendency towards myths in literature.

Ulysses is Joyce's second novel and it has been read and commented on in various ways so far. The diverse and sometimes colliding remarks on the work are the natural outcome of the richness it subsumes, so much so that it allows for new readings for the readers equipped with new perspectives over time. Ulysses is especially substantial in articulating Joyce's political and ideological views on Ireland. Considering Joyce's developing arguments about Ireland and Irish people in his former works and the historical, political, sociological and ideological dynamism of the days in which he wrote Ulysses, it is expectable that Ulysses offers more about Joyce's look at the political and ideological struggle in which Ireland and the Irish people were involved. Thus, a fresh reading of Ulysses from a political and ideological perspective suggests that Joyce's purpose in writing Ulysses is "to express his deep concern for his Irish motherland through mask and mockery, making the novel a nationalistic epic in prose" (Wang, 2011: 22). That is to say, in Ulysses, Joyce rejects all kinds of authority represented especially by the two masters of Ireland, the British Empire and the Catholic Church, and the patriarchal institutions of western civilization, which he believes are the real obstacles before the expression of Irish identity. With this purpose in mind, he develops a subversive attitude towards myths that reinforces the hegemony which exercises its power over Ireland. However, he acts contrary to the common

tendency towards myths in modern literature. Joyce rewrites Homer's Odyssey, one of the greatest myths at the heart of the British culture and the western culture as a whole, and subverts political, religious and cultural myths that he believes to cause unease in Ireland. His purpose is to overthrow the repressive powers of authority in Ireland and to define a new identity for his country, which is based on humanity rather than power struggles. Joyce's approach to myths and the problems of his country in Ulysses provide evidence to prove that he is beyond modernism both with his style and worldview.

National identity was a general matter around the world at the beginning of the 20th century. James Joyce's religious education and personal experiences in Ireland shaped his ideas concerning nationalism and religion in Ireland. He was born in 1882 in Dublin which was a part of Great Britain then. He attended Clongowes Wood and Belvedere College, both of which were Jesuit schools as mentioned in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, from the age of six to sixteen. He continued his education at the Catholic National University for four more years. As a result of the political dynamism at the beginning of the 20th century, which caused the decline of the imperial powers around the world, the nationalistic spirit was on the rise. Joyce was an ardent believer of an Irish homeland free from the British rule. Moreover, as a consequence of his education, he was familiar with the Catholic way of life and worldview. Joyce's writing reflects his deep knowledge about Christianity and the intellectual system and symbolism of the Church which he both admired and kept himself at a distance from. For Joyce, Catholicism was not an innocent belief but the ideological tool by way of which the lust for power was controlled and satisfied by the Church. Subjection to one authority created an obedient spirit in Irish society and thus subjection to British rule was guaranteed. In other words, Irish nationalism and Catholic faith became one and the same over time. Therefore, Joyce never accepted the kind of nationalism mingled with Catholicism.

However, Joyce was aware of the fact that a nation meant people unified under common and shared values. Ernst Cassirer states in The Myth of the State, "...myth lays the basis for nationhood. It is behind the feeling of nationality, and gives it its force" (1946: 280). That is why Joyce was persuaded that Ireland was in need of a national epic. Moreover, constructing a national epic for Ireland by rewriting the already existing myths would enable Joyce to undermine the authorities supported by these myths.

1.1. Myths in 20th Century Literature

Although modern period, in which Joyce lived and produced his works, is considered to be confined to the first decades of the 20th century, it can only be the final part of what Jürgen Habermas calls “the project of modernity” (1997: 45) that started with the Enlightenment in the 18th century. According to Habermas, the main purpose of the project was to achieve “the relentless development of the objectivating sciences, of the universalistic foundations of morality and law, and of autonomous art” (Ibid: 12). The project was largely dependent on scientific development to achieve human freedom and the victory of rationalization over the despair of humanity against the arbitrariness of nature and “the irrationalities of myth, religion, superstition” with the aim of revealing “the universal, eternal, and the immutable qualities of all of humanity” (Harvey, 1992: 12). In contrast to the previous centuries, during which religious mind had dominance, modernism seems to be intended as a secular movement aiming nonstop rational and scientific progress for the benefit man. Ideals of individuality, equality and liberty were praised while scientific discoveries of all kinds were believed to serve humanity.

Despite the noteworthy progress of the western world both in social and scientific fields during the 18th and the 19th centuries, the project proved its own failure with the dramatic twist at the beginning of the 20th century. The dream of a more humanistic world ended up “in a capitalist world of increasing economic conflict, social strife, and war, the heritage of bourgeois humanism and all the values it was taken to ensure [were] evidently at sea” (Eysteinnsson, 1990: 36). As suggested by Richard Bernstein, the goals of Enlightenment proved unsuccessful with their emphasis on the “necessary linkage between the growth of science, rationality, and universal human freedom” and it was only “the triumph of ...purposive-instrumental rationality” which “[did] not lead to the concrete realization of universal freedom but to the creation of an ‘iron cage’ of bureaucratic rationality from which there [was] no escape” (1985: 5). In contrast to the Enlightenment dream of liberation from all bounds with the help of science and rationality, humanity found itself on a point of crisis for both societies and individuals.

20th century modern writers and critics generally regarded literature as an ideological weapon against the chaos and fragmentation caused by modernism. Their main purpose was to find a stable and safe ground far from the disintegration, which

was the result of the questioning mind that replaced absolute subjection to universal values. T.S. Eliot was one of the most influential of them and some of his studies focused on the employment of myths in literature as an attempt to restore authority both in the world of the individual and the societies. With this object in his mind, Eliot introduced the *mythical method* in his two well-known essays, “Tradition and the Individual Talent” (1921) and “Ulysses, Order, and Myth” (1923). He believed that the *mythical method* was “a step toward making the modern world possible for art” (Eliot, 1988: 178) instead of “the narrative method” in which “the story that turns upon the solution of an enigma, the disentanglement of an intrigue, or an instructive change of fortune, the story in which ‘everything hangs together’ in a very obvious way” (Lodge, 1977: 137). Since the narrative method was insufficient to express the modern condition, in both essays he suggested the idea that modern writers should lean on the stability and authority of myths as well as other great cultural works of art and literature that belong to the past in order to shape their contemporary texts. Deborah Parsons describes this attempt as “the drive to impose a universal and eternal artistic shape on the manifold chaos of modernity” (2007: 44). Likewise, in Eliot’s opinion, myths provided a universal and timeless realm which stood against the fragmentation of modernity and the chaos of history. David Lodge states that this universal and timeless realm of myths was introduced as an alternative to the real world which was “a wasteland, a place of meaningless suffering, unsuccessful communication and shattered illusions” (1977: 157). According to Eliot, the excitement, hope and belief about finding absolute truths and a progressive rational world left their places to the loss of faith, fear and unease. In other words, as David Harvey states, for finding a stable ground “in the absence of Enlightenment certitudes as to the perfectibility of man, the search for a myth appropriate to modernity became paramount” (1992: 30).

That is why modern artists and writers had the “desire to lift art above the meaningless course of everyday life” (Blanning, 1996: 261) and to replace history with the timeless and absolute truth of myth as suggested by Eliot. History is about the conveyance of past events that are known to have happened in a chronological and sequential order. Likewise, myths belong to the “remote past, ... yet in its presence it [made] time timeless” (Rosenfield, 1967: 31). Thus, Eliot believed, modern writers should break their connection with history with the hope of uniting themselves with the ideals of a long past perfection. David Harvey considers this struggle of the modern writers as a “new conception of the

modernist project” which became a current issue in the first half of the 20th century when “the ‘eternal and immutable’ could no longer be automatically presupposed” (1992: 18). In other words, modern writers were forced to construct their own myths to overcome “the breakdown of agreed-upon systems of belief” (Graff, 1995: 10), which would enable the recreation of absolute truths “by freezing time and all its fleeting qualities,” (Harvey, 1992: 21) and that was possible through the application of myths in literature.

In “Ulysses, Order, and Myth”, Eliot cited James Joyce’s *Ulysses* as a perfect example of the *mythical method* and celebrated his choice of Homer’s *Odyssey* as his guide for a genuine technique in modern literature:

“It is here that Mr. Joyce’s parallel use of the *Odyssey* has a great importance. It has the importance of a scientific discovery. No one else has built a novel upon such a foundation before: it has never before been necessary. I am not begging the question in calling *Ulysses* a ‘novel’; and if you call it an epic it will not matter. If it is not a novel, that is simply because the novel is a form which will no longer serve; it is because the novel, instead of being a form, was simply the expression of an age which had not sufficiently lost all form to feel the need of something stricter.” (1988: 177)

It is clear that for Eliot “the need of something stricter” to bring the missing harmony back was the conscious employment of myths by the modern writers as a precaution and defence against the chaos of modernity. The employment of myths in literature, as Eliot claimed with the *mythical method*, “ingeniously redeemed by allusion to the lost mythical world” (Lodge, 1977: 139). Through his understanding of parody and employment of myths in literature, “*Ulysses* in Eliot’s eyes is a model of artistic control, its systematic method comparable to that of science. It is, significantly, not a ‘novel’ at all, but instead an ‘epic’. It is not written as ‘narrative’ but as ‘myth’ (Parsons, 2007: 44). Therefore, Eliot advised other modern writers to follow the example of Joyce in using myths because myths were the eternal, absolute and unquestionable truth which was considered as the unity necessary for fixing the shattered order of modern reality. As M. Keith Booker has pointed out:

“For Eliot and numerous other critics, modernist artists lean upon the stability and authority of myths and other great cultural artifacts of the past in order to help shore the fragments of their own contemporary texts against the ruins of modernity. According to this reading, myth provides a universal and timeless realm to which the modernist artist can remove her contemporary materials in order to escape the confusion and contingency of history.” (1997: 18)

Two years before this, in “Tradition and the Individual Talent”, Eliot suggested how to maintain this desire for unity within the secure sphere of the myths and tradition. For him, the poet, the artist or the writer should have close relationship with the past by whose standards he must inevitably be judged (1950: 50). Eliot also stated that “no poet, no artist of any art, has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists. You cannot value him alone; you must set him, for contrast and comparison, among the dead” (Ibid: 49) because the artist of any kind should be aware that “the mind of Europe [is] much more important than his own private mind” (Ibid: 51). So, Eliot believed that the artist should “surrender of himself ... to something which is more valuable,” because “the progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality” (Ibid: 52). What Eliot meant by self-sacrifice was “not the self-engendered emergence of creative originality ex nihilo, but a rearrangement of tradition in a new work that simply gives it the appearance of being new” (Meisel, 1987: 73). Under the light of these ideas, it is clear that literature for Eliot was the process of depersonalization of the individual in the name of tradition which, he believed, gave literature a scientific character (Eliot, 1950: 53).

Eliot’s views on the authors and their works are in harmony with the modernist approach towards literature as a way of creating a bond between the contemporary time and the past which would satisfy the “strikingly unhistorical yearning for a supposed past golden age” (Hewitt, 1988: 131). Joseph Frank criticizes Eliot’s views that modern literature joins past and present “in a timeless unity” and “eliminates any feeling of historical sequence” (1945: 653). By doing so, the literary work becomes the declaration of eternal truth, which is worthy and valid in all times, by its writer who is nothing but the mouthpiece of a larger authority. As Robert Onopa asserts, “once outside of history, the work is available as a paradigm of paradise, the antithesis of the fallen world, and, as a product of man, a means for him to transcend the fallen, time-bound world” (1973: 372), which is the mission of literature according to Eliot.

1.2. Myths and Ideological Manipulation in History

Manipulation of myths with ideological purposes was certainly not a modern discovery. On the contrary, it goes back to the transference of myths from oral tradition into written forms. However, outside the ideological sphere and in their original sense, myths were stories with a special value for the community in which they were told from one generation to another and sometimes performed in the form of a ritual. They were usually about remarkable events that supposedly took place in the past. Thus, myths survived through retelling or representing since they mark significant touchstones in community's own existence. Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty emphasizes the significance of myths for a particular group of people as a memorable event as follows:

“story that is sacred to and shared by a group of people who find their most important meanings in it; it is a story believed to have been composed in the past about an event in the past, or, more rarely, in the future, an event that continues to have meaning in the present because it is remembered; it is a story that is part of a larger group of stories.” (1988: 27)

These larger corpuses of stories are called mythologies, and they embrace a vast number of stories which, as a distinguished product of human mind, have never completely disappeared from the cultures of human societies despite having diverse functions and implications in particular periods. William G. Doty emphasizes the fact that myths maintain their place since they are about the basic human conditions and “generally concern themes that humans face over and over again, rather than problems that are relevant only to one person or one group or at one particular period of life” (1986: 8). Eric Gould agrees with Doty about the source of the power of myths and describes it as “a synthesis of values which uniquely manages to mean most things to most men” (1981: 5). Additionally, the fact that they are answers to fundamental questions gives myths an indispensable value: “Myths are perceived as essential accounts, the primary stories of a culture, the stories that shape and expose its most important framing images and self-conceptions, its ‘roots’” (Doty, 1986: 25). Moreover, myths usually involve heroes who bear superhuman traits and whose deeds have universal significance. Those characteristics give myths the power of being everlasting and giving order and meaning to the lives of both the individual member and the community.

Possessing significant connotations, myths for ancient people existed as a part of religious system. According to Robert Graves, ancient Europe had a matriarchal system in which “The Great Goddess was regarded as immortal, changeless, and omnipotent; and the concept of fatherhood had not been introduced into religious thought” (1992: 13). In this matriarchal system, The Great Goddess had many names and faces, each of which maintained a variety of rituals and cults. Out of these practices emerged the first stories that make up a large part of mythology which belongs to the geographical region including Greece and its surroundings together with the contribution of stories from other Mediterranean cultures.

The pre-Hellenic matriarchal culture had closer ties with Egyptian, Sumerian and Babylonian cultures, which added it more matriarchal elements. Like these cultures, “ancient Europe had no gods. The Great Goddess was regarded as immortal, changeless, and omnipotent; and the concept of fatherhood had not been introduced into religious thought” (Ibid: 13). However, the people living in the region were also influenced greatly when they came into contact with the Achaean, Dorian, Aeolian and Ionian cultures as a result of the Hellenic invasions. This influence introduced patriarchal thought into the region. As a result of their invasions, “a male military aristocracy became reconciled to female theocracy [in which] the king acted as the representative of Zeus, or Poseidon, or Apollo, and called himself by one or other of their names” (Ibid: 18). Thus, patriarchy started its dominance over the matriarchal rule. Graves puts forward that the cultural and religious change in the society can be observed in some myths such as Zeus swallowing Metis and giving birth to Athena from his own head. In Graves’ opinion, the story symbolically stands for patriarchy replacing matriarchy slowly. It symbolically tells the superiority of Zeus over Metis and replaces Athena under Zeus hierarchically by narrating her birth through the god’s head, which stands for the patriarchal rationality. Despite the underlined patriarchy and rationality with the arrival of new gods, the matriarchal rites and sacrifices lasted together with them and their cults for some time. Thus, the gods and goddesses of the ancient Greece took place in a new hierarchical order:

“The familiar Olympian system was then agreed upon as a compromise between Hellenic and pre-Hellenic views: a divine family of six gods and six goddesses, headed

by the co-sovereigns Zeus and Hera and forming a Council of Gods in Babylonian style.” (Graves, 1992: 19)

This new religious system became dominant over the whole region, and myths that narrate the stories of gods and goddesses evolved into common beliefs of the regional people.

The above mentioned progress has a critical place not only in Greek culture but also for all European cultures since they are deeply rooted in the Hellenistic tradition. The most striking point among all in the process of the shift from matriarchy to patriarchy is the emphasis upon rationality symbolized with Athena coming out of the rational mind/head of Zeus in the Zeus-Metis myth. The stress on rationality introduced by the patriarchal system was so effective that it created the polarity between *mythos* and *logos* in the intellectual world, and it was the beginning of long debate which would last for many centuries.

Myths had multiple versions within oral tradition. Different versions of the same myth were sung by bards. The main plot usually remained unchanged while the details showed abundance in each narration. Adam M. Parry exemplifies the difference between oral and written tradition with a reference to Homer’s Odyssey:

“through writing the text was fixed in a way that would have been impossible in oral composition. In an illiterate tradition, each singing, even by the same poet, yields a new and a different poem produced from the basic building blocks in the poet’s memory; within a few generations ...even a work as large as the *Odyssey* would become so drastically altered as to be no longer the same poem.” (1966: 189)

Thus, myths with their polyphony and plurality had a flexible character in the hands of bards who could make either omissions or contributions within the main structure of a myth. Yet, myth identified with unstable form and character did not lose any significance. In contrast, as put forward by Kathryn Morgan, “the world of myth was characterised by undemonstrable truth and poetic authority; the word *mythos* similarly connoted authoritative, efficacious and performative speech” (2004: 16).

As Morgan states, textualization of myths started with Homer and Hesiod around the 8th century BC and destroyed the multi-faceted nature of myth as a product of oral tradition and fixed it into single dimension. Although myths were fixed in

writing, they still had a negative meaning for both writers and the early philosophers. For example, the validity of myths started to be questioned with the attempts of pre-socratic philosophers to find out some answers for their questions especially about nature and cosmos. However, unlike single, rational and observable principles demanded by the philosophers who favoured rationality, myths had multiple and open ended nature that caused them to be labelled as untrustworthy. In other words, myths lost their reliability with the rise of pathos representing the rise of scientific thought and soon became “paradigmatic of a pre-philosophical world of irrational storytellers” (Morgan, 2004: 30).

The sharp separation between *mythos* and *logos* caused the unpleasant reputation of myths as false stories. As Laurence Coupe puts “‘myth’ originally meant ‘speech’ or ‘word’, but in time what the Greeks called *mythos* was separated out from, and deemed inferior to *logos*. The former came to signify fantasy; the latter, rational argument” (2009: 10).

The antagonism between *mythos* and *logos* is clearly indicated in Plato’s The Republic. Plato labels myths and poetry as irrational and false stories while he accuses poets of getting far away from the truth. The poet is simply an imitator who imitates nature which itself is already an imitation of a perfect original form. Thus, in the last book of The Republic, after detailed discussions on the role and influence of the poet on people, Plato concludes that poets should not be admitted into an ideal state for they awaken and nourish the irrationality in human soul (1968: 310).

Plato’s declaration of myths and poetry as the second level imitations of the truth and his clear opposition between the irrational myth and poetry and rational way of thought started a controversy about the true nature of myths. Although he claimed that poetry/myth and poets/myth-makers should be regarded as potential danger for the welfare of his ideal state, and therefore they should be completely banished, near the end of his dialogues he adds the option of allowing the poets back from exile if they offer a defence:

“Let it be said that, if poetry directed to pleasure and imitation have any argument to give showing that they should be in a city with good laws, we should be delighted to

receive them back from exile, since we are aware that we ourselves are charmed by them.” (Plato, 1968: 313)

Plato’s final decision about poetry/myth suggests that he is aware of its potential power and he may let the poets/myth-makers into his ideal state if he is persuaded for their benefit, which is possibly an ideological and moral advantage that supports his state as he exemplifies by the myth of Er in the final part of his dialogues.

Since Plato, mythical stories have become one of the popular sources of literature and philosophy. Richard Chase focuses on three main extensive views of myth, “the allegorical-philosophical, the euhemeristic, the Christian apologetic” (1969: 1) which were common in the ancient world. His classification contributes to a comparative review of mythopoetic thought in different time periods until the Age of Enlightenment. According to Chase, the allegorical-philosophical view explains myths as “allegories of nature, and that the mythical beings were personifications of natural phenomena” (Ibid: 1). Additionally, the Euhemeristic view, suggested by Euhemerus (330-260 B.C.), states that myths are the stories of totemic ancestors and culture heroes. Euhemerus puts forward that “the gods are deified men who once lived on earth as conquerors, rulers, or renowned philosophers, and that myth is history distorted by the fancy of storytellers” (Ibid: 3). As E.M. Meletinsky puts forward, the totemic ancestor or the culture hero is the one who “is responsible for everything that is known to the community” (1998: 163). Since the idea behind the community is explained by a shared origin, the common ancestor or culture hero’s lineage is closely related with the other members of the group. Thus, his existence supports the sense of unity. In addition to the sense of unity, these myths about the totemic ancestors or the culture heroes may include moral lessons as well. Therefore, mythical characters become first examples of vital situations and human conditions and their moral messages shape the moral structure of the societies they belong.

The third point in Chase’s classification is the Christian view of myths and it separates itself from the first two points with the ideological manipulation it directs towards the myths of the ancient world. It was a natural outcome of the Middle Ages since religion constituted the centre of all world views. The medieval approach to myths employed three basic directions according to which myths were either something

misinterpreted, expressed allegorically or something to be excused. First of all, since the former beliefs and culture related to pagan gods and their myths could not be erased or ignored, the Christian view of myths regarded all that is worthy in paganism either as allegorical stories or as plagiarism from first the Jewish and then Christian people. As suggested by Euhemerism in terms of nature, Christian view of myths claims that all pagan gods are the corrupted versions of Christian figures, and pagan myths are degenerate pieces of old wisdom. Or, in harmony with the medieval tradition of showing respect to the past, another common explanation of myths from this religious perspective was that “God admitted certain crude and savage elements analogous to pagan cultic practices into Judaism as a necessary step in the revelation of higher truth” (Chase, 1969: 5). Thus, the Christian view of myths made no distinction between the pagan deities and the God of the Bible and adopted a unifying role suggesting that the former are misrepresentations of the latter.

The second popular explanation for myths in the medieval era claimed that they were allegorical expressions of secular or religious matters. Thus, while preserving Latin literature which is built upon classical mythology, neither the Church nor the Christian readers were offended. For the Christian readers of that time,

“the myths were an integral part of the literature they loved and revered, but also part of a false, pagan belief system. The most popular medieval solution to this dilemma was to treat the myths allegorically. This was a strategy already tried out by pagan critics, who had suggested that the voyages of Odysseus or Aeneas could be seen as allegorical of the human journey through life, or that the disturbing story of Cronus eating his children could be rationalised as a symbol of devouring Time; it was also one familiar to Christian interpreters of the Bible, who were accustomed to read the biblical narratives on both a literal and an allegorical level. By allegorical interpretation any myth could be given a Christian meaning.” (Miles, 1999: 10)

The final route followed by the Christian interpretation of myths was a euhemeristic tendency to excuse the existence of mythical stories which tell the adventures of gods apart from the one and ultimate god of the Bible. In accordance with this tendency, Greek religion “became an important apologetic tool in the hands of early Christian writers, who used euhemeristic analysis to demonstrate the secondary nature of the Greek pantheon and to contrast Greek deities with Jesus Christ, who was regarded as a nonlegendary, nonmythological figure of history” (Doty, 1986: 5). Thus,

the delusive and futile identities of pagan deities increased the reliability of Christ both as a historical and a holy figure.

The striking point about the Christian apologetic view of myths is that it clearly points at the ideologically manipulative potential of myths by the dominant religious belief and its worldview. It is a conscious intervention which aims to create sense of unity and give moral messages or to disguise the material, which it finds impossible to erase, under the new ideology. That is to say that although the pagan religious system was extremely in opposition with Christianity, the supporters of the Christian apologetic view shaped the pagan heritage according to the new ideology because of its desire for ultimate authority based on monologism. This example is also significant for it reveals the mutual relation between religion and power.

Although interest in the mythology of antiquity emerged once again during the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, nothing new was introduced for the interpretation of myths. However, it was a period of the rediscovery of a lost classical world. Myths as moral allegory, manifestation of human passion or again allegorical expression of some religious, philosophical, and scientific truth were the most popular comments on the subject in Renaissance. Despite offering nothing original, the Enlightenment period discussed upon myths a lot, and 18th century became a period in which many books with strong effect on mythopoetic thought were published. However, unlike the views of the previous centuries which focused upon moral, allegorical or philosophical aspects of myths, 18th century critics stressed the spirit of scientific inquiry in mythopoetic thought. Especially in the second half of the 18th century, myths were handled as cultural phenomena instead of sources of ancient wisdom or pagan corruption.

19th and 20th centuries focused more on a rational understanding of myths which were in correspondence with the increasing popularity of scientific mind. However, in contrast to the religion based approach, myths were forced to fit into the rational thought. To put it briefly, myths were analyzed from an anthropological point of view by The Anthropological School whose leading figures included E. B. Tylor, Andrew Lang and Sir James Frazer and which mainly suggested a comparative study between cultures. The members of the Anthropological School believed that

“the treatment of similar myths from different regions, by arranging them in large compared groups, makes it possible to trace in mythology the operation of imaginative processes recurring with the evident regularity of mental law; and thus stories of which a single instance would have been a mere isolated curiosity, take their place among well-marked and consistent structures of the human mind” (Tylor, 1871: 255).

The Ritual School developed an alternative view based on the comparative study of cultures and rituals by Frazer. The key figures of the school, Jane Harrison and Bronislaw Malinowski developed the ritualistic view which emphasized the significance of myths for the whole community. The Ritual School shared the desire to give myths a scientific character and claimed that

“if by science be understood a body of rules and conceptions, based on experience and derived from it by logical inference, embodied in material achievements and in a fixed form of tradition and carried on by some sort of social organization-then there is no doubt that even the lowest savage communities have the beginnings of science, however rudimentary” (Malinowski, 1948: 34).

The French Sociological School developed by Emile Durkheim and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl offered that myths had the function of making individuals feel that they were the necessary parts of a community and of creating some vital bonds between all members. Especially the connection between myths and rituals were significant since myths became the expressions of “social life in tangible form and [they] periodically [reaffirm] the existence of the group” (Meletinsky, 1998: 26) through rituals. Finally, Sigmund Freud, Carl Gustav Jung and Joseph Campbell introduced the psychological approach to myths and focused on the individual instead of the society. While, Freud defined myths as “the distorted vestiges of the wish fantasies of whole nations-the age-long dreams of young humanity” (Freud, 1908: 153), Jung commented on them as the unconscious reflections of archetypes or “primordial images” (Jung, 1966: 81).

The scientific studies on myth in the 19th century started with the question of how so many cultures far from each other both in time and space shared similar myths and mythical motifs and ended up in the depths of the psychology of both the individual and the society. With this question in mind, they harshly criticized the conservative ideas that idealized the distant past with its noble and Christian values. Not only the ideal past of the Western societies but also their superiority as the most advanced civilization became a matter of question which resulted in a suspicious approach to

their colonizing behaviour and class separations. The comparative approach declared the common denominators of humanity while the ritualistic and sociological theories focused on the society as a unified organism. Finally, with the psychoanalytical approach, “the savage is brought home, not only into the slums, but into the very heads of otherwise respectable citizens” (Csapo, 2009: 121). Now, the Western elitism that found primitivism either in the savage tribes of the past or in the survivals that live in the cultures of lower classes and *other* nations, was forced to dispense with its usual attitude and develop a new perspective. As a result, despite the dominance of a rational mind, people came to realize the manipulative nature of myths which created a doubt for the unquestionable authorities supported by myths.

1.3. Postmodern Approach to ‘Myths’ in 20th Century and Joyce

Structuralism, which actually takes its source from the linguistic studies of Saussure at the very beginning of the century, brought a fresh look upon language and myths. Ferdinand de Saussure is surely a key figure in the development of modern linguistic theory. Unlike the linguists of the 19th century, “Saussure concentrated ... on the patterns and functions of language in use today, with the emphasis on how meanings are maintained and established and on the functions of grammatical structures” (Barry, 2002:41). Saussure’s theory radically challenged and changed the idea that language reflects the world around us and absolute reality. The traditional understanding of languages assumed that “there was a natural bond between word and thing, a given set of correspondences between the two realms. Our language laid bare for us how the world was, and this could not be questioned” (Eagleton, 2005: 93). Instead of this widespread notion, Saussure suggested that language is a construct which gains meaning with its elements in relation to each other and thus attempts to construct our world. Additionally, meaning is maintained by convention and it is arbitrary. In other words, “a word can be exchanged for something dissimilar,... Its value is therefore not fixed so long as one simply states that it can be ‘exchanged’ (Saussure, 1959: 115). Also it is constitutive for “language *constitutes* our world, it doesn’t just record it or label it. Meaning is always *attributed* to the object or idea by the human mind, and constructed by and expressed through language: it is not already contained within the thing.” (Barry, 2002: 43)

Structuralism follows similar rules with Saussure's theory, and its essence is the belief that things should be understood in the context of the larger structures to which they belong. Similar to what Saussure declared about language, structuralists claim that meaning is not contained within things, but they are attributed to them by the human mind. As a result "in the structuralist approach to literature, there is a constant movement away from the interpretation of the individual literary work and a parallel drive towards understanding the larger, abstract structures which contain them" (Barry, 2002: 40).

Structuralism is neither just about language nor literature. Structuralists discovered the transferable nature of his theory and its potential to explain how any signifying system worked in 1950s. Thus, Saussure's theory contributed to the works of Claude Lévi-Strauss and Roland Barthes who brought the structuralist outlook to the interpretation of myths, which offers the idea that myths are human structures rather than representing absolute truths.

Claude Lévi-Strauss suggested that myths acted like language because of the similarities between the constructions of both. Lévi-Strauss further stressed that "if one wants to establish a parallel between structural linguistics and the structural analysis of myths, the correspondence is established, not between mytheme and word but between mytheme and phoneme" (1988: 145). The parallelism between the mytheme and the phoneme was that both were the smallest individual units into which either a myth or language could be broken down. Moreover, both acquired meaning only when they were combined together in particular ways. Similar to language that was governed by the rules of grammar, myth was bound with some rules beneath the surface of the narrative which constituted the myth's true 'meaning'. Since it is the human mind that creates and perceives such meaning, the universal mental operations such as binary oppositions which structure myths are to be analysed. These universal mental operations are not only found in myths but also in totemic and kinship systems. For Strauss, all these structures and devices are "ways of classifying and organizing reality" (Eagleton, 2005: 90). They are codes to structure and transfer messages and work like a language to make communication possible among the members of a society.

In Myth and Meaning, Lévi-Strauss makes his point more clear. He defines structuralism as the attempt “to find an order behind what is given to us as a disorder” (Lévi-Strauss, 2001: 3). In order to find it, Lévi-Strauss looks into myths which sometimes may seem like meaningless narratives:

“Mythical stories are, or seem, arbitrary, meaningless, absurd, yet nevertheless they seem to reappear all over the world. A ‘fanciful’ creation of the mind in one place would be unique—you would not find the same creation in a completely different place. My problem was trying to find out if there was some kind of order behind this apparent disorder—that’s all.” (Ibid: 3)

According to Lévi-Strauss, the necessity of order is a natural tendency of human kind, and it is also a part of the functioning of their mental system. Therefore, the 20th century is the time to find a proper scientific method in the field of mythology, which makes a scientific investigation of myths possible. He states that since myths are structured as a system of signs, they act like a language that hides coded messages and it is possible to decode them by close analysis.

Roland Barthes similarly argues that the relation between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary and transfers this claim from language studies into cultural sphere. To put it differently, if language is a system based on the arbitrariness between the signifier and the signified, the myth is a second system based on language. Barthes explains the purpose of his application of Saussure’s theory on myths in the preface to the 1970 edition of Mythologies as an “ideological critique bearing on the language of so-called mass-culture” which aims to “account *in detail* for the mystification which transforms petit-bourgeois culture into a universal nature” (1991: 8). In Mythologies, he brings his essays on how everyday reality becomes ‘myths’ of the 20th century and gains immunity against criticism. He brings light on his concept of ‘myths’ as well. He calls ‘myths’ of the 20th century “falsely obvious” and although at first he “used the word ‘myth’ in its traditional sense”, he emphasizes that “[he] was already certain of a fact from which [he] later tried to draw all the consequences: myth is a language” (Ibid: 10). He analyzes this language with many examples from French daily life such as household products like detergents and plastic, food like margarine and steak and chips or drinks like wine and milk.

Barthes explains his motivation for Mythologies and states that his starting point for writing these essays

“was usually a feeling of impatience at the sight of the ‘naturalness’ with which newspapers, art and common sense constantly dress up a reality which, even though it is the one we live in, is undoubtedly determined by history. In short, in the account given of our contemporary circumstances, I resented seeing Nature and History confused at every turn, and I wanted to track down, in the decorative display of *what-goes-without-saying*, the ideological abuse which, in my view, is hidden there.” (1991: 10)

According to Barthes, “myth generally represents itself as always already complete by conceiving its own historical development” (Ibid: 177) and in it “the meaning is *already* complete, [and] it postulates a kind of knowledge, a past, a memory, a comparative order of facts, ideas, decisions” (Ibid: 116). That is to say, ‘myths’ claim themselves as unquestionable truth outside the borders of any ideology. He explains the naturalization process and states:

“A conjuring trick has taken place; it has turned reality inside out, it has emptied it of history and has filled it with nature, it has removed from things their human meaning so as to make them signify a human insignificance...Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification.” (Ibid: 142-143)

Thus ‘myths’ pretend to substitute history and create a frozen, single, and absolute reality, which is closed to any critical or questioning approach. Booker diagnoses it as the “traditional western (Christian) ideological habit of privileging eternal perspectives over temporal or historical ones, where eternity is associated with ideality (particularly with God) and temporality is associated with the fallen condition of humanity in the physical world” (1997: 27). To put it differently, this process of creating stable realities for a so called safe and familiar world finally becomes “a possession *of* history in order to ensure one’s place *in* history” (Barber, 1983-4: 32). Booker summarizes the role of ‘myths’ as an alternative to history as follows:

“It is true that myth, as Roland Barthes has argued, generally represents a denial of history by presenting itself as always already complete by concealing the contingency of its own historical development. Thus, myth becomes a form of ideology that attempts to pass itself off as absolute truth, as absence of ideology. But this naturalization of myth is accomplished by sealing myth off from history.” (1997: 19)

Naturalization process provides ‘myth’ the qualities of being “imperfectible and unquestionable” at the same time; “time or knowledge will not make it better or worse” (Barthes, 1991: 130). These qualities place ‘myths’ in a timeless sphere. Eric Csapo describes this timeless realm as “the very beginning of time, outside of historical time” (2009: 220), from which “myth derives its quality of permanence which binds past, present, and future together, and so its very contents express this ideal of reversible time” (Ibid: 220). His emphasis on this aspect of ‘myths’ continues as follows:

“ ‘Timelessness’ is what myths themselves signify. The abolition of time and history is what raises life and perceptions from the chaos of the phenomenal world to a sphere of pure logical relations, a world of Platonic forms, full of peace, stability, and meaning” (Ibid: 237)

Umberto Eco delineates such an approach towards ‘myths’ as an effort “to tame history” (1989: 39). Once history is tamed and manipulated it becomes “a strong myth, ... the last great myth... a myth that at once subtended the possibility of an ‘objective’ enchainment of events and causes” (Baudrillard, 1994: 47). And this ‘myth’ is an ideological weapon in the struggle to shape and dominate societies. Michael Gardiner explains it by stating that “myth, a signifying system which imparts an extremely powerful ‘reality effect’ on the social world, is directly imposed on the ‘masses’” (1992: 148). The process is directed in such a mischievous way that ‘myths’ are usually taken granted for absolute reality. Gardiner explains it as follows:

“Myth-as-ideology functions by naturalization, by transforming history and culture into nature. Myth functions by transforming historical intention into naturalized justification, contingency into eternal necessity.” (Ibid: 145)

Barthes agrees on naming this process as “[transforming] history into nature” (1991: 128) and he also finds such an attempt ironically ideological despite its denial of a relation with any ideology. He explains his point by claiming that “ancient or not, mythology can only have a historical foundation, for myth is a type of speech chosen by history: it cannot possibly evolve from the ‘nature’ of things” (Ibid: 108). However, the naturalization process is presented as absence of ideology and ‘myths’ are presented as “depoliticized speech” (Ibid: 142). However, they ironically gain an ideological aspect because history is replaced by myths that are turned into history and ideology. Namely, mythopoetic thought in the 20th century is closely related with power relations and

ideology as a result of which ‘myth’ is turned into “a value, [and] truth is no guarantee for it” (Barthes, 1991: 122). In other words, ‘myth’ is “a system of communication, it is a message” (Ibid: 107) rather than being neutral.

Joyce’s attitude towards myth in literature is closer to Barthes’ understanding of ‘myth’ rather than Eliot’s *mythical method*. Eliot suggests restoring authority by the employment of myths in works of literature, however; Joyce opposes this idea since he believes subversion of myths is necessary to break the authority of repressive ideologies over Ireland. Joyce returns the myths that claim so-called timeless and absolute truths into history and ideology. He believes that although myths claim to be outside of any ideology, they are actually representations of the ideologies which they reinforce. Joyce wants to reclaim Irish identity from their repressive authority and subverts not only Homer’s *Odyssey* as the myth representing the repression of both British rule and eventually the western culture but also ‘myths’ of all kinds of cultural, political and religious authority in the ideological sense Barthes uses the word. Thus, he prefers to reveal that none of these cultural, political and religious myths is as real as they are claimed and believed to be, but they are ideologically constructed.

Actually, the difference between Eliot and Joyce is clear. Eliot was sure about the superiority of the past over the present, on the contrary, Joyce was highly “sceptical about the supremacy of past eras or prior authors, [and] his historical and literary allusions are not in the nostalgic mode” (Schwarz, 1987: 20). Instead of Eliot’s expectations from the modern writer, Joyce’s references to his major predecessors were critical rather than an attempt to find a safe place among them. *Ulysses* is beyond an approval of the authority supported by the power of myth. On the contrary, *Ulysses* is “a playfully desperate utilization rather than acceptance of myth, which involves, not taking a mythic world for granted but taking it, so to speak, ‘in for questioning’” (Faulkner, 1977: 57). To clarify, Joyce never submits to authority but *Ulysses* is ideological since “there seems no getting away from the fact that literature must have an ideology-even if this ideology is one that calls all ideologies into question” (Graff, 1995: 11). Qing Wang argues that

“if *Ulysses* were a novel that merely borrows its structure from a Greek epic and characterizes its style by kaleidoscopic changes but lacks a serious literary theme or motif as its substance, it could never have been read and appreciated by so many readers and scholars. In this most innovative and stylistically eclectic novel of its period, Joyce

expresses his unremitting love and hatred. It is one of ‘revenge’ on England’s century-long intrusion into Irish political and cultural nationalism.” (2011: 24)

Thus, Joyce employed *Odyssey* in order not to form a chain between past and present and not to bring order as he also did with the cultural, political and religious myths forced on Ireland by the ideologies of The British Empire and the Catholic Church. His aim was rather to question these myths, not to restore them.

Jean-François Lyotard describes these absolute, authoritative and unquestionable constructions, which pass as absolute truths and which are constructed as a result of power relations, as metanarratives. Lyotard exemplifies metanarratives as the “orders in the army, prayer in church, denotation in the schools, narration in families, questions in philosophy, performativity in businesses” (Lyotard, 1984: 17). They exist to remind people what is right and wrong, appropriate and inappropriate, real and unreal or just and unjust and they eventually constitute absolute authority, which is exactly what Joyce objects. Furthermore, Joyce’s subversive approach corresponds to Jean-François Lyotard’s definition of postmodernism “as incredulity toward metanarratives” (Ibid: xxiv). Joyce’s objection can be considered as the loss of credibility towards metanarratives and is a behaviour that stands in contrast to the conscious modernist struggle to reconstruct them, which offers a new understanding of Joyce from the viewpoint of postmodernism although he wrote within the time interval called as modern.

A writer and his work may pioneer techniques, style or ideas which are beyond the time period to which they historically belong. Similarly, one can claim that Joyce is beyond his time especially because of his postmodern attitude towards myths, which overlaps with Barthes’ point of view. To clarify, Simon Malpas claims that “if postmodernism is thought of as a style rather than a period, there should certainly be no question but that texts and works of art from earlier times might be considered postmodern if they employ the range of formal devices associated with postmodernism” (2005: 28). Furthermore, Joyce corresponds to Fredric Jameson’s explanation of postmodern attitude as a “return to and the re-establishment of all kinds of old things, rather than their wholesale liquidation” (2002: 1). Likewise, Ihab Hassan puts that “postmodernism cannot serve simply as a period”, it rather “avoids categorical and

linear periodization” and that is why “we cannot claim that everything before 1960 is modern, everything after, postmodern” (2001: 7).

Joyce seemingly does not share the general tendency of the modern age about surrendering to some type of authority and sacrificing authenticity for the sake of certainty and security. He rejects the *mythical method* as introduced by Eliot seeing that it offers nothing original but only the approval of an established order. For Joyce, judging the value of a work of art in comparison with the canonical works of art, as suggested in “Tradition and the Individual Talent”, creates a structure in literature which “takes the form of an observable power play” (Eysteinnsson, 1990: 86). This canonical structure does not tolerate polyphony and insists on single dimension, truth and discourse as a result of which it gains an ideological character. And, this ideological character is at the service of the ideals far away from those of Enlightenment thinkers while constructing their modernism project. The *mythical method* introduced by Eliot in “Ulysses, Order and Myth” put forward the ideas of a both singular and canonical literature in which myth could have one and only role as giving literature a scientific and rational character and dismissing alternative voices for finding a firm ground. Eliot shared what was suggested by Plato in The Republic, that myths can be acceptable only as long as they served the sustainability of the established order; the ideal state (1968: Book X). The method is based on “preestablished codes” which “imply a myth of preestablished reality and order” (Graff, 1995: 67). At this point, Joyce’s opposition to Eliot makes sense because as Barthes states “the content of the word ‘Order’ always indicates repression” (1953: 26) and it is authority and repression what Joyce objects in his homeland.

To sum up, although both Eliot and Joyce agreed on the employment of myths in literature, they seemingly disagreed about the function of myths in literature. While Eliot sought conformity in anti-historical escapism by emphasizing tradition, Joyce preferred to evade from the cultural, political and religious authority that ideologically constitutes a false history for Ireland, which Stephen declares to be “a nightmare from which [he is] trying to awake” (Joyce, 2010: 32). In order to awake from this nightmare and to break the reign of the past on the present, Joyce preferred to subvert myths, which gained his work a dimension beyond modernism. Consequently, although mythopoetic thought and myths have been commented on from various points in human history, the link between myths

and power struggle became prominent once more in the 20th century, which Joyce stands against with Ulysses.

CHAPTER II

JOYCE'S MOTIVATION AND METHOD FOR ULYSSES

While he was writing Ulysses, James Joyce was living in self-exile far from Ireland, since 1902 with his departure from Ireland for Paris until his death. He and his family were living in difficult conditions during those years, and Joyce's decision of self-exile had significant reasons in his own way as well as a huge impact on his literary career. Therefore, this chapter aims to analyze Joyce's motivation for writing Ulysses and his choice of parody as a subversive method to construct a national epic for Ireland, both of which are closely related with the reasons behind his self-exile.

2.1. Religion and Nationalism in Joyce

While Joyce was working on Ulysses, his ideas about politics, religion and Irish identity, which he had expressed in his former works as well, were growing mature. In contrast to common sense at the time, he was neither a devoted Catholic nor a blind nationalist. He saw the dead ends of both extremes and believed in alternative solutions that would create a better future for his country. His self-exile was an "escape" from "what he regarded as Ireland's moribund parochialism and narrow Catholic nationalism" (Parsons, 2007: 4). Although he chose to stay away from his homeland for the rest of his life after his twenties, his interest in Ireland and the emotional ties he deeply felt never came to an end. On the contrary, his writing was always about Ireland and his feelings were hovering between love and hate for his country and fellowmen.

Joyce was angry with Irish people since "[his] ancestors threw off their language and took another" and "allowed a handful of foreigners to subject them" (Joyce, 2011: 323). Therefore, he was determined not to "pay in [his] own life and person debts they made" (Ibid: 323). Joyce also put forward his views on the Catholic Church in his letters to his wife, Nora Barnacle. He was full of rage and believed that "the Church [was] ... the enemy of Ireland: but ... her time [was] almost up" (Ellmann, 1992: 125). In another letter to Nora he wrote that he was "fighting a battle with every religious and social force in Ireland" (Ellmann, 1972: xv). This was because Joyce interpreted British imperialism and the Catholic Church as the most powerful barriers in front of any political development in Ireland as imperialism and religion were all around the world:

“One of the most striking aspects of Joyce’s writing is his ability to weave commentary on contemporary Irish social and political issues into the most seemingly ‘aesthetic’ aspects of his work...Joyce’s consistent subversive assault on the negative consequences of Catholic hegemony for Irish society also participates in a broader commentary on the status of the Catholic Church as the most powerful worldwide opponent of political progress in the nineteenth century. Joyce’s critique of Irish nationalism also refers to the contemporaneous wave of nationalism that swept across Europe. And the antagonism toward British imperial domination of Ireland that is so central to Joyce’s work is clearly relevant to the workings of imperialism around the globe.” (Booker, 1997: 5)

According to Deborah Parsons, Joyce distinguished himself from “the domination of British colonialism and the cultural paralysis of Irish nationalism” (2007: 123) as a reaction related to his frustration by putting a distance between his worldview and the mainstream ideas of nationalism and religion. He blamed religious authorities for he believed “the Church, far from providing the inspiration for a positive and healthy community, instead undermines any hope of establishing such a community in Ireland, thus assuring that the Irish people will not be able to work together to throw off their oppressors” (Booker, 1997: 71). Likewise, he criticised Irish people whose motto was “eat or be eaten” (Joyce, 2010: 151) for he thought their tendency as some kind of cannibalism:

“Joyce’s most horrific image of cannibalism is aimed at the British and at the Irish who act in complicity with them. In the ‘Circe’ chapter of *Ulysses* the ‘croppy boy’-hero of an Irish folk song about rebellion against the British- is brutally hanged, then mutilated and cannibalized by a fellow Irishman, showing the way the Irish tend to feed on their own fallen heroes” (Booker, 1997: 71).

By creating such images of cannibalism, Joyce puts forward his disappointment with his society and rejects the common views of nationalism. Booker states that “despite his rejection of Irish nationalism, Joyce makes quite clear throughout his work (especially in *Ulysses*) his awareness of the historical oppression of colonial Ireland at the hands of the British Empire” (Ibid: 166).

Joyce confessed that he “felt a stranger in [his] own country” (Ellmann, 1992: 173). Furthermore, he “felt proud to think that [his] son [would] always be a foreigner in Ireland, a man speaking another language and bred in a different tradition” (Ibid: 174). He explained his deep repugnance towards his country and people in another letter

to Nora in 1909: “I loathe Ireland and the Irish. They themselves stare at me in the street though I was born among them. Perhaps they read my hatred of them in my eyes” (Ellmann, 1992: 174). He developed his views in the following years and reflected them on his literary works, which can be commented as an “attempt to declare the autonomy of the self by denying the authority of the father and the values of the country” (Rosenfield, 1967: 39) in terms of Ireland’s struggle for a new identity.

2.2. Ulysses and Odyssey

Since Dubliners, Joyce was developing the basic outline of a work in his mind, which would later become Ulysses. At first, he was planning to write a story that followed a parallel plot structure with Homer’s Odyssey and include it in Dubliners. Joyce himself brings light on the matter in a letter he wrote to Carlo Linati in which he states that “the character of Ulysses has fascinated [him] ever since boyhood” and that “[he] started writing a short story for Dubliners fifteen years ago but gave it up” (Ellmann, 1992: 271). He even thought about “choos[ing] the title *Ulysses in Dublin*” (Borach, 1954: 325) for his short story collection. However, he never wrote such a story and he changed his mind about the title of his book. Instead, his first novel, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man followed Dubliners in 1916. People had to wait until 1922 to read what he planned for so long not in short story but in novel form and under the title *Ulysses*.

The question why Joyce changed his mind about the genre of Ulysses and preferred the novel form rather than short story is significant when Ulysses is taken into account as Joyce’s absolute separation from both the Catholic and nationalist views. More than in any other work of Joyce, “the reclaiming of the past from the hegemony of colonialist and patriarchal history was an increasingly important impulse” (Parsons, 2007: 123) in Ulysses. The book was frankly subversive both in style and content and seemed to have the intension to “critique the dominant historical narratives by which national cultural identity is formed and sustained” (Ibid: 123). These narratives, as mentioned in the previous chapter, are called metanarratives and they take their power from their unquestionable character. Their subversion and interrogation of their single dimensional nature added brand-new dimensions to the Irish matter. Therefore, it seems that Joyce preferred novel form for its promising polyphony and for his object “of the parodic subversion of dominant, patriarchal, imperial, canonical history and literature”

(Parsons, 2007: 126). Nancy Glazener explains the reasons why Joyce chose to write Ulysses in novel form from a Bakhtinian point of view:

“Bakhtin sometimes describes the novel as a genre distinct from the epic, the drama, or poetry, emphasizing the power of novels to open into ongoing history (in contrast with the bounded world of epic) and to subvert official or high discourses by relativising them (in contrast with the monoglossia he ascribes to drama and poetry).” (2001: 158)

In Mikhail Bakhtin’s view, novel is the only genre that can break the monologism which he describes as “the plane of a single consciousness” (1999: 286) and which “pretends to *possess a ready-made truth*” (Ibid: 110) as offered by other genres and particularly by epic. M. Keith Booker summarizes the world of epic by emphasizing its similarity to that of myths:

“For Bakhtin, the epic is the ultimate genre of authority, informed in a strictly monological way by the official ideology of the culture in which it arises. In particular, the epic resembles myth in its denial of historicity, presenting itself as a completed form and as a vehicle for the transmittal of the authority of the past. The events of the epic exist in an ideal past time that is strictly sealed off from any dialogue with the present.” (1997: 24)

Epic, like myths, is presented as the genre of unchallengeable authority in contrast to the polyphonic and questioning character of novel. Novel is certainly an anti-authoritarian genre, “a genre that is ever questing, ever examining itself and subjecting its established forms to review” (Bakhtin, 2008: 64). The role cast on novel by Bakhtin, who emphasizes the polyphonic and subversive potential of this genre repeatedly, gives one idea about Joyce’s final decision for the genre of Ulysses. Novel was certainly the most appropriate form that offered a multilayered world in which Joyce could express his views freely in contrast to the closed world of Homer’s epic.

Indeed, why Joyce placed the Homeric epic of Odyssey in the background while he was working on his subversive end is another significant question. Brian Arkins suggests a couple of persuasive reasons. First of all, according to Arkins, Joyce decided on constructing his story parallel to the epic of Homer since Homer is “more than any other figure of the historical past...a fundamental force in the collective consciousness of humanity” (1999: 47). In addition, Homer lies in the heart of western literature: “the Greeks began that Western literature and Homer began Greek literature” (Ibid: 47). Seth L. Schein also supports the importance of Odyssey in western culture and states that,

“the *Odyssey* ... has usually been thought of as the earliest work of Western literature ... For the Greeks and later Western readers alike, it has served as a model and a mirror of both individual and cultural self-definition” (1996: 3). Moreover, Joyce picked not *Iliad* but *Odyssey* for *Ulysses* because *Odyssey* was much more suitable for his subversive style with its comic and critical elements. To clarify, while *Iliad* was about war and tragedy, the main reason why “for Joyce, who abhorred violence, such a work could have no attraction” (Arkins, 1999: 49), *Odyssey*, with its comedy and the happy ending, covered “all human life [as] its theme and not some narrow segment of it” (Ibid: 49). Additionally, the story of Odysseus seemed to Joyce as “the most human in world literature” (Borach, 1954: 325) with the faith and perils he experienced. George Borach explains in detail how Joyce decided to choose *Odyssey* as his main material in *Ulysses*:

“The most beautiful, all-embracing theme is that of the *Odyssey*. It is greater, more human than that of Hamlet, Don Quixote, Dante, Faust. The rejuvenation of old Faust has an unpleasant effect upon me. Dante tires one quickly; it is as if one were to look at the sun. The most beautiful, most human traits are contained in the *Odyssey*. I was twelve years old when we dealt with the Trojan War at school; only the *Odyssey* stuck in my memory. I want to be candid: at twelve I liked the mysticism in *Ulysses*. When I was writing *Dubliners*, I first wished to choose the title *Ulysses* in Dublin, but gave up the idea. In Rome, when I had finished about half of the *Portrait*, I realized that the *Odyssey* had to be the sequel, and I began to write *Ulysses*.” (1954: 325)

Arkins also refers briefly to the fact that *Odyssey* has always been a popular model for many writers including Joyce:

“What Joyce does in *Ulysses* is to adopt the Greek practice of making the *Odyssey* an allegory for something; this began in the sixth century B.C., was continued by the Alexandrians, and reached dizzy heights among the Neoplatonists, who made the wanderings of Odysseus a symbol of the soul set amid the phenomena of the physical world (this is also how Bacon in *The Wisdom of the Ancients* interprets the *Odyssey*). What Joyce does is to make the Irish setting and characters of *Ulysses* interact constantly with their Homeric precedents, so that *Ulysses* is, in a sense, the Irish *Odyssey*.” (1999: 55)

Odyssey, neither a British nor an Irish text, was also attractive for Joyce to write his *Irish Odyssey* because Joyce believed that there was a close connection between Irish people and the ancient Hellenic world. Joyce’s belief in a historical connection between the Irish and the Greeks is not a fantasy according to Stuart Gilbert. Gilbert states that The Book of Ballmote, one of the earliest documents about the course of Irish history,

mentions Irish and Greek history and mythology together, which highlights a close connection between two nations. Gilbert also shows the “genealogies of all the principal Irish families, tales of the Irish kings, the translation of an Argonautica and a history of the War of Troy” (1955: 65) which are mentioned together and in relation to each other as evidence for his claim. Furthermore, he mentions A Concise History of Ireland in which P.W. Joyce claims that “Irish chroniclers had a strongly rooted belief in the Grecian origins of the Irish race” (Ibid: 65). To clarify, P.W. Joyce states that the manuscripts written by Irish chroniclers record five groups of people who left Greece to establish colonies in Ireland. P.W. Joyce also gives detailed information about the fate of these five colonies in Greece. Additionally, he points at the close trade relationships between the Irish people and the Greeks. Although Ireland was not too much known in many parts of the world at that time, P.W. Joyce declares that the Greeks were aware of the island, and they “mention[ed] it under the names of *Iernis* and *Ierne*” (1903: 65). Arkins supports their claims and suggests that

“In view of this connection in Joyce between the Western Mediterranean and Ireland, it is worth noting that, according to legend, the first colonisers of Ireland were the Parthalonians from Greece, to be followed by further Greek colonisers in the shape of the Firbolgs and the Dedannans. ...And in fact traders from the Mediterranean did visit Ireland from the third century B.C.-as attested by the skull and jaw of an ape found in Emain Macha (Armagh).” (1999: 54)

Joyce’s views about the Hellenic past of the Irish people relied on the historical facts about the bound between Ireland and Greece which eventually encouraged him to employ the Hellenic material for searching his Irish roots. Therefore, his subversive attitude was directed towards taking the authoritatively manipulated text of Homer out of the way to reach at the pluralism once offered by the authentic text of oral tradition.

Joyce borrowed Odyssey, an already existing text, and rewrote it in a subversive way. However, there are also speculations on the authenticity of Homer’s text. Gilbert brings light on the question:

“The Ulysseid appears to be a Phoenician *periplous* (log-book) transposed into Greek verse and a poetic legend according to certain very simple and typically hellenic principles: anthropomorphic personification of objects, humanization of natural forces, *hellenization* of the raw material. By these methods, to which the Greeks owe so many of their myths and legends, was woven on to a stout, if coarse, Semitic canvas that typically Greek masterpiece, the Odyssey.” (1955: 81)

Homer simply took the original Phoenician text, adapted and rewrote it as a Hellenic epic since Gilbert suggests “the Hellene is, first and foremost, a skilled arranger” (1955: 82). Schein also points out the fact that Odyssey “had roots in a still older Indo-European poetic tradition” (1996: 3) and adds that “the Odyssey is stylistically and thematically an end product of an oral epic tradition” but at the same time “it is equally the first work in Greek literature, that is, in writing” (Ibid: 4). Similarly; Joyce rewrote Homer’s text for his own purposes and proved how manipulative a text could be in line with the ideological background of the author, society and the zeitgeist.

Joyce refers to the polyphonic potential of a text in a self-reflexive manner in Ulysses with a term mainly used in mathematics, astronomy and photography. He explains his approach to the Homeric text with ‘parallax’ defined as an “apparent shift in the position of an object, relative to its background, that occurs when an observer changes his position” (Halsey, 1986: 730). Perry Meisel describes parallax in relation to the world of literature and mentions that:

“if an object’s position changes as a function of its perception, it is not only a function of its reading, but also an instance of the same principle by which the novel itself must oscillate between mythic ‘parallel’ on the one hand and the more particular shifts of linguistic and literary ‘parallax’ or genuine dialogism on the other” (1987: 151)

Therefore, it is clear that the term helps one to understand the employment of Homer’s epic in Ulysses. Ulysses refers to Odyssey, however, it does not aim to create an exact parallelism but Joyce is after offering plural perspectives. Daniel Schwarz explains Joyce’s employment of the term as follows:

“For Joyce, no one perspective could represent or do justice to the diversity of plausible views of reality. Thus he required multiple perspectives to create what he calls-borrowing a term from mathematics to describe how the same object can look different if perceived from different places-parallax.” (1987: 58)

Rather than limiting his understanding of myth to one single dimension, Joyce’s goal is to reveal the alternative meanings and comment on it to express his own perspective.

2.3. Political and Historical Motivation of Joyce

Joyce's motivation for writing Ulysses was limited neither with his personal experiences nor ideology. On the other hand, it was not only about the promising polyphony of the novel or the fascinating influence Odyssey had on western culture. Besides, Ulysses was a natural outcome of the historical, political and religious background of Ireland just as the entire literary career of Joyce. Since Joyce is a writer interested in the social and political changes that affected the Irish nation and Ireland, Ulysses falls short in expressing itself as a whole without having knowledge about the background that shaped it. In other words, Ulysses is best perceived along with Ireland, its history and people.

Written at the threshold of the 20th century, Ulysses pictures Ireland as a land of conflict. During the British rule over Ireland for centuries, Irish people had lost both their national identity and their language. However, as Matthew Hodgart indicates there had always been groups of people who objected to the authority of the empire during the course of history. It had been more than a century since the first serious nationalist revolts took place when Joyce wrote Ulysses:

“The first great nationalist movement of revolt took place at the end of the eighteenth century. The United Irishmen, led by Wolfe Tone, were Republican revolutionaries, inspired by the French Revolution. The Rising of 1798 ... was suppressed quickly and brutally, but it became a symbol for the whole country.” (Hodgart, 1978: 20)

In order to prevent further risings, Hodgart asserts that the Union of the Irish and English Parliaments was brought about in 1801. For him, although British government still had absolute power in Ireland, the union meant loss of prestige.

The nationalist spirit seemed to die out in the 19th century when people of Ireland were devastated with a series of disasters. The population of the country soared in the first half of the century. The rise of the population continued until the Potato Famine between 1845 and 1849 during which thousands of Irish people died. For the famine weakened the country, Irish people emigrated to the United States. As a result of death and migration, there was a serious decline in Irish population, which resulted in an indirect negative effect over Irish language and identity. The country became so

secluded that “in a few years more”, *The Times* prophesied, ‘a Celtic Irishman [would] be as rare in Connemara as is the Red Indian on the shores of Manhattan,’ (qtd. in Beckett, 1966: 353). However, as J.C. Beckett states, “things turned out very differently” for Ireland (1966: 353) and Irish people survived despite difficulties.

As a result of Potato Famine, life became even more difficult for Irish people. Irish people had to struggle with the outcomes of the famine and could not even satisfy their basic needs. Nick Pelling states that “hunger leads to revolt,” however, he adds that “hunger so weakened the population that the will to rebel barely existed” (2003: 37) in Ireland. It was the inertia of Irish people that disappointed Joyce most, not the weakened population. They remained unresponsive as if paralyzed. Instead of revolting against the British, who refused to help during the famine and created the impression that it was the natural outcome of the history for the Irish to be under their rule; the ordinary Irish people were taking refuge under the false guidance of the Catholic Church. According to Joyce, the Catholic Church “imposed a stupid and stunted provincial way of life on Ireland” (Hodgart, 1978: 16), as a result of which the Irish people saw the event as a punishment from God instead of blaming the British rule for not preventing the disaster or giving a helping hand:

“In Ireland itself the predominant view about the famine was one of despairing acceptance of a misfortune sent not by the English but by the Lord. For many, the potato blight was best understood as a divine punishment. Thus one of the most significant impacts of the famine was an increase in religiosity amongst the population.” (Pelling, 2003: 38)

Therefore, the Catholic Church gained unexpected power as a result of this disaster and “Ireland was thrust back into rurality, industrial stagnation and a strict Catholicism” (Ibid: 38) which doubled the problems according to Joyce. The basic problem was between the northern and southern parts of the country. Northern Ireland refused to join an independent Ireland for fear that it “would give majority rule to the Catholic south” (Hodgart, 1978: 25) and finally became a part of Great Britain after the southern region declared its independence. Religious and economic problems also caused the reluctance of the northern part to join a united Ireland. Northern part of the country mostly consisted of Protestants and “the effects of the industrial revolution in Ireland were confined almost entirely to the northern part of the country, strapping even closer its

industrial and commercial dependency on Britain” and this “increased its alienation from the rest of Ireland” (Annaidh, 2002: 203). Yet, for the southern part, being a Catholic was equal to being a nationalist in the Irish struggle for freedom. However, the controversial nationalist and religious views were seemingly more determinative than the economic situations. In other words, the northern part of the country chose to remain as a part of Britain for religious reasons and this triggered hostility between the north and the south of Ireland based on the ideals of nationalism. Hence, for the Catholic people of Southern Ireland, who had been committed to the Church for a very long time, their religious beliefs gained a national character:

“Since the Dark Ages, religion has permeated every side of Irish life; the Irish have always been a truly devout people, probably the most devout in Europe. They have supplied the Church with many monks, friars, nuns, members of teaching orders and so on, who have done the hardest and most unselfish tasks of the Church all over the world. When the Reformation came and the ruling English became Protestant, it was natural for the Irish to remain attached to the unreformed Church; and their adherence to the old cause became a symbol of political revolt.” (Hodgart, 1978: 15)

Thus, Catholic identity of Irish people, the majority of whom lived in the southern part of the country, separated them not only from the Protestant north but also from the British rule and became an indispensable part of the nationalist Irish identity. It is also indicated by Hodgart that “since Protestantism was the religion of the foreign power, the Catholic religion became permanently associated with Irish nationalism, and the association grew stronger with every persecution” (Ibid: 18) and created religious pressure that was imposed upon every aspect of life.

During the 1850s, despite the seemingly quiet political atmosphere, members of a new nationalist movement were coming together under the leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell, and under the name of The Fenian Brotherhood or The Irish Republican Brotherhood “dedicated to the overthrow of British Rule in Ireland” (Pelling, 2003: 43). Thus, a new period of political turbulence led to tensions in society. In the middle of these confusions, Parnell became the hope and symbol of nationalism for many people since:

“Parnell was an unlikely leader of the tenantry and an unlikely leader of Irish nationalists in general, being a Protestant landlord with impressive credentials as a man of the Ascendancy elite. But Parnell had inherited his American mother’s dislike of the

English ... It was Parnell's long-term aim to restore the Parliament which had closed with the Act of Union in 1800." (Pelling, 2003: 44)

However, after a long struggle, Parnell failed to achieve the restoration of the Irish Parliament called as Home Rule. His political career was worn out by his opponents and finally destroyed with a scandal about having an affair with a married woman, which was not tolerated by the Catholic Ireland and his Catholic supporters. He died in 1891 because of his bad health as a fallen national hero.

Meanwhile another nationalist reaction to British dominance came from the literary world, which was called The Irish Literary Revival or The Celtic Twilight as of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The main target of this nationalist literary revival was a return to the ancient Gaelic heritage of the country. It was the search of a nation, which spent years under the dominance of British Rule, for its origins in language, literature and history. Main interests of the movement were Irish literature, folk stories, mythologies, traditions and beliefs. The movement was so influential that it paved the way for the struggle of independence that would take place within decades. James S. Donnelly describes the aim of the movement:

"By the mid-1880s in Ireland the stirrings of a revival of literature had begun that was part of the cultural, artistic, and political awakening that contributed to the creation of a nation in the 1920s. Writers central to this revival tended to commit themselves consciously to the project of recovering as well as creating a national literature." (2004: 387)

Several important people contributed to the movement with their publications. Yet, the major figure of this nationalist literary movement was William Butler Yeats who travelled between the two centres of the revival; London and Dublin and published *The Celtic Twilight* which eventually gave its name to the movement in 1893. Despite his deep impact on Irish nationalism and its expression in Irish literature, Yeats and his views were not totally corresponding to what Joyce believed about nationalism. Joyce described him as "a tiresome idiot" who was "quite out of touch with the Irish people" (Ellmann, 1992: 147). To put it in more simple terms, Joyce rejected the exaggerated praise of the Irish literary past and folk life and its mysticism by Yeats and the revivalists. He found this kind of cultural nationalism as discredited and learnt without any essentialism:

“Joyce was not a Revivalist in the sense that he did fieldwork or sought to preserve, through translation or accurate and realistic accounts, the essence of Irish folk life... But Joyce did keep faith with the Revival’s ideal of creating an imaginary Ireland by applying his style of ‘scrupulous meanness’ to the critical analysis of this ideal.” (Castle, 2001: 177)

In Joyce’s belief, Yeats and the revivalists presented the Celtic heritage as something very valuable that belonged to distant past but dysfunctional and invalid under the civilized life introduced by the British rule. By idealizing the Celtic heritage, Irish people might have felt proud and they were amused with the memories of a dubious past but they were oblivious of the perils of their current situation. Hence, Joyce regarded *The Celtic Twilight* as another dead end for Ireland. Seeing the blind nationalism potential, he rejected the idea that Ireland needed to turn back to its Celtic heritage and specifically language for its future. Unlike Yeats, Joyce “was foreseeing the decline of Gaelic” so “he refused to have anything to do with the revival” (Hodgart, 1978: 16). Emer Nolan summarizes the polarity between Yeats and Joyce:

“Yeats himself sought to create an advanced art from the materials supplied by popular imagination, and he found Ireland ... a congenial place for such experiment. But Joyce, of course, welcomed that modernity which Yeats feared. He did not believe in resuscitating outdated traditions, either to help aspiring artists or to pacify the masses.” (2002: 23)

Joyce believed that the conservative and idealist views of Yeats on Irish heritage were merely constructed images of Ireland and Irish identity imposed on both the country and the people by the British Empire and the Catholic Church. As Enda Duffy explains, nationalism was imposed on and affirmed by Britain in Ireland rather than being shaped by the free will of the Irish people:

“As an ideology, a force by which the subject is convinced of the naturalness of her position, nationalism, despite its role as vehicle of the new state, turns out invariably to have been always already a discourse of the former imperial culture, the very culture it would overcome.” (1994: 59)

Joyce believed that this kind of Irish nationalism was no more than an extension of British and Roman Catholic imperialism (Deane, 2004: 31) both of which he was protesting because of their longlasting physical and cultural colonial effect over Ireland.

Joyce was neither obsessed with politics nor had actively participated in politics. He defined himself as a nationalist who “was incapable of belonging to any political party, but he continued to make war in his own indirect way upon tyrannical authority” (Ellmann, 1992: xvi). Yet, he had a peculiar interest for the ideals and character of his idol, Parnell, whose nationalist views he found closer to himself. Hodgart suggests that Joyce’s admiration for Parnell was “because he was the antithesis of the backslapping, sentimental, oratorical Irish type of politician” (1978: 23). For Joyce, Parnell was a touchstone in Irish politics though he was the enemy for many others. Joyce clearly puts forward his feelings for Parnell in the innocent remarks of young Stephen, in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Stephen’s observations in his home clearly show how Parnell politically divided Ireland into two and he triggered subsequent political tension:

“Dante had ripped the green velvet back off the brush that was for Parnell one day with her scissors and had told him that Parnell was a bad man. He wondered if they were arguing at home about that. That was called politics. There were two sides in it: Dante was on one side and his father and Mr Casey were on the other side but his mother and uncle Charles were on no side. Every day there was something in the paper about it.” (Joyce, 2011: 20)

Even as a little boy, Joyce was also observing the political tension both at home and in the whole country just like Stephen did and was also recording that “the priests and the priests' pawns broke Parnell's heart and hounded him into his grave” (Ibid: 49). Like Stephen, who was growing up as a member of “a priest-ridden Godforsaken race” (Ibid: 55), Joyce was trapped “in the nightmare of Irish history” which would “make him the potential author of an Irish national epic” (Lewis, 2000: 14).

Parnell’s powerful memory haunted Joyce throughout his entire career. For him, Parnell was the perfect leader of Irish nationalism that stood against the British rule that was generally combined with Catholicism. For him, “[they had] had too much God in Ireland” (Joyce, 2011: 57) and it was time “to follow the man that was born to lead [them]” (Ibid: 55). Joyce was nine years old when Parnell died in 1891 and “from then on, in Joyce’s view, Irish politics were absurd and led by charlatans or idiots, with a very few exceptions” (Hodgart, 1978: 24). This point of view became the main reason for Joyce’s self-exile, for he never forgave Irish people about Parnell who was “a heroic

spirit brought low by his own people” (Deane, 2004: 29). He mentioned his deep grief about the death of his hero through Stephen’s words:

“No honourable and sincere man, said Stephen, has given up to you his life and his youth and his affections from the days of Tone to those of Parnell, but you sold him to the enemy or failed him in need or reviled him and left him for another. And you invite me to be one of you. I’d see you damned first.” (Joyce, 2011: 323)

Under the shadow of Parnell’s memory, Joyce offered a fresh view of Irish nationalism as an alternative to the hegemony of the British Empire and the Catholic Church in stark contrast to the revivalists. Instead of preconditioned authoritative images of Ireland and Irish identity supported by the imperial power or the blind nationalism of the masses based on the union of a group of people who share a common race, religion and past, Joyce’s nationalism proposed an Ireland, where those strict borders were violated and broadened based on the values of being human and tolerance. He believed in an Ireland where a new approach of nationalism based on humanism rather than national fanaticism could outlive the idea of Irish nationalism submitted together with the assimilative attitude of the British and the yoke of the Church. His conclusion to the problem of Irish national identity is a reflection of his worldview based on pluralism and diversity, which he continuously developed during his life span and proves Joyce to be a prominent figure.

Ireland’s continuous struggle with problems of identity weren’t resolved when Joyce published both A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and Ulysses. A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man was published exactly in the year of the famous Easter Rising in 1916. Before the Rising, two unsuccessful attempts of Home Rule Bills had been made at the end of the 19th century. Following these, as Séamas Mac Annaidh summarizes, the Third Home Rule Bill became a current issue just before the First World War, which interrupted the Irish dispute on whether to stay a part of Britain or declare independence. As Finbar Madden remarks, “it was expected that the war would be over by Christmas 1914. As it turned out, this was ever so slightly optimistic” (2010: 102). According to Annaidh, “this delay was to change the course of Irish history” (2002: 231) since the Easter Rising occurred in 1916 before the Third Home Rule reached a conclusion. The revolt was defeated by the British Army quickly but triggered the heroic spirit among the Irish revolutionaries. After the First World War the Irish

people could turn back to their local affairs and the Fourth Home Rule Bill was accepted by the Parliament of the United Kingdom in 1920. The act aimed to establish two subdivisions of Ireland, each of which had its own government but remained part of the United Kingdom. The revolutionary party of Ireland had won the elections in 1919; however, “it was declared to be an illegal body by the British government” (Hodgart, 1978: 27). As a result of the conclusions of the Fourth Home Rule Bill and the British intervention in local affairs, the Catholic South did not accept the status given by the British government, therefore “the political entity known as ‘Southern Ireland’ had been still-born” (Annaidh, 2002: 265). As a result, the Anglo-Irish war began in the same year and ended with the Anglo-Irish Treaty which gave Southern Ireland its freedom. However, the treaty caused disagreement in Southern Ireland and a Civil War, which followed the division of Ireland, started in 1922. The disagreement was between the free-staters and the republicans who “felt that it was not an ideal situation or resolution to hundreds of years of conflict with the British. They wanted all or nothing, and would not sit idly by while part of the country was still under British control” (Ibid: 279). In other words, the free-staters were supporting Anglo-Irish Treaty according to which the Free State of Ireland would be established and the northern part would remain in the United Kingdom. The republicans believed that the treaty was a betrayal, and it was unacceptable to leave any part of Ireland under British Rule. The Civil War ended in 1923 with the victory of the free-staters, however, “it left a legacy of bitterness and division that was to remain with the country for many years” (Annaidh, 2002: 281).

2.4. Parody as a Subversive Method

Towards the end of the tumultuous years in Ireland, Joyce published Ulysses, which started uproar and created crisis with its unusual style and content in literary circles. It was found disturbing in many aspects by a majority of people, which caused the rejection and prohibition of the novel in some circles. Joyce wrote that

“no English printer wanted to print a word of it. In America the review was suppressed four times. Now, as I hear, a great movement is being prepared against the publication on behalf of puritans, English imperialists, Irish republicans and Catholics-what an alliance! Golly, I deserve the Nobel peace prize.” (Ellmann, 1992: 271)

In another letter to Harriet Shaw Weaver, he mentioned the fact that “the U.S.A. censor had burned the entire May issue [of *Little Review*] and threatened to cancel their licence if they continue to publish *Ulysses*” and added in a mocking tone that “this is the second time [he had] had the pleasure of being burned while on earth so that [he hoped he] shall pass through the fires of purgatory quickly” (Ellmann, 1992: 249).

Although the plot structure of the book roughly referred to the classical epic of Homer, it also included many distressing elements, which contradicted with the taken for granted assumption about the structure of a novel, Irish nationalism, Catholic religion or the established cultural values of western tradition. Despite the rising modern literary trend that confirmed the already existing institutions and their authority as suggested by Eliot’s mythical method, Joyce was creating his own version out of Odyssey. He was writing the epic of Ireland by referring to the classical and the authoritative text; indeed, it was rather a re-writing process. As for the negative reactions to the book, they seemingly contributed to its notoriety and, as Parsons states, “the complexity of the novel’s style and vision, supported by some skilful marketing and its cult as a ‘banned’ manuscript” turned Joyce “into a literary celebrity” (2007: 5).

Joyce was armed with the subversive and destructive effects of parody while writing Ulysses because it enabled him to question all types of authorities over Ireland and Irish people. He regarded Homer’s Odyssey mainly as the representative of the imperial and cultural authorities in Ulysses besides the ‘myths’ about patriarchal gender roles, marriage as an institution, race, nationalism and religion and many other so-called unquestionable and flawless values of the western culture like heroism, loyalty and morality in a broader sense. Joyce was fighting his battle with all and parody was the best method that would help him.

Parody as a method served for Joyce’s subversive style in Ulysses, but parody has been a literary device that has been used with various ends throughout centuries. The earliest definition of parody belongs to Aristotle who used the word *parodia* in his *Poetics* to make a comparison between literary figures and refers to “Hegemon the Thasian, the inventor of parodies” who represent men “worse than they are” (1895: 3) in a mocking tone with the help of parody. However, parody was not always associated with a negative attitude towards the person or the thing. Hence, different definitions of

parody suggest that it has not been possible to reach a consensus on “whether the term had any polemical edge to it in classical Greece” (Dentith, 2002: 10). Simon Dentith also defines the understanding of the parody in ancient Greece as “a narrative poem, of moderate length, in the metre and vocabulary of epic poems, but treating a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject” (Ibid: 10). Parody was popular both for its critical and humorous effect in the Roman world, during the Middle Ages and during the following centuries. Don Quixote is a famous example based on the mocking aspect of parody in the 17th century. Henry Fielding’s Shamela is an example of the 18th century parody that makes fun of an earlier text. Additionally, Lewis Carroll parodies that take place in the adventures of Alice become as famous as the original texts in the 19th century. However, whether the term stood for the treatment of an earlier text in a light and mocking approach or for the imitation of it in a critical way remained ambiguous. The only certainty about parody is its paradoxical function which became more obvious in the 20th century.

Multiple functions of parody were accentuated in the 20th century literature. 20th century critic Linda Hutcheon defines parody as follows:

“Parody can obviously be a whole range of things. It can be a serious criticism, not necessarily of the parodied text; it can be a playful, genial mockery of codifiable forms. Its range of intent is from respectful admiration to biting ridicule.” (2000: 15)

The debates over the definition of parody were mainly divided into two extremes between its conservative and subversive roles. Its nature implied both “authority and transgression” (Ibid: 69). The conservative aspect of parody usually corresponded to the tendencies of modern literature. This kind of reference to earlier texts means neither criticism nor mockery, but only submission to their canonical authority with the aim of finding “a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history” (Eliot, 1988: 177). Thus, modern writers used parody as a structuring device through which they could communicate with the authoritative texts of the past and achieve to be a part of the great literary tradition as advised by Eliot’s *mythical method*. This imitative aspect of parody enabled modern writers “to rewrite an admired classical original in contemporary terms in order to draw upon its authority and to gain purchase upon the modern world” (Dentith, 2002: 17). By doing so, they were able to present “all that is

considered universal and eternal, and therefore unchangeable” (Hutcheon, 2004: 8) one more time.

Contrary to the conservative approach towards parody, there is an alternative transgressive and subversive usage of this literary device. Dentith asserts that it “typically attacks the official word, mocks the pretensions of authoritative discourse, and undermines the seriousness” (2002: 20) which transforms texts. Consequently, the parodied text is distorted in a mocking manner that serves for purposes other than the original (qtd. in Genette, 1997: 16). Such an aspect of parody is in direct opposition to its conservative application and it is based on the idea that “effective parody must be transformative; it must change the way we look at the texts being parodied” (Booker, 1991: 95). From this perspective, parody is “a threatening, even anarchic force, one that puts into question the legitimacy of other texts” (Hutcheon, 2000: 75) and “acts as a consciousness-raising device, preventing the acceptance of the narrow, doctrinaire, dogmatic views of any particular ideological group” (Ibid: 103). Similarly, Mikhail Bakhtin describes parody as “the creation of a decrowning double” or “world turned inside out” (1999: 127) by emphasizing its subversive potential. For Bakhtin parody is “an intentional dialogized hybrid” because of its dual character (2008: 93). Likewise Dentith calls parody “both a symptom and a weapon in the battle between popular cultural energies and the forces of authority which seek to control them” (2002: 23) rather than a total surrender to authority.

In other words, parody in the 20th century served in two extreme ways first of which aimed to construct a bridge to an “accepted world of discourse” (Forrest-Thomson, 1978: 81) while the other followed a revolutionary road to challenge this authority. Hutcheon focuses on the dual aspect of parody and claims that “the ideological status of parody is paradoxical, for parody presupposes both authority and its transgression” (2000: 106). To put it simply, whereas the conservative approach referred to “the forms and values of the past without changing them” since “their value lies in their endurance, in their unchanging quality” (Ibid: 97), with the transgressive and subversive approach “the notion of the original as rare, single, and valuable is called into question” (Hutcheon, 2001: 89). The conservative approach of parody is usually associated with modernism for its interest in preserving the past and its authority. However, the subversive approach “is a perfect postmodern form ... for it paradoxically

both incorporates and challenges that which it parodies” (Hutcheon, 2004: 11). She concludes that the opposing qualities make parody “the mixture of conservative and revolutionary impulses” (Hutcheon, 2000: 115).

The dual character of parody is the cause behind the controversy about Joyce’s employment of Odyssey. Odyssey as a myth that shapes Ulysses was firstly regarded as an outcome of the conservative aspect of parody and Joyce’s approach to Homer’s text was praised by Eliot. However, nothing prevents a contrary view because of the double nature of parody. Patricia Waugh summarizes the double-edged aspect of parody as “either destructive or critically evaluative and breaking out into new creative possibilities” (2001: 64). Dentith points at the possibility of misunderstanding the intentions of an author because of this double nature as follows:

“A further point needs to be made in this context, that parody has the paradoxical effect of preserving the very text that it seeks to destroy, even if the hypotext remains only ‘under erasure’. This can have some odd effects, even running counter to the apparent intentions of the parodist. Thus the classic parody of *Don Quixote* preserves the very chivalric romances that it attacks-with the unexpected result that for much of its history the novel has been read as a celebration of misplaced idealism rather than a satire of it.” (2002: 36)

Given the abovementioned framework, Ulysses could be considered to be a praise of the great Greek epic of Odyssey at first sight. Yet, an alternative reading has the potential of proving otherwise by claiming that Joyce’s intention of using this classical text was to subvert it rather than to preserve it. The assumption that Joyce made use of the classic text to affirm its authority is caused by the duality and self reflexivity parody itself features:

“Parody has perhaps come to be a privileged mode of formal self-reflexivity because its paradoxical incorporation of the past into its very structures often points to these ideological contexts somewhat more obviously, more didactically, than other forms. Parody seems to offer a perspective on the present and the past which allows an artist to speak TO a discourse from WITHIN it, but without being totally recuperated by it. Parody appears to have become, for this reason, the mode of the marginalized, or of those who are fighting marginalization by a dominant ideology.” (Hutcheon, 1986: 206)

Hutcheon’s claim about why some writers prefer the subversive aspect of parody explains much about Joyce’s attitude towards this literary device:

“parody has also been a favorite literary form of writers in places like Ireland and Canada, working as they do from both inside and outside a culturally different and dominant context. And parody has certainly become a most popular and effective strategy of black, ethnic, and feminist artists, trying to come to terms with and to respond, critically and creatively, to the predominantly white, Anglo, male culture in which they find themselves. For both artists and their audiences, parody sets up a dialectical relation between identification and distance.” (1986: 206)

Joyce’s employment of parody is likely to what Hutcheon describes in his postmodern approach of subverting the accepted values. Hence, although Eliot suggested that “Joyce relies on Homer to provide the kind of authority no longer available in the modern world and thereby to stabilize *Ulysses* as a literary monument in the midst of the fragmentation and degradation of modern culture” (Booker, 1997: 13), reading Joyce through the postmodern character of parody reveals his opposition to traditional official cultural authority and religious oppression. Additionally, it is vital to emphasize that Joyce’s parody is not only directed to the Homeric text but also it is in harmony with the Barthesian concept of myth and postmodern approach to metanarratives. According to Booker, under the light of such a perspective, “these readings suggest a Joyce whose works are politically committed, historically engaged, and socially relevant” which “differs radically from conventional notions of modernist literature as culturally elitist, historically detached, and more interested in individual psychology than in social reality” (1997: 16).

Daniel R. Schwarz additionally emphasized that “*Ulysses* is Joyce’s inquiry into the question of what values are viable in the 20th century urban world where, according to Joyce’s view, God does not exist and traditional notions of heroism are obsolete” (1987: 1). In other words, Joyce rejects not only the Church, which claims to stand for absolute truths, but also the idealized form of the tamed Irish nationalism as well as the dominance of the imperial power by Britain together with the authorities that create ‘myths’, which form metanarratives. He declares his moral and ideological standing against all the institutions of authority representing the established and imposed values on the Irish society and individuals in a 1904 letter to his wife Nora as follows:

“My mind rejects the whole present social order and Christianity-home, the recognised virtues, classes of life, and religious doctrines...Six years ago I left the Catholic Church, hating it most fervently. I found it impossible for me to remain in it on account of the impulses of my nature. I made secret war upon it when I was a student and declined to accept the positions it offered me. By doing this I made myself a beggar but I retained

my pride. Now I make open war upon it by what I write and say and do.” (Ellmann, 1992: 25)

With this purpose, he turns the accepted values of the western culture and Church upside down, subverts them in a parodic attitude and rewrites a national epic. By revealing the ideological role of myths, which is construction of metanarratives and reinforcement of authority, he opposes the ahistorical attitude of myths, which claims absolute authority for them independent of any distinctive condition. Namely, rather than serving the authority of tradition, he follows an ideological tendency for myths as offered by Barthes. By calling the ideologies imposed on Ireland into question, Joyce demystifies “once and for all the artificial and thus alterable nature of the beliefs and usages that have for so long been regarded as part of the law of nature” (Graff, 1995: 27).

To sum up, Joyce had personal, historical, political and religious motivations for writing Ulysses in which he adapted the subversive aspect of parody as a method. Accordingly, the following chapter deals with Joyce’s criticism of the accepted authorities in Ireland through subversive parody and his subversion of the authoritative voices reveal the truth behind myths which will be exemplified by detailed analysis of Ulysses.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF ULYSSES

James Joyce placed Homer's Odyssey in the background of Ulysses. Certainly, the plot story and its main characters have clear references and implications to Homer's text. However, in contrast to Odyssey, Ulysses is a one-day long story that takes place in modern day Dublin. Furthermore, its plot structure does not follow the Homeric sequence of the flow of events and it either includes or lacks some characters or details, which create differences between the two texts in addition to the style of their writers. Still, following Homeric myth in Ulysses may create the impression that Joyce submitted to the authority of Odyssey as one of the great texts that shaped the western culture. Besides, one might think that Joyce's work was an attempt to restore the Homeric authority one more time in the name of restoring order. Moreover, he may be claimed to lean on the classical text since he saw its authority as a way of guaranteeing his literary success and all these conclusions would be in accordance with the opinions and suggestions of T.S. Eliot both in "Ulysses, Order, and Myth" and "Tradition and the Individual Talent". Yet, a close reading enables one to follow Joyce's employment of Homeric myth in his subversive style, which proves the opposite of Eliot's views, despite the undeniable similarities at first look.

The Homeric myth is not the only myth subverted by Joyce in Ulysses. As mentioned before, Joyce's approach to myths is closer to Barthes' understanding of 'myths' which construct metanarratives with ideological purposes. Therefore, in addition to Homer's text and Homeric characters, Joyce regards Shakespeare and Hamlet as oppressive metanarratives that serve the authority of the British Empire and subverts them in the character of Stephen. Thus, he focuses on the effects of imperial power in Ireland and the Irish attitude towards it. Stephen and Bloom share the same perspective while directing their criticism at religion as another 'myth'. Moreover, through Bloom and Molly as subversions of Homeric Odysseus and Penelope, he subverts 'myths' that constitute metanarratives about gender roles and marriage in the patriarchal western culture.

3.1. Religion and Politics

3.1.1. Stephen: Subversion of Telemachus

Ulysses is divided into three sections each of which is dedicated chiefly to one of Joyce's main characters. The first three chapters of Ulysses, known as "Telemachiad", focus on Stephen Dedalus who also reappears many times during the course of the whole story. Joyce created the character of Stephen firstly for his work which would later be called Stephen Hero and be published in 1944, after his death, with some parts missing. Later on, Stephen appeared as the protagonist of Joyce's first novel; A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, where he was a restless soul trying to shape his mind about some matters related with Ireland. Pericles Lewis summarizes Stephen's situation in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man:

"*A Portrait* tells the story of Stephen's emergence into consciousness as an emergence into Irish history. Political events that play a crucial role in Stephen's conception of his place in history, such as the fall of Parnell, precede Stephen's conscious understanding of Irish politics, and Stephen's attempts to understand such events are part of the novel's drama." (2000: 13)

As Joyce's first novel, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man is written in the form of a bildungsroman and it seemingly narrates the inner crisis of young Joyce in the character of Stephen, which raises comments that he is modelled as Joyce's alter ego and thus it is a semi-biographical novel. Joyce goes through the same process of gaining consciousness about his homeland just like Stephen. Young Joyce wants to write a new national epic and hopes it to be an alternative to the already forced 'myths' by religious and imperial authorities on Ireland and to help "to transform the Irish people" (Ibid: 14). Similarly, Stephen is a young man who looks for a way out of the oppression created by the same authorities. He "cannot forgive his church or country for his loss of faith in them" (Gilbert, 1955: 19) exactly like Joyce and his mind is tied up with thoughts related to political matters. According to Joyce, "the focus for a reawakening of national consciousness [is] centred on the awareness that individuals are both subjects and objects of historical processes" (Lewis, 2000: 2), which is a matter Stephen is aware of and Ulysses deals with. Indeed, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, which starts with Stephen's childhood and schooldays and closes with his departure from Ireland to Europe with a decision to "forge in the smithy of [his] soul the uncreated conscience of [his] race," (Joyce, 2011: 404), is an introduction and preparation for Ulysses that

followed it as Stephen's inner crisis forms a basis for Joyce's argument about Irish nationalism in Ulysses.

The first four chapters of Odyssey are called "Telemachia" which tells the story of the distressful situation of Telemachus. Telemachus is the young son of Odysseus who has not returned to Ithaca since the war in Troy came to an end. A baby in his father's departure from his country, Telemachus is now a grown up man whose house and wealth are continuously plundered by those who saw the authority gap in the country as an opportunity. Furthermore, his mother Penelope is suffering under a great pressure because of the suitors who claim both her hand and property. Telemachus is helpless until Athena offers him help and thus he decides to set off an adventure, as a result of which he hopes to find his father dead or alive.

Joyce's "Telemachiad" section of Ulysses corresponds to Homer's "Telemachia". Stephen is a subversive allusion of the Homeric hero Telemachus. Like Telemachus, Stephen is in a distressful situation in his country. Short time after leaving for Europe, it comes out in Ulysses that he turned back to Ireland some time ago for his mother who was in deathbed. Although his mother dies, he can neither go back to Europe again nor set a life in Ireland but he is wandering around Dublin on a shaky ground. He also has troubles about his family and particularly with his father. Besides, his mind is full of matters related to his country similar to Telemachus.

The first chapter of "Telemachiad" pictures Stephen in relation with his friends and forms a link between his past in A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man and his current self. His friends are his home mate Buck Mulligan and Mulligan's British friend Haines, with whom Stephen starts his morning on that particular day and exchanges his ideas until he leaves home with a decision for not sleeping there that night. Three young men and their triangular interaction with each other are important since their conversations picture where Joyce stands in terms of the relationship between the British and the Irish people besides his look at religion and how he subverts imperial and religious 'myths' imposed by the British Empire and the Catholic Church on Ireland.

Buck Mulligan is portrayed as the type of Irish man Joyce objects because of his close connection with Britain and British culture. Although Stephen decisively denies any connection with Britain, Mulligan seems not taking the matter so seriously and he even approves the British domination over Ireland as something natural. Thus, his friendship with Haines, who stands for the British invader, is quite considerable. On the other hand, Haines is the representative of the British figure who keeps curiosity towards Ireland and Irish people. He is “a literary tourist in quest of Celtic wit and twilight” (Gilbert, 1955: 100). As Gregory Castle indicates, he “tries to collect Stephen’s sayings” and wants to learn his intellectual views just because of the fact that he has “an outsider’s interest in someone whom he considers to be an exotic insider” (2001: 213).

The chapter opens with Buck Mulligan who is an Irish man like Stephen. However, Mulligan has a completely different stand and perspective than those of Stephen. The most striking point about him is his close friendship with Haines, who is a disturbing figure for Stephen. The fact that Buck Mulligan was portrayed by Joyce after his real life friend Oliver St. John Gogarty may help in understanding his relationship with Britain and British people. To bring some light on the subject, R.J. Schork indicates that “although [Gogarty] was resolutely Irish and Catholic, his education was essentially English” (1998: 28). His emphasis on Gogarty’s education in English may explain the closeness of Mulligan to Haines who is the master of the Irishman on symbolical level. Mulligan, the stereotype for the common Irishman, is educated by the British and his point of view is shaped by them after all. Schork also mentions Gogarty’s Jesuit background which shows itself in Buck Mulligan’s mastery in Latin. However, Mulligan has mastery not only in Latin, which “was the sign of the cultivated person in Ireland and on the Continent” (Ibid: 28), but also Greek, which was the language “every educated gentleman was expected to endorse, if not practice, in England” (Ibid: 29). His speech involves some phrases like “epi oinopa ponton” or “Thalatta! Thalatta!” (Joyce, 2010: 5) in Greek and this points at his effort to stand closer to his British friend.

As the embodiment of the Irish man who perceives Britain as his natural master, Mulligan opens the door of his house to Haines who represents Britain. He remains close to Haines by alienating Stephen when he remarks the Hellenic sound in their own

names and makes fun of Joyce's ideal of Hellenization represented in Stephen's personality. He finds the Hellenic tone in their own names "absurd" (Joyce, 2010: 4) and offers in a mocking manner to "do something for the island" and "Hellenize it" (Ibid: 7). However, when Stephen does not pay attention to his words, Mulligan sympathizes with him in an insincere way. He tells Stephen that he is "the only one that knows who [he is]" and asks "Why don't you trust me more? What have you up your nose against me? Is it Haines?" (Ibid: 7). Indeed, Mulligan is aware of Haines who has the typical personality and thoughts of a British man:

"God, isn't he dreadful? he said frankly. A ponderous Saxon. He thinks you're not a gentleman. God, these bloody English. Bursting with money and indigestion. Because he comes from Oxford. You know, Dedalus, you have the real Oxford manner. He can't make you out." (Ibid: 4)

Yet, knowing or even expressing these does not retain Mulligan from taking the keys of the tower from Stephen only to hand them to Haines. Stephen calls him "a jester at the court of his master, indulged and disesteemed, winning a clement master's praise" (Ibid: 23) in a bitter tone.

Mulligan is significant not only in his relation to Haines but also with his attitude towards religious matters. Umberto Eco asserts that "*Ulysses* begins with an act of rebellion, a liturgical parody, and a fireworks of destructive, scornful fraternity jokes" (1989: 35), which summarizes Joyce's mocking of the Catholic Church and religion in the character of Mulligan as a 'myth'. According to M. Keith Booker, Joyce utilizes parody which "must be transformative" and "troubling" (1997: 95) for his mocking tone. Like Eco, Booker gives *Ulysses* as an example of parody pointed towards religious matters: "Among the more striking examples of such troubling parodies in modern literature are Joyce's parodies of religious language and ritual in *Ulysses*" (Ibid: 95). In the very beginning of the chapter, Mulligan is pictured in his dressing gown while mimicking a church ritual by speaking Latin and using his shaving bowl as if it is full of holy water:

"Stately, plump Buck Mulligan came from the stairhead, bearing a bowl of lather on which a mirror and a razor lay crossed. A yellow dressinggown, ungirdled, was sustained gently behind him by the mild morning air. He held the bowl aloft and intoned:

-Introibo ad altare Dei.

Halted, he peered down the dark winding stairs and called up coarsely:

-Come up, Kinch. Come up, you fearful jesuit.

Solemnly he came forward and mounted the round gunrest. He faced about and blessed gravely thrice the tower, the surrounding country and the awaking mountains.” (Joyce, 2010: 3)

Joyce parodies the Mass here while he makes a reference to pagan elements in blessing the nature, which reminds one of the pagan past of Ireland before Irish Catholicism. Brian Arkins reads Joyce’s religious parody as “a rejection of Irish Catholicism and an espousal of neopaganism, whose temple is the Tower, conceived in terms of the navel-stone at Delphi in Greece” (1999: 71). Mulligan makes a reference to the religious stone by calling their home as “the omphalos” (Joyce, 2010: 17) and declares it another religious centre connected to the Greek religious centre. According to Stuart Gilbert, “Stephen conjures up an association between the Martello tower where he and Mulligan are living and the seat of the Delphic oracle, the world’s *omphalos*” (1955: 54) and this is in accordance with Joyce’s claim about the ancient bond between Ireland and Greece. Joyce continues his religious mocking and subverting the language of the Church with The Ballad of Joking Jesus which Mulligan sings in the following parts of the chapter. The ballad includes lines that mock the miracles of Jesus such as, “my mother’s a Jew, my father’s a bird” or “if anyone thinks that I amn’t divine/he will get no free drinks when I’m making the wine” (Joyce, 2010: 18). Hearing these words, Haines cannot stop laughing although he finds the song blasphemous. When he learns that Stephen hears it “three times a day, after meals” (Ibid: 18), Haines asks if he is “a believer in the narrow sense of the word” (Ibid: 18). Stephen’s answer gives voice to Joyce who believes that “there’s only one sense of the word” (Ibid: 19), which includes neither Joyce nor Stephen.

Stephen’s religious thoughts are often given in connected with his mother and her death. He thinks about his mother’s last wish and her disappointment ceaselessly. His thoughts focus on the dead body of his mother who visits him in a dream now and then. Stephen cannot help visualizing “her wasted body” (Ibid: 5). While walking in the Sandymount Strand in the third chapter, he is lost in deep thought. Stephen comes across with the dead body of a dog which is left to decay and reminds him of his mother. He reconciles two images in his mind and sadly admits that, if his mother stands for Ireland and the Catholic Church she respected, both are “beastly dead” (Ibid: 8) as Mulligan, who mocks the Church in every opportunity, comments for his mother.

After seeing the carcass of the dog and a live dog nearby, Stephen follows a chain of thoughts about “all kings’ sons” and “pretenders” that are the “dog of [his] enemy” (Joyce, 2010: 42) that can be interpreted as Ireland and Irish people in the service of Britain. Furthermore, he creates a word game out of the word dog by repeating like “poor dogsbody’s body” (Ibid: 43) which Mulligan recalls while shouting in Circe chapter as “Kinch killed her dogsbody bitchbody” (Ibid: 500). As William York Tindall suggests, “for word-loving Joyce, God and dog, verbal mirrors, were closely related” (1995: 79). The word *dog* turns into the word *god* when pronounced contrariwise and the dead bodies of both Stephen’s mother and the dog on the shore evokes the god who is dead for Stephen, who “is a solitary person who gets nowhere and fails to find any answer to the problem of life” (Arkins, 1999: 75). Gilbert comments on the connection between all by focusing on the conversation between Stephen and his mother again in Circe chapter. When his mother’s ghost wants him to repent, Stephen answers as follows:

“THE MOTHER. (With smouldering eyes.) Repent! O, the fire of hell!
STEPHEN. (Panting.) The corpsechewer! Raw head and bloody bones!” (Joyce, 2010: 501)

Stephen’s reaction to his dead mother is full of hatred because he associates her with his motherland that means only disappointment for him. Also, he reflects his emotions for her, such as pity and disgust, towards the dead dog and both recall for him a god, as Gilbert suggests, in which he sees “a Lord of Death, hangman god, a ghoul, a butcher” (1955: 345) which attacks to devour. Thus, he subverts the idea of the always merciful god of the Catholic Church and replaces it with negative connotations. His final and ultimate denial of God becomes apparent when he calls God just “a black crack of noise in the street” (Joyce, 2010: 357).

Stephen’s conversation with Haines does not only include his opinion about religion but his views on the effects of Britain over Ireland. Before talking to Haines, Stephen defines his relationship with Mulligan as a “forgotten friendship” (Ibid: 11) because of his being closer to Haines. However, Stephen is of the opinion that Mulligan is not a friend of Haines but his servant no matter how close they are. Therefore, he calls himself “a servant too” as Mulligan’s friend, he is “a server of a servant” (Ibid: 11). Likewise, while talking to Haines about free thought and being one’s own master,

Stephen's thought is distressed about his position against him: "He wants that key. It is mine, I paid the rent. Now I eat his salt bread. Give him the key too. All. He will ask for it. That was in his eyes." (Joyce, 2010: 19). Despite thinking in this way, Stephen is unable to prevent his invasion of the tower. Instead of this, at least he finds the courage to express his mind to his opponent:

"-I am the servant of two masters, Stephen said, an English and an Italian.

-Italian? Haines said.

...

-The Imperial British state, Stephen answered, his colour rising, and the holy Roman catholic and apostolic church." (Ibid: 19)

In response, Haines answers Stephen calmly. He says that "an Irishman must think like that" and admits that British people "have treated [Irish people] rather unfairly", for which "it seems history is to blame" (Ibid: 19). However, according to Joyce, history is a human invention and an excuse by way of which "Haines denies any English responsibility for the treatment of Ireland, placing the blame instead at the doorstep of some impersonal force called 'history'" (Booker, 1997: 223).

Similar to Telemachus whose house is invaded by the enemy and whose kinsmen betray him, Stephen is betrayed by his friend Mulligan who connives at Haines, the invader. Arkins points at the parallelism as follows:

"Joyce preserves the basic Homeric theme of the suitors of Penelope seeking to usurp the kingdom of Ithaca: representing the suitor Antinous (whose name means 'hostile'), Buck Mulligan is the usurper confronting Stephen, clearly has designs on his position (he gets the key of the Tower) and, in addition, is mean and gluttonous...Joyce establishes Malachi Mulligan as a materialist playing at being a priest, as a potential king who attempts to take over Stephen's role as artist, and as a man who is prepared to toady to the Englishman Haines, himself by definition the usurper of Ireland's independence." (1999: 69)

For Arkins, Haines is the usurper in Ulysses while Stephen's *usurper* seems to be rather pointed at Mulligan at the end of the first chapter since the betrayal of his own people hurts him more. He states that "a man's worst enemies shall be those of his own house and family" (Joyce, 2010: 185). Stephen is disappointed since Mulligan should be aware of the danger from the "horn of a bull, hoof of a horse, smile of a Saxon" (Ibid: 22). However, he trusts the enemy as his friend and is persuaded about the naturalness of his condition in relation to the British domination, which Haines calls history but

Stephen sees as ‘myth’, in the ideological sense Barthes describes the word. Like Telemachus and Joyce, Stephen’s only weapons in his struggle against the historical trickery are “silence, exile, and cunning” (Joyce, 2011: 394). Thus, he leaves the tower quietly. He is too weak in order not to accept to share his key with Haines. Yet, leaving the tower with the intention of not coming back for the night, he symbolically puts forward his resistance to the British hand in Irish matters.

More parallelism and subversive interaction can be found between Stephen and Telemachus. To illustrate, Homer opens *Odyssey* with “a Telemachus who never knew his father, but is growing to manhood and finds his inheritance being destroyed by a ruthless band of young men whom he is powerless to prevent courting his mother and wasting his substance” (Jones, 1991: xxiii). Readers of Homer who learn about the sad situation of Odysseus and how desperate Telemachus is wonder whether “this young man fit to be the son of such a hero? If so, how will he prove it?” (Ibid: xxiii). Although Telemachus remembers that “there was a time when this house was by way of being prosperous and respectable, when Odysseus was still among [them]” (Homer, 1991: 10) and knows that the invaders of his house “are eating [him] out of house and home” (Ibid: 10), he is helpless till divine help is offered by Athena who encourages him to take action. Athena advises him thus:

“You are no longer a child: you must put childish thoughts away. Have you not heard what a name Orestes made for himself in the world when he killed the cunning Aegisthus for murdering his noble father? You, my friend... must be as brave as Orestes. Then future generations will sing your praises.” (Ibid: 12)

After hearing her, Telemachus, who hesitates to do anything to struggle against his fate, finds the courage to “be master of [his] own house and the servants whom [his] royal father won for [him] in war” (Ibid: 14) unlike Stephen who names himself a servant. Yet, in contrast to Telemachus, who is led by a goddess, Stephen is alone and isolated without any guidance. Furthermore, both are aware of the fact that “the destruction of [their houses] is an injustice” (Ibid: 19) while only Telemachus is fearless enough to challenge to his enemies:

“But sagacious Telemachus replied: “Antinous, it is out of the question for a man to sit down to a quiet supper and take his ease with a rowdy mob like you. Isn’t it enough that all this time, under pretext of your suit, you have been robbing me of my best, while I

was still too young to understand? I tell you, now that I am old enough to learn from others what happened and to feel my own strength at last, I will do my best to send you all to perdition.” (Homer, 1991: 26)

Having said that, Telemachus goes ahead to get prepared for a journey with the aim of claiming what belongs to him back. However, his Joycean counterpart sits down to breakfast with both Mulligan and Haines. Instead of taking a step into action, he is mostly lost in thought and turns into his inner self. Rather than any similitude in behaviour with the Homeric hero, he constructs himself a labyrinth around the city all day like his Greek namesake Dedalus. Although numerous thoughts “fill [his] heart with a pain for which [he finds] no cure” (Ibid: 19) like Telemachus, Stephen avoids any action because he confesses that “[he’s] not a hero” (Joyce, 2010: 4).

Stephen is right when he denies being a hero since he shows no sign of heroism when compared with the epic heroes. According to Homer and his world, the hero should have great courage to take responsibility and to determine his fate as well as that of those around him. He must be so strong minded that the difficulty or even the dreadfulness of his action should not stop him. For the epic hero, his name and honour is above everything. Thus, for a stainless reputation the hero should act like the example of Orestes who took his revenge just after the war of Troy. He is often told as a good model for Telemachus and it is emphasized that his “fame will travel throughout Achaean lands and live in song for generations” (Homer, 1991: 36). Having a hero’s character is so much desired that Telemachus wishes that “the gods would only give [him] strength like his to exact revenge for the Suitors’ vicious crimes, their wilful disregard of what is right, and the ways they have humiliated [him]” (Ibid: 36). Again in contrast to Telemachus, Stephen is far from doing anything noteworthy about the invasion of his house in both meanings except his sulky behaviour and deep thoughts.

Stephen’s parental relations, which show striking contrast with the relationship between Homer’s Telemachus and his parents, lie at the bottom of his desperate behaviour. While Telemachus, Odysseus and Penelope are portrayed as the members of a family struggling to come together, Stephen and his family are characterized by a break down in accordance with Joyce’s subversive approach. To exemplify, unlike the relationship between Odysseus and Telemachus as the father and son who set forth from different places with the aim of a reunion, Mr. Simon Dedalus and Stephen wander in

distant parts of the city whole day without having the slightest intention of searching for each other. Although Stephen's search, both physically and metaphorically, around Dublin looks similar to Telemachus's wandering to find his father, his conditions do not fit with the Homeric hero. That is to say, Telemachus resists the false candidates of fatherhood, represented by the suitors, with the hope of finding his true parent. On the other hand, Stephen rejects his biological father and searches for someone he does not even know but he will soon meet in the personality of Bloom.

A similar principle prevails in the mother and son relationships between Telemachus and Penelope and Stephen and his mother Mary. While Telemachus and Penelope support each other for years in their resistance against the invasion of their house in the absence of Odysseus, Stephen simply leaves his mother and homeland. His reluctant return to Ireland for his mother's illness only adds to the disappointment of both when he rejects his mother's final wish. Arkins addresses the difference of the both mother and son relationships as follows:

“Stephen's relationship with his mother Mary is treated very differently from Telemachus' relationship with Penelope. Both mothers love their sons, but Penelope gives way to Telemachus' authority, while Stephen's mother reproaches him for refusing to pray for her.” (1999: 70)

In other words, Stephen's mother becomes an obstacle and symbol of oppression who demands his service although Stephen does not share a similar point of view whereas Telemachus' mother respects her son's individuality. In other words, although Penelope is unwilling about Telemachus' leaving home in search of his father, she supports his choice and does not stop him. Having his mother's support behind as well as the approval of divine help from Athena, Telemachus starts off to find out his father and restore authority and finally embraces his mother/land in return.

In contrast to Telemachus, Stephen denies his mother/land as well as his father and he is alone on his way. His loneliness occasionally disturbs him. To illustrate, when he watches his student Sargent in the second chapter, he remembers his own childhood and the unconditional love between a mother and a child:

“Ugly and futile: lean neck and tangled hair and a stain of ink, a snail's bed. Yet someone had loved him, borne him in her arms and in her heart. But for her the race of

the world would have trampled him under foot, a squashed boneless snail. She had loved his weak watery blood drained from her own. Was that then real? The only true thing in life?...She was no more: the trembling skeleton of a twig burnt in the fire, an odour of rosewood and wetted ashes. She had saved him from being trampled under foot and had gone, scarcely having been. A poor soul gone to heaven.” (Joyce, 2010: 26)

His mother dead and his father almost a stranger, Stephen is lost and tries to stand on his own without any support. That is why his purpose is different from Telemachus. Telemachus aims to restore authority by bringing his father back. But, since Stephen has no hope either from his mother and father, who never gave him a chance and respected his true identity, he wants to subvert their already existing authority. He seeks a father who can light his way and inspire him to write his epic for Ireland and a mother/land whose embracement and support he needs no matter what he chooses to become.

Stephen gives out his thoughts on his motherland many times in Circe chapter. According to Frederick K. Lang, “In “Circe”, Stephen’s trinity of oppressors-religion, British domination, Irish patriotism- is imaged in the apparitions of Stephen’s mother, Edward VII, and Old Gummy Granny” (1993: 327). After avoiding his mother’s attacks, he comes across with the other two, against whom he defences himself by expressing that “[he] must kill the priest and the king” and “[he has] no king [himself] for the moment” (Joyce, 2010: 507-508). He also adds that he does not want to die for Ireland unlike the soldiers he is talking with; instead he says “let my country die for me!” (Ibid: 508). And he blames the king for “he wants [his] money and [his] life, though want must be his master, for some british empire of his. Money [he hasn’t]” (Ibid: 511). Circe chapter ends with the celebration of a Black Mass where The Voice of All the Damned cries “Htengier Tnetopinmo Dog Drol eht rof, Aiulella!” which reversely says “Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!” (Ibid: 514-515) by emphasizing the contrast between the words *dog* and *god*. Daniel Schwarz indicates that the relation between these words “suggests the paradoxical relationship between the beastly and divine in man. Since the Irish Catholics believed that the Black Mass- performed variously by Satanists, Freemasons, and even Protestants- worshipped dogs, Joyce used dogs to represent what is ungodlike in man” (1987: 211). Thus, it seems that ungodlike is equalled with doglike by Joyce. So, it is also striking that “the Greek word *kynikos* means doglike and was chosen to categorize philosophers who turned their backs on traditional customs and values” (Schwarz, 1987: 212). Association of the dogs with the

rejection of the traditions become more relevant as far as Stephen's situation is concerned.

To further exemplify the subversive character of Stephen, his attack both on the Church and the British rule surface during his chatting with Mr. Deasy in the second chapter. Mr. Deasy, praises the British people because of their power that comes from money and Stephen associates him with the famous character of English literature; Iago, the traitor. His mind jumps from that thought to Haines, who is a British man too, and names him "the sea's ruler" whose "seacold eyes looked on the empty bay" and told "history is to blame" (Joyce, 2010: 28) for the bad treatment of Irish people by the British. That is the sea in which both Ireland and Stephen-Icarus, son of Stephen's namesake Dedalus both of whom Stephen refers to with his character and story, gets drowned while the British man feels no responsibility since he always claims that "[he] paid [his] way" and "owe[s] nothing" (Ibid: 28-29) as Mr. Deasy, another traitor, proudly indicates.

Stephen reveals his real self clearly while talking with Mr. Deasy about the Jews. Stephen objects Mr. Deasy's mainstream comments and answers him bravely:

"-They sinned against the light, Mr Deasy said gravely. And you can see the darkness in their eyes. And that is why they are wanderers on the earth to this day...Their eyes knew the years of wandering and, patient, knew the dishonours of their flesh.
 -Who has not? Stephen said.
 -What do you mean? Mr Deasy asked.
 He came forward a pace and stood by the table. His underjaw fell sideways open uncertainty. Is this old wisdom? He waits to hear from me.
 -History, Stephen said, is a nightmare from which I am trying to awake.
 From the playfield the boys raised a shout. A whirring whistle: goal. What if that nightmare gave you a back kick?
 -The ways of the Creator are not our ways, Mr Deasy said. All history moves towards one great goal, the manifestation of God.
 Stephen jerked his thumb towards the window, saying:
 -That is God...A shout in the street." (Ibid: 31-32)

Perhaps this is the most important moment in which Stephen expresses himself for the entire world to see throughout *Ulysses*. He builds up his nerve to resist against Mr. Deasy "whose wisdom consists of clichés rather than experience" (Schwarz, 1987: 22) about Jews and explicitly shows his mind about what people call 'history'. As Arkins remarks, "like many modern theorists of history, Stephen views it as myth rather

than fact” (1999: 73) and “both unreal and threatening” (Ibid: 73). Besides, he is well aware of the fact that “the ‘history’ [Mr Deasy] expounds is pure ideology” (Parrinder, 1984: 124). Therefore, he is calm and clear when he rejects Mr Deasy’s understanding of history as absolute and stable as the truth of God since he does not accept the existence of Mr Deasy’s God, either. Though, Stephen probably admits it when Mr Deasy declares: “I am happier than you are” (Joyce, 2010: 32), since Stephen is aware of the fact that to prefer to be “a learner rather [than a teacher]” (Ibid: 33) is more painful. Although Stephen is aware of the unhappiness waiting for him as a result of his questioning and subversive approach, he knows that there is no other way for him to find out the truth. That is why Stephen asks himself in the third chapter, reminding his attempt to leave Ireland for Paris, if “he [could] fly a bit higher than that” (Ibid: 35) and remembers his failure like Icarus in melancholy. He thinks in silence: “You flew. Whereto? Newhaven-Dieppe, steeregae passenger. Paris and back. Lapwing. Icarus...Seabedabled, fallen, weltering” (Ibid: 189) and feels like “the flood is following [him] (Ibid: 41). When Bloom asks “why [he left his] father’s house”, Stephen answers briefly: “To seek misfortune” (Ibid: 529), which is an answer that confirms Schwarz who claims that “Stephen inhabits his self-created Inferno” (1987: 45).

Similar to other subversive allusions to Homeric parallels, Mr. Deasy is the subversion of Nestor reduced “to having pictures of horses owned by Englishmen on his wall” rather than “a tamer of horses” (Arkins, 1999: 73) by Joyce. Schwarz compares him with the wise Nestor, who guides Telemachus in Odyssey, in terms of being a father figure and suggests that:

“While Nestor is a benign false father figure for Telemachus, Deasy is a malicious one for Stephen. Deasy, notwithstanding his veneer of civilization and concern for the public welfare as instanced by his campaign against foot and mouth disease, lives in a world of abstractions in which experience is no longer a mentor and personal relations are defunct. Deasy is hilariously insensitive and stupid.” (1987: 21)

In return, Schwarz adds that “unlike Telemachus who listens respectfully to the advice of his elder, Stephen is barely polite to Deasy and even more disdainful in his private responses” (Ibid: 22). Stephen feels no respect for him since he “is part of the English-Irish establishment that Stephen sees himself unwillingly serving” (Ibid: 22). As suggested by Patrick Parrinder, Stephen gains victory over Mr. Deasy when he calls

God only a shout in the street since his “gratuitous invention reveals what it is he means by waking from the ‘nightmare of history’. In identifying God with a shout in the street, he himself is the creator. The act of creation-artistic or intellectual- is what he opposes to the deadweight of history” (1984: 124).

However, Stephen never puts his victory into words because he is not a self-assured character like Mr. Deasy. Although Mr. Deasy’s confidence comes from his pedantry rather than wisdom, he keeps preaching Stephen. He talks about the things he calls eternal and absolute truths, which Stephen trifles with. He has a steady belief in the order of a God whose power he leans on and whom he believes to be the source of the unquestionable order on the world. However, Stephen is always doubtful about things around. He avoids having fixed views since he “fear[s] those big words which make us so unhappy” (Joyce, 2010: 29). Instead of having absolute trust or belief in anything, he approaches all and each one of the accepted values in Ireland in a questioning manner at the expense of torturing himself continuously.

3.1.2. Stephen: Subversion of Hamlet

Both Shakespeare and Hamlet are significant for Joyce as Homer and Telemachus are because Hamlet is one of the great characters created by Shakespeare whose “position [is] at the centre of the western cultural canon” (Booker, 1997: 141) like Homer. Furthermore, Shakespeare for Joyce is, in general, “an image of Irish subjugation to the British” (Ibid: 140). Although critics often regarded Joyce’s employment of Shakespeare and Hamlet as a result of admiration and respect, Booker emphasizes on the contrary:

“Critics have often seen Joyce’s use of Shakespeare, like his use of Homer, as an appeal to the authority of the cultural past the greatness and stability of which shores Joyce’s texts against the fragmented cultural ruins that Joyce finds around him in the modern world...[However], Joyce’s texts take a highly subversive stance toward the authority of the past in general and toward literary monuments like Homer and Shakespeare in particular.” (Ibid: 167)

Booker also adds that those critics “[ignore] the colonial past of Ireland” (Ibid: 167). Because of the colonial experiences between Britain and Ireland, Joyce’s employment of Shakespeare and Hamlet in a subversive manner is not surprising:

“Reading Joyce’s use of Shakespeare as a confrontation with authority (and with history) helps to bring into focus certain aspects of that relationship that have often been ignored by critics. For one thing, Shakespeare is an official icon of *English* culture, while Joyce is an Irish writer intensely aware of the long history of imperial domination of his country by the English. For another, Shakespeare stands as a symbol for Elizabethan England, which has functioned in the imaginations of a number of modern thinkers as a lost past Golden Age of cultural wholeness and integration compared to which modern culture is hopelessly fallen, fragmented, and decayed.” (Booker, 1997: 15)

When Joyce’s opposition to the modernist nostalgia for a Golden Age and his ideological views which correspond to the Barthes’ concept of ‘myths’ are considered, Booker’s point becomes more noteworthy.

Joyce subverts Shakespeare’s text in order to create an Irish character in Stephen. Shakespeare becomes Joyce’s target for being one of the most famous English playwrights in whose personality he criticizes the British hegemony. Likewise, Hamlet shares a lot with Stephen and thus holds down a significant place in *Ulysses* in terms of Stephen’s relation to the British Empire.

Stephen identifies himself with Hamlet to such a degree that exactly like him he is also “haunted by the ghost of his mother, estranged from his father, dressed in black, and paralyzed by artistic inaction” (Schwarz, 1987: 142). Definitely, the interaction between the two is undeniable. One of the most remarkable points Stephen shares with Hamlet is Hamlet’s famous hesitation. Similar to Shakespeare’s famous character, Stephen avoids taking any radical action but still his mind is busy always and everywhere. Mulligan names this situation as “g.p.i.” which he explains as the “general paralysis of the insane” (Joyce, 2010: 6) because he believes that Stephen suffers from a situation in which he focuses on details and nonsense stuff while he ignores the really significant points, just like Hamlet does:

“For some time Stephen seems to have acceded to Mulligan’s patronizing dominance. He had returned from his exile in Paris for his mother’s death, but it is not clear why he remains in Dublin. Morbidly savoring his own misery, he has been wearing black since his mother’s death ten months ago and is still locked in bitterness, self-pity, and melancholy. Like Hamlet with whom he identifies, Stephen realizes that he is paralyzed but he does not know what to do about it.” (Schwarz, 1987: 75)

In addition to their reluctance for any noticeable reaction against the circumstances that surround them, what create a more important connection between Stephen and Hamlet are their parental issues. Whereas Hamlet's mind is filled up with doubts and fears about his mother's loyalty and his father's death, Stephen is tortured both by his mother's death and his father's distance. If Stephen's relationship with his both parents is concerned on a symbolical level, it is possible to comment on it in relation to Joyce's look on Irish politics. In other words, Stephen's dead mother can be interpreted as his motherland, Ireland in front of whom he rejects to kneel down and pray for to the Catholic Church anymore, while his rejection of his father corresponds to the authority of the British Empire over Ireland.

The death of Stephen's mother becomes a subject of argument between him and Mulligan in the first chapter where Joyce not only develops the character of Stephen to fit into the plot structure of Ulysses but also builds the necessary connections between Ulysses and his previous novel A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man. Stephen is tortured by the feeling of remorse, which he mentions as the "agenbite of inwit" (Joyce, 2010: 15) many times, as a result of his rejection of his mother's request to kneel down and pray before her just before she dies. Mulligan accuses Stephen of killing his mother, which he did first by leaving her and then by rejecting what is divine and dear for her as he did to his homeland. Yet, Stephen believes that his attitude alone is not to be accused for the situation of Ireland while there are lots of Irishmen who betray their country as Mulligan does. So, he answers his charges ambiguously by saying that "someone killed her" (Ibid: 5). Mulligan insists that Stephen "could have knelt down...when [his] dying mother asked [him]" (Ibid: 5) and torments his friend with the rest of his words: "But to think of your mother begging you with her last breath to kneel down and pray for her. And you refused. There is something sinister in you..." (Ibid: 5). He also points at the destructive and disorderly attitude Stephen has developed for some time by saying that he has "the cursed Jesuit strain in [him], only it's injected the wrong way" (Ibid: 8). Though Stephen is full of remorse of conscience, he buries his mother in his memories like "the fox burying his grandmother under a hollybush" (Ibid: 25), which he mentions as the answer to the riddle he asks in the second chapter. For Schwarz, "the grandmother is not only his own mother, but his Irish heritage" (1987: 92). Leaving her behind, he believes, makes him more independent. He has to leave his mother/land behind since she is "the old sow that eats her farrow" (Joyce, 2010: 511).

Thus, he begs her ghost: “No, mother. Let me be and let me live” (Joyce, 2010: 10). Stephen struggles to get away from everything related with Ireland he criticises so much, yet he never feels comfortable. Although he knows that he should first get rid of the old values forced on him and his nation in order to become free, from time to time he probably feels like Joyce who confesses that “sometimes thinking of Ireland it seems to me that I have been unnecessarily harsh” (Ellmann, 1992:109).

Not only Stephen’s real mother, but also another mother figure, the old milk woman, represents Ireland in Ulysses. As he broke his mother’s heart at her death bed, Stephen constantly tortures himself. His emotions towards his mother stagger between love, pity and alienation which are reflected on the strange milk woman who enters into the kitchen like a miracle. She comes in suddenly while Stephen, Mulligan and Haines are sitting at the breakfast table and discussing about how to drink tea without milk because there is none left:

“Old and secret she had entered from a morning world, maybe a messenger. She praised the goodness of the milk, pouring it out. Crouching by a patient cow at daybreak in the lush field, a witch on her toadstool, her wrinkled fingers quick at the squirting dugs. They lowed about her whom they knew, dew-silky cattle. Silk of the kine and poor old woman, names given her in old times. A wandering crone, lowly form of an immortal serving her conqueror and her gay betrayer, their common cuckquean, a messenger from the secret morning.” (Joyce, 2010: 13)

She is old and deserves respect. However, she is still a servant for the betrayers and invaders and this makes Stephen feel sad. She brings pure and white milk to their table greeting them by saying “that’s a lovely morning, sir” and adds, “glory be to God”, which Mulligan answers “to whom?” (Ibid: 13) with his blasphemous attitude. Still, the old woman continues her conversation with Mulligan in a respectful manner and offers him some milk to taste without feeling disturbed by his estrangement to his homeland. However, she does not show the same warmth to Stephen. She “defers to Mulligan and slights Stephen” (Arkins, 1999: 69), who believes that he deserves to be treated better than his friend by Ireland since he is loyal to her deep in his heart. Mulligan and Haines sustain their humiliation of her as the arrogant medical student and the British man while Stephen listens “in scornful silence” and the milk woman does by “[bowing] her old head to a voice that speaks to her loudly” (Joyce, 2010: 14) without understanding

anything. Her conversation with the young men just before leaving involves irony through which Joyce emphasizes his point about the lost identity of Ireland:

“-Do you understand what he says? Stephen asked her.

-Is it French you are talking, sir? The old woman said to Haines.

Haines spoke to her again a longer speech, confidently.

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

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

-I am an Englishman, Haines answered.

-He’s English, Buck Mulligan said, and he thinks we ought to speak Irish in Ireland.

-Sure we ought to, the old woman said, and I’m ashamed I don’t speak the language myself. I’m told it’s a grand language by them that knows.

-Grand is no name for it, said Buck Mulligan. Wonderful entirely.” (Joyce, 2010: 14)

The conversation is full of irony and mockery since Joyce reveals how Ireland is unaware of her own history and learns about it only by listening other people’s stories whereas her language is told to her either by those who disdain her like Mulligan or by strangers like Haines. Finally, what is left for Stephen, who worries most about his country, is to watch the scene and Haines’ patronizing attitude in absolute passivity.

Despite his deep grief towards both female figures, Stephen remains distant. He does not know exactly how to behave while his mother/land is plundered. He remembers his unsuccessful attempt to fly away and feels as if he is trapped in Ireland just like Hamlet feels in Denmark. Haines indicates the similarity in the first chapter by purporting that the “tower and these cliffs [there] remind [him] somehow of Elsinore” (Ibid: 17). Surrounded by the sea, which should be a “great sweet mother”, (Ibid: 5) who presses her children to her “white breast” (Ibid: 9), Stephen cannot breath and feels imprisoned since it is not the “wine-dark sea” (Homer, 1991: 38) of Homer which promises Telemachus hope for the good. Instead, it is the “snotgreen” and the “scrotum-tightening sea” (Joyce, 2010: 5) of Joyce, which is rather hostile. While the sea means the door to learn more about his fate for Telemachus, the sea surrounding Stephen has negative connotations which may clarify why Stephen is a hydrophobic: “Stephen abjures the Irish Sea because it suggests English power over Ireland, the drowning of his mother who haunts him, the drowning of Icarus who represents him” (Arkins, 1999: 72). In other words, it is the political and religious pressure that the Irish Sea stands for, which leaves both Stephen’s motherland and himself breathless.

Unable to overcome his paralysis, Stephen walks back and forth within the dead ends of his mind just like Hamlet does. He is surrounded by both traitors and invaders in his own house without a single soul to trust. His feeling of insecurity leaves him alone like Hamlet. He is so much disappointed with the situation of Ireland that he confesses Mulligan the fact that he has hope neither from the milkwoman nor Haines which means neither from Ireland nor from Britain indeed:

“-I see little hope, Stephen said, from her or from him.

Buck Mulligan sighed tragically and laid his hand on Stephen’s arm.

-From me, Kinch, he said.

In a suddenly changed tone he added:

-To tell you the God’s truth I think you’re right. Damn all else they are good for. Why don’t you play them as I do? To hell with them all.” (Joyce, 2010: 16)

However, the difference between Stephen and Mulligan is that Stephen is unable to accord with his circumstances and to pretend to be convinced by its naturalness. Instead, he is very eager to question, which underlines his subversive character. Castle highlights the difference between the two friends as follows:

“Stephen’s position, as we have seen, is that of an anti-substantialist having rejected the nativism of Irish-Ireland nationalism with its emphasis on an essential Celtic substance. Mulligan, on the other hand, comically embodies the turncoat, who looks to the colonizer, in Albert Memmi’s formulation, as to ‘a tempting model very close at hand’ and who desires to ‘become equal to that splendid model and to resemble him to the point of disappearing in him.’” (2001: 216)

Stephen observes the hypocrisy of the so called Irish nationalists who are fed by the mysticism of the Celtic origins, an idea supported by Britain to make Ireland exotically valuable. He does not approve the ignorance of the British power imposed on their country by Irishmen like Mulligan. However, criticizing and blaming his fellowmen is not the solution for Ireland. Indeed, Stephen is inwardly aware of the fact that it is “the Irish heritage with which he must come to terms” (Schwarz, 1987: 220) if he really wants to make a claim over his motherland. But he has to deal with some personal matters as well.

In addition to the trauma related with his mother, Stephen’s father issues become evident and they are reflected through his theory about Hamlet in the ninth chapter, Scylla and Charybdis. His theory is discussed by a group of people at the library, which

bears much significance since it unravels the connection between Stephen and his father as well as the interaction between Ireland and Britain. First of all, Stephen and his biological father Mr. Simon Dedalus seemingly have almost nothing in common. Their connection with each other does not look like a son and his father at all. When Stephen is asked if he knows Simon Dedalus, he simply answers: "I've heard of him" (Joyce, 2010: 532). That is probably why Stephen suggests that "paternity may be a legal fiction" (Ibid: 186) just like Joyce himself who claims in a much clearer way that "paternity is a legal fiction" (Ellmann, 1992: 74). Therefore, Stephen starts his search for a father to replace Mr. Dedalus. Thus, he turns away from his country/city, because "it is the city of failure, of rancour and of unhappiness" (Ibid: 163), and both of his parents as a result of which he resembles the biblical Nathan "who left the house of his father and left the God of his father" (Joyce, 2010: 67).

On the other hand, as for Ireland, the denial of the so called father means Stephen's denial of the authority of the British Empire. In other words, through the character of Stephen, Joyce objects the patronizing role of Britain, the so called father of Ireland, with the intention of finding real Irish roots and identity. He is full of anger towards his homeland and people because of their situation in front of the religious and political authorities they knelt before. Here again Stephen's theory of Hamlet comes to the fore. During the discussion on Stephen's theory in the library, John Eglinton joins this discussion and claims that "young Irish bards have yet to create a figure which the world will set beside Saxon Shakespeare's Hamlet" (Ibid: 165). However, as Castle remarks, Stephen denies the views of the "paternalistic Revivalists like John Eglinton and Richard Best who fetishize an English playwright, holding him up as a model for 'young Irish bards'" (2001: 220). Joyce reflects "Shakespeare [as] an entire complex of cultural forces and their use as a major element of the ideological superstructure of the British Empire" (Booker, 1997: 142) Thus, Castle adds, "Stephen seeks to distance himself from the paternalism of Revivalist attitudes by parodying those attitudes in an audaciously implausible theory of autopaternity in which the son, rejecting the Father's agency, wills himself as the father of himself" (2001: 220). Castle's argument is consistent with Stephen who declares himself as "the father of all his race" (Joyce, 2010: 187) with his complex and impossible theory of Hamlet. From the intellectual perspective, denying Shakespeare-father, Stephen looks for another father figure either

in Bloom, modelled after the Greek hero with whom he will finally come across, or Homer, the Greek master whose text Joyce rewrites instead of a British father figure.

Joyce puts forward the problems of Ireland and contemplates about them in the character of Stephen and the world around him. However, Stephen's hesitation and pessimism leaves him without a solution. The following sections which will be shaped around Bloom and his wife Molly deal with these problems in a more optimistic way and they propose solutions to the problems expressed by Stephen. In other words, Bloom and Molly's perspectives are directed to the solution about *writing an alternative history* compared to Stephen's passivity.

3.1.3. Bloom: Subversion of Odysseus

Interpreting Stephen Dedalus of Ulysses is certainly crucial but not enough for a complete understanding of James Joyce's distinctive perspective about the religious and political issues of his country and people. Stephen reflects just one side of his thoughts whereas it is necessary to consider Leopold Bloom for a complete understanding of Joyce's point in Ulysses. In terms of their Homeric relations, if Stephen Dedalus stands for the Joycean counterpart of Telemachus, then Bloom is the 20th century embodiment of Odysseus. Joyce subverts the authority of Odyssey as a myth as he did through Stephen and continues his criticism of the 'myths' about religious and political institutions through subversion of Odysseus. However, the most important difference between Stephen and Bloom is that while Stephen's political perspective mainly criticizes the imperial power and Irish attitude towards it, Bloom's political view is centred on the understanding of nationalism.

Despite his reluctance for leaving his home and fighting in Troy, Homer's Odysseus becomes a successful leader and his brilliant idea of the wooden horse makes the victory possible for the Achaeans against Trojans. While he is a warrior figure in Iliad, he becomes the cursed and miserable human being left to the mercy of gods in Odyssey. Just like his tricky wooden horse that brings a debacle over Troy, he is the inventor of countless plans which saves his own life many times. As a result of his determination to survive and his intelligence, he finally comes to terms with gods and turns back his home successfully. Therefore, Odysseus deserves to be referred as the

symbol of rationality as well as the embodiment of the western type of rational man whose mind and wit overrun many obstacles set by both gods and men.

In comparison to Odysseus, Bloom is a subverted Odysseus in many ways. The most apparent connection between the two characters is Bloom's one day's journey, which constitutes almost the entire plot of *Ulysses* and hints at the specific moments of Odysseus' ten years journey. Nevertheless, this 20th century *Odyssey* is degrading the epic journey of Odysseus into the world of everyday trivia with the help of numerous parodies. Unlike the epic story full of heroism and the elements of an idealized world based on religious thought and patriarchal tradition, Bloom's story is composed of the ordinariness of any day. Deborah Parsons summarizes this ordinariness with the most extraordinary details of Bloom's day: "Leopold Bloom, an advertising salesman whose wife is cheating on him, who buys a kidney for his breakfast, picks his toe-nails and masturbates in public, may seem an unlikely parallel for the wily Greek" (2007: 62). Likewise, Cedric Watts states in the introduction chapter he wrote for *Ulysses* that a closer look at the two texts provides one a perspective based on differences rather than similarities:

"The relationship between Joyce's *Ulysses* and Homer's *Odyssey* is diverse, complex and shifting; sometimes it is subtle, at other times tenuous; often it is ironically contrastive or parodic. Some salient features of that relationship are obvious. Ulysses, King of Ithaca, is a wanderer: after participating in the protracted siege that culminated in the devastation of Troy, he sets out homeward, and, following dramatic encounters, delays and diversions, reaches the arms of faithful wife, Penelope, after twenty years' absence. Leopold Bloom proceeds in the morning from 7 Eccles Street, attends a funeral, and peregrinates through Dublin before returning to his unfaithful wife late at night." (2010: xxi)

One of the most significant differences between Odysseus and Bloom is their approach towards the role of fate in their lives and religious matters in general. Odysseus is famous for his rationality, yet his life is clearly shaped by the wrath or mercy of immortals. Certainly, *Odyssey* is shaped around the relationships between the world of the mortals and the immortals and *Odyssey* subsumes key points about religion according to which no matter how rational man is, he and his fate are at the hands of gods. To illustrate, Odysseus is cursed by Poseidon on his way back home after leaving Troy since he injured Poseidon's son; Cyclops, and is left in the middle of the sea as a wanderer until Athena feels pity for him. Upon this, although Odysseus offers sacrifices

for Zeus to avoid his bad fate, he adds that “Zeus took no notice of [his] sacrifice” since “his mind must already have been full of plans for the destruction of all [his] fine ships and of [his] loyal band” (Homer, 1991: 141). Thus, Odysseus becomes the victim of Poseidon’s anger. Finally it is Athena’s “idea that Odysseus should return and take revenge on **[the suitors]**” (Ibid:70). Until the time Zeus commands Hermes to “convey [their] final decision to that Nymph” and say that “the long-enduring Odysseus must now set out for home” to “see his friends and come to his high-roofed house and his native land once more” (Ibid: 71), Odysseus is a prisoner on Calypso’s island. He prays the river god to reach the land safely and follows Athena’s guidance not only on his way to Alcinous’s palace but also throughout the course of events that bring him back home. In short, gods and fate are a part of the world created by Homer, which forms the basis of western thought. This world involves a message that advises one to keep good terms with the immortals and offer them sacrifices to do well in life; an idea Joyce objects most because it is the same idea that gives power to the Catholic Church in Ireland.

Joyce continues his subversion of the ideals represented by the Catholic Church, which he started via Stephen in the early chapters of *Ulysses*, through Bloom in the chapters following *Telemachiad*. Bloom has a critical and mocking tone in his approach to religious matters and institutions. Since Bloom is a Jew, which gives him a rather distant position while commenting on the Catholic Church, he is able to employ a mocking approach to religious matters and institutions in Ireland. In other words, although Bloom and Stephen share a critical tone about these issues, it is more difficult for Stephen to comment without feeling offended and guilty whereas Bloom feels much freer about it.

Joyce’s employment of the stream of consciousness technique introduces us to the most sincere thoughts of Bloom. Bloom’s day starts by attending a funeral of Mr. Dignam and he visits Mrs. Purefoy who struggles to give birth at the hospital in the evening. During both events and after witnessing them within the same day, he thinks about life and death from various perspectives and matters of life and death intersect with religion in his mind. It starts with his visit to the church before going to the cemetery for Mr. Dignam’s burial where he witnesses a ritual of communion:

“Women knelt in the benches with crimson halters round their necks, heads bowed. A batch knelt at the altar rails. The priest went along by them, murmuring, holding the thing in his hands. He stopped at each, took out a communion, shook a drop or two (are they in water?) off it and put it neatly into her mouth. Her hat and head sank. Then the next one: a small old woman. The priest bent down to put it into her mouth, murmuring all the time. Latin. The next one. Shut your eyes and open your mouth. What? *Corpus*. Body. Corpse. Good idea the Latin. Stupefies them first. Hospice for the dying. They don’t seem to chew it; only swallow it down. Rum idea: eating bits of a corpse why the cannibals cotton to it...Look at them. Now I bet it makes them feel happy. Lollipop. I does. Yes, bread of angels it’s called. There’s a big idea behind it, kind of kingdom of God is within you feel. First communicants. Hokypoky penny a lump. Then feel all like one family party, same in the theatre, all in the same swim. They do. I’m sure of that. Not so lonely. In our confraternity. The come out a bit spreeish. Let off steam. Thing is if you really believe in it. Lourdes cure, waters of oblivion, and the Knock apparition, statues bleeding. Old fellow asleep near that confession box. Hence those snores. Blind faith. Safe in the arms of kingdom come. Lulls all pain. Wake this time next year.” (Joyce, 2010: 71)

Bloom watches every detail of the communion service finding the ritual meaningless. He confesses that such a ritual is the key for feeling the unity within a group of people who share the same belief. However, he is not able to desist from observing the primitive connotations of the ritual such as eating the parts of a corpse. His conclusion about religion as a whole is hidden in his final sentences where he points at the conformity of faith without any questioning. Bloom certainly knows that the happiness promised by any religion depends on absolute submission and acceptance that also brings the conformity.

Bloom, quickly puts on his mocking attitude and thinks what if the priest “lost the pin of his” (Ibid: 72) remembering the song of the two sluts about “Mairy” who “lost the pin of her drawers” (Ibid: 69), which he heard in his head early in the morning. His humour does not last long however, and he turns back to his continuous but silent comments. These comments also summarize seemingly what Joyce honestly thinks about the Catholic Church:

“Wonderful organisation certainly, goes like clockwork. Confession. Everyone wants to. Then I will tell you all. Penance. Punish me, please. Great weapon in their hands. More than doctor or solicitor. Woman dying to. And I schschschschsch. And did you chachachachacha? And why did you? Look down at her ring to find an excuse. Whispering gallery walls have ears. Husband learn to his surprise. God’s little joke. Then out she comes. Repentance skindeep. Lovely shame. Pray at an altar. Hail Mary and Holy Mary. Flowers, incense, candles melting. Hide her blushes. Salvation army blatant imitation. Reformed prostitute will address the meeting. How I found the Lord.

Squareheaded chaps those must be in Rome: they work the whole show.” (Joyce, 2010: 73)

Bloom seems to be the mouthpiece of Joyce in regard to the Catholic Church. His indifference towards religious devotion enables him to criticize objectively and to discuss the issues about death in a grotesque way. In Hades chapter, Bloom joins Mr. Dignam’s funeral, where he starts to bring his ideas about life and death together in a parodical and subversive way. Bloom starts thinking about his dead son Rudy on the way to the cemetery and dreams him as a grown up when his mind suddenly shifts on the day of his son’s conception:

“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. Must have been that morning in Raymond terrace she was at the window, watching the two dogs at it by the wall of the cease to do evil. And the sergeant grinning up. She had that cream gown on with the rip she never stitched. Give us a touch, Poldy. God, I’m dying for it. How life begins.” (Ibid: 79).

Juxtaposing the idea of the death of a son with the moment his life began creates a paradox about death and life while the Catholic Church never reconciles these two concepts. The Catholic Church ignores conception as the beginning of human life. But, Joyce ridicules the idea by making Bloom think about the starting moments of Rudy’s life in connection with the desires of flesh represented by two dogs while he recalls his son’s death and goes for Mr. Dignam’s funeral at the same time. These dogs are significant for their subversive role because their presence in such a scene “stresses Joyce’s insistence on the inextricable relationship, in the life that mankind lives right here and now, between what we think of as animal or physical and what we think of as the divine or spiritual” (Schwarz, 1987: 90). Additionally, Joyce ridicules the Catholic approach to death idealized by a vision of Heaven. Instead, living people are subject to the realities of this life which include people who are “in a hurry to bury” (Joyce, 2010:85) the dead body or people who commit suicide like Bloom’s father, “the greatest disgrace to have in the family” (Ibid: 86). There are also “funerals all over the world everywhere every minute” (Ibid: 90), which makes death an ordinary event. Bloom wonders whether “the news go about whenever a fresh one is let down” among the dead, which Joyce calls “underground communication” (Ibid: 103). Bloom’s mind also speculates about the possible advantages of being buried standing (Ibid: 97) and the rat that wanders around at the cemetery (Ibid: 102). Looking through Bloom’s eyes, death

paradoxically becomes both a mysterious and a real part of life rather than the dreamy or the scary stories pictured by the Church. He summarizes death as just a “nice change of air. Out of the fryingpan of life into the fire of purgatory” (Joyce, 2010: 99).

While hearing the priest during the funeral, Bloom’s mind carries on messing around with harsh realities of death in contrast to the spirituality shared by his friends who state that the preaching “touches a man’s inmost heart” (Ibid: 94):

“Your heart perhaps but what price the fellow in the six feet by two with his toes to the daisies? No touching that. Seat of the affections. Broken heart. A pump after all, pumping thousands of gallons of blood every day. One fine day it gets bunged up and there you are. Lots of them lying around here: lungs, hearts, livers. Old rusty pumps: damn the thing else. The resurrection and the life. Once you are dead you are dead. That last day idea. Knocking them all up out of their graves. Come forth, Lazarus! And he came fifth and lost the job. Get up! Last day! Then every fellow mousing around for his liver and his lights and the rest of his traps. Find damn all of himself that morning.” (Ibid: 94)

Mocking the idea of resurrection via Bloom, Joyce not only parodies the Biblical story of Lazarus as one of the miracles performed by Jesus Christ but also clearly declares his denial of a promised world -whether Heaven or Hell- after death. Instead, he celebrates the connection between life and death in this world. He emphasizes their connection with the representations of “whores in Turkish graveyards” who make “love among the tombstones”, which demonstrates that “in the midst of death we are in life” and it makes “both ends meet” (Ibid: 97). He finds a similar idea represented by “the blood sinking in the earth gives new life” in Christian faith that has its roots in Jews who “killed the christian boy” (Ibid: 97), Jesus Christ. Yet it seems that he finds this idea rather boring because he focuses on the idea of growing gardens over dead bodies and the price of each corpse, which he finds much more amusing:

“Every man his price. Well preserved fat corpse gentleman, epicure, invaluable for fruit garden. A bargain. By carcass of William Wilkinson, auditor and accountant, lately deceased, three pounds thirteen and six. With thanks. I daresay the soil would be quite fat with corpse manure, bones, flesh, nails, charnelhouses. Dreadful. Turning green and pink, decomposing. Rot quick in damp earth. The lean old ones tougher. Then a kind of a tallow kind of a cheesy. Then begin to get black, treacle oozing out of them. Then dried up. Deathmoths. Of course the cells or whatever they are go on living. Changing about. Live for ever practically. Nothing to feed on feed on themselves.” (Ibid: 97).

Joyce's dealing with the disturbing realities of death and even making fun of the details subvert the general approach to death. Mortality is not a popular topic and people avoid thinking and mentioning death let alone facing physical realities. Similarly, the Church mystifies death and the soul is privileged over the body. Thus, the transformation of the bodily material following death is ignored and the spiritual aspect is emphasized. On the other hand, Joyce focuses on the grotesque realities concerning the dead body from a parodic perspective. Similarly, he expresses the platitude of a priest's life with the same frankness he talks about death. Hence, since he wanted his readers to see death from another perspective, Joyce aims to picture a man of religion out of his clerical armour:

“Holy water that was, I expect. Shaking sleep out of it. He must be fed up with that job, shaking that thing over all the corpses they trot up. What harm if he could see what he was shaking it over. Every mortal day a fresh batch: middleaged men, old women, children, women dead in childbirth, men with beards, baldheaded business men, consumptive girls with little sparrow's breasts. All the year round he prayed the same thing over them all and shook water on top of them: sleep. On Dignam now.

-In paradisum.

Said he was going to paradise or is in paradise. Says that over everybody. Tiresome king of a job. But he has to say something.” (Joyce, 2010: 93)

Nevertheless, he questions and remarks about the matter occasionally in the course of Ulysses. For example, after helping the blind man on the street, he wonders how he dreams and calls God's justice into question: “Terrible. Really terrible. What dreams would he have, not seeing? Life a dream for him. Where is the justice being born that way?” (Ibid: 163). Or, he criticizes the priests' attitude towards families and especially women and finds them cruel: “Birth every year almost. That's in their theology or the priest won't give the poor woman the confession, the absolution. Increase and multiply. Did you ever hear such an idea? Eat you out of house and home. No families themselves to feed. Living on the fat of the land” (Ibid: 134). However, he is already well aware that there is no justice in life. Life, as Bloom thinks in Aeolus chapter, is nothing but a continuous power struggle in which “the angel of death kills the butcher and he kills the ox and the dog kills the cat. Sounds a bit silly till you come to look into it well. Justice it means but it's everybody eating everyone else. That's what life is after all” (Ibid: 109). Joyce's food chain is a definite implication for the Catholic Church, which, Joyce believes, is feeding itself on the people of Ireland.

Joyce, like Bloom, sees injustice on the world and expresses it either with a doubt towards the existence of God or the indifference of both him and his Church towards the misery on earth. He directly and indirectly reminds one the possibility of God's absence many times in *Ulysses*. For example, talking of their father, Boody, Stephen's sister, hints at the famous Lord's Prayer and says: "Our father who art not in heaven" (Joyce, 2010: 204), while Simon Dedalus claims that "the man upstairs is dead" (Ibid: 214) to tell his daughter Dilly that he will not give her a helping hand. Even if God existed, Joyce dreams, he would be "sitting on his throne, sucking red jujubes white" and drinking "the Blood of the Lamb" because "God wants blood victim" (Ibid: 133). He portrays God "the playwright who wrote the folio of this world and wrote it badly" since his text is full of mistakes: "he gave us light first and the sun two days later" (Ibid: 191). His Church plays the music of a "Hushaby. Lullaby." (Ibid: 255) and wants people only to "Pray for us. And pray for us. And pray for us", which Bloom associates with advertisements: "Good idea the repetition. Same thing with ads. Buy from us. And buy from us" (Ibid: 341). He emphasizes the role of the Catholic Church as a worldly, materialist and commercial institution. Joyce brings the elements of spiritual practices together with the elements of ordinary life in Ithaca chapter:

"The preparation of breakfast (burnt offering): intestinal congestion and premeditative defecation (holy of holies): the bath (rite of John): the funeral (rite of Samuel): the advertisement of Alexander Keyes (Urim and Thummin): the unsubstantial lunch (rite of Melchizedek): the visit to museum and national library (holy place): the bookhunt along Bedford row, Merchants' Arch, Wellington Quay (Simchath Torah): the music in the Ormond Hotel (Shira Shirim): the altercation with a truculent troglodyte in Bernard Kiernan's premises (holocaust): a blank period of time including a cardrive, a visit to a house of mourning, a leavetaking (wilderness): the eroticism produced by feminine exhibitionism (rite of Onan): the prolonged delivery of Mrs Mina Purefoy (heave offering): the visit to the disorderly house of Mrs Bella Cohen, 82 Tyrone street, lower and subsequent brawl and chance medley in Beaver street (Armageddon)- nocturnal perambulation to and from the cabman's shelter, Butt Bridge (atonement)." (Ibid: 632)

Thus, he reduces divinity to the life of everyman and at the same time he summarizes Bloom's day that even the most absurd detail of any life has the potential to gain a holy degree with some exaggeration and that is how 'myths' are formed. Furthermore, Bloom's journey gains a secular character free from the touch of gods when compared to Odysseus'. Joyce also thinks, comments on and mocks the common beliefs about fate and religion as one of the unquestionable institutions of the western world. Bloom

is depicted as the common Irish man with a certain awareness, rather than blind devotion, towards the Catholic Church.

In addition to his subversive thoughts and behaviour about religion, “Leopold Bloom is to some extent a political spokesman for Joyce” (Parrinder, 1984: 3). His political perspective focuses mostly on nationalism in Ireland. Bloom ardently discusses his political ideas with other people around Dublin. He occasionally has the chance of chatting on these matters with Stephen in person when they come together at night.

Politics and nationalism seem to be popular conversation pieces in Dublin those days. It is common in *Ulysses* to hear people discuss and express their views about the political history, current problems or the future of their country however this may cause serious disagreements of times. For instance, the attendants of Mr. Dignam’s funeral debate whether Parnell will come back one day. Mr. Power claims that “some say he is not in that grave at all. That the coffin was filled with stones” whereas Hynes objects and says that “Parnell will never come again” and he adds “He’s there, all that was mortal of him” (Joyce, 2010: 101). At the office of the Freeman’s Journal in Aeolus chapter, the historical connections of Ireland are a hot topic. Professor MacHugh condemns the Latin language for being the tongue of a race which is keen on materiality highlighting the connection between the word *domination* and the Latin word *Dominus* for Lord and he praises the Greek reminding the bonds between Ireland and Ancient Greece. Professor declares that “the closetmaker and the cloacemaker will never be lords of our spirit” (Ibid: 119) by “allu[ding] to the Roman Empire (cloacemaker) and the British Empire (closetmaker)” which “recalls Stephen’s comment in “Telemachus” that he is the servant of an Italian master and an English one” (Lang, 1993: 142). Lang explains the matter in a more detailed way:

“Professor MacHugh is comparing the Latin word for “Lord”, *Dominus*, with the Greek, *Kyrios*. The *Kyrie eleison* (“Lord have mercy”) is the last remnant of Greek influence in the Latin mass... Though the Irish “are the liege subjects of”, and spiritually allied to, both the ancient Athenians and the Catholic chivalry of Europe, the Greek in Catholicism is a lost cause.” (Ibid: 142)

Here Professor MacHugh makes himself clear by emphasizing a significant distinction; Irish people are “liege subjects of the catholic chivalry of Europe that foundered at Trafalgar and of the empire of the spirit, not an *imperium*” and states that they are “loyal

to a lost cause” (Joyce, 2010: 119) implying the rupture between modern Ireland and ancient Greece. The problem of the forgotten past also comes forth in the course of the discussion on Hamlet in the National Library in Scylla and Charybdis chapter when Stephen exemplifies the unavoidable cycles of life:

“And as the mole on my right breast is where it was when I was born, though all my body has been woven of new stuff time after time, so through the ghost of the unquiet father the image of the unloving son looks forth. In the intense instant of imagination, when the mind, Shelley says, is a fading coal, that which I was is that which I am and that which in possibility I may come to be. So in the future, the sister of the past, I may see myself as I sit here now but by reflection from that which then I shall be.” (Ibid: 174)

If the future is the sister of the past, Stephen optimistically states, then nothing is really lost but is turned into something new. Likewise, although modern Ireland seems to get far away from what it really was, it is just a matter of time to rediscover itself in its future.

Bloom’s political stance is more complicated than Stephen’s since he is an Irish man with Jewish and Hungarian background that makes him a vulnerable target of blind nationalism. Cyclops chapter certainly offers a more vivid picture of how the ordinary people regard nationalism in Ireland. The chapter, “the most politically committed piece of fiction that Joyce ever produced” (Parrinder, 1984: 172), narrates the events in a pub where Bloom goes to meet Martin Cunningham in the afternoon. While waiting for him, he is involved in some chatting with a group of men during which the readers are introduced with various opinions of all and each about politics.

Parrinder states that the idea behind Cyclops chapter is “a rejection of the violence and hatred engendered by two opposing political systems, British imperialism and Irish nationalism” (Ibid: 172). Thus, Joyce believes that Bloom has the potential to stop such violence and hatred by standing opposite the narrow minded perspective represented by the Citizen. Bloom tries to express his mind freely and clearly in a kind manner whereas the Citizen is rude and his worldview has such sharp edges that, indeed, he cuts the matter short at the very beginning by stating that “the friends we love are by our side and the foes we hate before us” (Joyce, 2010: 276). However, Bloom is pushing hard to make a mutual conversation possible “with his *but don’t you*

see? And but on the other hand" (Joyce, 2010: 276). The Citizen does not even hear him when he says "you don't grasp my point, ..., what I mean is" (Ibid: 276). Certainly, the Citizen is modelled as the Sinn Fein type of an Irish nationalist by Joyce. Like the members of the Sinn Fein political party who advocate the absolute Irish dominance in Ireland, the Citizen has no tolerance for diversity. He is a bigot and such a fanatic in his views that he ignores everyone with different political views and offers no real solution to the problems of Ireland other than discussing them in a pub. Joyce criticizes his drunkenness and states that only "Ireland sober is Ireland free" (Ibid: 280) and he finds the chance to picture what part of Irish nationalism he objects in the character of the Citizen who reduces nationalism to table talk.

The tension between Bloom and the Citizen gradually rises in Cyclops chapter. The Citizen's comments become harsher as they talk more about politics. He remarks that "[they] want no more strangers in [their] house" (Ibid: 292) and asserts the greatness of Irish culture above especially the British culture:

"To hell with them! The curse of a goodfornothing God light sideways on the bloody thicklugged sons of whores' gets! No music and no art and no literature worthy of the name. Any civilisation they have they stole from us. Tonguetied sons of bastrads' ghosts...They're not European, ...You wouldn't see a trace of them or their language anywhere in Europe." (Ibid: 293)

To criticize the Citizen's blinders, Bloom reminds that "some people can see the mote in others' eyes but they can't see the beam in their own" (Ibid: 294) as a result of which the Citizen loses his temper completely:

"There's no-one as blind as the fellow that won't see, if you know what that means. Where are our missing twenty millions of Irish should be here today instead of four, our lost tribes? And our potteries and textiles, the finest in the whole world! And our wool that was sold in Rome in the time of Juvenal and our flax and our damask from the looms of Antrim and our Limerick lace, our tanneries and our white flint glass down there by Ballybough and our Huguenot poplin that we have since Jacquard de Lyon and our woven silk and our Foxford tweeds and ivory raised point from the Carmelite convent in New Ross, nothing like it in the whole wide world. Where are the Greek merchants that came through the pillars of Hercules, the Gibraltar now grabbed by the foe of mankind, with gold and Tyrian purple to sell in Wexford at the fair of Carmen? Read Tacitus and Ptolemy, even Giraldus Cambrensis. Wine, peltries, Connemara marble, silver from Tipperary, second to none, our farfamed horses even today, the Irish hobbies, with king Philip of Spain offering to pay customs duties for the right to fish in our waters. What do the yellowjohns of Anglia owe us for our ruined trade and our

ruined hearths?” (Joyce, 2010: 294)

The Citizen and his chat mates express their hatred, disappointment and desire for revenge for the British Empire more than once. They mock Britain as the empire “on which the sun never rises” (Ibid: 297) in a bitter tone and the Citizen responds Bloom, who adopts a more moderate behaviour, vehemently:

“We’ll put force against force, says the citizen. We have our greater Ireland beyond the sea. They were driven out of house and home in the black 47. Their mudcabins and their shielings by the roadside were laid low by the batteringram and the *Times* rubbed its hands and told the whitelivered Saxons there would soon be as few Irish in Ireland as redskins in America. Even the Grand Turk sent us his piastres. But the Sassenach tried to starve the nation at home while the land was full of crops that the British hyenas bought and sold in Rio de Janeiro. Ay, they drove out the peasants in hordes. Twenty thousand of them died in the coffinships. But those that came to the land of the free remember the land of bondage. And they will come again and with a vengeance, no cravens, the sons of Granuaile, the champions of Kathleen ni Houlihan.” (Ibid: 298)

While the Citizen’s and his friends’ expressions gain a more fundamentalist character as time passes, Bloom tries to keep calm. Yet, he easily becomes the target for them when he calls “perpetuating national hatred among nations” as “persecution” (Ibid: 299). Both the Citizen and his friends are so blinded by their narrow minded worldviews that they miss Bloom’s point and make him the centre of their nationalist hatred. Upon Bloom’s comment, John Wyse, a friend of the Citizen, asks whether he knows the meaning of a nation:

“-Yes, says Bloom.

-What is it? says John Wyse.

-A nation? says Bloom. A nation is the same people living in the same place.

-By God, then, says Ned, laughing, if that’s so I’m a nation for I’m living in the same place for the past five years.

So of course everyone had a laugh at Bloom and says he, trying to muck out of it:

-Or also living in different places.

-That covers my case, says Joe.

-What is your nation if I may ask, says the citizen.

-Ireland, says Bloom. I was born here. Ireland.” (Ibid: 299)

Bloom’s answer means little for the Citizen and his company however hard Bloom tries to invoke a sense of empathy between Irish and Jewish people who both have the experience of hatred, persecution and injustice throughout history. Instead of focusing on the interaction and developing a mutual understanding, John Wyse roughly and

simply advises the Jewish people to “stand up with force like men” (Joyce, 2010: 301) against those who misbehave them.

Joyce clearly distinguishes Bloom and his opponents towards the end of Cyclops chapter and emphasizes the inflexible nature of nationalism supported by large groups of Irish people in the characters of the Citizen and his friends. He even mocks their obsession about the greatness and heroism of Irish past by giving a long list of Irish heroes in history. Booker comments on this list as follows:

“That this list serves as a parody of Irish nationalist attempts to romanticize and heroize their past is rather obvious, and one could read this overt mockery as a suggestion of just how unheroic the Irish are relative to their great epic predecessors, the Greeks. On the other hand, such lists could also be taken as a commentary on the ideological functioning of epic heroization in general: perhaps the Greeks also used the epic as a political tool to further their national pride and to solidify the power of the ruling order, whether such pride and power were justified or not.” (1997: 22)

Joyce challenges the significant figures of Irish history to elicit that canonization of any concept brings the danger of ideological manipulation. That is the reason behind his introduction of Bloom as a restrained and amenable alternative to the sharp attitude the Citizen and his friends employ. Bloom is not a fanatic and he does not believe in violence as a solution. In contrast, he is a supporter of love and peace:

“-But it’s no use, says he. Force, hatred, history, all that. That’s not life for men and women, insult and hatred. And everybody knows that it’s the very opposite of that that is really life.

-What? says Alf.

-Love, says Bloom. I mean the opposite of hatred.” (Joyce, 2010: 301)

When offering love as the only solution to the problems of his society, Bloom openly disagrees with the propaganda of the Catholic Church. Still, the Citizen is again far from understanding him and repulses Bloom with his criticism of the Church: “We know those canters, says he, preaching and picking your pocket. What about sanctimonious Cromwell and his ironsides that put the women and children of Drogheda to the sword with the bible text *God is love* pasted round the mouth of his cannon? The bible!” (Ibid: 301). The Citizen misses Bloom’s point one more time because although he has right in his criticism about the Church, what Bloom means by “love” is nothing but human love, which will enable peace between nations.

In the absence of Bloom, the Citizen and others go on picking up Bloom and they even speculate that his children are not really his children (Joyce, 2010: 305). They call him “a bloody dark horse” (Ibid: 303) in Irish society and “a wolf in sheep’s clothing” that is “cursed by God” (Ibid: 306). The chapter ends with the Citizen making a scene by shouting at Bloom and Bloom leaving the pub by running away from the Citizen’s fury.

Circe chapter also tips off Joyce’s understanding of new Irish man in Bloom’s personality. The chapter takes place in a brothel in the Red Light District of Dublin where Stephen and Bloom become part of an upside down world. The atmosphere and the setting are extremely blurred by Joyce to create a dreamy, grotesque and surrealistic effect at the intersection of reality and hallucinations. Indeed, Bloom watches over Stephen with all his good intentions and he finds himself in a hostile place where people criticize and make fun of him cruelly when he desperately voices his ideas.

At the beginning of the chapter, Bloom meets his parents in one of his hallucinations and is scolded by his father for denying his background. His father asks, “what you making down this place? Have you no soul?...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?” and Bloom answers, “I suppose so, father” (Ibid: 394). Following this, Bloom’s so-called Jewishness is mocked by A Voice From The Gallery which sings, “Moses, Moses, king of the jews, Wiped his arse in the Daily News.” (Ibid: 410). He is called “the world’s greatest reformer” with “the forehead of a thinker” (Ibid: 427) and is declared as “successor to [his] famous brother!” (Ibid: 428) by John Howard Parnell. Bloom even makes a speech after being announced as Leopold the First: “My beloved subjects, a new era is about to dawn. I, Bloom, tell you verily it is even now at hand. Yea, on the word of a Bloom, ye shall ere long enter into the golden city which is to be, the new Bloomusalem” (Ibid: 429), which makes even the Citizen cheer as, “May the good God bless him!” (Ibid: 431). Bloom as the new Irish man expresses his world view in a more vivid way in the rest of his speech:

“I stand for the reform of municipal morals and the plain ten commandments. New worlds for old. Union of all, jew, moslem and gentile. Three acres and a cow for all children of nature. Saloon motor hearses. Compulsory manual labour for all. All parks open to the public day and night. Electric dishscrubbers. Tuberculosis, lunacy, war and mendicancy must now cease. General amnesty, weekly carnival, with masked licence, bonuses for all, Esperanto the universal brotherhood. No more patriotism of barspongers and dropsical impostors. Free money, free love and a free lay church in a free lay state.” (Joyce, 2010: 433)

This is Bloom’s utopia as a way out of the pressure of both religion and nationalism for Ireland. For a more tolerant world, Bloom suggests “mixed races and mixed marriage” (Ibid: 433). His identity is already a mixture of identities, each of which he keeps his distance equally. Indeed, he is a complete stranger in Ireland: he shares neither the same origins of nationality nor religion with the people around him. Neither his religious beliefs nor his ideas about nationality contain hatred or fanaticism. Additionally, contrary to the prejudices, contempt and hostile manner directed at him, Bloom tries listening opposing ideas and only wants to put his ideas into words without feeling worried. He stands away from any type of rudeness and violence. Moreover, he values being human, love and mutual communication above all in contrast to the common attitude of people who are blindly committed to any religious or nationalist idea. In the brothel, which “seems a mock church” (Lang, 1993: 210), he sounds like a religious or a political leader or a prophet. He replaces their orders with new ones since none of their ideologies brings happiness for Ireland.

Joyce also gives voice to the fundamentalists of the Catholic Church and Irish nationalism who may attack the new Irish man. After his speech, Bloom is accused of being “an episcopalian, an agnostic, an anythingarian seeking to overthrow our holy faith” (Joyce, 2010: 433) by Father Farley. His opponents confront with him violently:

“Fellowchristians and anti Bloomites, the man called Bloom is from the roots of hell, a disgrace to Christian men. ... This vile hypocrite, bronzed with infamy, is the white bull mentioned in the Apocalypse. ... The stake faggots and the caldron of boiling oil are for him.” (Ibid: 435)

Furthermore, he is called to be “as bad as Parnell was” (Ibid: 435). To make him fall into disfavour like Parnell, a doctor announces that “Bloom is a finished example of the new womanly man” (Ibid: 436) and the papers name him as the Antichrist (Ibid: 445).

After all, Bloom fits into none of their definitions. Despite the Citizen's derisive tone in calling him "the new Messiah for Ireland" (Joyce, 2010: 305), he is indeed "a cultured allroundman" (Ibid: 211). He is "assumed by any or known to none. Everyman or Noman" (Ibid: 631). He is neither a hero nor a prophet and not a Messiah at all but only an ordinary man "[representing] the humane values that will lead Ireland out of its twin bondage to Catholicism and Britain" (Schwarz, 1987: 43). Joyce deliberately chooses a non-native hero for a national epic whose "grandfather came from Hungary, his father was a suicide, his wife grew up in Gibraltar, he is cut off from the Jewish as well as the Catholic faith" (Parrinder, 1984: 117). Bloom is Joyce's answer to the western civilization that stands on the shoulders of heroic figures like Odysseus. He has an ordinary job and a family history which is open to speculation. He is not a hero in the classical sense, yet he is a hero since he "repeatedly seeks to cross boundaries and erode divisions, whether of nation, culture or gender" (Watts, 2010: xxiii). Watts compares and contrasts him with Odysseus and concludes that:

"The book's very title obliges us to compare the character of Ulysses-Odysseus, wily, powerful, ruthless and at times murderous, with the character of Bloom, quirkily astute, enquiring, well-meaning, and sympathising; a man who endeavours to learn and to teach, an advocate of peace and harmony. On reflection, we may with reason prefer Bloom: he is, arguably, a hero that modern times need, in the sense that he is a man of good-will and kindness, who seeks a pacific world." (Ibid: xxiii-xxiv)

Bloom is not assertive for being a hero like Odysseus. As an ordinary man he has an ordinary world. What gives him a heroic character is his ability for empathy and compassion in his heart. He thinks everything over and over and tries to understand people and events. He loves Stephen and feels sorry for him when he thinks that "home always breaks up when the mother goes" (Joyce, 2010: 134). He feels mercy when he sees Stephen with "a good pair of boots on" since the "last time...he had his heels on view" (Ibid: 130). He cares for feeding "those poor birds" (Ibid: 135) and stops on the Liffey. He tries to understand women in general when he tries to understand his female cat. His final comment for the cat is seemingly not only intended for the animal but for the women as well: "They call them stupid. They understand what we say better than we understand them. She understands all she wants to" (Ibid: 48). He empathizes with women who have "to give the breast year after year all hours of the night" (Ibid: 143) when he thinks Mrs Purefoy who is in labour in the hospital:

“Three days imagine groaning on a bed with a vinegared handkerchief round her forehead, her belly swollen out! Phew! Dreadful simply! Child’s head too big: forceps. Doubled up inside her trying to butt its way out blindly, groping for the way out. Kill me that would.” (Joyce, 2010: 143)

His beloved ones, both dead and alive, give warmth to his heart. He remembers his “poor mamma, and little Rudy” (Ibid: 99) many times and a bird reminds him of his daughter as a little girl: “Silly-Milly burying the little dead bird in the kitchen matchbox, a daisychain and bits of broken chainies on the grave” (Ibid: 102).

Bloom’s moderate and agreeable character comes up again while he chats with Stephen on the critical issues of the country and society. Similar to his behaviour during their discussion with the Citizen, Bloom keeps his cool headedness while exchanging ideas on Ireland with Stephen towards the end of their day in Eumaeus chapter. Their heated conversation takes its start when Bloom tells Stephen about the Citizen and his own reaction. He narrates all his words and adds that “a soft answer turns away wrath” (Ibid: 551). Bloom’s distinctive approach to the matter of religion and nationalism in Ireland and his mild attitude while discussing them with others are remarkably different from those of Stephen Dedalus. In contrast to Stephen, who sees matters as black and white, has a harshly critical manner and thus is usually impulsive, Bloom has the experience of a father who knows that it is always possible to find another way than bring things to a deadlock:

“It is hard to lay down any hard and fast rules as to right and wrong but room for improvement all round there certainly is though every country, they say, our own distressful included, has the government it deserves. But with a little goodwill all round. It’s all very fine to boast of mutual superiority but what about mutual equality? I resent violence or intolerance in any shape or form. It never reaches anything or stops anything. A revolution must come on the due instalments plan. It’s a patent absurdity on the face of it to hate people because they live round the corner and speak another vernacular, so to speak.” (Ibid: 551)

The opposition between Stephen and Bloom’s characters and mind become more apparent during their conversation. The most obvious difference between the two is Bloom’s optimism versus Stephen’s pessimism. When they are compared in terms of their approach to the problems of their lives and country, Stephen has the disadvantage. “Living in a world of usurpers and serving alien powers, spiritual and temporal” (Gilbert, 1955: 143), Stephen passes through hard times. He lacks belief and trust in

religious and political ideals and social institutions. He bitterly knows that nowadays, “a brother is easily forgotten as an umbrella” (Joyce, 2010: 190). He seems to have brothers around, whom he does not confide in since “they mock to try [him]” (Ibid: 190). Following Mulligan, he is aware that “[he follows] a lubber” (Ibid: 193); however, he does not have the strength to change this fact. What is more, he knows that he is “a spoiled priest” (Ibid: 458). Thus, he is left without any shelter to feel secure. He rarely has optimistic moments in which he reminds himself that “life is many days. This will end” (Ibid: 193).

On the other hand, Arkins states that, “married and with a job, basically good-natured and open to interesting suggestions, Leopold Bloom is much more at ease with life than Stephen Dedalus” (1999: 81). Despite being “a Wandering Jew, an exile” (Gilbert, 1955: 366) insulted and humiliated many times, Bloom keeps his optimistic mood. He believes in the humanistic solutions for the problems of Ireland. Besides, regardless of the unfriendly attitude towards himself, he does not quarrel, fight or feel hostile against anyone. Unlike Odysseus, whom he subverts in every field of life, he is the 20th century hero standing against violence of any kind:

“The novel redefines the traditional concept of a hero to emphasize not only pacifism, but commitment to family ties, concern for the human needs of others, sense of self, tolerance, and decency. Heroism for Joyce is a set of personal values that makes it possible to improve the quality of life ever so slightly for others-as Bloom does for the Dignam family, Mrs Purefoy, and, most of all, for Stephen and Molly.” (Schwarz, 1987: 38)

Showing Stephen alternative and humane ways of solving the Irish problem, Bloom replaces Stephen’s biological father and he himself becomes an alternative father whom Stephen has the chance to choose both for himself and for Ireland. He clearly rounds up what Stephen lacks in his character. Thus, it is even possible to regard him as Stephen’s future. In other words, he stands for what Stephen needs to become both for his personal and national peace. Even Stephen is aware that he needs time. He just wants to “part” now since “the moment is now” but “where then?”, and he answers his own question: “that lies in space which I in time must come to, ineluctably” (Joyce, 2010: 195). However, Joyce does not come up with a clear conclusion. Instead, he leaves the relationship between Stephen and Bloom open ended in case of many possibilities. For this reason, after debating on Jews and Ireland for a while, it becomes

apparent that they stand in opposition to each other. Seeing that they can reach no conclusion, Stephen demands to “change the subject” for “[they] can’t change the country” (Joyce, 2010: 553). Bloom plays along as usual and does not insist on the subject.

The reason behind Bloom’s moderate behaviour is that he knows violence and hostility towards each other solve nothing. Moreover, he understands that ideologies only bring fanaticism that separate a society into conflicting groups. Yet, humanistic values are above all. Towards the end of *Ulysses*, “the only solution proposed for Ireland, we begin to realize, is the humanistic Bloom who is committed to life in the face of death” (Schwarz, 1987: 116). He does so with his continuous optimism and belief in life above all temporary values imposed on people to shape and limit their existence. He is a wise man enough to know that life is continuous unlike the temporariness of ideologies:

“One born every second somewhere. Other dying every second. Since I fed the birds five minutes. Three hundred kicked the bucket. Other three hundred born, washing the blood off, all are washed in the blood of the lamb, bawling maaaaaa. Cityful passing away, other cityful coming, passing away too: other coming on, passing on. Houses, lines of houses, streets, miles of pavements, piledup bricks, stones. Changing hands. This owner, that. Landlord neer dies they say. Other steps into his shoes when he gets his notice to quit. They buy the place up with gold and still they have all the gold. Swindle in it somewhere. Piled up in cities, worn away age after age. Pyramids in sand. Built on bread and onions. Slaves Chinese wall. Babylon. Big stones left. Round towers. Rest rubble, sprawling suburbs, jerry-built, Kerwan’s mushroom houses, built of breeze. Shelter for the night. No one is anything.” (Joyce, 2010: 146)

Bloom’s ideas and lifestyle prove that these temporary values are changeable and replaceable but life and its realities are the essence of human existence. He subverts religious and political/nationalistic ‘myths’ through his tolerant personality and viewpoint, which promises a brighter future for Ireland and makes him the man Ireland needs most.

3.2. Gender Roles and Marriage: Bloom and Molly as Subversions of Odysseus and Penelope

Joyce’s final Homeric subversion is Molly as the subversion of Penelope. Like subversions of Telemachus and Odysseus as Stephen and Bloom, Penelope subverted

into Molly has a lot to say on ‘myths’ criticized by Joyce. However, in contrast to Stephen and Bloom, who deals with religious and political issues in Ireland in previous chapters, Molly mainly focuses on ‘myths’ about gender roles and marriage as an institution that constitute patriarchal metanarratives. This final section deals with her relationship with Bloom within their exchanged gender roles and their ideas on issues like sexuality and marriage as a result of which 20th century relationship between Odysseus and Penelope is pictured.

Homer’s Penelope is the mythical representative of the faithful wife sublimated by the western tradition. She is celebrated for her virtuous character and patience. Odysseus spends twenty years away from home and during this time period Penelope waits for her husband’s return, which makes her the symbol of chastity and loyalty in marriage. She even stands against the disturbance of her suitors and finds a wise way to delay their insistent offers while she waits for Odysseus. Although she is not powerful enough to defend her house against the invasion of these brute men, she manages to remain devoted to her husband. Thus, she becomes the idealized wife figure and she is referred as an example of good name among other mythical women characters. The virtues she represents are summarized in Penelope in the Odyssey by J.W. Mackail by contrasting her with Clytemnestra, wife of Agamemnon, as the symbol of evil wife:

“How rightly minded from of old was she,
Icarus’ child, unblamed Penelope!
How well remembered she her wedded lord
Odysseus! Therefore undecayed shall be
Her fame for worth, among mankind so long
Shall the immortals make a lovely song
Of chaste Penelope, not like to her,
Tyndareus’ child, who plotted deeds of wrong,
Slaying her wedded lord; with loathing fraught
Shall be her lay upon the earth, who brought
Ill fame on the whole sex of womankind
Even on such as righteousness have wrought.” (1916: 18)

The contrast between two women is mentioned by Odysseus in *The Book of the Dead* chapter of Odyssey. Meeting Clytemnestra and Agamemnon in Hades, Odysseus listens to Agamemnon talking about his wife, , that “there is nothing more degraded or shameful than a woman who can contemplate and carry out deeds like the hideous crime of murdering the husband of her youth” (Homer, 1991: 172). Agamemnon does not

neglect to praise “Icarus’ daughter” who is “far too loyal in her thoughts and feelings” (Homer, 1991: 172). Thus, by being contrasted with Clytemnestra, Penelope gains a mythical state as the stereotype for the ideal woman.

Marriage relationship between Odysseus and Penelope and the gender roles they represent within patriarchal tradition have created stereotypes that are fundamental in western culture. These stereotypes lie at the bottom of western culture as timeless mythological models. Numerous characters have been shaped after them and their mythical story has inspired the plot stories for writers throughout the centuries in literature. The stereotypes created by them shape ‘myths’ mainly about the cultural male and female gender roles and marriage as an institution constituted by the patriarchal structure of the western tradition.

The gender roles are distinctive and firmly set by the patriarchal world of epic. In Odyssey, men are associated with masculine deeds like war, ruling, heroic adventures and with the world outside the domestic sphere while women keep themselves busy with household chores like washing or weaving as Penelope does. Odysseus and similarly all men in Odyssey always have their dinner ready and maids help them have their bath and provide them with clean clothes. Odysseus is never worried about these simple everyday tasks as a masculine hero with more important problems to deal with.

However, in Bloom and Molly’s marriage, both characters trespass the borders of gender roles set by patriarchal rules and their marriage relationship is also a subversion of the idealized marriage as an institution. By subverting the gender ‘myths’ attributed to men and women, Joyce challenges the idealization of marriage in Ulysses where gender roles are seemingly exchanged between the husband and the wife. Bloom’s day starts with domestic activities when Molly is still in bed. While preparing the breakfast, he suddenly finds out that there is nothing for breakfast according to Molly’s taste. He climbs upstairs being careful not to make too much noise and tries to learn what she wishes for breakfast:

“On quietly creaky boots he went up the staircase to the hall, paused by the bedroom door. She might like something tasty. Thin bread and butter she likes in the morning. Still perhaps: once in a way.
He said softly in the bare hall:

- I am going round the corner. Be back in a minute.
And when he had heard his voice say it he added:
- You don't want anything for breakfast?
A sleepy soft grunt answered:
- Mn." (Joyce, 2010: 49)

Before he leaves the house, he finds out that he forgot his key in his trousers' pocket, but does not go upstairs again for there is "no use disturbing her" because of the "creaky wardrobe" (Ibid: 50). After shopping, he returns home and brings Molly's breakfast to her bed.

During the day Bloom does his best not to forget the lotion Molly ordered: "O and that lotion mustn't forget" (Ibid: 253). Meanwhile, he tries to forget about Molly and Blazes Boylan: "Think no more about that" (Ibid: 136). Bloom seems to know about their affair and plans for that particular afternoon for some time; yet he never shows any sign of it to Molly. He feels anxious and curious about a letter arrived for Molly in the morning but Molly simply admits that it is from Boylan and explains that "he's bringing the programme" (Ibid: 56) for business. Bloom thinks about Molly and Boylan together at home in the afternoon one last time after realizing that his watch stopped at half past four:

"Funny my watch stopped at half past four... Was that just when he, she?
O, he did. Into her. She did. Done.
Ah!" (Ibid: 334)

Bloom reaction to Molly's adultery is contrary to the usual and expected behaviour of a husband. He even realistically justifies Molly for there has not been any sexual attraction between him and his wife since their son's death. In other words, unlike Odysseus who expects loyalty from Penelope after being away from home for twenty years, Bloom acknowledges Molly to be somehow right and he "ask[s] no questions and [he'll] hear no lies" (Ibid: 238).

Bloom's tolerance and passivity sometimes pictures an unmanly character that contradicts the manliness emphasized in Odysseus' character. The contrast between Bloom and Odysseus, as the representative of masculinity pictured by the patriarchal culture, is parodied by Joyce with Bloom's cat instead of Odysseus' dog, Argos:

“The cat walked stiffly round a leg of the table with tail on high.

-Mkgnao!

-O, there you are, Mr Bloom said, turning from the fire.

The cat mewed in answer and stalked again stiffly round a leg of the table, mewing. Just how she stalks aver my writingtable. Prr. Scratch my head. Prr.

Mr Bloom watched curiously, kindly, the lithe black form. Clean to see: the gloss of her sleek hide, the white button under the butt of her tail, the green flashing eyes. He bent down to her, his hands on his knees.

-Milk for the pussens, he said.

-Mrkgnao! The cat cried.” (Joyce, 2010: 48)

The cat being a more feminine character when compared with the dog emphasizes the difference between Bloom and Odysseus.

According to David Cotter, “it is passivity and accessibility that are identified as Bloom[‘s] femininity” (2003: 140). Indeed, Bloom is neither a feminine nor a passive character at all although “in comparison with the lofty, heroic stature of Homer’s Odysseus, Leopold may at first seem belittled, demeaned; virtually a pimp, collaborating in his wife’s rather sordid lifestyle” (Watts, 2010: xxiii). It is also true that Bloom avoids sexual intercourse with his wife for a very long time. When it comes to his passivity, unlike the rational Odysseus, Bloom is a man of contemplation and emotions. Cedric Watts suggests that “Bloom is as effective with words as Ulysses with a spear” (Ibid: xxiv). While Odysseus is characterized as a powerful, political, tricky man famous for his rationality, Bloom becomes prominent with his gentle, tolerant, kind, understanding and empathetic character. Arkins summarizes how the two characters are different from each other as follows:

“Leopold Bloom is very different from Odysseus: he is not a king, but a canvasser for advertisements; he is a non-practising Jew rather than a pious Greek; he is not assisted by the gods and does not hear Tiresias prophesying his Return; he has unconsummated sexual encounters with mortal women rather than consummated sexual encounters with immortal women; he is not crafty, and he is passive in the face of his wife’s adultery with Boylan, the Suitor, whose pervasive presence in *Ulysses* corresponds to that of the Suitors in the *Odyssey*.” (1999: 66)

In contrast to Odysseus’ masculinity, Bloom is pictured in a parodical way by revealing his most intimate moments within the course of daily events, so that he subverts both the idealism embodied by Odysseus and the roles of a married man and his relations with other women. Actually, Bloom’s parodical picture is based on the facts of being

human. Limits and transgressions of human body haven't been questioned in a real sense in the western literary tradition, including Homer's epic world. However, human body and its functions are central to Joycean parody, which pushes the established limits. Although Homer describes some intimate moments of Odysseus **who** is too shy "to take [his] bath with [the ladies] looking on" (Homer, 1991: 91) and looks so "radiant with grace and beauty" after having a bath and "wash[ing] and rub[bing] himself with oil" (Ibid: 92), it is still limited to the purpose of emphasizing either his perfect character or godlike appearance. However, Joyce does not hang back from focusing on the private details of Bloom's life, which may be found disturbing and undignifying compared with those of Odysseus. For instance, the readers of Joyce witness Bloom reading a newspaper in the toilet when "he allowed his bowels to ease themselves quietly as he read" and "seated calm above his own rising smell" (Joyce, 2010: 61). Or, it is possible to spy on Bloom when he urinates together with Stephen on the street in the middle of the night (Ibid: 607). Bloom's thoughts trespass the limits of common knowledge about what a man can or cannot comment on. Thus, his mind freely speculates about the menstruation dates of the women around him: "How many women in Dublin have it today? ... why don't all women menstruate at the same time with same moon, I mean? Depends on the time they were born, I suppose. Or all start scratch then get out of step. Sometimes Molly and Milly together" (Ibid: 333). Furthermore, in contrast to the virtuous Odysseus and princess Nausicaa, who is afraid of the "unpleasant gossip" which "might give [her] a bad name" if she "associate[s] with men before being properly married," (Homer, 1991: 93), Bloom and Gerty MacDowell share some privacy on the beach. Bloom masturbates watching under Gerty MacDowell's skirt and experiences an orgasm while feeling some kind of relief and guilt together (Joyce, 2010: 330-331). That is beyond the scope of the original Homeric text where Odysseus sheds light on his relationship with other women: "The divine Calypso was certainly for keeping me in her cavern home because she yearned for me to be her husband and with the same object Circe, the Aeaean witch, detained me in her palace; but never for a moment did they win my heart" (Homer, 1991: 125). Joyce expands his subversion in Nausicaa chapter to include Gerty MacDowell for whom sexuality is not a taboo "so long as [she] didn't do the other thing before being married (Joyce, 2010: 331). It certainly damages the representation of Nausicaa as a virtuous female character as well as "the totemized virginal figure in Western civilization" (Schwarz, 1987: 188). Besides using her "to ridicule society and subvert its virginity-worshipping culture"

(Schneeman, 2007: 6), Joyce adds a bodily subversion to Gerty MacDowell that contrasts the flawless beauty of princess Nausicaa. The readers of Joyce learn that Gerty is “lame” together with Bloom while he “watched her as she limped away” (Joyce, 2010: 332). And finally the simultaneous rejoice aroused by the fireworks of the church and Bloom’s orgasm adds a parodical touch to Joyce’s linking religious/spiritual and bodily satisfaction together.

Molly, as subverted Penelope, takes her share of the exposure of these private moments and bodily details as well, through which she subverts the female gender role and marriage as an institution. Despite being ironically described as “the chaste spouse of Leopold: Marion of the bountiful bosoms” (*Ibid*: 288), Molly’s mind is revealed by Joyce in Penelope chapter with utmost honesty, which is full of ideas that the idealized virtuous female type of the western culture is never expected to have. For instance, unlike the chaste female stereotype, Molly frankly narrates her experiences with men. She remembers “the first man kissed [her] under the Moorish wall” (*Ibid*: 660) and how she “had that white blouse on open at the front to encourage him as much as [she] could without too openly” (*Ibid*: 661). Her most sincere thoughts are not only about men but also about the feminine issues like childbirth. But most strikingly, Molly is caught while making obscene comments on the bodies of men and women:

“the same in case of twins theyre supposed to represent beauty placed up there like those statues in the museum one of them pretending to hide it with her hand are they so beautiful of course compared with what a man looks like with his two bags full and his other thing hanging down out of him or sticking up at you like a hatrack no wonder they hid it with a cabbageleaf the woman is beauty of course” (*Ibid*: 654)

Such a comment is certainly impossible to hear from Homer’s Penelope, the embodiment of chastity and virtue in the western culture rather than a woman of flesh and blood. She is experienced enough to know that “for being a woman as soon as youre old [men] might as well throw you out in the bottom of the ashpit” (*Ibid*: 660). But, she denies such fate because although Bloom “thinks [she is] finished out and laid on the shelf well [she is] not no nor anything like it” (*Ibid*: 667). after eleven years without any sexual experience following their son’s death, Molly decides to fulfill the demands of her body and plans an afternoon with her concert manager Blazes Boylan unlike Penelope who “is still living in [Odysseus’] home” even twenty years after her

husband left and “has schooled her heart to patience, though her eyes are never free from tears as the slow nights and days pass sorrowfully by” (Homer, 1991: 164).

The marriage beds of both couples become the symbol of the contrast between Penelope and Molly. While Odysseus and Penelope share a bed built around an olive tree and is the symbol of stability (Ibid: 349), Bloom and Molly’s bed jingle through the chapters for various reasons. Arkins emphasizes that Molly’s bed is “very different from that of Penelope and Odysseus: whereas their heroic bed is noted for its marvellous construction, Molly’s bed is noted for the way it jingles” (1999: 81). Joyce mentions the jingle over and over: “ [Molly turns] over and the loose brass quoits of the bedstead jingle” (Joyce, 2010: 49), jingling voice is heard during the Sirens chapter in which Bloom meets Blazes Boylan just before he meets Molly. The jingles continuously remind him of their approaching date in their marriage bed, Molly complains about “the lumpy old jingly bed” (Ibid: 672) because of which “they could hear [Boylan and herself] away over the other side of the park” and confesses that she “suggested to put the quilt on the floor with the pillow under [her] bottom” (Ibid: 670) to prevent the jingling noise. Bloom and Molly’s bed is “the bed of conception and of birth, of consummation of marriage and of breach of marriage, of sleep and of death” (Ibid: 634). However, the bed Odysseus built is the symbol for his marriage to Penelope. Finally, Penelope’s bed becomes the subject of a test for ensuring the identity of Odysseus whereas Molly even does not bother herself to clean the sheets after Boylan leaves home. Thus, she metaphorically profanes the marriage bed.

She not only metaphorically but also literally stains the bed with her unexpected menstruation blood flowing out of her body. Similar to Bloom’s physical reactions as a result of his orgasm narrated by Joyce in all details, Molly’s menstruation and her thoughts about menstruation are narrated with complete directness. Seeing the blood, she is glad to learn that “anyhow he didn’t make [her] pregnant” (Ibid: 670).

In addition to her frankness about both her body and feelings, what gives Molly her subversive feature is the fact that she has the courage to shake the basic foundations of the patriarchal culture of the society which she belongs to. Unlike Homer’s Penelope, whose inner thoughts we are completely unaware since she seems to admit how she is supposed to behave in silence, Molly’s discourse has strikingly brave comments on

sexuality, marriage and women in general “in which the authority of patriarchy is destabilised and subverted” (Downes, 2006: 156):

“they always want to see a stain on the bed to know you're a virgin for them all that's troubling them they're such fools too you could be a widow or divorced 40 times over a daub of red ink would do or blackberry juice no that's too purpley.” (Joyce, 2010: 670)

Her mocking tone turns into defiance towards the end of the chapter where she dreams about telling Bloom the truth about herself and Boylan:

“Ill let him know if thats what he wanted that his wife is fucked yes and damn well fucked too up to my neck nearly not by him 5 or 6 times hand running theres the mark of his spunk on the clean sheet I wouldnt bother to even iron it out that ought to satisfy him if you don't believe me feel my belly unless I made him stand there and put him into me Ive a mind to tell him every scrap and make him do it out in front of me serve him right its all his own fault if I am an adulteress.” (Ibid: 680)

She criticises marriage as an institution because marriage in western culture is based on patriarchy and those who support this institution “don't know what it is to be a woman and a mother” (Ibid: 678). However, they still make judgements about women and their world as if women need a control mechanism over themselves. Molly is conscious about the facts of marriage. Parrinder lays stress on the limits of her awareness and states that “Molly remains deeply aware of her married state, and has no thought of giving up its responsibilities. Even her adultery has taken place under the marital roof and in the connubial bed” (1984: 161). She knows her role as well and “as sleep approaches, her mood, with one interruption, softens. After all, she will give Poldy ‘one more chance’; she will go out early marketing and bring him his breakfast in bed, play the faithful Penelope” (Gilbert, 1955: 394). Molly is in stark opposition to Penelope, which gives Joyce the opportunity to question the myth of the woman-as-angel and to replace it with woman-in-flesh in Molly's character. All in all, parodies related to human body in Ulysses create a sharp contrast with the timeless and perfect statues, which Bloom sees when he visits the museum. This contrast indicates the ugly truth versus the ideal representations as repeatedly.

Bloom and Molly bring a fresh look at the issues related with patriarchal gender roles and marriage institution. Their flexibility questions and subverts the ‘myths’ about ideal men, women and marriages as an alternative to the firmly set borders of gender

issues and marriage institution in patriarchal societies. Bloom's thoughts in his bed late at night summarize the alternative he and Molly offer instead of the fixed rules of patriarchy. When Bloom examines his feelings looking for jealousy after thinking over Molly and Boylan, he reacts contrary to the expectations of the patriarchal society. He looks into his choices and concludes that he will remain calm: "assassination, never, as two wrongs did not make one right. Duel by combat, no. Divorce, not now" (Joyce, 2010: 636). What is more important than Bloom's decision is the fact that it depends on his free will as opposed to Odysseus, who abandons his weapons and spare the lives of his enemies on Athena's command to "stop this disastrous fight and separate at one before blood is shed" (Homer, 1991: 370). Watts concludes that "instead of the carnage of *The Odyssey's* conclusion, instead of the house as the bloody battlefield where warriors massacre the suitors and hang the hapless maids, Molly secures, on the whole, a victory for relative tolerance, for resourcefulness, honesty and vitality" (2010: xxxvi).

CONCLUSION

This study has investigated the subversion of myths through parody in James Joyce's *Ulysses* in order to criticize the domination of religious, imperial, national and cultural hegemony represented by the Catholic Church, the British Empire and the patriarchal institutions of western civilization in Ireland. Joyce primarily targets these institutions for he believes that they promote 'myths' about religious and political ideas as well as about the issues related with marriage and gender roles within Irish society. He not only directs serious criticism at the problems Ireland faces in relation to these 'myths' but also offers alternatives for the systems and values he subverted. Thus he aims to rewrite an Irish epic and define a new Irish identity.

Joyce's utilization of myths is usually regarded as a part of the modern critical theory outlined by T.S. Eliot in his *mythical method*. Eliot's method is based on the principle of mythopoetic thought based on the assumption that the truth is universally taken for granted and monologic since its validity cannot be questioned and challenged. Early 20th century literary criticism was marked with a search for order and security in literature since people were living "in fear of the consequences of what [their] forefathers unironically called 'progress': urbanization, technology, and so on" (Hutcheon, 2000: 73). Due to the disappointment caused by the collapse of the promises of modernity, they needed a firm ground to bring their shattered world together. The popularity of myths was offered as a response to the problem of modernity. Eliot's method offered the restoration and regeneration of tradition as well as its imposition on the society through literature. To be more precise, his attempt was a conservative authorization of tradition and writing history in a monopolistic understanding by leaning on the metanarratives reinforced by myths.

However, despite the rising popularity of the myth studies as a tool for restoring authority in the first half of the 20th century, Joyce preferred to employ a subversive approach towards myths. Joyce's attempt to rewrite an Irish epic and to create a new Irish identity for Ireland through subversion of the authoritative 'myths' corresponds to Roland Barthes' argument that "the best weapon against myth is perhaps to mythify it in its turn, and to produce an *artificial myth*" (Barthes, 1991: 134). Thus, this study relies on a Barthesian reading of 'myths' and explores Joyce and his work, *Ulysses*, as a

subversive writer and a subversive text, which offers a new reading of Joyce and Ulysses even nearly after a hundred years of its first publication.

Joyce utilizes parody as a literary device in Ulysses which is usually defined as a double edged device that creates ambiguity and controversy. Therefore, one of the primary outcomes of this study has been the light shed on Joyce's subversive attitude through parody in his use of 'myths' in Ulysses, which has been elicited and supported with the examples from the text. Joyce allows the forbidden and repressed elements of the nature of mankind to subvert the authoritative powers of the Catholic Church and the British Empire which produce canonical stories that pass as *history*, and the forced values of the patriarchal western culture that pass as unquestionable norms. His approach to 'myths' is not directed to a desire to restore tradition but rather bringing it down. Hutcheon emphasizes that 'myth' in Joyce "is not a matter of nostalgic imitation of past models; it is a stylistic confrontation, a modern recoding which establishes difference at the heart of similarity" (2000: 8). That being the case, Ulysses is an outstanding piece because it bravely "puts in question its own finally quite ironic gesture toward the kind of mythic replication erected by Eliot as the novel's ultimate organizing device" (Meisel, 1987: 144). Thus, Joyce employs a parodical approach to 'myths' for his subversive end in Ulysses and states his deep contempt for colonizing oppression of Britain, Roman Catholic domination of Irish spiritual life and hypocrisy in social values.

Ulysses is, as Terry Eagleton calls it, "scandalous and subversive" because it destroys the "bourgeois myth of immanent meaning" (1990: 375). Despite his employment of classical myths as well as his references to the classical literary texts and canonical authors of western culture, "Joyce's attitude towards his sources in high culture is frequently critical, and his dialogues with his literary predecessors tend to undermine the authority of high culture" (Booker, 1997: 206). As mentioned earlier, in contrast to the general tendencies of the modern writers towards a return to the past in search of something refreshing, Joyce rejects the tyranny of the past and this is proved by his subversive challenge of the authority.

Joyce subverts the Homeric Telemachus and Shakespearean Hamlet in the character of Stephen as well as 'myths' related with religious and imperial authorities in

Ireland. Thus, he displays the pessimistic atmosphere of Ireland that suffers under the maltreatment of the Church, the Empire and his own people and to reflect his own feelings about this matter. He continues his criticism of religious ‘myths’ as well as political ones in the character of Bloom. Yet, Bloom as an outsider in Irish society is interested more in the understanding of nationalism in Ireland. Contrary to Stephen’s hesitation and pessimism, Bloom offers an optimist picture of Ireland based on diversity and is pictured as the new kind of Irish man whom Ireland needs according to Joyce. Bloom does not only deal with religion and nationalism, but also he and Molly subvert the ‘myths’ about gender roles and marriage within patriarchal western culture. Molly is pictured as the subversion of Homeric Penelope and reveals the exchanged gender roles and alternative understanding of marriage between Molly and Bloom in contrast to the established rules of the patriarchy.

Indeed, Joyce’s point in Ulysses is that his characters’ symbolic functions and the concepts they represent are subverted by their human nature. In other words, Stephen’s despair and hesitation, Bloom’s 20th century heroism far different from an epic hero, and Molly’s justification of her cheating on her husband are all human experiences, which millions go through every day. Contrary to the frozen world of ‘myths’ and epic that cannot tolerate variations, everyday reality functions in a flexible way and offers diversities. It is this flexibility that gives Joyce hope over the artificial and forced values of an idealized world. Joyce believes that it is Bloom’s humanism, Stephen’s creative imagination and Molly’s freedom of mind that will create hope for Ireland as affirmed by Molly’s famous “yes” (Joyce, 2010: 682) which closes Joyce’s/Stephen’s Irish epic with an optimistic glimpse to the future.

Although Joyce is commonly considered as a modern writer, it is also suggested in this dissertation that Joyce is beyond modernism. Like Shakespeare, whose texts gained a Victorian character rather than Elizabethan in Joyce’s time, the modernist Joyce is now a postmodernist for his postmodern readers. Joyce is postmodern simply because he subverts the use of ‘myths’ in literature and stands against the narrative traditions. He voices his ideas and protest in Ulysses in a way that his style corresponds with the postmodern tendency “to transgress boundaries, destabilize hierarchies, and question authority of all kinds” (Booker, 1991: 23). This is exactly the method of Joyce in writing Ulysses. Joyce is also postmodern because his writing can be defined “not as

a break with romantic and modernist assumptions but rather as a logical culmination of the premises of these earlier movements” (Graff, 1995: 32). Furthermore, his writing reflects the relationship between modernism and postmodernism as confusion versus harmony or chaos versus order. Joyce as a postmodern writer focuses on displacement of concepts. At this point, a legitimate question asking why Joyce reflects the waste and chaos, represented by the ruined tower, rubbish on the beach and grotesque bodily details, in contrast to Eliot who searches for order, brings light on the matter. Indeed, the answer lies in Joyce’s subversive attitude. Joyce does not disregard chaos and confusion; on the contrary he embraces them as a part of life. He does not take pains to make things seem different or better than they actually are. Instead, he is loyal to the realities of life and emphasizes them wide open. In this manner, he becomes a part of the postmodern movement in reaction to the modernist writing seeking for order, value and meaning against the chaos and fragmentation imposed by the modernist realities and outcomes of industrial society. Chaos that caused anxiety for Eliot becomes the source of hope for Joyce since he regards this chaos a potential for polyphony and diversity.

Offering new forms and possibilities for 20th century novel, Joyce certainly has a significant place in literature. Besides, his subversive stance concerning religious, political and cultural matters in Ireland makes Joyce a highly political and ideological writer both in his time and today. Ulysses, a text of constant dynamism which is impossible to be fixed in single meaning, reflects Joyce’s belief in polyphony which he desires to have in Ireland. He rejects any kind of authority whether it is religious, political or cultural and offers solutions for his country based on tolerance, humanism and diversity. Thus, his rejection of authority aims to rewrite an Irish epic, a national history based on the unspeakables of authority, rather than an escape from social or political reality. Furthermore, suggestions put forward by Joyce for the problems related with authoritative forces that insist on monologism and the ‘myths’ created by them may offer hope for countries with similar problems. These suggestions may even inspire solutions for the countries which face the dangers of monologism including our own and finally point at peace, which is hidden in diversity and the shared human values. Joyce’s worldview puts forward the idea that nothing is unchangeable and absolute except humanity and being human is only possible with having flaws.

REFERENCES

- Annaidh, S.M. (2002). *Irish History: from prehistoric times to the present day*, Parragon Books: UK.
- Aristotle (1895). *Poetics*, Courier Dover Publications.
- Arkins, B. (1999). *Greek and Roman Themes in Joyce*, The Edwin Mellen Press, USA.
- Bakhtin, M. M. and Emerson, C. (ed.), (1999). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, (Trans: Caryl Emerson), University of Minnesota Press, USA.
- Bakhtin, M. M. and Hoquist, M. (ed.), (2008). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*, (Trans: Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist), University of Texas Press, USA.
- Barber, B. A. (1983-4). "Appropriation/Expropriation: Convention or Intervention", *Parachute*, 33, 29-39.
- Barry, P. (2002). *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, Manchester University Press, UK.
- Barthes, R. (1953). *Writing Degree Zero*, (Trans: Annette Lavers), Hill and Wang, New York.
- Barthes, R. (1991). *Mythologies*, (Trans: Annette Lavers), The Noonday Press, New York.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and Simulation*, (Trans: Sheila Faria Glaser), University of Michigan Press, USA.
- Beckett, J. C. (1966). *The Making of Modern Ireland: 1603-1923*, Faber and Faber, London.
- Bernstein, R. (ed.), (1985). *Habermas and Modernity*, the MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Blanning, T.C.W. (ed.), (1996). *The Oxford Illustrated History of Modern Europe*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Booker, M. K. (1991). *Techniques of Subversion in Modern Literature: Transgression, Abjection, and the Carnavalesque*, University of Florida Press, USA.
- Booker, M. K. (1997). *Joyce, Bakhtin, and the Literary Tradition: Toward a Comparative Cultural Poetics*, The University of Michigan Press, USA.
- Borach, G. and J. Prescott. (1954). "Conversations with James Joyce", *College English*, Volume 15, No. 16: National Council of Teachers of English, 325-327.
- Cassirer, E. (1946). *The Myth of the State*, Yale University Press: USA.
- Castle, G. (2001). *Modernism and the Celtic Revival*, Cambridge University Press, UK.

- Chase, R. (1969). *Quest for Myth*, Greenwood Press Publishers, New York.
- Cotter, D. (2003). *James Joyce & the Perverse Ideal*, Routledge, Great Britain.
- Coupe, L. (2009). *Myth: The New Critical Idiom*, Routledge, USA.
- Csapo, E. (2009). *Theories of Mythology*, Blackwell Publishing, USA.
- Deane, S. and Attridge, D. (ed.), (2004). *The Cambridge Companion to James Joyce*, Cambridge University Press, USA.
- Dentith, S. (2002). *Parody*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Donnelly, J. S. (ed.), (2004). *Encyclopedia of Irish History and Culture: Volume I*, Macmillan Reference, USA.
- Doty, W. G. (1986). *Mythography: The Study of Myths and Rituals*, University of Alabama Press, Alabama.
- Downes, G. J. (2006). "Indifferent Weib": Giordano Bruno and the Heretical Mode of Vision in "Penelope", *Joyce, "Penelope" and the Body (European Joyce Studies 17)* (ed. Richard Brown), Rodopi: Amsterdam and New York.
- Duffy, E. (1994). *The Subaltern Ulysses*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Eagleton, T. (1990). *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Eagleton, T. (2005). *Literary Theory*, Blackwell Publishing, USA.
- Eco, U. (1989). *The Middle Ages of James Joyce: The Aesthetics of Chaosmos*, (Trans: Ellen Esrock), Hutchinson Radius, UK.
- Eliot, T. S. (1950). "Tradition and the Individual Talent", *The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism*, Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Eliot, T. S. and Kermode, F. (ed.), (1988). "Ulysses, Order, and Myth", *Selected Prose of T.S. Eliot: The Centenary Edition 1888-1988*, Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Ellmann, R. (1972). *Ulysses on the Liffey*, Oxford University Press, USA.
- Ellmann, R. (ed.), (1992). *Selected Letters of James Joyce*, Faber and Faber, London.
- Eysteinsson, A. (1990). *The Concept of Modernism*, Cornell University Press, USA.
- Faulkner, P. (1977). *Modernism*, Methuen & Co., Great Britain.
- Forrest-Thomson, V. (1978). *Poetic Artifice: A Theory of Twentieth-Century Poetry*, Manchester University Press, Great Britain.
- Frank, J. (1945). "Spatial Form in Modern Literature: An Essay in Three Parts", *The Sewanee Review*, Volume 53: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 643-653.
- Freud, S. (1908). "Creative Writers and Day-Dreaming", *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Volume IX (1906-1908): Jensen's 'Gradiva' and Other Works, 141-154.

- Gardiner, M. (1992). *The Dialogics of Critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology*, Routledge, USA.
- Genette, G. (1997). *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, (Trans: Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky), University of Nebraska Press, USA.
- Gilbert, S. (1955). *James Joyce's Ulysses: A Study*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Glazener, N. (2001). "Dialogic Subversion: Bakhtin, The Novel and Gertrude Stein", *Bakhtin and Cultural Theory* (ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd), Manchester University Press, UK.
- Gould, E. (1981). *Mythical Intentions in Modern literature*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Graff, G. (1995). *Literature Against Itself: Literary Ideas in Modern Society*, Elephant Paperbacks, USA.
- Graves, R. (1992). *The Greek Myths*, Penguin Books, England.
- Habermas, J. and Passerin d'Entréves M. and Benhabib S. (ed.), (1997). "Modernity: An Unfinished Project", *Habermas and the Unfinished Project of Modernity*, MIT Press, USA.
- Halsey, W. D. (ed.), (1986). *Macmillan Contemporary Dictionary*, ABC Yayinevi, İstanbul.
- Harvey, D. (1992). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Blackwell Publishers, USA.
- Hassan, I. (2001). "From Postmodernism to Postmodernity: The Local/Global Context", *Philosophy and Literature*, Vol. 25 (No.1), 1-13.
- Hewitt, D. (1988). *English Fiction of the Early Modern Period 1890-1940*, Longman Inc., USA.
- Hodgart, M. (1978). *James Joyce: A Student's Guide*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Homer. (1991). *The Odyssey*, (Trans: E.V. Rieu), Penguin Books, England.
- Hutcheon, L. (1986). "The Politics of Postmodernism: Parody and History", *Cultural Critique*, No. 5, 179-20.
- Hutcheon, L. (2000). *A Theory of Parody: The Teachings of Twentieth-Century Art Forms*, Illinois, USA.
- Hutcheon, L. (2001). *The Politics of Postmodernism*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Hutcheon, L. (2004). *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.

- Jameson, F. (2002). *A Singular Modernity*, Verso Books, UK.
- Jones, P. V. (1991). *Homer: The Odyssey Introduction by Peter V. Jones*, Penguin Books, England.
- Joyce, J. (2010). *Ulysses*, Wordsworth Editions, Great Britain.
- Joyce, J. (2011). *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Pergamino Publishing, Turkey.
- Joyce, P.W. (1903). *A Concise History of Ireland*, Longmans, Green and Co., New York.
- Jung, C. (1966). *The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature*, Princeton University Press, New York.
- Lang, F. K. (1993). *Ulysses and the Irish God*, Bucknell University Press, USA.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1988). *The Jealous Potter*, Chicago.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (2001). *Myth and Meaning*, Routledge, London.
- Lewis, P. (2000). *Modernism, Nationalism, and the Novel*, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Lodge, D. (1977). *The Modes of Modern Writing: Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature*, Willmer Brothers Limited, Great Britain.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester University Press, UK.
- Mackail, J. W. (1916). *Penelope in the Odyssey*, University Press in Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Madden, F. (2010). *Understand Irish History*, McGraw-Hill Education.
- Malinowski, B. (1948). *Magic, Science, and Religion and Other Essays*, Anchor, New York.
- Malpas, S. (2005). *The Postmodern*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Meisel, P. (1987). *The Myth of the Modern: A Study in British Literature and Criticism After 1850*, Yale University Press, Great Britain.
- Meletinsky, E. M. (1998). *The Poetics of Myth*, (Trans: Guy Lavone and Alexander Sacletsky), Garland Publishing Inc., New York.
- Miles, G. (1999). *Classical Mythology in English Literature*, Routledge, USA.
- Morgan, K. (2004). *Myth and Philosophy: From the Presocratics to Plato*, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Nolan, E. (2002). *James Joyce and Nationalism*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.

- O'Flaherty, W. D. (1988). *Other Peoples' Myths: The Cave of Echoes*, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.
- Onopa, R. (1973). "The End of Art as a Spiritual Project", *TriQuarterly*, No. 26, 363.
- Parrinder, P. (1984). *James Joyce*, Cambridge University Press, Great Britain.
- Parry, A. M. (1966). *Have we Homer's Iliad?*, Yale University Press.
- Parsons, D. (2006). *Theorists of the Modernist Novel: James Joyce, Dorothy Richardson, Virginia Woolf*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Pelling, N. (2005). *Anglo-Irish Relations, 1798-1922*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Plato. (1968). *The Republic of Plato*, (Trans: Allan Bloom), Basic Books, USA.
- Rosenfield, C. (1967). *Paradise of Snakes: An Archetypal Analysis of Conrad's Political Novels*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Saussure, F. (1959). *Course in General Linguistics*, (Trans: W. Baskin), Philosophical Library, New York.
- Schneeman, C. (2007). "Pornography, Pleasure, and Policing Female Sexuality in Joyce's *Ulysses*", *Irish Studies Capstone Essay*.
- Schein, S.L. (1996). *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays*, Princeton Academic Press: USA.
- Schork, R. J. (1998). *Greek and Hellenic Culture in Joyce*, University Press of Florida, USA.
- Schwarz, D.R. (1987). *Reading Joyce's Ulysses*, The Macmillan Press, Great Britain.
- Tindall, W. Y. (1995). *A Reader's Guide to James Joyce*, Syracuse University Press, USA.
- Tylor, E.B. (1871). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*, Bradbury, Evans, and Co., London.
- Wang, Q. (2011). "Ulysses: The Novel, The Author and the Translators", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Volume I, No. I: Academy Publisher, Finland, 21-27.
- Watts, C. (2010). "Introduction", *Ulysses*, Wordsworth Editions, Great Britain.
- Waugh, P. (2001). *Metafiction: The Theory and Practice of Self-Conscious Fiction*, Taylor & Francis e-Library.

VITA

Name and Surname: Meltem UZUNOĞLU ERTEN

Mother's name: Asuman

Father's name: Tevfik

Birth Place and Date: Denizli/1982

B.A.: Ege University
Faculty of Letters
English Language and Literature Department

Graduation Date: 2004

M.A.: Pamukkale University
Faculty of Letters
English Language and Literature Department

Graduation Date: 2008

Work Place and Position: Pamukkale University
School of Foreign Languages -Instructor